

# SOCIATRY

*Journal of  
Group and Intergroup Therapy*

PSYCHODRAMA

SOCIOMETRIC METHODS

RE-GROUPING

ACTION METHODS

RE-TRAINING

THERAPEUTIC FILMS

SOCIAL CATHARSIS

SOCIODRAMA

Volume I

JUNE, 1947

Number 2

Manuscripts and communications to the editors should be addressed to SOCIATRY, Beacon, N. Y., and *not to an individual*. Unsolicited manuscripts which are not accepted for publication will be returned if accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

# SOCIATRY

*Journal of Group and Intergroup Therapy*

SUBSCRIPTION \$5.00 YEARLY

FOREIGN POSTAGE \$1.00 ADDITIONAL

CURRENT SINGLE ISSUES \$2.00

SINGLE BACK COPIES \$2.50

*Make checks payable to Beacon House Inc.*

---

Published quarterly by Beacon House Inc. at Beacon, N. Y., in March, June, September and December. Address communications to: Beacon House Inc., Beacon, N. Y., or 101 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

---

# SOCIATRY

*Journal of Group and Intergroup Therapy*

Volume I

JUNE, 1947

Number 2

J. L. MORENO, EDITOR

Beacon, New York

ZERKA TOEMAN, MANAGING EDITOR

Psychodramatic Institute

New York City

## CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

LEWIS BARBATO

University of Denver

ROGER G. BARKER

Clark University

MARGARET E. BARRON

Federal Security Agency

KENNETH D. BENNE

Columbia University

LELAND P. BRADFORD

National Education Association

ARTHUR W. CABLE

University of Arizona

HUBERT S. COFFEY

University of California at Berkeley

LLOYD ALLEN COOK

Wayne University

PAUL CORNYETZ

Brooklyn College

MAYHEW DERRYBERRY

U. S. Public Health Service,

Washington, D. C.

H. V. DICKS

Leeds University, England

ERNEST FANTEL

Veterans Administration, Los Angeles

NORMAN FENTON

Department of Correction, California

PIERRE D. FOUQUET

Office Public d'Hygiene Sociale,  
Paris, France

JOHN R. P. FRENCH

Nejelski & Company, New York City

ROBERT B. HAAS

Ohio State University

MARGARET HAGAN

American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.

BERT B. HANSEN

University of Montana

GERTRUDE S. HARROW

University of Chicago

CHARLES E. HENDRY

University of Toronto

HELEN H. JENNINGS

American Council on Education

LILLIAN WILD KAY

New York University

LEONA M. KERSTETTER

New York University

GERALD W. LAWLOR

Brooklyn College

S. S. LIFSON

U. S. Public Health Service,

New York City

RONALD LIPPITT

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

ROSEMARY LIPPITT

Camp Fire Girls

MARGHERITA A. MACDONALD

University of Chicago

JOSEPH I. MEIERS

Creedmoor State Hospital

ABRAHAM MYERSON

Boston State Hospital

FLORENCE B. MORENO

Psychodramatic Institute, Beacon

ELWOOD MURRAY

University of Denver

WINFRED OVERHOLSER

St. Elizabeths Hospital,

Washington, D. C.

JOSEPH H. PRATT

Pratt Diagnostic Hospital, Boston, Mass.

HOWARD P. ROME

University of Pennsylvania Medical  
School

HANS W. SCHWERIN

University of Breslau

PAUL H. SHEATS

University of California at Los Angeles

NAHUM E. SHOOPS

P. S. 157, Brooklyn

EUGENE H. SLOANE

Willimantic State Teachers College

PITIRIM A. SOROKIN

Harvard University

ELISABETH STEVENS

University of Kansas

PERCIVAL M. SYMONDS

Columbia University

ALVIN F. ZANDER

Springfield College

## THIRD NUMBER OF SOCIATRY

### CONTENTS:

Howard Becker—Black Propaganda

Kenneth Benne—Psychodrama and the Philosophy of Education

J. L. Moreno—Sociatry and Social Medicine

Z. Toeman—Maturity of Role Taking

Group Psychotherapy in Veteran Hospitals; Group Psychotherapy in Social Case Work; Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama Combined with Insulin Treatment; Group Discussion Programs as a Form of Group Psychotherapy; A Program of Group Psychotherapy for State Hospitals; and papers by:

Arthur W. Cable, Theodore Newcomb and Urie Bronfenbrenner, Hans W. Schwerin, Eugene H. Sloane

# SOCIATRY

*Journal of Group and Intergroup Therapy*

Volume 1

June, 1947

Number 2

## CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| EDITORIAL: INTERNATIONAL SOCIATRY AND THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION—J. L. Moreno .....           | 145 |
| PSYCHODRAMA IN THE HOME—Rosemary Lippitt .....   | 148 |
| PSYCHODRAMA IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD—Florence B. Moreno .....   | 168 |
| PSYCHODRAMA IN TEACHING SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES—Roger G. Barker .....             | 179 |
| ROLE PLAYING AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING—Alex Bavelas .....  | 183 |
| THE USE OF PSYCHODRAMA FOR GROUP CONSULTANTS—Leland P. Bradford .....                              | 192 |
| ROLE PRACTICE IN INTERVIEW TRAINING—Margaret E. Barton ....  | 198 |
| ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL: A COMMUNICATION PROBLEM—Ronald Lippitt ..... | 209 |
| ROLE TESTING FOR MARRIAGE PREDICTION—Leona Kerstetter .....  | 220 |
| ROLE PLAYING: A TECHNIQUE FOR TRAINING THE NECESSARILY DOMINATING LEADER—Alvin F. Zander .....     | 225 |
| REPETITION AND PSYCHODRAMA—Ernest Fantel .....   | 236 |
| THREE WORD HISTORIES IMPORTANT IN PSYCHODRAMA—J. I. Meiers   | 239 |
| ANNOUNCEMENTS .....  | 243 |
| PSYCHODRAMATIC INSTITUTE PROGRAM—1947-48 .....   | 244 |

## INTERNATIONAL SOCIATRY AND THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Sociatry has a double role. On one hand it tries to become a science among the social sciences. On the other hand it has the difficult task of watching the behavior of the social sciences, and particularly its own, to see that they do not fall into pathological and illusionistic behavior. Statesmen and diplomats have gone ahead again and formulated a world organization. The section programs of the UNO make such excellent reading that when under their spell we forget that programs similarly eloquent have been formulated in the past. We have seen already social scientists rising from their chairs, not unlike the way it was after the end of the first world war, adding to the politico-legalistic their own utopias—international language, international justice, international education, international university, international police and so forth. Physical and social scientists are equally inclined to follow blindly the baton of the piedpipers and advocates of the "One World" system. It is at this point that sociatry has the task to examine critically the behavior of social scientists. They do not differ in procedure from religionists—whom they consider otherwise so thoroughly antiquated. Religionists too have often been inclined to think in terms of universal brotherhoods, considering the real people lightly as temporary obstacles and sinners, as if the Kingdom of God would be just around the corner. The social scientists, not only that they fall easily into the popular myth of the one world, have themselves developed another idea in recent years, that of the "lag of the social sciences, marching far behind technology." This has a basis in fact, but it implies the myth that if the social sciences would be sufficiently advanced, having better instruments, methods and knowledge of social structure, it would then be easy to attain the aims which humanitarian projects and the UNO have set. This proposition is dangerous because it deviates our attention from the truly crucial dilemma which we are facing. Even if the social sciences would be advanced far beyond any dream we have of their future, we would be just as poor and unable to make progress as we are now.

The greatest difficulty in our actual mastery of the social universe is not in the lack of invention of instruments by which these ends can be attained, but in Man himself. He is inept and inert, his spontaneity is in an embryonic stage of development. It is therefore not the lag of the social sciences as compared with the physical sciences which bars progress; the lag is rather in Man's limitations and unreadiness for using instruments and

methods which already exist in order to master his biological, social and cultural challenges. In the social sphere, even today, he lives in a world of comparative "plenty". The number of methods and instruments which social science has developed are rotting in libraries and small experimental communities. Whereas on the technological plane Man's readiness to make use of instruments as soon as they are invented is great, on the social plane the readiness is extremely low, practically nil. It is easy for Man to use a stick, a gun or an atomic bomb, but extremely difficult for him to adapt himself to the use of social instruments which would assure his freedom within his own society. The answer to this difficulty is not easily given. Man needs to be educated, but education means here more than mere intellectual emancipation, it isn't a matter of a deficiency of Man's intelligence only. It is also more than a matter of emotional enlightenment, it is not a matter of insight only. It is rather a matter of the deficiency of his spontaneity to use the available intelligence and to mobilize his enlightened emotions. But such a program of preparedness requires in addition to factual information, the training of Man's spontaneity, the training and re-training of men on a worldwide scale. It requires action research and action methods continuously modified and sharpened to meet new inner and outer environments.

There are, therefore, three propositions which we have to weigh: 1) the myth of the one world; 2) the myth of the insufficiency of the social sciences to deal with the present emergency in human society; 3) the myth of a research panacea. We have considered the first two, and are proceeding to evaluate the third. Social scientists, when challenged with the need of doing something about the world situation usually respond with a statement of despair: What we need is more research, more research here, more research there. Each has his own private list of research projects—study of national characters and customs—of moral and immoral standards—of similarities and differences—of attitudes and prejudices—of official and unofficial ideologies—of white and black propaganda—of psycho-social networks as to the dissemination of ideas, feelings and attitudes through them, etc.—which should be undertaken, and which are of first, second or third importance before anything constructive can be done. They appear to be so correct in their judgments that the challengers usually retreat in silence. We, however, are interested in the result: what is usually observed is that the social scientists do nothing except perhaps write a paper in which the position of futility is explained in scientific terms.

It cannot be denied that many of our own friends are among the scientific

town criers. The sociatric status of a scientist is not changed by the quality of his phraseology, whether he talks of "attitude and opinion research", "morale and propaganda research", or "action and operational research", "sociometric and psychodramatic research". What matters is whether they share the same behavior in regard to a) carrying their hypotheses to actual test and b) particularly in regard to a situation which requires some decisive, personal action.

There is a need for a behavioral imperative for scientists—it might also be called a "sociatric code". It is generally recognized that certain social phenomena operate in most social groups, small or large, as for instance attractions and repulsions, ethnic attitudes and prejudices, national character and custom, official and unofficial ideologies, etc. The first behavioral rule to which all scientists should agree is: If a scientist enters a situation as member of a group, he should act in accord with the sociatric code; behaving like a scientist means to apply scientific instruments with which he is acquainted to the immediate situation at hand; *action in situ is the thing*. Action in prospect may be premature, action in retrospect may be too late. It is obvious that when joining a committee consisting of a few, the members may be of different sex, of different religious, ethnic and cultural background, and provide an urgent occasion to apply to them sociometric or any group method which might help towards a substantial improvement of the relations among the members. The first step which one makes when entering an unexplored social area is to treat it. Every next step has to be taken up again and treated in turn, and so forth ad infinitum. The social units which are formed by scientists themselves in behalf of societal goals should be sociometrically and sociatrically sound and *thus lay a brick towards the sociometric foundation of the United Nations Organization*.

One bitter lesson we should have learned from the twenty years of sociometry behind us, that it is fruitless to plunge ahead of the dynamics of the small groups to which we belong to the next larger group. The fire which we have left raging behind us will reach us and stop our march forward.

J. L. MORENO  
*Editor*

## PSYCHODRAMA IN THE HOME

ROSEMARY LIPPITT

### *Camp Fire Girls*

Psychodrama and sociodrama seem to present unlimited possibilities for practical application in the home and family. From the very preliminary explorations described below, it seems clear that the role-playing stage can become an integral and fruitful part of family living and childhood education. The discussion which follows indicates how psychodrama was used by a mother in daily living with her two children, a boy aged five years three months and a younger sister aged two. About thirty minutes a day were spent in psychodramatic periods for about six weeks. The daily topic for the psychodrama presented itself through the daily experiences of the children. In these early explorations, the mother feels that psychodrama has been an invaluable help to her in meeting the following rather typical situations in the life of her children:

1. Overcoming or greatly lessening a deep-set fear.
2. Overcoming an emotional blocking of long duration.
3. Improving social behavior techniques.
4. Achieving understanding and acceptance of the physical abnormalities in other children.
5. Helping the child to meet daily frustrations in the home, school, and neighborhood.
6. Making for better sibling relationships.
7. Promoting kindness to pets.
8. Communicating an understanding of the news of the world.
9. Preparing for a new experience.
10. Stimulating increased spontaneity and creativity.

### *Overcoming A Fear*

This was the first type of situation spontaneously reenacted by the boy, who was not yet ready to dramatize the more typical activities of his daily living at school and home. The mother also felt that the fear warranted early and careful investigation. Larry's fear of the house's burning up was evidenced by his drawing, painting, and even modeling houses that were all burnt up or destroyed by fire. Sometimes the occupants of the houses, or animals which happened to be in them, were also completely destroyed. The

child had shown no fear of fire until just before his fifth birthday, when he moved to a new home in a new community where the daily newspaper made considerable pictorial display of crimes and disasters in the pictures on the front page. It was the child's custom to look at the paper as he took it to his father from the doorstep each morning, and to ask for the news about any interesting pictures. During a period of about two months, some five families were burnt out and some of the children burned to death before the firemen could get them out of the house. One case in particular seemed to hold the attention of the boy. It was the case of a family of some four or five children who were burned to death while their parents were out at a show. The front-page picture of these jolly-looking children and the morbid ending seemed to stick with the boy. It was some weeks later that the parents first discovered his fear when they were going out one night and told him they would be back that night and that Mrs. H. was staying with him and his sister until they returned. He said nothing for a while, and then calmly remarked, "But you know that when mommies and daddies go out, the children are burned up in the house." The parents spent some time talking with him, and when he seemed quite satisfied that it was not going to happen to him and that Mrs. H. always sat on the same floor on which he and his sister slept, he said, "Okay. Good night." He did not again mention fire that the parents can remember until the sudden wave of house-burning appeared in his drawings. Three months after the first show of the fear of fire, Larry was drawing only fire pictures. The parents noticed it and several times tried to discuss the pictures with him in an interested, matter of fact way. The usual answer the boy gave was, "That is what happens. It all burns up." Grass, trees, and animals as well as persons were soon burning up in each artistic effort. Whatever he drew was sure to end up by being covered with red flames and black smoke. This continued without much change for some five or six weeks. The frequency of the drawings was increased by a visit of his school class to the firehouse, where he had witnessed two double alarm fires as they came in on the board of the fire station. He was very excited and talked about this experience in a high, emotionally pitched voice for the rest of the day. It was at this time that the mother found she was able to get Larry involved in psychodramatic situations about fires. He became so interested in playing fire that little else was suggested by him for some days. It was "Let's play fire" every few minutes during the first day or so. Here is the first fire he dramatized:

Larry, all excited and alive with physical movement, rushes into the living room. "Here's the fire—No, it is here," pointing to the fireplace. "No, it is here in the house," pointing to a big soft chair. "Here is the baby, asleep in the bed." He put the baby doll in the chair. He jumps up and down with excitement. To his mother, "You ring the fire alarm." He stops for a moment quite still, "Say, how do you think it got started?" For a few moments he is quiet and serious in mood, but he continues without waiting for an answer, "Say, someone drops a match in the attic and doesn't notice it." His mood changes. He becomes excited again and jumps about saying, "Hey, you ring the fire alarm." His mother makes a movement as though to pull out the handle on the box and makes a *ding* sound. Larry rushes around making fire engine sounds very loudly and excitedly. He grabs a play fire truck and in his excitement has great difficulty in fastening the ladders together. Usually this is an easy task for him. He makes much sound of spraying the fire out with water. He does not think of saving the baby at this time, but at a later date in playing fire again, he saves two dolls from the fire in a very big, he-man fashion.

Fires were dramatized for several days, and each time the incident was discussed with the mother, who talked about the kind of fire that it was and later discussed how the children themselves might even get up and go out to the fire box and then to the neighbors in case of need. Thus the boy more and more began to play the role of a big brother saving his little sister. This was quite appealing, and he carried this through, even to the point of getting his sister, Caroline, out of bed and down the stairs and out into the street.

After the first few days of psychodramatic fires, the mother suggested a period of drawing again, and Larry again drew houses which burned up. She did not pay any attention to this fact. He was often encouraged to draw sitting up in bed during rest periods so that he might be entirely alone and have no one present to distract or frustrate him. He drew innumerable houses burning all during that week. By the second week, he had dramatized many fires, and each time the mother tried to help him get a new understanding or insight in the situation. By the end of the second week, he was tired of fires and wanted to play something different. He took to playing other life experiences at this time, which will be described below.

During the third week of psychodramatic periods, he did not respond to the fire idea as a very interesting or stimulating situation. When he did respond, he wanted to be various members of the fire department, the fire chief, the fireman on the roof, the man who registered the fire alarm at the station, and so forth. During this period, a typical psychodrama went like this:

"Yes, let's play fire today. You sit in the chair with Caroline. You are in the house when the fire breaks out. You make a noise or ring the alarm or something, and then I'll come. First I will be the fire chief. Say, you better watch and tell us what kind of fire it is—a gas fire or something. You send in the alarm. I am the fire chief." Speaking into the phone, "Say, what kind of fire is it?" Turning to his men, "Say, fellows, get going. There is a fire over there." Then as a fireman on a fire truck, he rushes into the room making fire engine noises. He then takes the role of the fire chief on the scene, "Say, men, get up on that roof and chop a hole through and put the hose inside. Get that lady and that little girl out of there first." He then becomes a regular fireman again and rushes up on the chair pretending he is making a hole in the roof and shooting water through the hole. To the mother and little girl, "You better get out of there before I get the water in down there."

The mother and child start to move. The mother remarks, "Perhaps another fireman should help us get to the neighbor's house."

Larry, "That is a good idea. You aren't hurt, you know. The firemen have saved you." He descends to the floor and takes the role of the fire chief. In a loud voice he calls up to his men, "It's all out now, men. You can come down. Say, I'd better leave a man or two here to keep watch for a few hours. You—Joe and Harry—stay around for a while to see nothing blows up again." He then becomes Joe, "Okay, Chief."

The mother and child return from the neighbor's. The mother remarks, "Is it safe for us to go in now?"

Larry (in the Joe role), "Yes, if you don't go up where it is wet on the top. Say, I see the wind is blowing up a blaze back in the garden. Where will I get some water?"

Mother, "Quick—the garden hose is out back."

Joe gets the hose and puts out the fire, "There, it is all out now. Guess I better stay around a little longer to be sure it is all out." He now becomes the fire chief again, "Say, now I'll be the fire chief coming back to see how the men are getting along. How is it going, Joe and Harry? I think it is safe now. You fellows better come along with me and get back to the station." He turns to go, "It is all over now. You can go."

At about the period of this psychodrama, it was noted that Larry no longer drew, painted, or modeled fires although his interest in drawing houses continued, along with a wide variety of other enthusiasms for drawing boats, landscapes, animals, and other items of his experience. Since that time, over a month ago, he has not returned to the burning theme in any of his work or in his active play.

## OVERCOMING AN EMOTIONAL BLOCKING

Larry has attended three different preschools since the age of eighteen months. During these three school experiences, he had in some way built up the idea that he would not sing at school, either with the other children or alone. He sang a great deal at home and enjoyed it very much. By the age of three, his teachers were working on the idea that they would help him enjoy singing with the other children. Just how it was approached at school, the parents did not ascertain. The teacher at that time asked the mother about the problem, and the mother felt that some momentary like or dislike had started the incident and suggested that the school not take any notice of the behavior and that it would probably take care of itself. A few days later, Larry came home saying, "I don't sing at school. I don't like singing. It hurts my ears." The mother remarked, "Well, you like to sing at home, and why don't you sing at school?" Larry responded, "I don't want to, and I'm not going to." The mother went on to suggest what fun he had at school and how kind the teachers were and how nice it would be for him to do what they asked, as they did what he wanted most of the time. There were a number of rather matter of fact mother-child conversations on the subject. The mother was not very concerned other than liking to see the child cooperate with the school whenever possible. The teacher at that time seemed to give up the attempt, and no more was heard of it. The boy enjoyed school and loved all the other activities such as dancing, art work, free play and so forth. He cooperated in all other situations except the singing. This continued for the eight months he attended that school. Later he moved and the next fall attended another school. Here he was very happy until he came home one day saying, "I hate school." Upon discussion, it was discovered that the old idea of his not singing had again been brought to the teacher's attention. The mother felt that now it was becoming generalized and that it was not just one school and one teacher but had carried over into a new situation. Thus she and Larry had some talks about how much fun he had with the children doing this and that because he did what was expected of him, how he enjoyed the games at school because he obeyed the rules, how he enjoyed dancing because he did what the music told him to do. It was suggested that he would enjoy singing too if he sang with the other children. He seemed to see the point but was unable to make the adjustment the next day. He came home and announced, "I did not sing today." He then sang all the songs, some ten or more, that he had learned at school and which he knew very

well. School closed in the spring without any change in this particular emotional blocking. The next fall, Larry entered another school which his parents had observed and which was felt to have an outstanding school atmosphere. Now in kindergarten, at the age of five, Larry was most enthusiastic about this school and loved his new teacher very much. From the first week, the reports came back that he had made a fine adjustment and that the teacher was delighted with him. At the end of about a month, Larry came home in a grumpy mood. He stamped in and informed his mother in a positive voice, "I hate school." He stamped about for a minute and then, as it was evident to his mother that he wanted her to discuss it with him she suggested that something must have happened that day that had changed his mind, because yesterday he had loved school so much. She suggested that it was often that way with work, school, life and that perhaps she could help him if they talked about it. He was interested but tried to hide his gleam of hope, "Well, it is the singing. I wouldn't sing with them, and I won't say grace before we eat our morning lunch." Upon asking whether he knew the grace, he proudly repeated it. With praise for doing such a good job and further discussion of what other schools do and what kinds of graces they say, the subject was dropped until after lunch. That afternoon when it was playtime, the mother suggested that they play school.

Larry was not very keen at the idea, but agreed that it might be all right. The mother suggested that she be teacher and that they play the game he loved at school.

Mother, "Now let's play 'kitty wants the slipper.'"

Larry enthusiastically, "Oh yes. I love that. I'll be the kitty and the chairs be the children." He carried on through this game for a few minutes, then the mother as teacher announced, "It is time for music, children."

Larry seemed reluctant, but the mother lined the chairs up, and the younger sister joined in. It was suggested that they sing "Row Row Your Boat" because it was the only song the little two-year-old could sing which they also sang at school. Larry sat and sang very well.

Then the mother as teacher stepped forward, "Say, there is a little boy," pointing at an empty chair, "who doesn't sing at all." Larry was a bit surprised and then laughed because it wasn't he at all this time.

The mother then asked, "Why doesn't he sing? Doesn't he know the song?"

Larry answered, "He doesn't want to sing. Oh yes, he knows the songs all right."

The mother asked, "Do you think he is happy like you and Carolyn and the other children? I don't think he is enjoying the singing as he should. It is sort of silly not to have fun when he could so easily,

isn't it? He likes to be like the other children and have them like him. They do like him, and his teacher likes him too. Don't you think it's a bit hard on the teacher, as well as silly, for him not to sing? I wonder how she feels when she tries to get him to sing and he won't. She does a lot for him, and he won't even do that for her when he could so easily and it would be so much more fun for him."

At this Larry looked a bit sheepish and gave his mother a very knowing look, suggesting that they play train.

The next day, Larry went to school very happily, much to his mother's interest, as on previous days following a report of not wanting to sing, he had not been so keen to go to school for several days. He returned from school full of exuberance, rushed in and threw his arms around his mother, proudly announcing that he had sung and had said the prayer today. His joy was equally shared by his mother, and the day was declared a holiday when they would do some special treats together. Larry was walking on air, so to speak, for the rest of the day. He eagerly told his father that night how he now enjoyed singing at school. Since that time, there has been no more trouble over singing.

This is rather a dramatic ending to what parents and teachers had been working on for some time. It is important that the school and excellent teaching be given credit, and it is quite possible that they might have solved the problem in time had not the psychodrama been carried out. It does seem quiet clear that the sudden change was due to the psychodramatic episode having been played through at an auspicious moment in the total learning process. It is possible that if the incident had not taken place, he might never have sung in this school either but have built up an ever deeper resistance to group singing, repeating of grace, etc. and sharing in other forms of group activities.

#### IMPROVING SOCIAL TECHNIQUES

A number of psychodramas have been carried through to improve the social graces of both the five and the two year old. Here is the recording from a typical episode of this type:

Larry, "What shall we play today?"

Mother, "Well, we might play that we are getting ready for a party and have the children and parents come to have a birthday party."

Larry is very excited and delighted.

Mother, "Let's sit down a moment and plan what we will have and do at the party, and then we can play it out."

Larry, "Oh, it is my birthday, and let's have the table set there, and

here are all the presents piled up that I got." He points to the corner of the room beside the table.

Mother, "Let's see. First we would have to set the house in order and dress ready for the people. You could open the door for them as you know all the children and their mothers. Say, what do you think you should do when one of the mothers comes in that I haven't met?"

Larry, "Well, I should ask them their names—no, I know their names, don't I? I should bring them to you and say, 'Here is Bob's mother.'"

Mother, "Yes, and you could say, 'Mother, it is Mrs. Jones, Bob's mother.' That would be nice."

Larry, "Say, that is the way the big folks do it, and I am getting big now."

Mother, "How about Carolyn (baby sister). Should you introduce her too?"

Larry, "Say, I never thought about her. They don't know her, do they? I'll have to say, 'Here is my sister, Carolyn.'"

Mother, "Well, are we ready to begin?"

Larry, "Yes. Oh boy!"

Mother, "Oh, there is the phone." She runs to the child's phone and says, "Hello. Oh, it is Mrs. Brown. I am so sorry Joan cannot come today. I do hope she will be well soon."

Larry, "Oh, there is the phone again." He runs to answer it. "Oh, hello Jack. You cannot come? Okay." He hangs up the phone.

Mother, "What was that, Larry?"

Larry, "Jack cannot come."

Mother, "Do you think it might have made Jack feel better if you had said how sorry you were that he could not come and that you will see him when he is well again or something like that?"

Larry, "Say, I could have said how much I like his card he sent, and I never thought about it."

Mother, "Larry, there is a car stopping in front. It must be—no, I do not know the lady, so you must bring her in and introduce her to me."

Larry rushes to the door and pretends to open it. "Hello Joyce." And then stepping back, "Come along in." Then walking up to his mother he says, "Mother, here is Joyce and her mother, Mrs. oh—er—a Jones." Then aside in an amused way he remarks, "I almost forgot her name, didn't I, mother?"

Mother, "Well, it might help if you think of her name as soon as you see her coming up the walk. It would give you time, and then when you bring her in to me it would be easier. Never mind if you make some mistakes. We all do that. Even big people do it sometimes." Then looking at sister Carolyn, she remarks, "You'd better introduce her to Mrs. Jones and to Joyce, Larry."

Larry, pointing to his sister, "This is Carolyn, my sister."

Mother, "Larry, you'd better take the guests in and show them seats in the living room, and the children might like to go outdoors. Don't

forget to introduce the mothers to each other if they do not know each other. You can ask them if they know all the mothers or whether you should introduce them as you bring them in."

Larry, "Say, do you suppose some of the children will bring me presents? Should I open them right away or keep them until later?"

Mother, "Well, Larry, when you take a present to a friend, do you like to see the friend open it and enjoy the gift?"

Larry "Of course I do. Then maybe they would like me to open it right away and show them how much I like the gift. Oh boy, this is fun." He jumps up and down in real excitement. (Episode continues at some length.)

Of course, one does not expect all this behavior to carry over to real life situations all the time, but a surprising amount is adopted forthwith as the only behavior the child knows how to use in a similar social situation. It helps a great deal to prevent a shy, not-know-what-to-do behavior that some children have when company arrives. Although the two year old does not take a great part in the psychodrama, she is absorbing the ideas, and as will be indicated in later episodes, she comes out with some very fine ideas. The effects of a psychodrama such as that indicated above are noticeable in her behavior when company arrives. She goes through the steps of meeting friends in a happy, open way as if it were a part of a game instead of being shy and hiding behind her mother as is often typical of her age.

#### UNDERSTANDING PHYSICAL ABNORMALITIES

Although Larry attends a school of normal children, one girl in his group has some difficulty in walking due to a birth injury. She is very attractive and normal mentally. She entered school a few weeks after the other children. Thus, she was noticed as a newcomer. At the end of the first week, Larry came home and announced that there was a girl in his group who could not walk and run like he could. He took great interest in trying to imitate her walk and show his mother how she walked upstairs. His first reactions were signs of interest. His mother talked to him a bit about how some children and people were different and how wonderful it was that most of them could get around even when they had legs that did not work so well as his. His reaction was, "Guess I'm lucky to be all right and not be stiff in the legs like Kate." His mother mentioned how it might be fun for him and the other children to try to help Kate become like them and how they must be patient in helping her learn to do active things. A few days later, he returned from school and made some remark to the

effect that he and the boys thought Kate was a dope. She could not do things he could do. That afternoon his mother suggested that they play a game and that he should get hurt by a car and that he would go to the hospital and then get better. He was quite enthusiastic and suggested that his sister be a nurse.

Larry, "Here I am in the street, and a car comes whizzing along and clips the tail of my bicycle so that I am thrown off on the street. Then my friend Jim (a much older and admired boy) comes along and trips over me so that I get hurt."

Mother, "Yes, he accidentally runs over your leg, perhaps."

Larry is delighted and lies kicking on the ground in supposed pain. Mother and nurse-sister come rushing along and put him in an ambulance and take him to the hospital.

Mother, "Now I am the doctor. Hello, little fellow. What happened to you? Oh, it is your leg. Say, it is pretty bad, and it will take a while to get well. You will have to walk stiff-legged for a few weeks."

Larry, "You mean I can't run and jump any more?"

Doctor, "No, you must take care of it for a long while. I guess you can get up now and try to walk." He lifts Larry onto his feet. "Oh no, you cannot move like that. You must not bend your knee except by lifting it up by your hand. See, when you want to go upstairs, you must raise the legs with the hand like this."

Larry, "Oh, that is difficult. It makes my back tired before I get up the first flight of stairs." He puts forth much effort and pulls each leg onto the next step. He gets to the landing and sits down. "Say, this is not fun. Why are we playing this? I want to get well soon."

The mother sits down a moment on the step too. "Well, Larry, did you ever think of what Kate has to do when she walks upstairs? She never complains but keeps right on trying. Don't you think she is brave and courageous like the soldiers were in the war?"

Larry, "Say, she is. I never thought of that before."

Mother, "Do you know how you can make it easier for Kate and have more fun yourself?"

Larry, "No. How?"

Mother, "It makes Kate happy to have the boys and girls nice to her and not impatient with her when she is slow about getting places. Perhaps you can help the other children to be nice to her too. You know they think a lot of you, and if you showed them that you like Kate and think she is brave, they will not talk about her being a dope. That must make her feel pretty bad like it would make a soldier feel bad if you said he was a dope because he lost a leg fighting in the war."

A few weeks later, the school had a visiting day, and the mothers of each age-group met to chat for a few minutes. Kate's mother approached Larry's mother right away and said, "It is amusing that Kate does not talk

of any of the children at home except Larry. It is Larry this and Larry that all the time. She points out your home every time we pass it and calls my attention to the fact that Larry lives there." Kate is a very quiet child and due to her handicap has spent much time with adults and is the only child. She thus needs a variety of friends her own age and help from the total group. As this is her first school experience, it seems most important that she learn to enjoy working with others her own age. It would be most interesting to see what could be done by some psychodramatic episodes with the whole group to promote a better environment for Kate.

*Meeting Some Daily Problems of Adult Expectations*

One can prevent many of the frustrations of awkward social behavior by preparing the child more effectively to meet the expectations of the adult society in which he moves. Many people, for example, expect the child to shake hands with them upon first meeting. This is often demanded even of the toddler. The request or expectation for such social behavior seems to come from a variety of people, especially professional personnel like the doctor, teacher, clergyman, etc. The child's very natural response is often to withdraw to the security of his parents, not knowing clearly what is being requested of him by the outstretched hand of the stranger. In this way awkward, and often socially handicapping behavior patterns are set up for the child in even such a simple situation as the adult asking the child to shake hands. "Shakes hands", "How old are you?", "How are you?", and "What is your name?" are probably some of the most frequent first meeting demands that even the two year old can be helped to meet confidently with a little guidance. These demands had all been made of Carolyn, age 2, before her parents had prepared her adequately for them. In these early situations the request to "Shake hands with Dr. Blank" led to a vigorous waving of both hands with much laughing. This was the behavior called for in an action rhyme she knew which goes like this: "I put my hands in and give them a shake, shake, shake, and turn myself around". In this new request situation she picked out the "Shake hands" idea and responded to it with the usual merriment and behavior pattern of the action rhyme. Helping her to meet these new social problems of "greeting" were approached in the following psychodramas:

Larry (older brother aged five and a half) was taken into our confidence and told what the game was to do and how we were going to teach Carolyn to shake hands, etc. He entered into the spirit of the event with great joy, "Oh, I'll show her how, and then she will do

as I do". The two adults planned to have a situation of one of them bringing the children into the home to visit a friend.

Mother, "Now Larry and Carolyn, you and Gram are going to come to visit me. You will go out onto the porch and then ring the doorbell. I will answer the doorbell and invite you in. I will say hello to Gram first and shake hands with her. Then I will turn to you, Larry, and shake hands with you like this (demonstrating so Carolyn could see), and ask you how you are. You must look glad to see me and say you are very well, thank you, and ask me how I am. Then I will turn to you, Carolyn, and shake hands like this (takes Carolyn's hand and shakes it with a smile) and ask you how you are, and you say 'I am fine, thank you', and then I will invite you to come in and sit down, and we will talk about what we have been doing today."

At this the two children and grandmother went out through the hall, and grandmother again mentioned how they would enter and shake hands with their friend. She then rang the bell. Mother opened the door, "Oh, come along in Mrs. Smith, I am so glad to see you (they shake hands), and this (turning to Larry) is Larry. How are you dear?" (They shake hands) Larry, "Oh, I am fine, and you?" Mother, "Just fine, thank you". (Carolyn is all interest and full of merriment at the game) (Mother, turning to Carolyn, "How are you, Carolyn?" She extends her hand and takes Carolyn's and shakes it. Carolyn is all smiles and says, "Fine". They enter the livingroom and continue talking.

This, and numerous other types of "people-meeting situations" are very much enjoyed by both children, and they are both learning at the same time. It seems important to have each situation different, so that no one fixed type of behavior will become the pattern instead of real spontaneity.

#### *Stimulating Better Sibling Relationships*

The rather typical sibling disputes that arise over possession and the use of various toys are very unproductive in terms of learning human relationship skills, and often end in situations that have to be settled by the intervention of an adult. The children seem to gain nothing from the experience that could be regarded as educational or therapeutic or recreational. This type of conflict behavior, of course, is also more frequent when the children are tired or hungry and less capable of receiving educational interpretation. It seemed to the parents of Larry and Carolyn that social pressure and reasoning made little progress in eliminating the situation, or in helping the children to meet the next one with any better solution. It was felt that perhaps psychodrama might help Larry to see that there are other ways of solving the difficulty, even when you are tired or hungry. He was

informed that one day soon his mother and grandmother were going to act like two little children for him. He was very delighted and the next day requested that they show him how they would act like two little children. He was in a very cooperative and jovial mood himself, and sat down to watch with considerable expectation and joy. His mother and grandmother had planned to depict the situation of two children playing happily and suddenly both wanting the same toy. They planned to carry this through for several toys, fighting, and doing some soliloquizing about their feelings. Their aim was to later let Larry help them decide what the children might do to have more fun, and to prevent the conflict.

Mother, "Now Larry, Gram and I are going to play like we are two children. We are just about your age (this was the only reference that was made to him). You sit there on the chair so you can watch us. Now we are going to play with toys here on the floor". The adults began playing happily with the few toys side by side. Suddenly they both grabbed the kiddie car. Gram, "No, I want this". Mother, "I want it, give it to me". There was much pulling back and forth, both holding the toy, and both yelling, "No, I want it, you give it to me, I had it first, it's mine, etc." Larry sat on his chair with an expression of great enjoyment on his face and laughing from time to time. Then Gram dropped the kiddie car and took up a horse which did not please her companion. Mother, "Give me that, it's mine". She snatched at the horse and both pulled so it came apart. Then Gram began to cry and Mother yelled, "Now see, you have broken my toy". Gram then took up the fiddle and Mother snatched it away and hit it on Gram's head with "There, take that". Gram began to cry again, and Mother stopped glowering with the fiddle in her hand. She then muttered, "This is not much fun. I wonder why we had fun at first, and now she is crying and I'm not happy a bit. I don't like playing like this really. I wonder why we did it". Gram stops her crying to sob, "I don't see why we fought and had no fun any more. I wonder what we might have done to play nicely and have fun."

At this point the situation was turned over to Larry who was not having quite so much fun, and was looking a bit self-conscious. Mother, "Well, Larry, how do you think you could help these children to play better?" Larry, "Well, they might have taken turns and then had fun and not fought. They wouldn't have broken the toy then". Mother, "Yes, that is a good idea, but suppose one of us would not take turns, which sometimes happens when children are tired?" Larry, "Well, they might have played another game". He blocked then and did not go on, so his Mother said, "We might have done like you did one day with Bob when he would not share the tricycle. You made up a game so he could ride and you were the policeman. One of us could have ridden the kiddie car, and the other might have marched behind blow-

ing the horn or playing the fiddle. It might have been a parade". Larry was all enthused at this point and agreed to this solution with joy.

At this point the adults became children again and showed how they might carry out happy play and still not come to blows over the toys. When this was completed, Larry was very pleased and remarked, "It is sort of like me and Carolyn, isn't it?"

Because Larry had enjoyed this demonstration and seemed to have gained considerable insight, a number of other psycho-dramas of child conflicts were carried out on other days. For example, there was the situation where he met a very selfish child who gave up nothing and where Larry had to take the responsibility of drawing such a child into harmonious play. Such situations met with a very active interest and participation on Larry's part.

#### *Creating an Understanding Attitude Toward Pets*

Larry is very fond of animals and extremely interested in them, large and small. Usually his pets get very kind treatment. It is not always clear to the child, however, that his particular kind of treatment of the animal may not be what the animal enjoys. Some of the typical treatment of the animals at the zoo are examples of this. The young visitors want to see action, and they want to see what the animal can do, what kind of noises it makes, etc., so sticks are often poked in to awaken the sleeping animal and to arouse it to action. A variety of noises and threatening motions are used to attempt to stimulate the animal. So it is not unusual that children also want their pets to be active, even on a hot day. Larry wanted a little action and had the idea that a stick against the wire would move the rabbits in his wire cage, bringing them to the side because they would be expecting food. When the rabbits arrived at the side he withdrew the stick and pushed his foot against the wire. This gave the rabbit a fairly mild, but definite bump on the nose. His mother came up at this moment, and Larry looked a little guilty.

Mother, "Larry, how would you like to play rabbit?" "I can take the bunnies out and you can get into the cage for a little while." Larry, a little hesitant at first, and then eager, "Well, I don't know. Say, I could hop around and you could bring me food and take care of me". Mother, "Yes, that is a good idea". Larry was then placed in the cage, and the lid closed but not locked. He hopped about in cramped quarters a bit. Then his mother brought him some leaves for food. Then she came with a stick and said, "Here is a piece of apple branch".

Larry knew that the rabbit liked apples very much. Larry, "Oh, ym, ym". Just as he came to grab the branch his mother pulled it away and put her foot in its place. He took one look, and laughed sheepishly and jumped out of the cage. Mother, "I didn't want to hurt you, but I wanted you to see how the bunnies feel. They can't hop out or tell us how they feel, so we must watch them and think how they feel". Larry stood still for a moment in apparent thought, and then said, "I never thought how it might be in the cage and have the people outside. Say, that is why that polar bear in the Bronx Zoo got angry and ate that girl's arm off. Do you remember that picture of the bear in the paper? It was when we were down in Pelham".

*Understanding the Larger World*

During the big coal strike of 1946, Larry was much interested in what it all meant, who was striking who, etc. He heard of the strike from all sides and naturally his questions sought for information. His parents thought that one of the best ways for him to get an insight into the situation might be to enter the situation of being a miner through psychodrama, living through a few of the experiences in the daily life of the miner and his family. His grandmother, who had always been interested in the life and hardships of the miners and their families, led off in a psychodrama one day:

Grandmother, "Larry, let's play miner, and we could have a strike if you like". Larry, all very enthusiastic, "Oh, yes, Gram". Gram, "Well, we must talk a bit about what miners do, and get the plans all set before we begin. Miners usually go to work with a lunch pail, and meet at the mine shaft. That is where an elevator waits to take them down, down into the earth. Sometimes they go further down than a block or two". Larry, "Oh jeeppers, that is fun. Let's get going, Joe. I'll be Bill and you are Joe. We meet at the shaft, you say?" He strides across the floor in big-man fashion with an imaginary weight in his hand, his lunch box. He comes to the hall, which he designates as the shaft. "Here Joe, is the shaft. Oh, you aren't here yet. I hope he gets here in time. He is my friend, you know". He then looks up and sees Joe coming. "Hi, Joe". Gram, "Hi, Bill. Did you bring your lunch today?" Larry, "Yes, Joe, I won't have to go without eating today". Gram, "Here we go down. Swish! It is a long way down, and the elevator goes very fast. Whoosh! Here we are at the bottom. What a fast ride down. I almost was taken off my feet for a while". Larry, "Yes, I felt it in my legs too". Gram, "Now Bill, you'd better hang your lunch up on the peg, get your tools and a light for your head. Here, I'll fix it in place for you". Larry, "Hey, why do we have lights for our heads, Joe?" Gram, "Well Bill, we need to see in the dark places so we can pick and dig out the coal. They can't light it all

up down here, you see. We each have to carry our own lights in some mines." They pick up their tools and walk over to the wall. Gram, "Here is a good vein to dig in. A vein is what they call a place in the ground where there is a lot of coal laid down. It runs along under the ground for miles sometimes. Here, you pick here, and I'll use my pick over here". They pretend to pick at the wall with imaginary picks. Gram, "Say Bill, I'm tired. This is hard work". Larry, "Yes, it is hard. Coal is heavy to lift". Gram, "Bill, you know they don't pay us much for all this hard work, and one often gets sick or injured. Some get killed when the rocks fall down or the gas escapes and they can't get us out soon enough. Say, it's about time we had our lunch. Let's go and get the boxes". Larry, "Yes, I'm hungry too". Gram, "I wonder what's in our lunches today. What did our wives put up for us today, do you think?" Gram walks over to the lunch boxes in a tired way. "Say Bill, I'm tired. My back aches and my arms are sore". Larry, staggering, "Say, I'm so tired I can hardly walk. This is really hard work". They get their lunch boxes and sit down to eat. Gram, "It isn't very nice to sit down in the dark and damp to eat, is it? The miners really don't have a very pleasant life, do they?" Larry, "No, I should say they don't. Does all the coal come from under the ground?" Gram, "The hard coal is found down deep, but the soft coal, the kind that makes all the smoke, is found near the surface or on top of the ground in some places". Larry, "This is hard work. Let's quit and do something else". Gram, "Well, we might ask for higher pay and less hours, so we could be with our families more and spend less time in this damp place. If we get more pay, we could have more nice things too". Larry, "Say, where is the boss. I'm going to ask for more pay and shorter hours". Gram, "Well, if one man asks, he is not usually given much thought, but if all the miners ask together and then refuse to work if they do not get more money or shorter hours, then something has to be done. When we all stand together they have to listen to us. That is what it means when a strike is called. Right now the miners here in America are out on a strike". Larry, "Say Bill, let's pretend we are out on a strike and not come to work this afternoon. Let's go home to the family now, and refuse to come to work tomorrow".

Larry greatly enjoyed the miner experiences and in other psychodramas continued with various phases of the miner's life. The family and the community were later drawn into psychodramas by grandmother. His younger sister soon took her place beside the miners, hacking at the rocks and eating her lunch as the other two gave her an example. She is too young to understand mining and the life of the miner, but she is not too young to enjoy active, imaginary play and to feel that she is a part of their more adult activity. Eating and sleeping situations are quite understandable

for her, and she added suitable comments at such times. When it is night and the miners go to bed she announces in a loud whisper, "Quiet, please", or at meal time she remarks, "I want water too". Whatever Larry or her grandmother may have mentioned they were pretending to eat, she actively asks for. She will also ask for certain types of psychodrama such as, "I want to be baby bear", "I want to be baby bird", or "I want to be horse", or "I want to be plane". Thus by the age of two she is giving indication of enjoying psychodrama and in her behavior is showing the benefits of its educational values.

### *Preparing for a New Experience*

Before Larry's first airplane ride, he was prepared in the following way for his adventure:

Mother, "Larry, I am going to New York next Monday, and I'll have to spend the day working in the city. I expect to fly down and come home by train that evening. Would you like to fly down with me and spend the day with one of your friends in Pelham, where we used to live?" Larry, very enthusiastically jumping up and down, "Boy, I want to fly down with you. Will it be a big plane? Who shall I visit? I want to see Archer and Andrew, and of course Susan. She is my real friend, you know". Mother, "Yes, it would be nice to see Susan. She has invited you to come and spend the day with her whenever you can. Now how about playing plane, and you will see how it all works out before we go next week? First, we better phone the airport to make sure the plane is flying. It is early in the morning now. We are just getting up and the first thing is to be sure the plane is going to fly". Mother pretends to dial the phone and asks, "Is the 7:45 flight number 206 going to New York this morning? Thank you. Yes, Larry, it is going. The weather is clear enough. Those light clouds in the sky had me worried a bit. Now we had better get dressed and eat a good breakfast, because it will be a long day before we get home again. Without a good meal we will get tired out before the day is over". Larry, "I'm dressed, and I'm going to eat a big breakfast now. I want an egg in an egg cup, and some shadroe, and some peaches, and of course, some milk. There, that is a good meal". He sits down at the little table and pretends to eat. "Boy, this shadroe is good. I like it so much. Just think of all the millions of fish eggs I have eaten. Boy, they should make me strong". He gets up and says, "Say, let's get going. I want to see the plane and everything". Mother, "All right, get your coat and hat and we'll be off. Here is the car that we will drive to the airport in. There is the airport". They get into the chair designated as the car and pretend to drive. Larry, "Say, there is the Cities Service sign that we always see. It isn't lighted up today". Mother, "No, it is daylight already. It is only lighted up at

night, you know. There, we will park the car here, and over there is the airport. Say, they have a new door and the new buildings are being used. Last time we came to get Daddy, we used the old building. Now we have to go into long buildings like tunnels. See, here is the one for our plane going to New York. Would you like to give the man the tickets, Larry?" Larry, "No, I want to look out at the plane. Say, is that big one ours?" Mother, "Yes, that is ours. It's a beauty, isn't it? All right. They are all set. We can get on now. We walk over here and go up these steps into the plane. There, that is the way. Say 'hello' to the stewardess. She is a kind lady who takes care of us while we are on the plane. She brings you chewing gum later on". Larry, "Where is she?" Mother, "She stands by the door just inside the plane. She hangs up our coats and hats if we like to leave them". Larry, "Hello". (to the imaginery stewardess) Mother, "Shall we sit here where you can look out over the wing? Now the plane is filled up and ready to start. See the bright words on the sign? They say for you to fasten your seat belt. When one is in the plane they must put a belt over their laps in case the plane jumps around a bit. There we go now. Now we will stand and warm up the motors and test them out to see that they are working well. Now we are going down the runway. There, did you feel us leave the ground?" Larry, "Say, it is fun up here. I can see out of the window and watch the engines turn the propellers". Mother, "Larry, here comes the hostess with the gum. See, she is offering you a piece". Larry, "Oh, I like gum. I didn't know they gave you gum on the plane". Mother, "What do you say to her, Larry?" Larry, "Oh, thank you very much". (Psychodrama continues with other aspects of the trip.)

The aim of this psychodrama was to prepare Larry so he would not feel too insecure, and perhaps even afraid a bit at the idea of being strapped into the seat in the plane. Familiarizing him with the routine procedures helped a lot in making him less fatigued also. He was to have a very full and exciting day, and his parents thought any preparation might lessen the newness of some of the experiences and most certainly make the day less fatiguing, and therefore make him more able to enjoy it to its fullest. The plane ride in reality came out very successfully and Larry was most delighted and keen to share his experience in detail with his friend Susan, and then with his school companions when he returned home the next day. It was felt by the adults that the few minutes spent in preparation via psychodrama were most helpful in giving Larry a feeling of security. His expectations were realistically orientated and prevented the new situation from being too overpowering.

*Increasing Spontaneity and Creativity*

One hypothesis which we had was that the children's spontaneity and creativity should be increased through their experiences with psychodrama. The observations so far seem to bear out this hypothesis. Very soon after the beginning of the psychodrama sessions Larry began using clay in many more ways than he had previously. He had always enjoyed working with clay but many new variations in his use of plasticene appeared, as for example: sticking it on the wall of his room to hold string from one point to another to represent his telephone and electric lighting system, as hats on all of his little peg men, as feet, to keep these same men standing on their trucks, as a means of attaching two cars together, as a receptacle for his crayons to be stuck into, keels to keep his boats floating up the right way, as well as his previous usages for modelling animals and people. His painting also showed a sudden spurt toward greater variety. Previously, he had not enjoyed painting many different objects. Usually he was limited to fish or houses. He now started putting trees and fences around the houses, painting views of things he had seen in New York, his own back yard, and some vacation spots in the mountains. His drawing showed a great variety of new creative attempts. He asked his sister what she wanted him to draw for her, and then tried to create each of the named objects including baby buggies, turtles, fish, chairs, beds, balls, birds, trains, cars, etc. He not only showed much greater variety in his art work, but indicated an increased interest in this type of activity by spending much more time in various creative activities of this kind.

Larry's teachers at school reported that he seemed to have developed greatly in his spontaneity of reaction to music, and that he had begun to produce a great many different ideas for group games and dramatic play. At home too, it was noticed that he had found a new interest for himself in developing games when alone during rest period, and when his sister was sleeping or otherwise occupied. He found a new interest in dramatic doll play with his Indian dolls, soldiers, and cowboys. His stories were acted out with appropriate vocalizations for each character, Indian, dog, or cowboy. Finally, his greater readiness and speed to cooperate with adults and children is one of the marked changes that seems to have taken place.

*Summary observations concerning the use of psychodrama with pre-school age children:*

1. The felt need to overcome interpersonal problems is lacking to a large extent, and therefore there is less "motivation to practice" to be used

as a basis for getting the children to enter into psychodrama. The appeal must be on a different basis.

2. The children have a very limited ability to communicate in words their feelings about social relationship problems. Thus the psychodramatic director usually finds himself in the situation of having a child or children who are ready to "act out" various themes, but not with any feeling for or perception about the possibility of finding help on a problem. It is rare therefore to go into a psychodramatic episode from a diagnostic discussion of a problem. Much more frequently the director draws the problem theme into the content area of a child's chosen activity, e.g., into a fire, being postman, playing the plumber, etc.

3. To a much greater extent than with adults psychodrama with young children involves setting up new patterns of social relationship rather than re-educating ineffective established patterns. This of course calls for a change from the usual sequence of diagnostic and re-practice role-playing.

4. The preliminary briefing must be very short if the child's interest is to be held. Briefing may be easily injected into the sequence of the psychodrama with this age group. The children easily swing back and forth from getting facts and guidance for next steps of psychodramatic action and complete absorption in living out the situation. There is much less chance of spontaneity-killing interruptions.

5. The ease of warm-up and the remarkable spread of effect into every-day living are additional evidences of the lesser distance and greater fluidity of the relationship between the reality and irreality levels of action in the pre-school child. Another important phenomenon follows from this fluidity. From our observations to date it seems clear that the children have much quicker insight experiences concerning relations between the psychodramatic event and everyday reality situations than do adults.

6. The use of psychodrama in the home with the parent playing various adult roles seems to make it very easy for the parent to transfer the warm emotional relationship and its effects to other adult-child relationships outside the home such as the teacher-child, policeman-child, etc., relationships.

7. Psychodramatic episodes with children of this age must include clear demonstrations of cause and effect. The burden of this type of perception must be borne by the actual action rather than by any attempts at verbal interpretation after the situation has been enacted. Demonstration psychodramas with the children as observers are often very effective in this regard.

## PSYCHODRAMA IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD

FLORENCE B. MORENO

*Psychodramatic Institute*

*Beacon, N. Y.*

### INTRODUCTION

A setting for gathering neighborhood groups of children and parents together to act out their problems on a stage has been established at the Psychodramatic Institute at Beacon. In other communities, a stage in a church or a community club house could be used. Such an "objective" setting is valuable for bringing out the prejudicial attitudes developed from partial information transmitted from children to children, and hence from family to family. We know that the close identification of parents and children often involves adults being personally effected by the attitude and behavior of neighbors' children toward their own, as if their parents were reacting to them directly. Tensions often result among families on this basis alone. They withdraw from each other, are "not on speaking terms", or if they are, an under-current of ill-feeling exists as they build within themselves hatreds and prejudices without ever examining the facts. A thorough examination of the facts should develop a *feeling* for their deeper meanings. In order to accomplish this, families need to help each other by re-enacting or witnessing re-enactment of the *actual* conflicts which produced their existing attitudes, not only within their own setting but in that of the "other fellow" as well.

### PSYCHODRAMATIC SESSION

Parents and children of the neighborhood are brought together and form the bulk of the audience. Problems of an ethnic and socio-economic character, which the neighbors have "tried to solve themselves but have failed" are brought to the attention of the director.

First, five children effecting five different families, have been resorting to stereotyped words of racial and religious connotation as weapons of attack. Such words as "guinea", "catholic", "protestant", "jew", etc., have been introduced to the children for the first time, and they are asking "why" and "what they mean". As the children bring the reports home to the parents, withdrawal and feelings of resentment are manifest among the families. Jim's Italian girl friend, Rita, heretofore a very good friend, is

now categorized as a "guinea" by Jim, who has just learned the use of the term as an effective counter-attack. The Italian parents of Rita have "cooled" toward the parents of Jim, and excuses are found for refusing invitations to play with him. Another family, the Morgans, report that their child was always friendly with the Browns, whose children, during a minor quarrel, are retaliating by telling their child that her father is a "dirty jew". Mr. Morgan told Mr. Brown that their children would not be permitted to come to play with his child if this behavior continued. Mr. Brown promised that he would speak to his children about it, but the result has been that he apparently felt it safer to forbid the children to go to the Morgan home altogether. The result is that the children and parents of both families ignore each other except for the children's continuing "name-calling" on the streets. It is obvious that all these gestures to meet important ethnic problems are "a running away from it" technique with prejudices still going on, being fed by incidental reports of the children.

The second problem is largely of an interpersonal nature with an ethnic problem seeping in. Mrs. Hall, who is of German descent and had at one time expressed sympathies for Nazi Germany, states that she likes Mrs. Morgan very much, *but* disagrees with her on her liberal method of handling children's problems. The six-year-old daughters of Mrs. Hall and Mrs. Morgan are very good friends, but junior Morgan has a very strong influence over junior Hall, to the extent of counter-acting Mrs. Hall's authority. One morning, in front of the school, Mrs. Hall called Mrs. Morgan's child "a very nasty little girl" because she was repeatedly telling Judy that it was not necessary to wear leggings, and she should tell her mother so. Mrs. Hall felt that her parental authority should not be over-ridden by the influence of another child. The suspicion which Mrs. Morgan always had that Mrs. Hall was still pro-nazi was now heightened and her "nazi sympathies" were given as one important reason for her sudden outburst against her jewish child.

A third problem to which the session presented here is primarily devoted is a sample of an increased misunderstanding among people of different socio-economic levels involving also an ethnic problem. It involves the threats of the school principal and a critical point of tension among the families concerned. The three families are inter-dependent in the neighborhood. Mr. Brown is employed as Mr. Morgan's caretaker and Dr. Smith as a physician by the Morgans.

## Dramatis personae

| Parents                      | Children     |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Mr. and Mrs. Morgan          | Jean Morgan  |
| Dr. and Mrs. Smith           | Donald Smith |
| Mr. and Mrs. Brown           | George Brown |
| (caretakers for the Morgans) |              |

Seven-year-old Jean Morgan was wanted as a friend by George Brown, the caretaker's son and Donald Smith, the physician's son. She had always been extremely friendly with Donald, but indifferent to George. On one occasion, she told George's parents that she was not allowed to come into their home because they were not nice and clean; the tension was evident by the attitude of the caretaker toward his employer, Mr. Morgan, though nothing was actually said concerning the matter. Suddenly, as is characteristic of friendships of children at this age level, Jean began to reject Donald for George. The rejection of Donald was at first mild, while at the same time, the Smiths and Morgans grew apart, hardly seeing each other. The rejection for Donald grew still more intense until one day, in front of the school building, Jean, in the presence of Donald's mother, told Donald that she hated him, that he made funny faces all the time, acted silly, and his mother was funny too. Then came the real crisis. After school George and Jean waited for Donald on the back school yard. (Donald wanted to be friendly to them.) For no immediately provoked reason, George and Jean attacked Donald, biting and scratching him severely. The same day, Donald's mother telephoned Jean's mother, relating all the incidents that had happened, saying that she had been wondering for some time why this hostility was going on, that Donald was disturbed about it as well as the parents. What had Donald done? Were Jean's parents behind this hostility? Had Donald's parents done anything toward Jean or her parents? She and her husband had been asking each other these questions ever since the rejection became noticeable. She wondered if something could be done about it, and was willing to try psychodramatic counselling. Meanwhile, the principal of the school had heard of the incident; contrary to the wishes of the parents, who felt they could work it out themselves, the principal threatened punishment to the children if it happened again.

In working out this problem, two aspects of therapy have to be considered: (1) the children and parents involved in the problem and (2) the audience with somewhat similar ethnic and socio-economic problems.

The children are approached first and the session begins this way:

DIRECTOR: "I believe you had some difficulty in the school yard last Friday, and Donald is not very happy about it; we would like to help you work it out so you can all be good friends."

JEAN M.: "I didn't do it. George wanted to get him."

The director knows this is untrue. Actually, from reports of witnesses Jean had incited George to join her in the fight. George is a very submissive child and behaves almost entirely upon the suggestion and leadership of Jean.

Donald walks onto the stage making a friendly gesture toward George and Jean who attack him and begin to hit him. Jean demonstrates, saying: "First I tried to fool him. I kissed him like this, and bit him on the cheek by mistake."

Out of this scene, we gather that Jean is guilty over her part in the incident, trying to shift the blame to George in order to release herself, but at the same time wanting George to seem more important and superior to Donald.

It is decided, then, to play up to her expectations, and assume that George is the aggressor and has conquered, but to let her play the role of the victim of the attack from some one she really likes. Very often children develop deeper insight into social interaction by taking a role in which they experience the effects of their cruelty. However, while they are still warmed up, a shift should immediately be made to a superior role in which they can work out their own ideas as to how the situation can be handled.

George (usually very unresponsive) dashes across the stage to hit Jean.

JEAN: "If you hit me, I'll hit you back."

She pushes him. He pushes her back. She sees that she cannot win (in fact, she does not want to), so she turns to the audience: "Mommy, I don't like this. Let's play something else."

She is asked if she would like to play the mother. She agrees to playing the mother of Donald, whose role is taken by George.

GEORGE (in the role of Donald): "George and Jean bit and scratched me, and I didn't do anything."

JEAN: "I'm going to call their mothers. No, I'm going to get them."

A little girl in the audience plays the role of Jean.

MYRA: (in the role of Jean): "Did you want me?"

JEAN (in the role of *Donald's* mother): "Jean, don't you know you shouldn't do that? You should like Donald; he's a nice boy, too. Besides he's younger, and you shouldn't hit younger children." (This is significant,

since later on Jean's mother admitted saying just about these words to Jean concerning her rejection for Donald.) This is a clue to finding out what she feels her own mother's attitude is in the matter. Jean is asked to play her own mother and gets a telephone call from Mrs. Smith that Jean and George have hurt Donald badly.

Telephone rings. Jean lifts up imaginary phone and says: "Hello. What? (gasps) Jean did? Oh! she shouldn't do that. I'll punish her."

Jean comes over to two other children on the stage—George and another child.

JEAN: "I don't want you to play with George anyhow. You're not supposed to go over there. Donald is such a *nice* boy. I like him much better. You have to play with him, too. You can play with George most of the time, but Donald can still be your friend."

This was the crux of the matter.

Jean's mother says she never said such a thing and told Jean so, but Jean answers: "But mommy, you're always saying how nice Donald is, and when George comes, you don't look nice at him, and when Donald comes, you're always loving him. I was afraid you'd take George away and make me play with Donald."

Mrs. Smith, in the audience, nods her head in approval as if she "had thought it was that all the time."

(It is interesting to note in the above dialogue that Jean injects her own solution, as she plays the mother role, which is inconsistent with the dialogue representing what she assumes to be her mother's attitude.)

Later, Jean's mother admits that she had more positive feelings for Donald than for George, had felt he reflected the alertness and more refined mannerisms of a finer family, but had thought she had "concealed" it. She could see, through the psychodramatic mirroring of herself, that she had no real "hidden" feelings as far as her child was concerned.

In order to guide the children to some satisfactory solution acceptable to them, they were asked what they could do to become better friends. Jean suggests that they play together at her home on Saturday. Mrs. Morgan asks both George and Donald to come. Jean jumps up and down with happiness as she studies Mrs. Morgan's face very carefully as she invites George. She looks back at George again, as if to see how he is effected, and then returns her glance at Mrs. Morgan as if searching for a sign of insincerity.

The next phase of the session is devoted primarily to the parents in

attempting to break down socio-economic and ethnic barriers, particularly between the Smiths and Browns, who actually never met but felt antagonistic toward each other due to their children's conflicts. The attitude of Mrs. Brown has been a defensive self-depreciating one which found its expression in depreciating the Morgans and Smiths by emphasizing their "jewishness". The children became the carriers of this attitude. In order to let these two families actually experience each other's home life, to learn to *feel* themselves into the other fellow's situation, the role reversal technique is used. The present scene starts with Mrs. Smith playing the role of Mrs. Brown who has six children and a baby to take care of, a small income, and no help.

MRS. SMITH (explaining the arrangement of her house according to the instructions given her by Mrs. Brown. No one is able to find anything in getting ready for school—general commotion on the stage; children are all talking at once.): "Can't you find your own clothes? Can't you see I'm busy getting Daddy's breakfast? He has to be to work by 9."

Mrs. Smith's daughter Myra: "Mommy, I don't want to get up. I'm tired." (Pretends to fall back to sleep again.)

Here we get a glimpse of the interaction of mother and daughter in the Smith family, and this is important for Mrs. Brown to see that the "upper classes" have conflicts which they cannot always control also.

MRS. SMITH: "Myra, you *have* to get up. You're going to be late. Do I have to go up and get you?"

JEAN (another child): "I'm not going to wear my leggings this morning—ha-ha." (tantalizing)

MRS. SMITH: "Oh, heavens!"

DONALD: "He's hitting me." (The children make gestures of fighting, laughing and giggling at the same time.)

MYRA (from upstairs): "I don't want to get up."

MRS. SMITH: "I'm going up after you, Myra. You're going to be late. Hurry!"

MYRA (yawns): "Oh, dear. I don't know what to wear. I can't find my stockings."

Meanwhile, a general commotion is going on with the other children on the stage.

MRS. SMITH: "All right, have you had your breakfast yet? Come on now, let's all sit down to breakfast."

They rush to the table. Finally, each one dashes to get his wraps. A general confusion results. They don't know where to find them.

MRS. SMITH: "Oh, dear, well look over there. Why didn't you hang them up yesterday?"

There is general confusion as every one seems to be talking at once. The children go out.

Mr. Brown plays the role of a bill collector who threatens to turn gas and electricity off if bill is not paid.

MRS. SMITH: "I'm sorry. My husband has not received his check this month. He will in two days."

BILL COLLECTOR: "O.K. lady. I'll let it go this time, but it better be soon."

GEORGE (entering): "My shoes are all wet. I can't go to school. I fell in a puddle."

MRS. SMITH: "Oh, dear, your only pair. I can't buy any today until pay day. You'll just have to stay home."

DIRECTOR: "Mrs. Brown, is that the way it would actually be in your house?"

MRS. BROWN: "They drive me crazy with the noise, but I haven't got time to wait on them. I slap them if they get too rambunctious. They know their own clothes pretty well, but they do fight. It's terribly hard for me, and I'm not well, and *he* (pointing to her husband) thinks I'm awful because I go to pieces, etc."

DIRECTOR: "Perhaps someone has some suggestions as to how Mrs. Smith might have a smoother time in her household."

AUDIENCE MEMBER: "Organization."

DIRECTOR: "Well, specifically how?"

MRS. HALL: "Have a room for each child or at least one to accommodate two; let them be responsible for it, keeping their own things in it and in place. Let each child have a task to perform in helping with the housework."

DIRECTOR: "All right, let's try that."

The director continues to regard the problem as belonging to Mrs. Smith so as not to embarrass and depreciate Mrs. Brown, although she will be learning from the performance without attention being focussed upon her.

MRS. SMITH (on stage. The children are just rushing in from school.): "George and Donald, you will have a room by yourselves. You may use

this closet to put your own coats in, and here are shelves your father built to keep your toys in. Mary and Joan, this is your room. Myra and Laura, this is yours. These can be your play rooms, too, and when you invite your friends, you may play with them here. Let's go downstairs and work out a schedule for the week. Myra and Joan—Monday, dishes; Kate, table setting, etc. (Continues to work out a chart with the help of the children.)

It is now Mrs. Brown's turn to take Mrs. Smith's role and to discover the meaning of the phrase "upper classes and jews don't work and have an easy life". Mrs. Brown is a Doctor's wife, has three children, must answer telephone calls for the Doctor as well as care for the home and children. A new point is added here to give Mrs. Brown some insight into what it means to be the victim of racial intolerance and a chance to give her own suggestions as to how to handle it. In this scene, Mrs. Brown's husband is a Jew. It is at first hard for her to warm up. The children are repeating the same confusion and commotion revealed in the former scene, when the telephone rings.

MRS. BROWN: "Hello. No, the Doctor is not in yet." (She is beginning to warm up.)

She goes back to the children; the telephone rings again.

MRS. BROWN: "No, the Doctor is not in yet."

She keeps running back and forth to the telephone, while the children are becoming increasingly noisier. She shows signs of having been effected by the previous performance of Mrs. Smith in suggesting order for the children.

MRS. BROWN: "Now you know where your wraps are. Remember you have them all in your rooms where they belong, if you hung them there as I told you last night. (She appears to be carrying on with the rest of Mrs. Smith's scene.) Whose turn is it tonight to set the table?"

JEAN: "It's my turn."

MRS. BROWN: "Don't forget."

Children come home from school. Rush in noisily.

MRS. BROWN: "Are you staying in or out? Go first to your rooms and take care of your things. You can play there awhile until supper, unless you want to go out. I have to work down here."

Suddenly George enters, pretending to cry: "A little boy hit and bit me and he's calling me a 'dirty jew.' I'm afraid to go back to school."

George himself had previously been resorting to this phrase as a weapon against Jean and Donald.

MRS. BROWN: "Well, I'll see that you get to school. You're just as good as they are. You go right out and tell them so and hit them back."

She takes him by the hand, and walks off the stage.

DIRECTOR: "Now we see from this that no matter what race, religion, or social group we belong to, we all have to learn new and better ways of helping ourselves and each other. Now, how can we help Mrs. Brown?"

MRS. HALL: "Maybe it would be better to ask the children to come into the house and talk to them."

DIRECTOR: "Would you please come up and show us?"

MRS. HALL: "Come in, children. How are you, Bobby? Won't you all sit down? Now then, that's fine. Well, now, what seems to be the trouble? George, what is it?" (George relates being hit and being called a "dirty jew". In actuality, he has been called a "dirty Brown" by Jean Morgan, which also offended Mrs. Brown.) "Well, now let's talk this over. You see, all of us have either grandparents, great or great-great grandparents who came over to this country from many different lands. All of them got together and built America, but many of them still went to the same kind of churches they went to in their own countries. They also sent their children, grandchildren and great grandchildren to these same churches. All the people who go to different churches seem to stay by themselves, and never try to know how interesting other churches can be, and how nice the people are. They really have never found out, so they just *think* they don't like each other, and so they begin to call each other names. Isn't that silly?"

The children are silent as if "caught" by the story before they finally say "yes".

Mrs. Hall's verbalization is not an indication that a deep catharsis has taken place relative to ethnic tolerance. What is important, however, is its effect upon Mrs. Brown who, at the height of warming up to doing something about being a victim of racial discrimination needed to be imbued with a more constructive way of looking at and handling this problem. This is an important beginning for Mrs. Hall, but she needs to test the depth and sincerity of her verbalizations by acting out the role of a German in a Jewish majority group, for example. The effect upon Mrs. Morgan is important. She admits that "she never dreamed Mrs. Hall had any such liberal slants as she revealed here".

## DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

1. The *audience* reactions are not tested quantitatively, but are studied by casual comments, gestures and facial expressions noted at strategic points of the scenes. Then, too, the Italian family is asked which method they would have used in dealing with children who resort to name-calling such as George experienced—that of Mrs. Brown or Mrs. Hall. They think Mrs. Hall's method is good, but if they were in the same situation they would first complain to their parents about them and would not let their own child play with them. Mrs. Morgan is primarily concerned and enlightened by Mrs. Hall's performance, which revealed personality characteristics hitherto unknown to her. She admits that she *may* have been on the "wrong track" when she was attributing the aggression exerted toward her child to a camouflaged racial prejudice.

2. The *parents* involved in the problem, through actually experiencing the role of every other parent, must now *feel* the deeper meaning of the facts underlying their biased attitudes. Mrs. Smith experiences the problems involved in bringing up so many children, trying to keep them all in order, and to run a home on a limited salary. She admits to the Morgans that she had felt more antagonistic than ever toward the Browns when she felt that a child from a very "low" family should be instrumental in causing so much unhappiness for her child. She felt, too, that the children must have bad manners, and was resenting Mrs. Morgan for letting Jean associate with them. After the session, in the course of a sympathetic conversation with Mrs. Brown, Mrs. Smith remarked: "You know your children are really very nice, so well-behaved and quiet." Mrs. Brown has a chance to relieve her self-depreciating attitude by getting a deep impression of problems which other people, even in the "upper classes", have to face and learn how to handle just as she does. She is learning new ways of handling her own home situation. This does not mean that all old habits are replaced for new ones in one session, but she carries some experience in reorganizing her household as well as with new attitudes into her actual life situation. From now on, it is the function of psychodrama to meet any *new* conflicts emerging within this new trial. This is also true of re-training ethnic and social attitudes in general; any new conflicts arising after their experiences in the session should stimulate them to investigate the facts before they allow their prejudices to dominate, and, if necessary, to bring them back again to the psychodramatic sessions for further clarification. Psycho-

dramatic learning must be followed through in actual life situations in order to become meaningful.

3. The *children* involved in the problem have an opportunity (a) to work out their own solution to their triangular conflict without adult threats and imposed solutions; (b) to show the parents how children become the carriers of their own stereotyped expressions and "hidden" feelings, and how, in turn, they cause conflicts among children which may re-arouse and intensify their own prejudices; (c) to get the feeling of the effect of using stereotyped phrases and to discover why they are using them.

4. These neighborhood problems support the point of view that the mere proximity of unlikes does not increase inter-ethnic tolerance. Very often, it produces further withdrawal and increases intolerance. Paul Deutschberger concludes this in his sociometric study of neighborhood groups: "The evidence is overwhelmingly against the hypothesis that the day-to-day contact with unlikes that the changing atmosphere affords in any way predisposes greater inter-ethnic tolerance."<sup>1</sup> Deeper experiences in ethnic inter-action as demonstrated in the above technique need to be brought about in order to "get at" the deeper roots of prejudice.

---

<sup>1</sup>Deutschberger, Paul, "Interaction Patterns in Changing Neighborhoods: New York and Pittsburgh", *SOCIOMETRY*, Vol. IX, No. 4, 1946.

## PSYCHODRAMA IN TEACHING SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

ROGER G. BARKER

*Clark University*

The potentialities of psychodrama as a teaching tool have by no means been completely explored. It is important that this be done, and it appears that reporting diverse teaching experiences may further this end. With this in mind, the following excerpts are presented from the record of a class session in Social Psychology. They illustrate the use of psychodrama in teaching a scientific approach to problems of human social behavior. This is a frequent goal of instruction in the social sciences, but a very difficult one to achieve. Among the obstacles encountered are those of beginning on the student's own level of understanding, and of dealing with real, concrete problems. In overcoming these difficulties, psychodrama appears to be a highly valuable aid.

**INSTRUCTOR** (to the class): The scientific study of social psychology is not easy. It possesses, however, one advantage as a subject of study over many of the more highly developed physical and biological sciences, namely: even very elementary students have had direct experience with the raw material with which they are to deal. This is not true of the materials of many other sciences. In the study of embryology or geology, for example, a great amount of the student's time must be occupied in gaining an elementary acquaintance with the phenomena to be studied. Few students have ever seen a fetus or a penepain; but all have seen a fight and participated in an organization. In this class, then, we have a head start in this respect. To some degree we can go immediately to the essential task of science: to account for and understand the phenomena with which the science deals. Of course, we all do this in some fashion with the raw material of social psychology every day. Let us illustrate this with a concrete instance of social behavior. Each of you should make a detailed record of what occurs so that we can discuss it later.

### *First Psychodramatic Episode*

*Instructor's directions to student volunteer (given privately):* You are to play the role of a business executive. This is the situation: you have come to your office in the morning and found that it has not been cleaned.

It is in bad shape. This is the second time this has happened recently. You are very disconcerted, as you brought an important client into your unkempt and foul-smelling office. You are to call the janitor who is responsible and speak to him in whatever way you think best.

*Instructor's directions to a second student volunteer (given publicly):*

You are to play the role of a janitor. Your boss calls you to his office to speak to you. You will behave in whatever way you think the situation requires.

*Executive (rushes up to janitor shouting angrily):* Do you see my office, Smith! It is in a terrible condition!

*Janitor:* I'm sorry.

*Executive:* Sorry, sorry! I'm sick of excuses! I want a clean office!

*Janitor:* I cleaned your office last night.

*Executive:* The next time I come into my office and it's dirty, you're out! (pounds desk)

### *Second Psychodramatic Episode*

*Instructor's directions to the student who played the executive in the first episode (given privately):* In this episode you are at home in the evening of the same day. You tell your wife about the day's happenings.

*Instructor's directions to third student volunteer (given publicly):* You will play the role of the executive's wife. It is the evening of the same day. He will talk to you; you reply in whatever way you think appropriate.

*Executive:* Those janitors are getting worse all the time.

*Wife:* What do you mean?

*Executive:* Oh, he left my office in bad shape last night.

*Wife:* Why don't you fire him?

*Executive:* Oh, I can't. He's been working there for twenty years and deserves some consideration. Maybe something's wrong at home.

*Wife:* You're too big to worry over such a little detail.

*Executive:* I've a big deal coming up. If we land this one, we'll be set. That janitor! I certainly hope he does his job.

### *Third Psychodramatic Episode*

*Instructor's directions to student who has played the role of executive (given privately):* On this occasion you're driving to your office and run out of gas. You have only 10 minutes to get to an important meeting. You will verbalize your thoughts and feelings, and take whatever action you think best.

*General instructions to the class:* This is the executive's car; he is on his way to his office; the car has just come to a stop.

*Executive:* Heavenly days! What's this? I can't be out of gas; there was almost 10 gallons in it yesterday. (Gets up and examines tank). Well, I'll be damned! Dry as a bone! And I have only 10 minutes to make that appointment. How could this have happened? Maybe Jim used the car yesterday. I'll certainly attend to that boy tonight—but no time to get to the bottom of this now. I'll get a taxi. (Hails taxi.)

#### *Fourth Psychodramatic Episode*

*Instructor's directions to student who has played the role of executive (given privately):* This is the evening of the day you ran out of gas. You are telling your wife about the day's happenings.

*Instructor's directions to student who has played the role of wife (given publicly):* Your husband has come home and will tell you of the day's events.

*Executive:* I ran out of gas on the way to the office. Has Jim been using the car again? Heavenly days!

*Wife:* No, Jim hasn't.

*Executive:* Did you use the car yesterday?

*Wife:* Just a little bit.

*Executive:* Just a little! Ten gallons of gas!

*Wife:* Is just running out of gas so important?

*Executive:* I barely got my bid in! After this, the house will run like a business organization. Anyone who uses the car must fill it at night.

*Wife:* If he has some money!

*Executive:* I'll leave money in the cookie jar.

*Wife:* I can't see why there was no gas. I'm sure I didn't use that much.

*Executive:* Perhaps there is a leak in the tank. We ought to check on that. I'll send Jim out to the garage. If there isn't any leak, we must set up a system.

Such psychodramatic episodes as these demonstrate the fact that every social and physical obstacle instigates behavior that implies assumptions as to the nature of the obstacle. Such episodes can be used, therefore, to illustrate different kinds of behavior made in response to social and physical obstacles, and to analyze the different assumptions and ways of thinking this behavior signifies.

In the present case differences in the implicit assumptions as to the

essential nature of the social and physical obstacles (unreliable janitor and empty gas tank) are so dramatic that the most unsophisticated student can see some of the differences immediately. The contrast may be made even more emphatic if the episodes are repeated with the behavior artificially transposed: i.e. with the behavior made in response to the social problem coupled with the physical problem and *vice versa*. For example:

*Executive:* Heavenly days! What's this? Tank, you're not empty, are you? Well, I'll be damned! This is terrible. You've gone dry on me again. This is the second chance I've given you. After this I want you to stay full. The next time you go dry on me in this way I'll throw you out!

Being thus confronted with contemporary, concrete instances of more or less primitive approaches to social and physical obstacles respectively, students are more able to take the problem seriously, and by discussion and further psychodramatic consideration of the same episodes to begin to understand the essential differences in these ways of dealing with obstacles, and to lay the emotional and intellectual foundations for more adequate behavior.

The demonstration that culture includes ways of thinking as well as social customs and attitudes, and that in present-day culture even educated people are largely at a pre-Galilean stage of thinking about social problems is impressive to many students.

# ROLE PLAYING AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

ALEX BAVELAS

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

## I

Management consists of getting jobs done through people. The efficient manager has a double objective: a) to fulfill the technical requirements of the job, and b) to do so in such a way that the human resources he employs are maintained and developed. Management, on the whole, is impressively competent in the technical aspects of its job, but is only beginning to appreciate the responsibilities and possibilities of the human relations aspects. While many of the human problems in industry derive from the workings of social and economic forces "outside" a given industrial organization, it is clear that the larger part of a particular management's troubles can be traced to inept handling of human relations problems "inside" the industrial organization. These difficulties do not arise entirely out of incorrect philosophies of human relations. There are notable examples of failures of "theoretically" sound industrial relations programs, and of theoretically suicidal ones that have had a surprisingly long life. These cases are understandable, however, when one examines the quality of the "face-to-face" relationships which exist within the organization. All organizations reduce ultimately to such direct contacts, and these are critical links which determine to a large extent their success or failure.

Developing and maintaining optimal face-to-face relationships is, for many managers, a very difficult thing to do. And the prevailing notion that this phase of management is a matter of "personality" or "knowing human nature" etc., has obscured the problem and made it difficult for the manager to get the help he needs. Actually, both casual observation and research indicate that the quality of personal relationships depends upon specific social skills, and that like other skills they may be learned by practice. They cannot be learned out of books to any greater extent than skill in playing tennis can be acquired by reading a book, and a traditional course in psychology is little more helpful than a course in physics would be to the tennis player.<sup>1</sup> What appears to be the most effective method for teaching these skills is a common sense one—watch others, let others watch you,

---

<sup>1</sup>This statement, of course, refers exclusively to "skills", and not to matters of philosophy and attitude.

discuss and evaluate differences, and try it again. Practical considerations usually make such a procedure extremely difficult if not impossible to follow in the actual work situation. Because of this, training ordinarily takes the form of meetings, in which the conference method has been generally conceded to be superior to "formal" instruction methods.

## II

The conference or group discussion method, successful as it is in presenting points of view, genuinely involving the participants, and changing attitudes, suffers from one grave disadvantage in that its activities are confined to "talking about" rather than "doing". Group discussion may effect considerable changes in motivation, and may raise the group's level of understanding regarding the problems of face-to-face relationships, but it is not very effective in transmitting behavioral skills. It is this defect in the discussion method that has led individuals interested in the problem of training social skills to experiment with role-playing. The central idea of role-playing is the assigning of roles to various members of the training group and the acting out of problem situations. While role-playing as a method of training in industry is not widespread, it has been used enough to show that it is possible to proceed in a variety of ways. The problem situation and the roles to be played may be defined so strictly as to constitute, for all intents and purposes, a demonstration; or they may be set so loosely that the "play" is highly spontaneous and the outcome all but unpredictable. The play may deal with a single incident, or it may contain a series of incidents each growing out of the preceding one. Various individuals playing parts may be instructed as to how to react if certain events take place, or they may be told to react "naturally".

Whatever the form of role-playing used, if it is well planned and directed, the following advantages for teaching are usually gained:

- 1) Playing a role before an "audience" makes an individual self-conscious. Since the purpose of role-playing is not to present a finished performance, this self-consciousness is desirable because it makes the individual aware of his actions in a new way. It is a common occurrence in role-playing that a person makes the same mistakes he has been observed to make unconsciously while on the job, and immediately after the play is over points out, himself, that he has made errors. He becomes, as it were, "sensitized" to himself.

- 2) Since the roles other than the one primarily under consideration

are also played by members of the group, it is possible to get direct expression immediately after the play of the effects caused by the actions of the primary actor. For instance, the foreman who is playing the role of a *worker* can report how it made him feel when the *foreman* treated him the way he did. This helps the trainees to get a better insight into the effects of their actions on others. They become, in other words, sensitized to the effects of their actions on others.

3) Since everyone, sooner or later, takes a turn at playing a role, everyone in the "audience" has either taken his turn or is waiting to go on. This rotation of roles causes certain factors to operate:

a) The individuals waiting for their turn take full advantage of the chance to see what the fellow "at bat" will do, and thus eliminate errors from their own performance.

b) The individuals who have already been at bat, elated with their success or chagrined at their errors, are also only too ready to find and point out the good or bad points in the current play.

c) Very often an individual who has just played the role of *foreman* takes the role of *worker* in the very next play. For him this offers the stimulating experience of "feeling the difference" between the foreman's and the worker's position in a difficult situation.

4) Role-playing has the advantage of emphasizing *showing* how you would do something rather than *telling* how you would do it. Many individuals who "talk a good game" are woefully inadequate when it comes to performing the actions they describe so glibly.

5) And finally, role-playing has the sound virtue of getting people to learn by doing. The advantages of actual practice over pure discussion, in terms of effecting on-the-job behavior changes, are considerable.

### III

The success of role-playing in effecting actual behavior changes depends, as do all methods of training in this field, upon the background situation in which the training is being done. The problems in this respect stand out more clearly if one thinks of a company in which foreman training is about to be initiated—especially if the training is to be done by an outside expert. Two factors in such a situation can become either great assets or insurmountable obstacles: a) the relevance of the course content to the problems of the foremen *as they see them*, and b) the extent to which the foreman's work-situation will permit him to put what he learns into practice.

Let us consider these factors separately. It is not difficult to conduct a series of meetings which the foreman will find both entertaining and "educational", but it is quite another matter to conduct meetings which will in fact give the foreman the help he really needs. Of course, everyone in management can, and will, tell in some detail "what the foremen need". But the problem of course content cannot be solved by merely compiling a list, however correct, of areas in which the foremen are deficient. It is necessary to know what the foremen themselves feel they need. It is when the foremen perceive the material being taught as better means than they now have for the accomplishment of their purposes that sufficient motivation to learn will develop. Whether it takes a week or six months, an investigation into the "felt needs" of the group to be trained should precede the course itself. But this is only half of the problem. It is often the case that foremen, conscious as they are of certain of their problems, are quite unconscious of others. Problems in personal relationships, especially, which are too difficult for the individual to solve or too threatening in their implications often remain unperceived, or are conveniently explained away. In connection with this problem, role-playing can be of great value, aside from its usefulness in teaching. The shrewd observer can learn a great deal about the members of the group as he watches their actions and reactions in various situations, and the experience at playing certain roles can be, for the individual himself, a touchstone for uncovering hidden problems. (Actually, the whole idea of role-playing was pioneered by Moreno as a technique for psychological therapy.)<sup>2</sup> It becomes, therefore, the task of the trainer to increase the awareness of the individuals to these "blind" areas, and keep the content of the course aligned with the shifting and emerging needs of the group.

With respect to the second of the two factors mentioned above—the extent to which the foreman's work-situation will permit him to put what he learns into practice—it should be remembered that the final test of the effectiveness of a training course is not what happens in the training room, but what happens on the job when the foreman goes back to work. It is a psychological commonplace that an individual's behavior is greatly affected by his immediate environment. The social behavior of an individual is especially sensitive to factors in the social environment, such as disapproval, encouragement, aggressiveness, insecurity, etc. In training meet-

---

<sup>2</sup>Moreno, J. L. "Inter-personal therapy and the psychopathology of inter-personal relationships" *Sociometry*, July and October, 1937, Volume I, Nos. 1 and 2, Pp. 9-76.

ings the skillful course leader maintains an atmosphere of encouragement and approval. He is very careful to recognize and reward constructive actions. But what of the social atmosphere at the foreman's place of work? The nature of this atmosphere is largely determined by the foreman's immediate superior. Suppose it is essentially one of insecurity and disapproval. A foreman who works in such a setting and who wants to keep his job—to say nothing of being promoted—will be primarily motivated to increase his security and avoid disapproval. And this will mean acting in a way that he knows by experience will get him by with his boss. In other words, there will be strong inhibitory forces against trying the new things he learned in the training course. Obviously, there are great difficulties in the way of training foremen to be better foremen than their superintendents. One might well ask where training should begin. With the foremen? With superintendents? With the plant manager? It is clear that since management involves the coordinated functioning of a group, effective training at any level of management implies adjustments throughout the group. Otherwise, training directed at a specific group in a management can only be as effective as the adequacy of the entire management group permits it to be.

#### IV

Some of the possible variations of the role-playing method have been indicated above. Which particular method is best may depend upon the specific use to which the role-playing is to be put. A method which is effective for the purpose of exploring the ramifications of a problem may not be as effective in teaching a specific skill. Several years of trial and error in the use of role-playing in management training seems to indicate that an effective procedure for teaching specific social skills requires 1) the use of carefully planned "stereotype" situations as basic training material, and 2) rather close controls of all roles being played, with the exception of the role primarily under consideration—that one being left entirely free to be played as the individual sees fit.

The outline following is a general description of the succession of events in a typical role-playing session.

1. Begin with a short discussion of the general area in which the problems to be taken up lie. The group may be encouraged to tell about "cases" that illustrate the various aspects of the problem.

2. Select and send out of the meeting room two or three of the trainees. If this is the first time role-playing is to be attempted, try to

select individuals whom you judge will have least trouble in entering into the spirit of the thing, and spend a few minutes explaining what role-playing is all about.

3. Describe to the group the problem situation which will be played out. (This has been prepared by the trainer in advance of the meeting. It might be a situation in which a foreman has decided to have a talk with one of his men regarding excessive absenteeism). Give enough background material so that the problem becomes alive. For instance, the details might be

a) The man has been employed for a year and a half and is a better-than-average worker; b) up to three months ago his attendance had been very good; c) a month ago he received a routine warning slip on his absenteeism, but the absenteeism continued; d) the foreman has decided to do something about it; e) the man's absenteeism is due to some very personal difficulties, and he would rather lose his job than talk about them to the foreman.

4. Select a member of the group to play the role of the worker, or in initial sessions the trainer himself may play this role.

5. Ask the group if there are any questions—if the problem under consideration is clear. Suggest, or better, obtain from the group, possible lines of action that the foreman might take, and orient the group toward watching the ensuing play with the set "how could it be done better". For example, "What might the foreman do? Will he try to discover the cause of the man's absence? When he realizes that the man won't tell him why he is absent, what will he do? Will he threaten him? Will he say it doesn't matter? What *can* the foreman do in such a situation? Is he completely blocked?"

6. If the play is to take place in the foreman's office, set before the group a table and two chairs and furnish enough "props" to make the situation quite definite.

7. Call in one of the men waiting outside. Have him take his place at the desk and explain the problem to him. (It is usually interesting in a problem like this one to say nothing of the worker's resistance to revealing the reason for his absenteeism. Let the foreman discover it for himself, as he would in a real-life situation.) Make sure he understands the setting, and then start the action—"The problem is clear? Very well. You are in your office and you had asked Jack to come in. Here he is. He walks in and says, 'Did you want to see me, Mr. Frank?'"

8. This kind of situation may end by itself with the man going back to his place of work. Some situations, however, do not come to an end naturally if left alone. In such a case, the trainer must decide when the play has gone on long enough for the purposes he has in mind, and arbitrarily "end" it.

9. Have the primary player take his place with the group. Sum up the action that took place. Do not enter into a discussion at this point as to how it could have been done differently. Rather, prime the group to look for differences between what they have seen and the next play. It is helpful to outline the events of the first play briefly on a blackboard and cover it up before the next man comes in. If the first player has had difficulty because of factors in the problem of which he was not aware (the resistance of the worker against explaining the cause of his absenteeism), explain them to him so that he can watch the second player on a par with the rest of the group.

10. Call in the second player and repeat instructions. The man taking the role of worker essentially repeats his previous behavior.

11. When the second play has ended, and assuming you sent out only two people, sum up the action of the second play and review what happened in the first one. The review is important because the second player must be brought up to date. If you are using a blackboard, you will now have two outlines, side by side, each describing the action in one of the plays.

12. Before general discussion evaluating the two performances begins, it is usually best to ask all three of the actors for their reactions. This gives the players a chance to "save face" by pointing out themselves the errors that they may have made, and serves to give the group additional information. It is often helpful to prompt the man playing the role of worker by such questions as "Which foreman do you think you'd rather work for? Why?"

13. Open the meeting to general discussion. As a result of the discussion try to get a third column on the blackboard indicating what the group now feels would be the preferred foreman behavior.

14. Select a member of the group who has not yet played a role and have him act out the foreman's role along the lines indicated by the group. Instruct the group to watch carefully for flaws in what they have set up as "preferred" behavior.

## V

Lectures, group discussion, and role-playing can be regarded as being on a continuum along which the skill of the training leader is increasingly important. Leading a good group discussion requires skills in addition to those required for delivering a good lecture. Conducting a role-playing session requires a high level of discussion leadership—and considerably more. It requires, obviously, that the leader be able to actually *do* as well as *tell* how to do. This is an innocent-sounding requirement, but many a seasoned talker has had cause to smart in retrospect at his first attempt to act out the solution to an apparently simple problem. There is also the requirement of an adequate technique in directing role-playing (not the same problem as *method*, which was briefly discussed above). And there is always the task of constructing the situations which will be acted out. Almost always they must be planned anew for each group and organization, and it is not easy to find the problem situations which will yield the most fruitful material. It may appear on the surface that certain types of problems are common to all foremen—attendance, discipline, work delegation, employee training, etc. But in reality these are areas of responsibility, not problems. The problems that arise in these areas are due to factors specific to the organization itself—its type of management, its social atmosphere, its position in the labor market, its product, etc. The planning of situations for role-playing rests finally not upon generalizations from the picture of industrial management as a whole, but upon individual diagnosis of the organization in which the training is to be done.

The question often arises "Granted that role-playing is an efficient training method, can individuals be trained to use it?" The answer is a qualified "yes", based upon both failures and successes. Attempts to train individuals to direct role-playing yield very questionable results when reliance is placed upon lectures, demonstrations, and trainers' manuals. Experience indicates what should have been self-evident: that the directing of role-playing can best be taught by the use of role-playing itself. In one case, after spending twenty hours of meetings in demonstration and discussion without appreciable effect, a successful transmission of the skill was accomplished in three two-hour sessions in which the individuals took turns playing the role of trainer. In another case, several individuals of a group of plant managers who were using role-playing to solve some of their own problems spontaneously began using the technique with their own subordinates with excellent results.

---

The latter instance may be a good example of the soundest way to approach the problem of training within an organization. Experiences in many and varied situations in which training has been attempted lead the writer to the conviction that training is an integral part of the management function and cannot easily be delegated. The logical and psychological point at which training can best take place is between an individual and his immediate superior. Any other arrangement necessitates such a close and comprehensive liaison between trainer and line management as is seldom achieved. The proper duties of the training consultant or the staff man to whom the problem of training has been assigned are not the conducting of training courses. This may appear at first to be helpful; actually it is an inefficient procedure and is often deleterious to management in the long run. The training consultant's objective should be to restore and to implement, not to perform the training function for management. He should work to create an awareness at all levels of management of the importance of training. He should make available to management resources for training in the form of materials and methods. He should assist in the diagnosis of training needs and in the development of training programs. He should stimulate and guide the evaluation of training programs, both completed and in process. He should, in short, help management to acquire the skills and understandings it needs to do the job for itself.

## THE USE OF PSYCHODRAMA FOR GROUP CONSULTANTS

LELAND P. BRADFORD

*National Education Association  
Washington, D. C.*

Characteristic of most conference and group meetings throughout the country is the inadequate utilization, and frequent misuse, of the consultant, resource person, or expert. The following picture of the roles of these persons is all too typical.

1. The expert is called on to give a talk to the group under the assumption that he will answer all unasked questions. The participants become an audience with an attitude of passivity. Essentially unfamiliar with the particular problems plaguing the members of the audience, the consultant, trying to meet the unknown needs and unaware of the degree of sophistication in his field of the listeners, either so generalizes that he meets no problems or gives an exhortatory pep talk. In either case the participants, immediately or later, depending upon the oratorical skill of the expert, sense futility. Two further disastrous results of this use of the expert occur. One is to build in the 'experts' ego satisfaction in oratory and in "getting a laugh" that is antithetical to the development of a deeper and more lasting contribution to the group. The other is the development in participants of a satisfaction with the lazy passivity of being a member of a listening audience and with the temporary emotional exaltation of being "uplifted."

2. The consultant, or resource person, is brought into a discussion group with the vague hope that he will lend authority and weight to what is too infrequently merely a rambling interchange of opinionated ignorance. Often he comes in long after the beginning of the discussion. The discussion leader, feeling impelled to make use of the expert, stops the flow of group thought "To have the expert tell us what we ought to be doing." The expert, again relatively unfamiliar with the exact problems and the degree of sophistication and experience of the group members, proceeds to "tell" the group. The result, obviously, is a change in the status structure of the group to a point where the expert dominates the group while the members become more and more reticent about expressing their problems, experiences, and points of view. The expert frequently causes discouragement and rejection of action by setting levels of aspiration too high for the present level of the group.

3. Frequently the expert has become too centered on one aspect of a problem or on one area of a field. He sees invitations to act as a consultant or resource person as another opportunity to spread the gospel as he views it. The result is an effort to pervert the group thinking to his opinion and a destruction of the process of group thinking.

Many more pictures of the typical use of experts could be given. The foregoing, however, will suggest to the reader similar experiences. The net result of these misuses is frustration and lack of growth of both participants and experts, increased lack of communication between those facing problems and those having contributions to the solution of their problems, and an increased false dependency upon the expert.

In facing the problem of a more adequate use of the consultant, three general points should be seen. These are, first, the desired results from the use of the consultant, second, the role of the consultant, and third, the specific steps in using the consultant.

1. Desired results from consultant use.
  - a. The group should receive definite assistance in terms of their problems.
  - b. The group should be further aided by the consultant in their growth as a group and as individuals in their ability to solve problems.
  - c. The consultant should, in recompense for his services, have an opportunity to learn more about the problems of people in the area of his concern and should grow in his ability in the role of the consultant.
2. The role of the consultant.
  - a. To help the group uncover problems and to delineate the specific aspects of the problems.
  - b. To bring a background of information and experience to the group to aid in the diagnosis and solution of problems.
  - c. To bring alternative points of view which may help in the thorough determination of problems and the adequate solution of problems.
  - d. To bring specific information to the group where needed.
  - e. To help the group test their diagnosis of problems and their tentative solutions.
  - f. To help the group evaluate the process of their own group thinking. Obviously the role of the consultant should not involve:
    - a. Setting too high a level of aspiration for the group activity.

- b. Dominating the group by insisting on bringing in information where not needed.
  - c. Perverting the group to the consultant's way of thinking.
3. Specific steps in using the consultant.
    - a. Opportunities should be planned to enable the group to think through and analyze its problems and to determine exactly the kind of help they wish to secure from the consultant.
    - b. Opportunities should be provided for the consultant to be thoroughly prepared in terms of the problems of concern to the group and in terms of the degree of awareness of these problems, the depth of thinking and total experience of the group.

Experimentation has been carried on in various conferences on the use of the consultant. The following examples indicate ways in which psychodrama may be effective in making a more efficient use of the consultant.

*Example A:*—In this conference an education officer of a major labor union had been asked to attend as a consultant during one general session of the conference. The director told the consultant that instead of being introduced from the stage he would be asked to sit quietly in the back of the room while a preliminary discussion was held with the conference group on exactly what they wanted to get out of this consultant. After this preliminary discussion, the consultant would be brought into the picture with a clearer understanding of the problems as seen by the participants and of their perception and growth. For a while some discussion was held by the consultant concerning the problems raised by the group. However, the consultant tended to generalize and to make a speech on each point. The leader then endeavored to lead the consultant into role-playing as a means of developing specific group thinking.

LEADER: "What we really want, Mr. Blank, is a picture of how we in education can work more closely with local labor groups. We often find difficulty in getting down to brass tacks on specific projects. To help us out, I wonder if you would mind being the President of a local union and one of us will play the part of a local director of Adult Education. Who will play the role of local director?"

*(After some discussion, it was finally decided that one of the participants would play this role.)*

LEADER: "Let's see, I assume that this would be in an entirely industrial community of 60,000 to 80,000 people, is that about right?"

*(Nods of assent from the group and also the consultant)*

"All right, you, Mr. Blank, are now the President of a Local Union and you are in your office and the Director of Adult Education is coming to see you. Are we all agreed on that point?"

*(The consultant sits at the end of a small table with a chair beside him, and is engrossed in his work, as the local Adult Education Director comes into his office.)*

AE DIRECTOR: "How do you do, Mr. Jones. I am Mr. Smith and I am responsible for adult education activities in the Board of Education here in our city. I know you are busy and I hate to bother you but I have a problem, I think, which concerns you just as much as it concerns me.

*(The Adult Education Director leads very gradually and somewhat timidly into his proposed project which is that of establishing a number of family-living discussion groups among the wives of the union members. Both the union President and the director of adult education have difficulty in talking freely with each other. The Director of Adult Education seems uncertain as to how he should approach the union President and the union President gives evidence that he feels the proposal of the Director of Adult Education is somehow a reflection on his union's activities. His statements are almost entirely directed towards defending his union's activities.)*

UNION PRESIDENT: "Well, Mr. Smith you know of course that we are always interested in education here in the union and I will be glad to take this up at our next meeting, and let you know how they feel about it.

At this point the scene is cut and the evening's discussion leader enters again into the general group discussion.

LEADER: "While I think, Mr. Blank, that gave us some picture of problems which concern us, I have a feeling that we still don't know very well how to approach the President of a local union. I think it might be more helpful if we switch roles at this point. Why don't you be a Director of Adult Education and one of us will play the role of the union President. We have a clearer idea of how to play that role now after watching you in that position."

*(The Leader very quickly sets up a similar scene in which another member of the audience now becomes the union President and Mr. Blank prepares to come in as a local director of Adult Education. This scene is played through much more successfully. Mr. Blank knowing thoroughly the way of thinking of the union President, does a very excellent job of reducing any suspicions the union President may have and of setting up*

an atmosphere of free interchange of thought in which the two work together towards accomplishing the purpose the AE Director had in mind. After the scene was cut, the whole conference group discussed with considerable interest and almost total participation, the ways in which they in their own community could develop greater cooperation between labor groups and educational groups. The discussion, in fact, went much deeper into the techniques of developing cooperation with other agencies on the community level. Instead of a situation in which the audience listened, courteously but somewhat indifferently, to Mr. Blank as consultant, there was developed a definite feeling of friendliness and mutual cooperation between Mr. Blank and the rest of the group. So warm was this feeling of fellowship that some of the members talked with him for over two hours after the close of the meeting on common problems.

*Example B:*—In this conference a number of groups had been working for days on the problem of developing community participation in the educational and social problems and in practicing needed leadership skills in this area. On this particular afternoon one consultant was brought to the group. This consultant was an editor of a newspaper in a nearby city. He had previously met the discussion leader, who had talked to him briefly about the problems this particular group was facing. When the afternoon session began, the consultant merely joined the group without the discussion leader doing more than introducing him by name, but not by occupational responsibilities. Some of the group looked at the leader with the expectation that he would tell just who this member was and what he had to tell to the group but the leader ignored these glances and continued with the work of the group. The group itself was carrying on a sequence of psychodrama scenes concerned with developing community concern over the problem of juvenile delinquency and the lack of recreational facilities. Gradually the psychodrama scene pinned down the thinking of the group to a point where they could see more clearly the kind of program which ought to be developed in this community. One of the ways of tackling this problem was seen to be getting the cooperation of the local press. In a particular psychodrama scene the group talked over the problem of going down to meet the local editor. At this point, the group leader suggested that the consultant might well play the role of the local editor. Having watched the thinking of the group for a previous hour, this consultant was in a good position to understand the problems faced by the group and to grasp their level of experience and competence. As a result, in his role of local editor he was able to help

---

the group to analyze very clearly exactly how they would approach the local editor and what they would do to win his cooperation and assistance. It was only after the scene was played that the group realized that the person playing the role of editor was himself the editor of a large newspaper, and that the help they had received had added to it the authority of the expert.

The above examples have indicated ways in which consultants can be helped to being more effective through the use of psychodrama. In each instance the consultant was carefully prepared for his role in terms of understanding of the group with which he was to work. Because the problems were specific problems his contributions were specific rather than vague and general. Again, the consultant was accepted more as an equal worker with the other group members than as an expert who was merely to be listened to.

## ROLE PRACTICE IN INTERVIEW TRAINING

MARGARET E. BARRON

*Federal Security Agency*

The use of role playing or reality practice is being increasingly recognized as an effective means of translating principles into methods, of learning the *how*, of getting the feel of doing something in a situation where one is not playing for keeps. In training which is directed toward improving skill in interpersonal relations it offers a most effective way of bridging the gap between formal study of principles, methods, and techniques on a verbal level to actual work with those methods and techniques. It offers an opportunity for practice in those kinds of work, such as interviewing, for example, where close supervision and training on the job are very difficult.

Because the interview is essentially an unrehearsed play in which the two persons involved are both playwrights and actors, the use of psychodramatic methods is particularly appropriate in the training of interviewers.

To be a really good interviewer, to be able to sense correctly and understand and appreciate the feelings of the client, keen sensitivity is required. Role playing as part of the training program contributes greatly to the achievement of this sensitivity. Through taking roles as client as well as interviewer ("role reversal" as it is called by Moreno), the trainee finds himself inside the skin of the client, so to speak, and has an opportunity to experience first hand what it means to be on the other end of the interview process. Moreover, if further exploration is needed to understand the point of view of the client, the use of role playing enables the training group to go behind the interview situation, reenacting scenes at home or at work out of which the problem as it is seen in the interview may have developed.

Role playing as it is used in training is generally not for the purpose of developing the one best way of doing things. Usually there are many possible ways in which a situation may be handled effectively. The "best way" for interviewer A may not be the best way for interviewer B because of his different equipment, personality, relationship to the client, and many other factors. The aim is not to develop a set of recipes or rules which the interviewer can follow under specified conditions. In the interview, as in other kinds of interpersonal relations, we can't "cook by the book," though there are, of course, some general rules or principles of which we must be

aware. The aim is to increase the interviewer's flexibility as well as his skill, and to give him experience in meeting different kinds of situations appropriately and effectively.

By creating problems similar to those with which he will have to cope in real life, work in the training group is substituted for actual life experience. Within a one semester workshop, for example, he can have been confronted with a variety of problems, representing a range of perhaps five years on the job. Many problems, and some of those which are most difficult to meet, occur infrequently, and if the trainee must wait until they arise in the due course of the work, training is greatly protracted. But if he receives training only on those problems which occur in a specified period, his training is often incomplete. In other words, if the role playing situations are carefully set up they can serve as a substitute for life experience—the trainee doesn't have to get old before he knows life.

Role playing supplies a clinical interview laboratory where various methods and techniques can be experimented with. In addition to making possible the practice of accepted and well recognized techniques under more or less controlled conditions, it permits experimentation with new and untried methods, for role playing also provides a prediction of results.

Moreover, role playing permits the group to go forward, to project itself into a future situation which would be the logical outcome of the situation under study. The interview, or almost any other situation for that matter, is an event in a sequence, and the structure and content of subsequent situations will be determined at least in part by the character of the current situation. It is often hard to know whether or not a particular kind of behavior is leading to the desired goal. In the interview, it is difficult for the interviewer to know whether what he has done will produce the desired results. It is also hard for the interviewer-trainee to completely understand and accept emotionally, as well as intellectually, the fact that certain kinds of techniques in the interview will be ineffective or may lead to disastrous consequences.

This was strikingly illustrated in a recent session of a training course for counselors which is being conducted by the author. The following transcript of several short interviews shows how a counselor gained insight into the danger of "manipulative counseling," and illustrates the use of role playing in interview training. In previous sessions the group had studied interview principles and techniques and were now exploring the appropriateness of the so called directive and non-directive techniques in various kinds of interviews.

In the discussions it had become clear that some of the trainees had a strong desire to *do things* in the interview—to try to secure another job for the interviewee, or to make arrangements with other persons in his behalf. In their eagerness to help they took the presenting problem as their point of departure and began making suggestions and giving advice. They found it difficult to accept the fact—other than to give verbal recognition to it—that the job of the counselor was to help the individual help himself, to gain insight into the nature of his problem and develop and use his own resources in coping with it.

The problem on which we were working was one selected by the group as of major concern to them. Instead of discussing it on the verbal level, the student who had suggested the problem, a veteran himself, was asked to serve as the employee, a returned veteran who was coming to see the counselor. As counselor the leader selected Miss C, a student who in previous work had shown a tendency toward a directive and manipulative approach. The leader instructed her to use directive techniques in the interview. This was done both to insure a contrast of techniques for discussion purposes, and also to protect her self-esteem. With such instructions she was taking a role at the direction of the leader, and was not exposing herself to the group in a role of her own creation. Yet at the same time, by placing her in a role similar to that in which she often placed herself in real life, she was being put in a position to gain new insight into her behavior.

A transcript of the interview follows:

Mr. K-1: Miss C, I'd like to see you about a problem which has been on my mind for some time. I've been in the army and have just come back to this outfit again. I don't know that you remember me. I don't think you were here when I left so suppose I start back at the beginning of my problem. I was drafted in the army in 1941, and a pretty good buddy of mine who worked right with me didn't go in. I never asked him why—that was his business. Well, we started out here together. We were appointed as grade 3<sup>1</sup> clerks on the same day. Up to the time I was drafted we worked in the same section. I put in 4 years and 9 months in the service.

I knew the regulations giving you your old job back and I came back

---

<sup>1</sup>In the Federal service, jobs in the "Clerical, Administrative, and Fiscal" series are classified from grade one, the lowest, to grade 15. The beginning salary of grade 3 is \$2168, of grade 4, \$2394, and grade 6, \$3021.

to work within 90 days. I came back to see what I could get. Well, I'm a little bit ahead of myself. I'll go back and explain. Just before I left I had been appointed to a grade 4 and Johnny stayed at grade 3. Now, when I come back, I find I can get my grade 4, but Johnny has jumped to a grade 6. Since that's the top grade in my particular unit, he is naturally the supervisor. That goes against the grain. To have somebody under you when you were drafted into the service and just because he has the luck to stay here he gets the grade 6. It's pretty rough treatment.

Miss C-1: Have you talked with your supervisor, that is, the one over Johnny, about this?

K-2: I have. He gave me some assurance that he would see what he could do about the situation. I don't know just what steps he plans to take.

C-2: He may not have had time to look into it yet.

K-3: He's had two or three months.

C-3: Do you think it might be well to see him again and ask what he is going to do about it?

K-4: I don't want to give him the impression that I am pressing him—that I'm trying to push him into doing something for me. Maybe he has something in mind. I might antagonize him.

C-4: You feel you like it here in this organization—that you want something that is higher here rather than looking for a job elsewhere?

K-5: I've liked the work the little while I've been back. I just don't like the idea of working under someone I used to supervise. It looks like discrimination. It's quite possible that the fellow has more ability than I do, but since I didn't have as long a period to demonstrate my ability I think I should be given the same chances he had.

C-5: I think it should be straightened out to your satisfaction. You should talk with your supervisor again. Maybe he would look into the situation and see what he can do.

K-6: I will go back and see him if you think it will do any good. But I don't want to kill my chances by going to see him when he may be working on it right now.

C-6: I would suggest that you go back and remind him of this situation and see what he can do.

K-7: Do you think it is right that all I can get is my old position back? Can I go any higher at the present time? At least get the same level job as those I was working with when I went into the army. That's the thing that really bothers me. That's the sore spot.

C-7: I can see it's a tough spot. Have you thought that there might be some other job you could get? After you see your supervisor I'd suggest you see the Placement Officer. You might be able to work out something somewhere else under a person who has not been under you.

K-8: Do you think it is just a question of ability that I haven't gotten a higher job? A fellow has to have ability, but those who stayed had more time to demonstrate it.

C-8: How do you feel about that, Mr. K?

K-9: I feel the equation should balance. I didn't actually have sufficient time to demonstrate my ability, to show them how high I might be able to go, due to the fact that I spent so much time in the army while he stayed on the job.

C-9: You haven't been back long enough to show what you can do.

K-10: What I think should add to my favor is my length of service, my seniority rights should have been built up while I was in the service. But maybe seniority rights don't mean much. Maybe you just have got to have ability. Maybe my supervisor feels I'm not ready for the job.

C-10: I feel that it would be an excellent idea to talk it over with your supervisor. Find out what he thinks about it. Then you'll be in a better position to decide whether you want to continue in the same section, or to have the placement office try to find you something else.

K-11: Well, thanks a lot.

C-11: OK. You talk to your supervisor, and if that doesn't work let me know.

Unfortunately space does not permit an analysis of specific responses in this interview from the standpoint of technique. A number of the counselor responses, however, are highly directive and some are quite inappropriate and even inept. In C-5 and again in C-6 and C-10 the counselor tells Mr. K quite definitely that he should see his supervisor again, with no recognition of K's reluctance to do so. Moreover, the counselor, in an effort to handle the problem from a manipulative standpoint, completely misses the feeling expressed by K in 8, 9, and 10 of his own personal inadequacy.

In order to point up the dangers of a directive approach in a problem of this kind and to let the group experience the results of such an interview, the leader moved them immediately into a situation two weeks later. Mr. K has talked to his supervisor, as the counselor told him to do, but he got no satisfaction. In accordance with the implied promise in C-11 that the counselor could *do* something, he returns to the counselor's office.

K-12: Well, I'm back.

C-12: How did you make out with your supervisor?

K-13: It took me two or three days before I could see him. I brought the subject up in line with your suggestion but it seems to be the same old story. "We love you veterans. We are doing everything we can for you. Thank you. Goodbye." He gave me nothing concrete. He may be doing something about it and he may be just shutting the door and forgetting all about me.

C-13: He didn't make any suggestions or say whether he was considering you for another position?

K-14: I presented my problem again. I told him that the situation was getting rather bad and I would like to know if he could help me. He said he sympathized with the veteran but he didn't seem to want to play his cards. He said, "Let me handle this. Everything will come along." There was nothing for me to hold on to.

C-14: Would you like me to talk with your supervisor? Would you care to have me do that? I'd explain that you have been down here, but I don't want to talk to him without your permission. I might be able to find out if there is another place for you, or whether he thinks they should try to place you in another section.

K-15: I'm not too much concerned about going to another section. I'd like to stay where I am. There should be some solution in my own section. I'm sure something can be worked out. I feel that if anyone sits down and looks at the whole problem, it can be straightened out. All I want is to be considered for a promotion if I'm able to do the job. I feel I'm due that consideration.

C-15: Yes, I think you should get that consideration.

K-16: My supervisor won't commit himself. He certainly wouldn't to me. I don't see where your efforts will accomplish too much, or do you have some secret weapon?

C-16: No, I don't have any secret weapons. But I might be able to see what they have in mind. Do you want me to talk it over with your supervisor or would you rather wait and see how things work out?

K-17: That would be good if you would talk to him. I'll go back to the job now and maybe things will go along smoothly. But when something irritates me I want to take everything out on Johnny. Sometimes I feel he is trying to push more on me than he should. Sometimes I feel he is not giving me all he should. Something comes up I don't like and then

everything is all bawled up. I have that discontent on my mind. I'm trying to work for a promotion, but I feel this thing is showing up on the job.

C-17: It seems to me it could not be eliminated with Johnny there. You should be placed elsewhere. Have you looked anywhere else?

K-18: I like the section I'm in.

C-18: Would you like me to go to the supervisor above yours—the one next in line?

K-19: That seems to be a round-about way of doing it. I can't see doing it that way. I like my job; I like the fellows. I don't think it should be too great a problem to devise a solution.

C-19: How do you feel it should be solved?

K-20: I've done quite a bit of thinking about this problem. I believe I'm due quite a bit of consideration. Being a veteran it's pretty hard to go back into the same job and work under someone you've supervised. It seems at least I could be on the same level with him. Someone ought to be able to work that out.

C-20: I'd be glad to see if there is anything I can do about it. I can talk to your supervisor and to the one above him—that is, if I have your permission. But I will be glad to talk with them.

K-21: OK, suppose you do that. You go and see what information you can get. Shall I come back to see you, or will you call me?

C-21: I'll call you.

Active discussion among the "trainees" followed this interview. It was pointed out that the employee had attempted to carry out the suggestion which the counselor made in the first interview, but he felt that it had accomplished nothing. In accordance with the counselor's implied promise of help in the first interview, he then came back for that help. In this interview the counselor still wants very much to help, but she seems pretty ineffective in trying to do it. In commenting on her own performance, she recognized that she had stuck her neck out and gotten herself in a jam. In this second interview she had to come up with another suggestion. She had no alternative but to try to do something. So, following the course to which she had inadvertently committed herself, she continues in C-14, "Would you like me to talk with your supervisor?" The employee, rightly enough, is skeptical as to just what this might be able to accomplish, and states it pretty bluntly, K-16. She replies rather weakly, "I might be able to see what they have in mind." He agrees that she do this, K-17, but he still seems to have a need to discuss his problem further. Again the coun-

selor fails to recognize his feelings and, in her desire to help and to do something, comes up with another suggestion in C-14 and in C-17, that if Johnny cannot be eliminated, Mr. K should get a job elsewhere. He replies in K-18, "I like the section I'm in." He had expressed this previously in K-15, but the counselor had been blind to his feelings. She then returns to her former suggestion, that she talk to someone, this time the supervisor next up the line. Thinking that at this point it probably couldn't do much harm, the employee concurred in her suggestion. Commenting on this after the interview, Mr. K said, "I felt that I might be able to use her as another means of getting what I wanted. It was just putting another spoke in the wheel."

The discussion further pointed out the impracticability of the manipulative approach. During the war there was a strong tendency to try to transfer a dissatisfied person to another job rather than attempt to get at the root of the trouble and help him adjust in his present job. This was not satisfactory in war time, and it is a far less feasible solution now when the number of available jobs has been greatly reduced. In many instances it resulted merely in a series of transfers, for in a maladjusted person the causes of dissatisfaction come largely from within and they will be manifested in many different kinds of job settings. Moreover, the individual is trained in his present job, and to shift him elsewhere is expensive for the organization. In the opinion of the group it was the function of the counselor first to try to help the individual adjust to circumstances as they are, and only when this fails to try to adjust the circumstances.

The counselor in these two interviews commented about the situation, "He had me trapped." She recognized that she had taken over the running of the employee's affairs, that by telling him what to do and by going to speak with others in his behalf she was not strengthening him to handle his own problems. But in addition to weakening the employee, the counselor recognized that she was damaging her own position. In most organizations a counselor has no responsibility for promotions or changes in jobs, and by meddling in this area he is tearing down his own working relationships within the organization.

Apart from the fact that by such action a counselor is taking over a responsibility which is not properly his, one may well ask: what good can come from the counselor's talking with the supervisor or the placement officer in a case like this? From these interviews the employee seems able to express himself; he does not appear to need a spokesman, and there might

well be an adverse reaction on the part of the supervisor if he feels the employee thinks it necessary to get an intermediary to deal with him.

The question was also asked: Does the counselor know enough about work relationships within the section and about the supervisor to urge the employee to see him even when the employee expresses reluctance about doing so? It was the consensus of the group that the counselor must be pretty sure of his ground before telling an employee what to do.

At the conclusion of this discussion a different approach to the same problem was attempted, keeping in mind the pitfalls into which Miss C had fallen. In *replaying* the situation the same member of the group took the part of the employee.

Mr. K-1: I thought I'd drop down to see you. I have a little problem on my mind. It's not such a little one either. I'll give you some of the background. A friend of mine and I were taken in the organization at the same time at grade 3 clerks back in 1939. After working a few months I was promoted to grade 4. Within that little unit it practically meant I was straw boss. There were 7 or 8 other people in the unit. In 1941 I was drafted. Johnny stayed at grade 3. I spent nearly 5 years in the service. After discharge I decided to get my old job back. They said they would take me on as a 4 and sent me back to the same unit. Here's what happens when I get up there. Johnny never saw the army. Now he is a grade 6 and I have to work under him.

Miss S-1: You feel it's pretty tough, after you have left your job to serve your country, to come back and find yourself under someone whom you supervised before and who stayed home.

K-2: I think there's a lack of justice. He was working right along while I was in the army. I expected my seniority rights to be building up all the time while I was in the army, and I come back to find just a grade four job. I would have been able to demonstrate my ability if I hadn't been in the army. The other fellows had a chance to demonstrate their ability and they moved up. I come back now and find I have to start with a 4.

S12: Well, you find it kind of hard to come back and face that. He was below you working on this job and while he was getting more experience in that particular job, you have been gaining in experience, too, in a different line.

K-3: I feel I was robbed of the opportunity to demonstrate my ability, therefore, some consideration should be given me.

S-3: You think it's hardly fair that those who didn't have an oppor-

tunity to demonstrate their ability should have to come back and find themselves behind the ones who stayed on the job.

K-4: It is quite hard—sorta goes against the grain. We made a lot of sacrifices and those who weren't called upon to make those same sacrifices had a chance to go ahead. (Pause) I feel there might be a little reason for it.

S-4: You feel there might be a justification for it. What justification do you see?

K-5: It may be a point of ability. What I'm talking to you about I told a line supervisor the other day. He said something about ability in these promotions and that he would sort of take my problem in consideration. Using his words, the work is highly specialized and you have got to keep full grasp of it all the time. Coming back after 5 years of absence there is a lot to learn. Still, if I ask for special consideration I think it should be extended.

S-5: You feel, perhaps, that though the people who have been here have gained through their experience, you would have gained if you had been here.

K-6: Yes, I don't have any bitter feelings, but I don't feel I am getting an even chance. I want a good break. Ability is one thing, sacrifices another.

S-6: By "good break" what do you mean? What do you consider a good break?

K-7: The idea of maybe getting consideration for my absence, so that I can get back into the swing of things and then get a promotion. That's what you normally expect.

S-7: In other words you would like to have your supervisor keep you in mind and advance you at the first opportunity if you show ability.

K-8: That's it. The long range solution appears to be the way it has to be worked out. Well, thanks a lot for talking it over with me.

In discussing this interview, the group felt that Miss S had been quite effective in recognizing and reflecting the feelings of Mr. K so that he was able both to get his feelings off his chest and to gain greater insight into his situation, coming finally to a recognition that it was a long range matter that had to be worked out through his own efforts over a period of time. Mr. K, in commenting on Miss S's interview with him, said: "Any time I showed any insight she picked it right up. I came to a clearer understanding of my problem and what I had to do about it."

From the animated discussion which followed each of these three interviews, it was clear that there had been active spectator participation. It was a learning experience not merely for the three persons taking roles, but

for the whole group. They actually got the feel of directive and non-directive counseling in connection with a specific problem which was one that they all recognized as very real. They also had the opportunity to learn from experience—or from synthetic experience—that when once a counselor takes over and starts trying to do things about a problem, he has put himself in a very awkward situation.

Role playing is an ideal medium for developing interviewing skill. Through training and controlled practice, many people who in general would not be good interviewers become better interviewers than those who have much more natural aptitude for the job but who do it "by ear," whom we might call instinctive interviewers.

Moreover, just as the interviewer often does not know in advance what he will be up against in the interview, that is, the presenting problem, the personality of the client, the client's feelings about the problem, and the environmental factors bearing upon it, so the role playing situation may be set up so that the trainee does not know the kind of situation which will be presented to him and he cannot prepare for it in advance. He must remain flexible and apply the information and principles he has learned in an appropriate way to meet the needs of the client or the demands of the situation as it unfolds.

On the actual job the fear of failure or of damaging the client is very great for most beginning interviewers so that their performance is seriously interfered with. If, in training, we can teach them not only by lectures and discussions and by questioning and testing them, but by actually letting them work at what they are studying in a situation which is more flexible and yet more controlled than life, and where they are not playing for keeps, we have made a great advance in teaching methods.

## ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTION AND ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVAL: A COMMUNICATION PROBLEM

RONALD LIPPITT

*Research Center for Group Dynamics  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

A small but increasing number of administrators in business, labor organizations, social welfare agencies, and educational institutions are becoming sensitive to the need for consultant or staff specialist help in evaluating and improving the pattern of human relationships that exist in the work situation of themselves and their employees. These men are becoming keenly aware of the extent to which an upward gradient of group and individual productivity hinges on the releasing of the creative forces that can emerge from an increased understanding and an improved utilization of newer techniques of group leadership, group supervision, inservice training, and techniques of evaluation of group process.

### *The Problem of Communication*

However, the vast majority of administrators have not yet become sensitive to this potentiality. Their own experiences and their own observations have not given them any real basis for knowing what they have a right to expect from various unfamiliar changes in the social atmosphere and interpersonal relations in the work situation. As one sits down to talk to these administrators about possibilities of instituting an inservice training program in relationship skills and group leadership skills for staffs or supervisors; or spending some time with the top staff on problems and techniques of leadership of staff meetings and conferences, a variety of attitudinal barriers appear which must be resolved if there is to be any administrative approval of a first step toward an adequate demonstration of the possibilities of such a program in the organization. Some of the most important of these attitudinal barriers seem to be:

1. A strong feeling on the part of the administrator that there are no data about what makes productivity in human relationships and are, therefore, no standards of evaluation and no scientifically based technology for improving such productivity. The implicit assumption is clear that, after all, administrators themselves are really the best "applied psychologists" in this area of technology because of their great experience in "dealing with" and "handling" people.

2. A second barrier is the implicit or explicit belief that the crucial aspect of good leadership or relationships is the "intangible" qualities of personality, rather than trainable behavior skills. Therefore, the personnel problem is one of selecting good personalities and little can be done by training in this area of performance.

3. A third and very interesting barrier which is discovered in talking with administrators who are quite sensitive to the importance of good leadership is the feeling that it is a bad thing to have people pay conscious attention to the techniques of human relationships. There seems to be a feeling that "paying attention to technique" is somehow basically unethical and "manipulative".

4. A fourth typically tough minded attitude is that the consultant or trainer should be able to predict in dollars and cents just what this type of training will be worth, particularly as he is usually asking for the involvement and participation of top management personnel.

5. A fifth barrier is the suspicions that are aroused when the administrator discovers that the inservice training program would not be a specific "curriculum package" where it can be predicted just what topics will be taken up and what will not. This situation not only creates certain doubts about the competence of the consultant, but also as to just what might be discussed and presented which might be "dangerous" and meet disapproval if there were really an opportunity to review it in detail.

The personal conference with the administrator in his office has usually proved very unfruitful in overcoming these barriers, even when a very concerted effort was made to describe concretely what had been tried elsewhere and just what the objectives and the operation of the training program would be. Because of these failures of communication, two other approaches were tried: (1) *Getting the administrator to visit one or more supervisory training sessions as an observer*; (2) *Making the presentation of the program in a group setting where a number of administrators would be present, one or two of them having favorable attitudes toward and experience with the type of training program being discussed.*

To our surprise, "the visiting program" was not at all successful. When the trainer would get together with the administrator for a chat at the end of the training conference, the trainer's enthusiasms for what had been going on were quickly dampened by the discovery that the administrator-observer had really not been seeing very much in spite of the fact that he had been present. In fact, his perception was usually along rather negative

lines of wondering why various members of the group hadn't been "set right" or "answered" when they raised certain questions or made various comments which were off the beam as far as the administrator was concerned. It was clear that the administrator was hearing with an ear to content rather than seeing with an eye to process. His value judgments were of such a different nature than those of the trainer that there was really no basis for discussion of the observation.

The verbal presentation of the training idea in the group setting met with equal failure, except that from a number of angles it was a more disastrous failure because of the reinforcement of attitudes that takes place in a group setting. The trainer would attempt to describe the objectives and procedures of an inservice training program in human relationship skills for perhaps twenty minutes or half an hour and then try to draw in the group with a question or two to stimulate discussion. First there would be a cautious round of remarks "in favor of training". Each administrator would be verbally proving to the others how much he approved of such a progressive thing as "training". Usually his remarks also were slanted to show how much he was already doing in a variety of ways in his organization. These remarks showed a wide variety of conceptions of what the term training meant for each of those present and how little the trainer had been able to communicate his specific conception of "human relationship training". After this round of remarks, it was quite likely that one or two members of the group would advance cautious qualifying remarks about some of the dangers and wastes of the wrong type of training. From then on, although one or two members of the group might be attempting to answer these questions with testimonial from their own experience, the band wagon effect would continue with more and more freedom of expression of the real negative feelings of the group members. The only thing for the trainer to do was to get the meeting adjourned as soon as possible.

As we attempted to diagnose these failure situations, it seemed clear that some type of interpretation situation would have to be established where there would be no opportunity for the ambiguity of the verbally described training process into which a wide variety of meanings could be projected. It was also felt that it would have to be some kind of an at-the-elbow pointing out situation in which the trainer could get the administrator to see exactly what the trainer was seeing as a basis for an interpretative discussion. Concretely it was felt that the administrator should somehow be involved as a participant in positively thinking about the mean-

ing of the training process, rather than sitting back in judgment on the value of the training process.

*Communication by Sociodrama with Clarifier*

To meet these requirements of an interpretation situation, we decided to try a combination of sociodrama and a clarifier role. The plan was to present by sociodrama a picture of some of the salient features of the training process in a situation where a clarifier would stand at the elbow of the observers pointing out important things for them to see and commenting interpretively on the perception. We would attempt then to center the discussion of the administrators on some of the interesting problems of the training situation rather than on an initial evaluation of the training itself.

The first opportunity to experiment with this type of interpretation was an after luncheon session of a group of about twenty-five administrators.<sup>1</sup> It was an excellent experimental opportunity because an almost identical group had rejected a verbal description and interpretation of the training approach just two or three weeks previously. The following is a somewhat condensed protocol of the thirty-five minute presentation:

*Preparation for Perception*

CLARIFIER: In a few minutes you will have a chance to visit a training session. Before the visit, I'd like to go over with you a few of the ideas about training which serve as the framework for the approach to training which you will see. And during the meeting itself, I'll be at your elbow to call attention to certain aspects of the training procedure.

1. We are interested in training supervisors to supervise more effectively. This means we want to change their skills of behaving toward employees as individuals and as total work groups. This presents us with a much different and more difficult training problem than changing the ways of behaving toward machines or materials, e.g., a typewriter, a filing system, a blowtorch.

2. The research on training leaders or supervisors to change their style of human relations indicates that there are many forces operating against change which do not come up in the other training situations mentioned above. For example:

a. It is found that supervisors usually have an underlying feeling of futility about the possibility that any changes in their performance

---

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Leland Bradford cooperated with the author in this specific communication situation with a group of government administrators. A shorter description of this project appeared in *Personnel Administration*, Vol. 8, No. 6, February, 1946.

can make much difference. If only things would change! And after all, with the budget situation and the present level of personnel they are hiring, it's ridiculous to expect a supervisor to be able to do anything!

b. Not only is this attitude a barrier to training, but there is evidence of the strongest sort to indicate that a line supervisor in an organizational hierarchy cannot by himself be a very effective agent of change. Most of the problems of supervision are not "misbehaviors of a supervisor" but problems of relationship of the whole hierarchy from employee to top supervisor. It is unrealistic and unfruitful to attempt to bring about effective changes by working with one or even two levels of the hierarchy.

c. In this field of human relationships, many of the supervisory behaviors we would like to change are behaviors which provide strong satisfactions to the supervisor. The dominating behavior, or the benevolent kindness which creates dependent loyalty that we know must be eradicated if productivity is to increase, is in many cases the main "ego-support" of the supervisor in question. This is a different training problem from the case of a secretary who wants eagerly to increase her typing and stenographic speed. Her personal "vested interest" is all in the direction of making the change, and she sees that.

d. In stimulating changes in a person's style of human relationships, we also run up against the fact that all of us guide our behavior to a large extent in terms of the expectations others have built up as to how we will behave. These expectations are a strong force "holding our behavior in place" in its accustomed channels.

3. The research evidence also indicates clearly that supervisors may learn to talk very effectively about how good supervision should be performed without this increase of knowledge having any effect at all on their actual performance. The training problem, or challenge, is further complicated by the evidence that training in human relations skills may be negative in effect, as well as having a zero or positive result. In some courses where great stress is laid on "how the good supervisor should perform", but without giving the supervisor any real practice of new skills, some supervisors become painfully aware of the discrepancy between these high standards and the way they actually do things. Guilt feelings and anxiety are aroused and supervisory performance becomes more tense and inadequate.

With these facts in view, an approach to supervisory training has been developing recently which has been tested experimentally in an industrial setting, a government situation, and in the training of leaders in a youth movement. The main elements of this training process seem to us to be:

1. The "training course" includes several groups meeting in parallel fashion whose members interact with each other as different levels of the organizational hierarchy in the on-the-job situation. In the example you will see in a few minutes, there are three groups meeting

one after the other, division chiefs, section chiefs, and representative employees. The training person acts as leader of each group and one of his jobs is the continuous interpretation of the points of view of each group to the others.

2. The meetings take as their starting point the feelings and ways of thinking of the group members—their problems as they see them. The leader rejects if he gets right to the heart of the supervisory job as he sees it, or if he brings in a prepared curriculum of ideas and techniques to “get across” as dramatically as he can. These approaches have proved effective in teaching certain types of skills but not in the area of supervisory performance.

3. In getting down to a concrete diagnosis of supervisory problems as felt by group members, the psychodramatic technique of actually “living the situation” is used so that discussion and analysis can proceed on the basis of a common experience.

4. But the training leader is careful not to let the group feel that they have “solved the situation” successfully by just arriving at an intelligent diagnosis of why the problem happens and some good ideas as to what a supervisor should do about it. He keeps pushing the point that “doing it” is the only real solution. Because he realizes all the barriers that exist for a supervisor who wants to try out a new way of behaving, the leader provides practice opportunities in the training situation itself where, during these first awkward attempts to behave differently, the supervisor is not “behaving for keeps” and where friendly evaluative discussion by the group can provide needed guidance and encouragement.

#### *Observation of Training Process—Guided Perception*

CLARIFIER (continued): You will now visit the third meeting of the middle group, section chiefs, in a training course in the Claims Division of the ABC Agency. At the previous two meetings<sup>2</sup> the group has had some lively discussions of just what problems they run up against in their daily operations as supervisors. It took them a while to get warmed up to sharing this type of thinking, but they have completed a census of about twenty-five problems. At this meeting, it is understood they will select one to start work on.

(The leader arrives, puts a copy of the minutes of the last meeting of each group at each seat and puts a large sheet with the census of problems upon the wall. The group straggles in; members read meeting notes until the last of the group arrives.)

LEADER: You see that you have the minutes from all three groups today. At your last meeting Group III (the employers) voted that

---

<sup>2</sup>Actually the group in this demonstration meeting had only had one brief session to decide on their roles and to project the problems each of them had had in the hypothetical “previous meetings”. Within this framework, all the interaction was completely spontaneous. All members of the group had supervisory positions.

they would like to exchange notes just as the other two groups had decided. They had a good, lively discussion as to whether this would put a damper on their discussion in any way.

If you look carefully at the lists of problems of the three groups, I think you'll be struck first by the fact that each group sees their major problems in their relationships with those above them. Even Group I (the administrators) see their main problems up the line or across to others at their own level, rather than looking down to their relations with you here in this group.

Guess from what you say you'd like them to look down a bit more.

CLARIFIER (to audience): Here you see an example of how the groups get a chance to see and understand each other's points of view more fully.

SUPERVISOR 1: I see you've got our problems all classified into five types.

LEADER: Yes, I did a little homework which I want to get your reactions to first off today. I had a feeling as I listened to our discussion last time that it might be possible to boil down our problems so that we might tackle them more effectively. You see, I've tried listing them all under "problems of employee motivation and acceptance of responsibility"; "problems of inadequate communication and clearance"; "problems of getting more backing and delegation of authority from superiors"; "problems of getting a clearer definition of job duties"; and "problems of lack of facilities to do the job". Do they seem to fit? Can you see some other way of putting them together?

CLARIFIER: This is an important step. Here is a chance to increase insight, to make possible the transfer of thinking from one problem to another because they are the "same type", and to make the whole job look more hopeful.

SUPERVISOR 3: It looks like a good idea to me. It seemed a little foolish to me the other day to make such a long list of problems when we couldn't possibly get to all of them. This begins to look as if by tackling certain ones we would be hitting others at the same time. (Discussion continues around this point for several minutes.)

SUPERVISOR 5: Well, where do we start? I can't see as we can do much on most of these. Group I is where they can be fixed up.

CLARIFIER: This is a typical example of an attitude that will drop out as the group matures in its approach to problem solving.

LEADER: I think from their discussions that they'll certainly be glad to chip in their bit. Don't we first have to have some pretty good ideas, though, about what changes are needed?

CLARIFIER: This type of reassurance is usually necessary in the early stages. The lowest groups are apt to be skeptical as to the genuine interest of "Group I" in the whole process.

(Rather general assent, with some doubtful looks. Discussion turns to what problems they want to start on. A consensus finally swings to "employee motivation".)

LEADER: Well then, let's get down to brass tacks. Is one of the items you've got listed there a good example to start on or does someone have another one in mind?

SUPERVISOR 8: That one about the file clerks sure hits me. How about the rest of you?

LEADER: Let's see, "Can't get file clerks to take any interest in improving filing procedures; seem to be bored and can't get them motivated". Sounds like an interesting one. How about the rest of you?

(One or two other items suggested but majority are strong for the problem of the file clerks.)

SUPERVISOR 2: Looks to me like you're just too easy on those fellows. They get away with a lot of loafing. I'd say make clearer just what you expect of them and make them toe the line.

(One or two others chime in along the same vein.)

CLARIFIER: There's a good example of the type of everyday faulty thinking that jumps from problem to solution without diagnosis. This is one of the main thinking problems.

LEADER: Let me make one suggestion. I have a hunch that like any doctor we've got to be pretty clear about our diagnosis before we can write out the prescription. Personally I'm in the dark. No matter how hard I listen, I can't get any real picture of just how these clerks behave, and how you have been handling them. Let's really take a look at what happens. Who really knows how the clerks react to your supervision?

CLARIFIER: Unless they take a look together, they will just talk past each other without knowing what each has in mind. This observation situation is a first step to a real group diagnosis.

SUPERVISOR 8: Guess I've got more than my share of them.

SUPERVISOR 10: I've got a couple I can't seem to do much with.

LEADER: Okay, now if you're willing I'd like you two to step out for a minute and plan to show us a typical episode between a supervisor and clerk. Don't rehearse what you will say. Just take a minute to decide what the situation is.

(They leave with a bit more coaxing. This is the first time the technique has been used in the group. Volunteers will be no problem after another session or two.)

LEADER: Now, while they are out, just one suggestion. Let's watch this little episode carefully with two or three questions in mind. (1) Is it typical of what you have seen or experienced? How is your experience different? (2) Why do you think the clerk is acting the way he does? (3) Is there anything different the supervisor might have done that would have brought a different reaction? You might want to jot ideas that come to mind so we won't lose them.

(The two supervisors come back.)

LEADER: Let's see now—where does this little situation take place?

SUPERVISOR 8: He's the clerk, on a chair at the files. I come over. Where are we?

LEADER: Good. How's this for the file? And here's a chair. Let's go.

(He takes a seat to the side and leaves the front of the room to the supervisors.)

SUPERVISOR 8 (Going over to the "file"): Smith, I noticed the other day we have a lot of folders piling up in the back of some of the drawers.

SMITH (Supervisor 10): Yes, they don't fit the way we file things. Guess somebody will have to fix some new headings.

(The situation develops spontaneously and waxes quite vigorous for about ten minutes when the leader interrupts.)

LEADER: Guess we'd better stop there. We've certainly gotten a clear picture of how this situation is developing. Is it a familiar scene to all of you? (Practically everyone assents readily.) Are there any important variations?

SUPERVISOR 3: Some of the clerks are lot snappier than he was, but they seem to think the same way and act just as irresponsibly.

CLARIFIER: You see how quickly and spontaneously these supervisors have gotten immersed in this everyday situation they know so well. The group now has something concrete to tackle.

LEADER: Let's sit back and think about that file clerk for a few minutes. Just why might he be acting that way?

A lively discussion ends up with the following items on the blackboard:

1. Maybe he didn't know the importance of the work he was doing.
2. Probably nobody ever told him the purpose of it all.
3. It's easier not to do much reading of the stuff.
4. He doesn't see much chance of promotion; he's in kind of a hopeless spot.
5. Maybe nobody has given him any training in the system.

CLARIFIER: The observation of this situation in the objective atmosphere of the training situation is making it possible for these men to begin to look through the eyes of the clerk. This is a major step toward a successful solution.

SUPERVISOR 10: Sure looks like he needs some training in what it is all about, but nobody has any time for that.

SUPERVISOR 2: If the training would really help, it would save a lot of time it seems to me.

SUPERVISOR 8: I've got a feeling that it wouldn't take very much time to get him to see it differently, but I surely felt irritated at him. Seems as if you just fly off without thinking about it.

LEADER: Our time is up today, in fact we seem to have gone overtime, but I'd like to suggest that next time we take a look at some of these ideas of yours about how you might make him see this job of his differently. Let's take time next time for several of us to try out these different possibilities. This will get us right down to brass tacks.

CLARIFIER: And next time when they begin to practice "doing it differently" they will be acquiring a skill which is likely to be transferred to their daily performance.

(Meeting adjourns.)

#### *Filling Out the Picture*

CLARIFIER: And so at the next meeting they will begin to practice behaving differently in a typical supervisory situation. Of course, they see some of their ideas for improving the work situation of the clerk are beyond their power. They will need to call on Group I for help. Because the leader will already be interpreting these problems to Group I, they will find a cooperative readiness—and have a real success experience and move ahead on the next problem with a lot more confidence and group spirit. Various other problems will come up which will probably call for committees made up of members from two or all three of the groups. As these vertical relationships develop, the transition will have begun toward getting the problem-solving approach and spirit into staff meetings. This is the stage we are aiming for.

#### *Group Discussion After the Demonstration*

The Clarifier took on the role of discussion leader with the administrator group as the demonstration concluded. The discussion was very active and continued for the allotted period of about twenty-five minutes. First there was a flurry of questions about specific aspects of the training technique—whether the role playing situations were realistic or artificial, whether you could really get people as easily as this to enter into spontaneous reproducing of life situations, whether the problems brought up by any given group were really the "important ones that they needed training on", whether such training sessions didn't turn into gripe sessions rather than learning better techniques, etc. The discussion leader found that he was in an entirely different atmosphere from the previous meetings with administrators in that he was being accepted as a skilled technician who was now the focus of questions of information rather than of critical attack. Toward the end of the discussion, it centered more and more on the administrative mechanics of putting such a training program into effect, how many meetings were needed in such a series, how could you involve employees and have small enough groups, how large should the groups be, was there a manual describing this procedure, what type of training personnel were needed to conduct such a program, etc. Although two or three of the group came forward with rather critical evaluations at one point or another in the discussion, they in no way disturbed the total group atmosphere or changed the constructive direction of the discussion. At the end

---

of the period the training leader and Clarifier were asked for specific dates for follow-up consultant sessions by three of the administrators.

*Concluding Observations*

From this and a variety of other similar experiences, it seems probable that there are a great number of communication situations where verbal description and interpretation are inadequate but where concrete socio-dramatic situations with guided perception and interpretation stimulate interest, create understanding, and stir up action minded motivation.

## ROLE TESTING FOR MARRIAGE PREDICTION

LEONA KERSTETTER

*New York University*

"My fiance and I want to be certain that our marriage will be a success. If there's any way of finding out whether or not we are suited to each other we want to make use of the opportunity." This statement by a young man led to the experiment which is described in this article.

Role testing is a technique through which prospective marriage partners can see each other more clearly in the light of the various roles which will come into play in their marriage relationship. Moreno has developed the concept of the "cultural atom," a term used to indicate "the pattern of role relationships around the individual." The role test explores this pattern of relationships. The appalling state of instability in marriage indicates the need for emphasis on the importance of prognosis for success in marriage.

During the summer institute held at the Psychodramatic Institute at Beacon, New York, a session on role testing for marriage prediction was arranged. The young couple who made the request for an opportunity for testing compatibility attended the session. A brief introduction regarding the importance of role relationships in marriage was followed by a discussion in which all members of the group participated. The discussion centered around an analysis of the phases of the marriage partner role. The group agreed that the following phases were crucial: provider, lover, mother-father, partner, host-hostess, citizen, worshipper, emotional companion, intellectual companion, homemaker, roommate.

The next step was the actual testing in these phases of the role. The young man was asked to come to the psychodramatic stage and a brief explanation of the procedure was given. He was asked to show the group how he would function in each separate phase. He was given absolute freedom to develop the situation. In *the provider role*, he began to lecture as if he were in a classroom. Teaching seemed to be his idea of his future vocation. In *the lover role*, he became self-conscious and caricatured the role with a simulated embrace and a look of endearment. *The father role* was developed in a situation with his adolescent son. He participated in sports, ping pong, carpentry, fishing, etc. A discussion with his wife regarding financial matters and joining together in a game of ping pong were the situations he depicted in *the partner role*.

In *the role of host*—which he had suggested in the opening discussion—he functioned most spontaneously and adequately. He greeted guests, offered cocktails, suggested cards and carried on a running conversation about OPA etc. In portraying *the citizen role*, he dashed about getting voting petitions signed, attending political meetings and calling the Department of Sanitation regarding garbage collection. In *the role of worshipper*, he was very devout. He knelt in an Episcopal church and said the Lord's Prayer. He self-consciously rejected *the role of emotional companion*. The role of *intellectual companion* was portrayed at dinner with his wife. They discussed the United Nations organization. He practically gave a lecture and then asked his wife how she felt about it. They retired to the library and read making comments to each other now and then.

In *the role of homemaker*, he gave a rather detailed description of the home but when urged into action, he had a limited concept. He got out of bed and came downstairs to a ready prepared meal. He was very meticulous. He got out of bed, took a shower, put laundry in the hamper and put everything in order.

The next step in the procedure was to ask the young man's fiancee who had been a member of the audience during his performance to show the group how *she* would function in these *same* phases of the marriage partner role.

In the role of provider she depicted herself as a teacher of Spanish, then as a translator working on a novel. She gave a full presentation vocationally but indicated no relation to the marital situation. In the lover role, like the young man, she was embarrassed and dismissed the situation with "Oh, we've been married a long time."

*The mother role* was portrayed in a scene advising her teen age daughter on problems of adolescence. They went on a shopping tour together and mother helped daughter in the selection of her clothes. She also portrayed a scene giving motherly advice to her adolescent son. The situation depicting her concept of the *partner* included a discussion of the children's problems, world news and the new president of Columbia, South America, and the effect of his incumbency on her property there. She also discussed the buying of a new summer home. In the *hostess* role, she played a secondary part assisting her daughter in giving a party. In another scene she entertained her own guests by playing records of Rachmaninoff's 2nd piano concerto in a room dimly illuminated by light from an open fireplace. The role of *citizen* was played by calling the Cuban Commissioner of Agriculture

regarding the trees in their block, voting a mixed ticket and entertaining an informal bridge club.

The *worshipper* role was portrayed in the early Sunday morning setting of the home. She called the six children to get ready for ten o'clock Mass. She asked her daughter Mary whether she had gone to confession. When the children asked about their father, they were told that *he had already attended Mass and had gone back to bed.*

The *emotional companion* role was depicted in a scene attending the movies. She cried over the picture which reminded her of her courtship and added, "I cry whenever I hear good music, too."

She did not enact the *intellectual companion*. She stated that she felt that role had been depicted in her presentation of the partner. The role of *homemaker* she first performed in her kitchen where she was cooking dinner. "Oh it's Friday," she said, "and I can't cook fish but —— expects it"—a remark which was later shown to have more than a cursory significance. However, her husband did not come home to dinner. She ate with her six children, saying grace (Roman Catholic) before the meal. In another scene, she cleaned house getting help from both her husband and the children.

In the role of *roommate*, she went about tidying up and scolding her husband for not putting things back in their proper places. "You're making me old before my time," she said. Then she continued, adding in a side remark to the audience, "The children take after their father, too." Next she became particularly disturbed and complained about her husband's habit of smoking in bed.

Following these separate tests, the crucial part of the procedure began. The two young people were asked to enact a few scenes together. Among others, they chose to plan their future home. This proved to be revealing for the girl described her home as an unusually elaborate, suburban place. When the boy mildly but firmly protested against several of her more grandiose ideas, she nonchalantly tried to override him.

In evaluating the performances, there was a difference of opinion among the group as to the compatibility of the couple. It was concluded, however, that the important thing was not the opinion of the audience but whether the individuals themselves had learned anything new about each other or about their own determining tendencies.

No attempt was made at the time to get any information on these two points but several weeks later the young man came to the office quite upset because his fiance had told him that she was no longer sure that

she loved him. When asked whether he felt he had learned anything from the role test experience, he said that his fiance's conception of her future home indicated expectation of a standard which, as a teacher, he may not be able to maintain. In view of a teacher's income, he explained, some basic compromise was necessary on this point. He also felt that the present confused status of their relationship was closely connected to this economic problem of the provider. A matter over which he expressed minor concern was the fact that in the role of homemaker, the young lady had warned one of her sons that his father would beat him when he came home. He did not like her conception of him as the sole family disciplinarian.

Several other statements were also a revelation to him. In the role of worshipper, his fiance had stated to the children that he had already attended early Mass. This, he felt, was incomprehensible because they had already discussed and agreed that he would not join the Catholic church. However, as she wished, the children would be brought up in the Catholic faith. By the agreement, they were not to attend parochial schools. Another statement for which he could not account was in regard to the Friday fish dinner. He felt this was associated with religious custom and, as he said, "fish, like parsnips, occupy no place in my diet."

An interview was then arranged for the fiance. She said that she had learned nothing new about her prospective husband. When an attempt was made to get at the reason why she now questioned her love for him, a definite resistance was encountered. The young man later stated that he met the same kind of "wall" when he tried to get at the reason. This attitude in her part indicates the need for additional psychodramatic sessions to explore the deeper problems involved in the situation.

When asked about her statements with religious implications, her answer was quite revealing. "I know —— doesn't like fish and we had agreed about religion but, I guess, it was wishful thinking—hoping it would be that way. And I wasn't fair to him in my idea of the roommate role when I talked about his being untidy. I must have projected my father's fault into that situation because that is the way he acts around the house."

From these few examples, it is possible to note the manner in which persons unconsciously reveal information regarding cultural backgrounds, values, hopes and fears when they are permitted to react spontaneously.

The following suggestions were derived as desirable steps in role testing for this purpose:

- (1) Warming-up the subjects before actual role testing by psychodramatic interviews;

- (2) A demonstration of the role testing technique by auxiliary egos as part of the warming-up process;
- (3) Directions to testees should be specific and strong;
- (4) It is useful for partners to observe each other in the role performance;
- (5) Partners should be alternated in such a way as to minimize the suggestive effect of one performance on another;
- (6) After the partners have been tested separately they should interact together in specific situations such as an enactment of how they met, going on a date etc.;
- (7) The most important result of the role test is what the individuals have learned *about each other* and the effect of that knowledge upon their relationship.

This session was an experiment in role testing as a means of predicting success in marriage. Many more experiments are necessary before the technique can be refined. Following the role test there should be an opportunity for role training for specific roles in which the person performed inadequately. A thorough knowledge of the cultural atom of the individual is important for prognosis.\*

---

\*J. L. Moreno, *Psychodramatic Treatment of Marriage Problems*, *Sociometry*, Vol. III, No. 1, 1940, see also *Psychodrama Monographs* No. 7, p. 20.

## ROLE PLAYING: A TECHNIQUE FOR TRAINING THE NECESSARILY DOMINATING LEADER

ALVIN F. ZANDER

*Springfield College*

Most discussions of leadership training have dealt with methods for democratizing the leader. Writings by Bavelas, Bradford, French, Fjeld, Lippitt and others have described methods of training club leaders, discussion leaders, recreation leaders and supervisors all with the purpose of transforming him into a person who works with the group rather than pushes it around. (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) These are important efforts, and they are being encouraged in many places. In fact, a recent poll of professional group workers indicates that first priority is placed by them on the continuation of such investigations and writings as they look toward the next ten years of group work. (9)

However some situations demand domination on the part of the leader, and the leadership trainer can do very little about it. If he refuses to work with leaders who must continue as dominators, he ignores the opportunity to take the sting out of a large proportion of the people who deal with others in a necessarily-dominating manner in our society. We do not mean to imply that no efforts should be made to develop democratic processes in an undemocratic setting. There are situations, however, where starting with an attempt to democratize would mean that the trainer is beginning with the most difficult job, and one which might spoil his later effectiveness in accomplishing something in a democratic direction. For example, a situation in which there are a large number of persons who are strangers to each other and to the setting in which they are placed, demands leadership of a dominating nature, such as in: handling crowds, automobile traffic, groups or military personnel, square dance calling, and so forth. Situations where production is much more important than the growth of the participants in the production are likely to demand dominating methods. In a tight spot, "producers" think of production first and worry about what the work does to the workers and their efficiency next, probably because such a procedure seems to take them most directly to their goal. Naturally this point of view is most common in industry and business, since their reason for existing is production and not the growth of the workers. But it is also frequently found in schools who insist on production in the form of facts

regurgitated at exams, and youth agencies who are more concerned with achievement awards than with the person who earned the badge. Dominating methods will be frequent in places where an undemocratic viewpoint is confirmed and cannot be shaken, and also in those places where safety is of such importance that dominating practices must honestly be used in order to ensure that it is possible. There are places where a dominating leader in our culture is a necessity although this is not well understood and difficult to delineate.

It is not the purpose here to expand on the nature of leadership in our society. The foregoing will serve to remind us that dominating leaders are frequent among us and that such people need training too in dealing with human beings, even if they must remain dominating in method.

The purpose of this discussion is to describe the reality practice part of a training program for helping the leader who operates in an undemocratic setting, so that he might deal with groups of men in a way that does not spoil their effectiveness. The course was developed at a military-type training station as a mental hygiene measure. It was found that despite careful psychiatric screening many men were becoming psychiatric casualties due, among other reasons, to poor leadership (7). Those who were not actual clinical entities were sub clinical in the sense that their effectiveness was spoiled by resenting or worrying over the treatment they received, or imagined they had received.

The participants in the training sessions were told, in the popular language of the course, that the purpose of the training was to make them aware that:

1. A man cannot work well if he is upset, worried, or feels gyped.
2. The leader who is in an embarrassing or tight spot often does unwise things toward those under his command in order to make himself feel better.
3. When the leader acts in an emotional manner, he may create in the group upsets, worries, or feelings-of-unfairness which lead in-turn to poor work by those in his care.

This training program was repeated about 75 times at a base containing over 8,000 trainees and 2,000 permanently on-shore personnel known as ship's company who do teaching, drilling, and barracks administration. The course consisted of six meetings spread over three weeks, and was part of the training program in which the new Ship's Company man learned his "shore" jobs and the methods of the base. A new course was begun each week for groups averaging sixteen men.

The overall nature of the training program and its total setting in a mental hygiene service is described elsewhere (11); however, it will be useful to briefly describe it here. Each meeting was a combination of group discussion and blackboard lecture with use of training aids and occasional use of role playing. The main ideas covered in each of the six meetings are:

#### *First meeting*

Men often do unaccountably senseless things when disappointed, embarrassed, or worried.

#### *Second Meeting*

There are many causes of disappointment, embarrassment, or worry for trainees at a large base like this: impersonal handling, being "buried" in a group, a constant audience to see one's mistakes, school work, sexual restrictions, physical fears, class distinctions, and others.

#### *Third meeting*

1. Trainees show many forms of unaccountable behavior on this base: grudges, rebellions, brooding, bodily complaints, work-ducking, passivity, childish dependency, and others. This behavior disturbs group efficiency and troubles the leader.
2. These forms of behavior are to be expected because of the nature of the problems trainees meet at this base. It is important that leaders learn how to identify these problems and how to reduce their impact.

#### *Fourth meeting*

1. The group members rate themselves on a brief leadership test and discuss their self ratings. The ratings show that leaders often act in ways similar to the trainees.
2. The test also shows that leaders have their special problems, such as: being a "middle" man, routine nature of jobs, work below the ability of the leader, promotion worries, trainees' fear of leaders, stage fright, and others.
3. The group then observes one member of the class as he directs the work of a small crew of class members on a clean up job. The good and bad practices in his leadership skills are discussed.

#### *Fifth Meeting*

1. A second leader is observed directing the work of another crew and the leadership skills are discussed.
2. The "attitude" that the worker has toward his duties and his supervisor is crucial in determining effective effort.
3. A brochure is distributed for study: *Some suggestions on helping trainees to do their best.*

*Sixth meeting*

1. The marks of the good Ship's Company man may be summarized: (list too long to reproduce here.)

For our purposes we shall discuss in detail the two class sessions in which role playing was a central feature. We shall do this by examining a typical reality-practice session and then discussing the values of this method, with concluding comments on situations in which the values as listed failed to accrue.

At the beginning of the fourth session, as already mentioned, the group was given a simple test entitled *Test Yourself on Dealing with Men*. This was handed to them without explanatory comment other than the request to begin work on it at once. It asked the students to state whether or not they were guilty of certain leadership faults such as:

- |   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 5. Promising and failing to keep your promises?   | Yes | No |
| 10. Never giving reasons for an unreasonable appearing order?                                   | Yes | No |
| 11. Unveiling the work to be done step-by-step rather than giving an overview of the whole job? | Yes | No |
| 12. Constantly expecting disobedience?  | Yes | No |

Most students claim that they make very few of these errors (which was expected) so that scores were always very high on the test. The instructor then asked, "How frequently have you seen the errors listed on this sheet made by the present members of Ship's Company?" This question always brought forth a storm of illustrations of poor leadership and condemnation of the methods used by some of Ship's Company and by their own classmates. Then came the next question: "Since most of you have done so well on this test, and everyone who took the test before you and is now in Ship's Company has done as well on this test, it must mean that we all know better than to do these things. Therefore, why do some men make these mistakes even though they admittedly know better?" This is a crucial question in this brief series of meetings. Some groups recognize at once that the leader may *intend* to avoid these errors but that he cannot keep himself from doing them, since they are really forms of "making himself feel better" when he runs into insecurity on his job from lack of training, pressure to conform to "tough" behavior of other Ship's Company men, or into horseplay by trainees under his care. Other groups do not get this point, and the question must be left undecided for later decision.

The discussion thus far has served to "shock" them into the awareness

that they do not always recognize their own likelihood of making leadership mistakes in action and that there is more to be learned about the subject.

"Now we are ready for discussing an actual sample of leadership behavior in order that we might be specific in our thinking," says the instructor. "Who will volunteer to play the part of a leader before the class?" Thus the preparation for willingness to use role playing is finished and the WARM-UP (12) is under way. There follows the protocol of a typical reality practice session.

(a student volunteers)

Instructor: Will you come up here, please? (student comes to front of class with instructor) What jobs have they had you doing since you arrived here?

Student: Oh, I've mopped floors, washed windows, cleaned boiler flues.

I: Have you been in charge of a group on any of those jobs?

S: Yes, I had five "boots" working for me the other day buffing the deck in building C.

I: Is that your first experience in acting as the boss of a bunch of men?

S: Yes, it is, although I have had lots of jobs in the past.

I: What difficulties did you run into in getting your crew to do the job well?

S: None, except for one guy who thought I was a louse just because I belonged to Ship's Company.

I: What did he do?

S: He horsed around trying to get me sore by acting disgusted when I asked him to get to work.

I: What did you do?

S: I told him to lay off the funny stuff or he would be jockeying a buffer all night—even if I had to stick around to see that he did it.

I: Well, we want to see you in action with a group of men on an actual job. Here is what we want you to do. Pick about three men to work with you and put them to work on something. We want to see how you start your group out on a new job. That's where you make a first impression. . . . What would you like to have them work on?

S: Let's buff floors. I'm used to that.

I: O.K., you'll find buffing equipment in the locker. Get what you need and get your crew together. While you are doing that, I'll tell the rest of the class what they are to do while you are cleaning this floor. Now, gentlemen, your job is to watch Joe closely while he leads his men. Write down what you think are the bad practices and the good methods of leadership which he uses. Make sure that you write these down because it is easier to speak from penciled notes than from your memory. When

Since the role to be played is a standard and familiar one to all of the class, the teacher concentrates in re-creating the role for the student and the work atmosphere for the class.

Definition of the situation was done by instructor in order to speed up the pace.

The class-group is helped to observe intelligently.

- the group has finished, we shall list his good and bad methods on the board.
- S: (Returns with buffing mops, rags, kerosene, wax, and three uneasy fellow students).
- I: We want to see how you would put these men to work on a job. What would you actually say to them? Then we want to see what you would do as the boss while you are at work. Then, how do you bring the job to a finish. Follow those three steps. We'll give you about six minutes to complete that job. (Instructor seats himself with rest of class and assumes attentive air, with paper and pencil note-making).
- S: (addresses crew) All right fellas, we hafta make this deck shine. So get to work, I guess you all know how to do this (smiles). I'll consider the job done well enough when all the pieces of gum are scraped from the deck, and you can see your face in it. (Pauses) Uh, the reason for making it so clean is that a dirty deck wears out faster—according to the Chief. (Crew members stand around, momentarily uncertain of their duties. S. says nothing, is busy tearing large rag into smaller pieces. Finally, each crew member takes a buffing mop and begins to move it listlessly across the floor). (Crew members continue to move mops back and forth. Leader supports himself on wall and watches).
- S: Let's have a little pep, you guys.  
(Crew members move a little faster).
- S: Say, did you use the kerosene I brought to take the rubber heel marks off? It helps get the gum off, too.
- CM: No.
- S: Well, what a bunch of dopes. What do you think I brought it for? Here, you, use this!  
(Hands CM2 the kerosene bottle).
- CM2: How do you do it?
- S: Well, how do you think? Spill a little on the floor where the spot is and then rub hard.  
(CM2 doubtfully sets about removing spots according to directions)  
(Other CM's are smearing wax on the floor and buffing it)
- S: (After several minutes) O.K. that does it. Charlie, you put the stuff back in the locker straight, will you? Help him carry the stuff?  
(makes concluding nod to Instructor)
- I: (steps to front of class) Let's spend a minute or two thinking back over the whole scene and making any other comments we want to jot down.  
(Quiet for several minutes)
- I: First, what was good about Joe's method of getting his men to work? By "good" I mean what were the things he did that you think helped them to do the best job they could do?

Even a leader on his "best behavior" seldom is able to disguise his usual pattern.

At this point, the class group and the former crew members all join in an evaluation of the leadership methods that they had just witnessed. As each comment is made, the instructor determines if it is the consensus of most of the group before it is listed on the board with the other comments. When discussion arises out of disagreement as to the positive or negative value of the criticisms made, it is encouraged until a reasoned conclusion is reached. The instructor makes "expert" comments whenever he feels sure that they will help the quality of the discussion. About the above reality-practice session, for example, the class made the following criticisms: (It should be noted that these are fairly obvious and non-technical, but it was felt that only such easily observed and accepted comments would be readily understood and used—as long as they were semantically specific.)

*"Good" job supervision behavior*

1. Had clear standards in mind by which he could tell when the job was well done. Told crew what these were.
2. Gave a reason for doing the job.
3. Knew his stuff about how to clean a deck the right way.
4. Didn't act as though he thought they would be running out on the job all the time.

*"Bad" job supervision behavior*

1. Knew his stuff about the job, but he did not tell them how to do it—just assumed that they knew how.
2. Didn't tell them how much they had to do so that they would know when they were done.
3. Gave no praise.
4. Did not give them specific duties so that they stood around and then he bawled them out for not doing it right.
5. Didn't check up to see if job was done the way he said he wanted it.
6. Just stood around, which looked funny with such a small crew.

Now, for the first time, one can be quite sure the group knows there are such things as leadership skills. The Instructor summarizes at the end of the hour by pointing out that they have been able to identify some of the specific things that are important in leading a group of men. He also thanks the volunteer leader and soothes any ruffled feelings that might have developed during the group criticism.

The next day, a new volunteer is chosen and another clean-up job is performed by a new crew in front of the class. This session is developed in a manner quite similar to the above with no urgings to improve on the

mistakes of the previous role playing. It is discussed in a similar fashion after the role playing is completed and another list of "goods" and "bads" in leadership practices are listed on the board. These are briefly summarized by the instructor.

Suddenly the instructor changes the orientation of the group with the following question: "It has been fairly easy for you to decide what is "good" and what is "bad" in leadership behavior. This means that you must have some measuring rod in mind that helps you to define a certain method as either good or bad. What is that measure?" At this point, the group is usually faced with the realization that they have been judging the leader as good or bad by putting themselves in the place of the crew members he leads and asking themselves whether or not they would develop a positive attitude or a negative one toward work, as a result of the orders and the way they are given. By identifying themselves with the crew, they have experienced the importance of attitudes generated in the worker by the boss. Class attention is turned then directly to the importance of the worker's sentiments, and suggestions are made for developing a positive attitude toward the job in the men with whom he must work.

The methods used in the development of this reality-practice experience followed a definite sequence of steps as described by Zander and Lippitt (10):

1. Sensitizing to the need for further attention to leadership skills by the use of the training aid, *Test Yourself in Dealing with Men*.
2. Warming up by defining the situation and the roles by the use of the interview of a volunteer before the rest of the class.
3. Helping the group to observe intelligently by requesting that they take notes on leadership ability.
4. Evaluating the ability of the leader by a discussion of his leadership skills.
5. Re-playing a similar (or the same) situation. (13)

The manner in which the course was administered allowed time for only two role-playing episodes. This means that we could not assume that the group members were learning leadership skills, since only two persons had a chance to practice these skills. If more time had been available, it would have been possible to allow each student to participate in a role-playing situation; which could be followed by observation and criticism of his leadership methods after he had assumed a permanent post on the base. Such a procedure would be adequate in training for leadership skills.

What must be understood in the above course is that these students

were obtaining an insight into the importance of dealing with workers as human beings. There was no need to make them consciously aware that they were aiding the *mental hygiene* of their workers. It is enough for them to realize that the best production, in the long run, comes from men who are not fighting with their feelings of resentment, worry, or unfairness. This was the greatest value in the course, and the point which most impressed the men, according to follow-up interviews.

Brief as was the discussion of them, the men did learn that leadership skills exist. They learned that it was possible to identify these skills and to give them actual names so that one need not talk about leadership in terms of vague traits like honesty, friendliness, cooperativeness, and so on.

The instructor had a chance to comment on the group evaluations of the leadership behavior and thus to make "expert" ideas available when the group was most ready for them. The fact that certain other information about supervision and human relations was learned on the verbal level was proven by the routine use of a pre-test and a post-test. However, this pre- and post-testing covered the content of the entire course, and it cannot be said how much the role playing actually influenced their thinking. Group interviews with classes after they had left the training were useful in helping us to direct the content of the course into the channels indicated by the needs they professed to have when they were beginning their jobs.

The reality-practice procedure was not always wholly successful. There were some situations in which role-playing worked poorly. The large number of repetitions of the same role-playing sequence in the same setting but with different participants each week made it possible to identify certain factors in the group atmosphere which prevented the best functioning of reality practice. When, for example, the instructor failed to create roles for class members to assume, he found that they did not as readily identify with the participants of the role playing. The audience must be helped to enter into the role playing themselves or else they will observe the interactions of the role members without feeling them. They will see, for example, a group of classmates, doing a poor job of acting, without sensing the important relations between these participants. They will observe best if they are advised to assume roles, too, such as: "Imagine that you are a boot just entering this room and you stop to see these men work". Or, "Pretend that you are a friend of the leader and have agreed to watch him in action with a bunch of men in order that you might make some suggestions to him on how to improve his methods."

Sometimes it is difficult to get the players into their roles, that is, to

become so spontaneous that they forget themselves in the role playing process. This was most apparent in the dull student and suggests that role playing is limited in its usefulness with groups of duller persons (14).<sup>1</sup> It was difficult to create spontaneity in the psychopath (using the term in the sense of the person who solves his neurotic difficulties by becoming a conduct problem in the group). He could not restrain himself from giggling before his mates or from clowning in a way that smelled of sabotage of the teacher's plans in a legal fashion. Unfortunately, such men hastened to volunteer for such a job, and worse, bitterly resented the "bad" comments made about their leadership practices. Indeed, the presence of a psychopath in the group, even though he was not participating in the role playing created a frequency of "wise-guy" behavior that superbly demonstrated the weight of emotional contagion in a group.

Rigid persons could not be softened enough to flexibly participate in role playing in the time we had. For some students, there was a kind of situational rigidity in that they could not lose themselves in a role because the role demanded of them was too unlike their present jobs to be able to enter it.

Role playing always failed, for the present purposes, when the nature of the session was so neutral and colorless that it was impossible to work up any feelings in the group ardent enough to spark a discussion in the class.

#### SUMMARY

Although most work in developing methods of leadership training has been concerned with democratizing the leader, and it is important that this continue, there is a need for human relations training of the necessarily dominating leader. This paper describes a brief method for the use of role-playing in training dominating leaders to work with their men as human beings. The brevity of the course made it necessary to concentrate on developing insights rather than allowing practice in specific leadership skills. The values, limitations, and difficulties in the use of this method are described.

---

<sup>1</sup>Theodore Sarbin however describes excellent results with groups of feebleminded individuals.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bavelas, Alex. Morale and the training of leaders. Chapter VIII in *Civilian Morale*. Goodwin Watson, ed. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1942.
2. Bradford, L. and Lippitt, R. Role playing in supervisory training, *Personnel*, 22, 6, 1946.
3. Bradford, L. Future of supervisory training. *Personnel*, 21, 6, 1945.
4. Fjeld, H. A., Training leaders of discussion groups, clubs, projects, activities. Study Group Outline No. 2. New York: National Council of Women Psychologists. 1943.
5. French, J. R. Retraining an autocratic leader. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 39, 2, April 1944.
6. Lippitt, R. The psychodrama in leadership training, *Sociometry*. 6, 3 Aug. 1943.
7. Marmor, J. and Zander, A. Psychological problems in the training of 16 and 17 year olds in the United States Maritime Service, *Am. J. Orthopsychiatry*, 15, 4, 571-583 Oct. 1945.
8. Marrow, A. and French, J. R. Changing a stereotype in industry, *J. of Social Issues*, 1, 3. Aug. 1945.
9. Zander, A. and Cartwright, D. Looking toward the next ten years in group work. *The Group* (in press).
10. Zander, A. and Lippitt, R. Reality practice as educational method, *Sociometry*, 7, 2 April 1944, see also Psychodrama Monograph No. 9, Beacon House, N. Y. 1944.
11. Zander, A. Group education for mental health, chapter in *Applied Psychology Monographs*, 12, 1947 (in press).
12. J. L. Moreno. Psychodrama, Vol. I, Beacon House, New York, 1946.
13. Zerka Toeman. Role Analysis and Audience Structure, Psychodrama Monograph No. 12, Beacon House, N. Y., 1944.
14. Theodore Sarbin, Spontaneity Training of the Feeble-minded, *Sociometry*, Vol. VII, No. 314, 1945.

## REPETITION AND PSYCHODRAMA

ERNEST FANTEL

*Veterans Administration, Los Angeles*

With the greater part of the emphasis in psychodramatic therapy hitherto focussed on spontaneity, it begins to appear that the element of repetition has not sufficiently been evaluated. When we reenact a situation for the purpose of catharsis, we are often dealing with a repetition of a trauma and the trauma itself proves generally to be not a single event but a chain of repeated injuries. Finally, for success, spontaneity training frequently requires many repetitions—which seems a self-contradiction.

According to Freud<sup>1</sup> a neurotic symptom is a substitute for an omitted mental act and a reminiscence of the occasion which evoked the omitted mental act; recovery is the discharge along a normal path of the affect which had gone astray. But according to Moreno<sup>2</sup> this hypothesis is a figment of the psychoanalytic mind: "There is no original trauma. When the idea of traumatic fixation is abandoned all experiences of early childhood gain a new significance. The relationship of the infant to his parents and to his siblings, to his own body and to extraneous targets must be interpreted in their relationship to spontaneity. As it operates from birth on he can never become their victim as analysts imagine. As there is no 'original' trauma and a mental fixation to it, it is meaningless to talk about repression towards it and speculating that as soon as a certain set of fixations are established the rest of living is a more or less unchangeable chain of events. The reality model of Freud is like a house with permanent and rigid 'exits.' It is finished in essence when the child is four years old, from then on just to be used. All emotions have to abreact through these exits exclusively. A person falls mentally ill when he does not use these exits and create substitutes for them. The patient gets well when he learns to conform or return to the exits he has established in early childhood, and to discharge his emotional strivings again through them. The reality model of a psycho-dramatist differs substantially. The building of the house goes on as long as man lives. It cannot stop ever. There are no rigid exits. The original exits move imperceptibly from their original positions to different

---

<sup>1</sup>Breuer and Freud, "Studien ueber Hysterie", 1895.

<sup>2</sup>This quotation is taken from J. L. Moreno, "Note on Models of Reality", *SOCIATRY*, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. also J. L. Moreno "Psychodrama" Vol. I, 1946, Beacon House, N. Y.

sites. A person falls ill because 'in want of spontaneity and creativity' he is not able to produce new exits indispensable to his new aspirations."

The function of the physician has become similar to that of the sleuth: he tries, like a detective to search for all the exits through which the criminal may have escaped. It is surmised that, once the criminal is caught all will be well. All that then remains necessary is to give the patient an opportunity for a more adequate reenactment of his inner conflict than life permitted him to express. The psychodrama being the most life-like form of psychotherapy, lends itself best to such reconstruction. Using this discipline, the physician is able to recreate any traumatic experience—for instance, a combat situation—but if he expects a cure after only one reenactment, he will be disappointed.

Only rarely do we find an isolated traumatic experience—as in an airplane crash. More often we find such experiences repeated over and over again—particularly in combat. John W. Appel and Gilbert W. Beebe<sup>3</sup> have recently studied the effect of repeated exposure to danger. They found that the average front-line soldier "wears out" after from 200 to 240 aggregate combat days, just as the average motor truck wears out after a certain number of road-miles. The physician who expects a "miracle" recovery after only a few psychodramatic sessions will therefore be disappointed. Since it takes so many exposures to danger to break a man down, it follows that his cure can not be attained in just a few interviews.

The soldier in combat is faced with an emergency so threatening and terrifying, that he is not able to deal with it adequately on the spur of the moment.<sup>4</sup> The trauma is an overpowering experience with which his spontaneity is unable to cope. If the danger is not too great the soldier might become accustomed to the combat situation, once he has learned to deal with it adequately. He no longer fails because of his inadequate spontaneity but handles it with mastery as a thing he knows well: a conserve. The closer the training will simulate actual combat conditions, and psychodramatic techniques lend themselves well to such training—the better will the soldier stand up under combat stress.

If we reconstruct a situation from the battlefield in the security of the make believe—we shall help the soldier to find a way out of a difficulty which he met originally with inadequate spontaneity and thus relieve his

---

<sup>3</sup>John W. Appel and Gilbert W. Beeke, "Preventive Psychiatry" (*The Journal of the American Medical Association*, August 31, 1946).

<sup>4</sup>Ernest Fantel "Psychodrama in an Evacuation Hospital" (*Psychodrama Monograph* No. 18, 1945).

anxiety. The failure of his spontaneity seems to have burdened him like a heavy debt, (we might speak of a spontaneity dept causing anxiety) and the final solution of his problem seems to lift a weight from the patient's shoulder.

After the first reenactment of a combat experience we shall often find the patient more afraid than relieved. Everything in the psychodramatic scene will impress him as real. He will, for instance, be desperately afraid of an attendant acting as a corpse, and will remain afraid of him long after the dramatic session. His spontaneity is still so weak that we have to go very slow, otherwise we shall only add more trauma and precipitate another panic reaction. We shall gradually familiarize the patient with the simulated corpse. It will require a number of treatments during which we direct him to touch and handle the body. Only after many repetitions will he become de-sensitized to such an extent that his original fear has given way to the realization that his first anxiety is now unfounded and even ludicrous. Instead of growing frightened as the result of his inadequate spontaneity, he has acquired confidence in handling a situation which has grown familiar to him and finally even appears funny to him. In an appreciation of the humor in a situation which originally impressed him as being full of horror, we recognize—in the quality of the ludicrous—a characteristic of the conserve.

Having reached this point in the patient's recovery, we should not rest upon our laurels. We shall find that he has a great tendency to relapse. We must keep in touch with him and see him at first once a week, then once a month and, eventually at longer intervals. We shall be on hand to discover the return of the old fears to combat them effectively. It will even be of advantage to repeat, on and off, the original traumatic repetition—merely as a preventative measure.

Up to this point, the training and treatment of the patient has acted like a crutch, teaching him to acquire conserves rather than spontaneity. In the end, we shall advance to true spontaneity training in which our goal will be to develop the spontaneity factor instead of drilling the patient in the solution of a specific problem. Thus we prepare the individual better to face future emergencies. Repetition of scenes will be discontinued: each situation will be new and unique. Only well-developed spontaneity will protect the individual from succumbing to future trauma.

### THREE "WORD HISTORIES" IMPORTANT IN PSYCHODRAMA

#### *Persóna—Rôle—Spontaneity*

J. I. MEIERS

*New York*

Words, too, have their "case history"—they arise, are derived, develop, change in meaning, vanish, and have even their "family relationship"; the science of all which we usually call etymology.<sup>1</sup> Today we want to examine from this viewpoint only three such word histories. In the process of the investigation it might become clear that by scrutinizing, in such manner, a word which we have been taking heretofore "for granted", we are to gain deeper insight into its meaning and wider implications; that thus we reach much farther out than before when we were using that word as a mere "conserve", as a sort of canned good.

*Persóna*, an original Latin word, had—to the best of our historical knowledge—primarily no other meaning than that of a theatrical mask; a mask used, possibly,—before the legitimate scene arose in Rome—already in the older Italic-Etruscan religious plays. It is derived, according to the ancient Roman etymologist Aulus Gellius, from "per-sonáre"—to sound through. Meaning that it describes not just any "mask", covering the face; but only that mask through which the player speaks, a "sound-through". As a side line, it is not without interest to state that in Rome as in Greece these theatrical masks (*personae*) often covered the whole or at least the greater part of the head, helmet-like; thus reminding us of the masks of our mummery or of the children's halloween masks, which have preserved that ancient tradition.

From that aboriginal significance were derivated:

Persona = sound mask

" = "rôle" (character in the play)

" = a human character in general; an individual

This development took place already in antiquity. Cicero, the philosopher, orator and statesman in the century before the Christian era, wrote of his "own person"; Seneca, the stoic philosopher of the next century, spoke, figuratively, even of the "person" (properties) of a thing.

It may be added here, in view of the higher originality and antiquity

---

<sup>1</sup>From: "étymon—the true, the real, the primordial (meaning); Greek word.

of the drama in Greece, that in the Hellenic world the evolution of the mask was a very different one:

In Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the word face is, strangely enough, rendered almost only as a plural "pros-opa" which means, literally, "the parts to (or around) the eyes (Opa; compare "optic"). In later Greek, the face is called, in the singular, pros-opon. From this, then, is formed the word "prosopeion"—a mask, in the *theatrical* or, originally, in any cultic-scenic, sense. In Greek, too, this word for mask (facial covering) was used later for a person or character in a play or, also, in the Esopian fable. However, in the Hellenic development this word, prosopion, never carried over to that wide range of meanings in philosophy, law, etc. as did in Latin (and later in our own cultural heritage) the much more resounding word "persona"—personal—personality. It could be argued whether or not this difference should be traced back to some "basic" contrast in the psychology of these two cultures—the Greek being more "optic", bent upon the fine arts (painting; sculpture; scenic) and, altogether, more theoretical (from the word *theo*=look, contemplate); as compared to the greater "practicality" and materialistic coarseness of the Romans. Such interpretative generalizations of "national character" often are precarious, almost far-fetched even if we have the feeling that there may be "something in it".

In the foregoing comparison, however, as to why the Latin word "persona" did have such far-reaching development whereas the Greek word "prosopion" was lost in the course of History,—the hypothesis appears reasonable that "Persona" which re-united both sound and sight has proved stronger than the Hellenic word which aimed at the visual sense only.

*Rôle*, originally an old-French word, which penetrated then into medieval French and English, is derived from the Latin "rotula" (the little wheel, or round log), the diminutive of rota=wheel. In antiquity it was used, originally, only to designate a round (wooden) roll on which sheets of parchment were fastened so as to smoothly roll ("wheel") them around it since otherwise the sheets would break or crumble. From this came the word for an assemblage of such leaves into a scroll or book-like composite. This was used, subsequently, to mean any official volume of papers pertaining to law courts, as in France, or to government, as for instance in England: rolls of Parliament—the minutes or proceedings. Whereas in Greece and also in ancient Rome the parts in the theatre were written on the above-mentioned "rolls" and read by the prompters to the actors (who tried to memorize their part by heart), this fixation of the word appears to have been lost in the more illiterate periods of the early and middle

centuries of the Dark Ages, for their public presentation of church plays by laymen. Only towards the 16th and 17th centuries, with the emergence of the modern stage, the parts of the theatrical characters are read from "rôles", paper fascicles. Whence each scenic "part" becomes a rôle.

Still, we observe here the interesting phenomena that to the word "rôle" clings the meaning of being something theatrical; external—so to speak—(the role is "*played*"); in contrast to the older word "persona" which now has come to mean the fullness of an individual's character, its wholeness of feelings, thoughts, actions and thus has become more complex, "intransparent".

The *Persona* (erstwhile the face-bearer of a clearcut character, a god, a hero or historic unique being) has now, in our parlance, become a complex, complicated *Personality*; this latter concept having grown unwieldy and too indistinct to lend itself well for psychologic description.

The "person" can play many various (even contradictory) "rôles". The same "person" Achilles can be: the lover; the mourning friend; the killer; son; brother, . . . ad infinitum. —The rôle becomes one of the facets of the crystal "person".

*Spontaneity*. This concept—which is of the foremost importance in the whole philosophy of psycho- and sociodrama and the meaning of which had to be revived, for our times, by J. L. Moreno,—is likewise a heritage from Roman antiquity. In fact, the Greeks did not leave us a "word for it". Spontaneity is, of course, derived from "spontaneous"—a word which we find already in classic Latin; and this, in its turn, from the rather unique and almost mysterious word "sponte". We have to attach to it this strange characterization since it exists, in Latin itself, only in this fragmentary and isolated form. It occurs exclusively in the contexts: *Méa . . . túa . . . súa spónte* = on my, on thy, on his(her) *own* volition = from my (thy, his, etc.) own free will. . . .

The old Latin grammarians and etymologists as well as our modern ones have tried to trace this unique and strange fragmentary word further back; thus, it was connected with the similar root *spond(eo)* which means= to shed (a liquid), to spend, and thence, to solemnly vow, to promise. But as can be readily seen, there is no real close connection between 'sponte' (the energetic and un-influenced act) and the slow water-shedding of "spondeo". Nor is there in Greek (which otherwise is the nearest sister-language to Latin) nor in any other indo-european tongue anything comparable to "sponte". It arises, indeed, like one of those inexplicable, lone stone-witness of pre-historic antiquity, as are certain unreadable ogham-

inscriptions in pre-Celtic Britain or unriddled wall carvings in caves the meaning of which we cannot "read", only divine. The nearest we can find in Latin itself, of cognate roots, is "spuo"—to spout, to spring geyser-like.

In the later usage of Latin, "spontaneous" was then applied also to inanimated things which arise or "act" without anybody's prompting. So, the alleged "procreation of microorganism from dirt" etc. was called *generatio spontanea*.

All in all, in the word "sponte" the unparalleled *genius of the Latin tongue* has given us a root and a concept never found elsewhere; and which word, in an act of creation by those old people, "anticipated" for some thousand years the ideas of J. Peirce<sup>2</sup> on the pre-existential "beginning", on originality, and so on,—and has inspired J. L. Moreno's re-discovery of, and insistence on Spontaneity—the self-created push and moving.

---

<sup>2</sup>James Peirce, Collected Papers. 10 vol.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### *Group Psychotherapy—Psychodrama—Sociatry, Mid-Summer Conference at Beacon, N. Y., July 26 and 27, 1947*

The conference will take place at the Psychodramatic Institute, on Saturday and Sunday, July 26 and 27, and leaders in the above fields are invited. The proceedings will be presided over by J. L. Moreno, Director of the Institute. Students who plan to participate in the conference are urged to enroll for the weekend now. The full fee for the two days, including room, board and attendance of all sessions, is \$25.00. The sessions will cover the application of group psychotherapy, psychodrama, role training, and to matrimonial, industrial and cultural problems. Students who enrolled for the intensive training course at the Institute during the summer at the time of the conference may attend it as a part of their training course.

### *Graduate Course on Sociometry*

Dr. Merl E. Bonney, of the North Texas State Teachers College at Denton informs us that he is giving a graduate course called Sociometry next fall, in the psychology department of his college. Students will cover the research in the field and each will do some research of a sociometric nature.

### *New Psychodrama and Sociometry Monographs*

The following new monographs are in process: Rosemary Lippitt, "Psychodrama in the Home"; Margherita A. Macdonald, "Psychodrama Explores a Private World"; J. L. Moreno, "The Present Situation in Group Psychotherapy"; J. L. Moreno, "The Future of Man's World".

### *Sociometry and Sociology*

A paper by this title was read by J. L. Moreno at the American Sociological Society meeting in Chicago in December, 1946 and is to appear in the June, 1947, issue of the *American Sociological Review*. A French translation of this paper is appearing in the fall issue of the *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie*.

## PSYCHODRAMATIC INSTITUTE PROGRAM—1947-48

*Part Scholarships Available*

*Special Rates for Veterans*

In 1947 it will be eleven years since the Psychodramatic Institute opened its doors. During this period its Therapeutic Theatre has been applied to treatment, training and research.

The Institutes of Beacon and New York have organized facilities for the enrollment of one hundred students for the course during the coming year. All students are to receive instruction and training in sociatry, socio- and psychodrama, sociometry and group psychotherapy, covering among others, the fields of: Nursery School, Child Guidance, Public School Education, Juvenile Delinquency, Speech Disorders, Intercultural Relations, Leadership Training, Family and Marriage Problems, Music Therapy, Therapeutic Films, Rehabilitation of the Returned Soldiers and their Families, Community and Religious Problems.

The objectives of the program are: (a) Training of directors of psychodrama and group psychotherapy in the conducting of sessions; (b) Training auxiliary egos (therapeutic and research actors), of group interviewers and group lecturers; (c) Training of social analysts in clinical and actual situations; (d) Seminars covering the fields of psychodrama, sociodrama, sociometry, group psychotherapy and therapeutic motion pictures; (e) Research and field projects in psychodrama and group psychotherapy, with study of methods and analyzing and classifying psychodrama, sociodrama and sociometric materials.

Teaching and training will be given jointly at the auditorium of the New York Institute and at the Therapeutic Theatre of the Beacon Hill Sanitarium.

Students fall under two categories: Category A: the Beacon Group-Enrollment in this group is limited to 30 students. Classes and sessions begin on June 1st and last for 4 months, until October 1st. Students of this group receive their room, board and training at the Psychodramatic Institute at Beacon, N. Y. The fee for students of this group is \$60.00 per week, \$240.00 for a four weeks' stay. Directorial work is part of the training of this group. Applications for enrollment in this group should be in our hands by June 15, 1947, with registration fee of \$5.00. Members of the Beacon group may attend New York sessions at a small additional expense.

B: The New York Group-Students live in New York (those who have private residence) or commute from out of town and attend the classes

at the New York Institute at 101 Park Avenue. These courses are continuous throughout the year. For this group sessions and classes are given 3 times a week in the late afternoon and evening, so that they are able to pursue a professional occupation during the day, or other academic studies. The full enrollment capacity of this group is 80 students. The weekly tuition fee is \$20.00, the fee for a 12 weeks' course is \$240.00; with additional training in directorial capacity the fee runs to \$360.00. There are a number of half scholarships available. Students who qualify for and obtain such scholarships pay half the tuition for the 12 weeks' course, \$120.00 and \$180.00 respectively. New York students may attend weekend sessions at Beacon, N. Y., staying at the Beacon Institute for the weekend if room is available, for an additional fee. Such weekend training is meant especially for students interested in directorial techniques and work with mental patients. All students are required to pay a registration fee of \$5.00 in advance.

J. L. Moreno, M.D., Director of the Psychodramatic Institute in Beacon and New York City, assisted by a staff of instructors, will conduct the seminars and sessions. Students will be permitted to use the library at the Psychodramatic Institute. Every student is expected to formulate and work out a research project related to his own field of application, under guidance. Upon completion of the course every student will obtain an official acknowledgment from the director as to the duration of the course and the accomplishments of the student.

Students interested in training courses in 1947 and 1948 may file their applications *now*; they will be placed on a preference list which will assure their admission.

ENROLLMENT CARD FOR STUDENTS,  
PSYCHODRAMATIC INSTITUTE

I enroll for a ..... weeks training course at  
 Beacon, New York  
 from ..... till .....  
 ..... and enclose herewith the registration fee of \$5.00.  
 Name, in full (please print) .....  
 Address .....

Fill in, tear off and mail to Psychodramatic Institute,  
 Beacon, New York

*Two New Publications:*

# **THE THEATRE OF SPONTANEITY**

By

J. L. MORENO

Translated from the German "Das Stegreiftheater", by the author, the pioneering book on Psychodrama and Sociodrama, Role- and Spontaneity Training. With Illustrations, Charts and Action Diagrams; Historical Documentations and Glossary of Terms. Cloth-bound, Price \$3.50.

# **THE PSYCHODRAMA OF GOD**

A NEW HYPOTHESIS OF THE SELF

With Introduction and Comments by

J. L. MORENO

**CLOTHBOUND, PRICE \$6.00**

**BEACON HOUSE**  
101 Park Avenue  
New York City

**BEACON HOUSE**  
P. O. Box 311  
Beacon, New York

# PSYCHODRAMA

IN THREE VOLUMES

*By*

J. L. MORENO

The three volumes contain the most complete presentation of psychodramatic theory and practice to date. They tell the story of psychodrama from its beginning in the gardens of Vienna in 1910 up to the Theatre of Psychodrama at Beacon, New York City and St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C. Besides papers previously published they contain a large number of papers yet unpublished, untranslated or out of print. The first volume concentrates on psychodrama in its psychological, educational, anthropological and sociological aspects, with an introduction into spontaneity theory. The second volume concentrates on psychodrama in its relation to psychopathology and psychiatry with an introduction into the meaning of group catharsis and group psychotherapy. The third volume is a complete psychodramatic protocol of a typical marriage situation.

The volumes contain twelve photographs of therapeutic theatres, psychodramatic scenes and more than sixty charts and diagrams.

VOLUME I: \$6.00    VOLUME II: \$6.00    VOLUME III: \$4.00

*Published by*

BEACON HOUSE

101 Park Avenue

New York 17, N. Y.

## PSYCHODRAMA MONOGRAPHS

- No. 1. Sociodrama, A Method for the Analysis of Social Conflicts—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.25)
- No. 2. Psychodramatic Treatment of Performance Neurosis—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 3. The Theatre for Spontaneity—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$3.50)
- No. 4. Spontaneity Test and Spontaneity Training—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 5. Psychodramatic Shock Therapy—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 6. Mental Catharsis and the Psychodrama—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 7. Psychodramatic Treatment of Marriage Problems—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 8. Spontaneity Theory of Child Development—J. L. Moreno and Florence B. Moreno (List Price—\$2.00)
- No. 9. Reality Practice in Education—Alvin Zander, Ronald Lippitt and Charles E. Hendry (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 10. Psychodrama in the Schools—Nahum E. Shoobs (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 11. Psychodrama and Therapeutic Motion Pictures—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 12. Role Analysis and Audience Structure—Zerka Toeman (List Price—\$1.25)
- No. 13. A Case of Paranoia Treated Through Psychodrama—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 14. Psychodrama as Expressive and Projective Technique—John del Torto and Paul Cornyetz (List Price—\$1.25)
- No. 15. Psychodramatic Treatment of Psychoses—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 16. Psychodrama and the Psychopathology of Inter-Personal Relations—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$2.00)
- No. 17. Origins and Development of Group Psychotherapy—Joseph I. Meiers (List Price—\$1.75)
- No. 18. Psychodrama in an Evacuation Hospital—Ernest Fantel (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 19. The Group Method in the Treatment of Psychosomatic Disorders—Joseph H. Pratt (List Price—\$1.25)

### WHO SHALL SURVIVE

J. L. MORENO

*A New Approach to the Problem of Human Interrelations*

This authoritative work on sociometry presents the most important source-material in this field. It contains 100 charts and sociograms in color. 437 pages. \$6.00.

PSYCHODRAMA, VOLUME I

J. L. MORENO

\$6.00

# SOCIOMETRY MONOGRAPHS

- No. 1. Developments in Social Psychology, 1930-1940, Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., and Ruth Gallagher (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 2. Sociometry and the Cultural Order—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.25)
- No. 3. Sociometric Measurement of Social Configurations—J. L. Moreno and Helen H. Jennings (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 4. Foundations of Sociometry—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.25)
- No. 5. Group Method and Group Psychotherapy—J. L. Moreno (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 6. A Constant Frame of Reference for Sociometric Research—Urie Bronfenbrenner (List Price—\$2.25)
- No. 7. Sociometric Control Studies of Grouping and Regrouping—J. L. Moreno and Helen H. Jennings (List Price—\$1.25)
- No. 8. Diagnosis of Anti-Semitism—Gustav Ichheiser (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 9. Popular and Unpopular Children, A Sociometric Study—Merl E. Bonney (List Price—\$2.25)
- No. 10. Prestige Rank in a Rural Community—Harold F. Kaufman (List Price—\$1.50)
- No. 11. Personality and Sociometric Status—Mary L. Northway, Esther B. Frankel and Reva Potashin (List Price—\$2.25)

## GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY

With More Than Fifty Contributions

Edited by J. L. MORENO, M.D.

Drs. Winfred Overholser; William A. White; Vernon C. Branham; Amos T. Baker; Fannie French Morse; Julia K. Jaffray; Franz Alexander; Wm. J. Ellis; F. Lovell Bixby; Edgar A. Doll; Q. Hoisopple; Paul L. Schroeder; Ellen C. Potter; Benjamin Karpman; S. W. Hartwell; E. Stagg Whitin; J. L. Moreno; Roscoe W. Hall; Francis J. Braceland; Bruno Solby; Frances Herriott; Louise A. Sullivan; Samuel B. Hadden; R. Robert Cohen; J. H. Pratt; Abraham A. Low; E. W. Lazelle; Louis Wender; Wladimir Eliasberg; Nathan W. Ackerman; Ernest Fantel; Margaret Hagan; Edith Wright; Theodore R. Sarbin; Gerhard Schauer; Lewis Barbato; Zerka Toeman; John R. P. French; Florence B. Moreno; J. Sutherland; G. Fitzpatrick; Paul Cornyetz; Ira M. Altshuler; Leila A. McKay; Milton H. Ward; Howard P. Rome; Marian Chace; Joseph I. Meiers.

The volume covers: Lecture Methods, Analytic Methods, Psychodrama, Sociodrama, Sociometric Methods, Dance Methods, Music Methods, Motion Pictures and Historical Survey.

The most complete treatment of the subject, from its origins to its uses in World War Number II.

325 pages—bibliography—index—\$6.00

Basic Book Selection

**BEACON HOUSE**

101 Park Avenue

New York 17, N. Y.

