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ABSTRACT

A systematic model of psychodrama is proposed to help clarify the complex psychodramatic process. It is intended to complement the immense amount of literature concerning the theory and techniques of psychodrama.

A review of related literature is presented in the thesis. The development of systems theory and its application to counseling/therapy is considered, as well as the specific utilization of the systems approach in psychodrama. It is noted that the use of systems theory to conceptualize the psychodramatic process has been limited.

A flowchart is used to describe the systematic model of psychodrama. The flowchart is supplemented by a narrative and a list of process questions, which help the reader to analyze the performance of the psychodrama director.

The model is viewed as a cognitive reference map for the psychodrama director, and it is adaptable for each psychodramatist. The model can also be helpful as a training guide for neophyte directors, with the ultimate goal being improved services for the client.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

If one does not have a systematic scheme, a series of problems follow. One does not know which of a myriad of events one should attend. Without system, there are no explicit criteria by which to determine what is relevant and what is irrelevant for one's purposes (Ford and Urban, 1963, p. 27).

Psychodrama is a therapeutic technique originated and developed by the late Jacob L. Moreno (1890-1974). There are numerous writings on the general theory of psychodrama, for example Moreno's (1964) Psychodrama, Vol. 1. Other literature includes psychodrama case studies (Blatner, 1970; Haskell, 1967; Moreno, 1954; Yablonsky, 1976), as well as a detailed monograph specifying general principles and techniques (Z. Moreno, 1966). The many volumes of works about group psychotherapy and psychodrama contain frequent examples of the development of techniques as well as specific applications of psychodrama in clinical settings.

However, with the exception of The Hollander Psychodrama Curve (Hollander, 1974), and Ann Hale's (1974) portrayal of a sociometric exploration, there is no readily useable systematic guide for psychodrama available to the interested student or reader.

Part of the difficulty in presenting such a guide to psychodrama is the complexity of the method, and, according
to J. L. Moreno, its "existential" character (Moreno, 1968, p. 3). Each client, or protagonist, is viewed as a person whose life experience is so unique that each psychodrama will be unique; a psychodrama session will not follow the same formula for any given person (Goldman, 1978). The situation is made more difficult in that each psychodramatist may use his/her understanding of psychodrama in different ways, emphasizing different views of personality dynamics and development. The variety of theoretical viewpoints coupled with the assumed existential position of the protagonist has complicated the understanding of an already complex and seemingly mysterious method.

Considering the concerns of the student-in-training and the interested observer, the absence of an explicit system is, at the very least, frustrating. The student finds it difficult to conceptualize the process, other than trying to imitate fellow directors and pondering through the abstract writings of J. L. Moreno. The untrained observer is often left mystified; unable to communicate much of his/her own experience to other people, or to find adequate written material that describes the process systematically. The protagonist, as client and consumer, is, in many cases, unsure about what the psychodramatist is attempting to accomplish in a session, which can leave some question about the accountability of the psychodramatist in our post-Corvair society.
Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this manuscript is to provide a systematic model of psychodrama that will delineate the psychodramatic process and help the psychodramatist refine his/her cognitive understanding of psychodrama.

Rationale

In light of the background information from the introduction, this writer offers the following rationale for a systematic view of the psychodramatic process:

1. A systematic view of psychodrama can provide an accessible frame of reference for understanding the complex methodology, to assist both the student-in-training and interested observer, and

2. In providing such a cognitive reference, this systematic view will hopefully aid the psychodramatist in becoming more "effective," i.e., helping the protagonist achieve his/her goals.

Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made in presenting this model of psychodrama:

1. This model will be intelligible to the student-in-training and untrained observer of psychodrama,

2. This model can assist the reader in developing his/her own cognitive understanding of psychodrama,
3. There is a positive relationship between increased cognitive understanding and therapeutic "effectiveness," and

4. This model will accurately convey the "classical" Morenoan-psychodrama process.

**Limitations**

The following limitation is to be considered in this model. This writer's experience is primarily limited to researching the relevant literature, and to contact with psychodrama at the Western Institute of Psychodrama at Camelback Hospital in Phoenix, Arizona. This is important to the extent that there are a variety of training institutes throughout the world, emphasizing different approaches and uses of psychodrama.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definition of terms is divided into two distinct sections. The first is specifically concerned with psychodramatic terms; the second, with terms involving systems theory. The definitions are listed as a progression of concepts rather than in alphabetical order.

**Psychodrama-Related Terms**

**Psychodrama**—A form of psychotherapy, usually occurring in a group, in which a protagonist enacts his/her life conflicts or situational difficulties, using techniques such as
role-playing and role-reversal, for any of a multitude of purposes including anxiety reduction, attitudinal change, personal insight, and behavioral change (Moreno, 1953, p. 81).

**Protagonist**—From the Greek "first actor" (Random House Dictionary, 1973, p. 1155), the protagonist is the person whose psychodrama is being enacted, i.e., the client, counselee, or patient.

**Director**—The counselor or therapist who utilizes psychodrama in working with the client-protagonist.

**Auxiliary Ego**—Any person who takes the role of some person, animal, or symbolic feature that is important in the psychodrama session. For example, the protagonist may be exploring his/her relationship to a lover, and so a member of the group may be asked to play the role of lover.

**Double**—An auxiliary ego used by the director to help the protagonist identify certain feelings that might not be clear to the director or protagonist. The double accomplishes this by assuming the protagonist's posture, and utilizing cues offered by both the director and protagonist to verbalize what the protagonist may not be saying in his/her self-presentation.

**Group**—The context of people in which most psychodrama is enacted. It is a source of auxiliary egos, as well as for verbal feedback for the protagonist during the sharing and dialogue.
Warm-Up--The process of "increasing involvement in an activity" (Goldman, 1978). In a formal sense, it is the first stage of a typical psychodrama session, and is used to encourage group cohesiveness and to select a protagonist. However, this process continues as one warms-up to a number of scenes or situations in the entire session, moving from superficial experiences on the "periphery" to the essence of behavior and emotion at the "core" of life experience (Goldman, 1978).

Action--Constitutes the bulk of time and activity in a typical psychodrama, when the protagonist is assisted in clarifying his/her own emotion, cognition, and behavior, through enactment of significant literal and symbolic experiences.

Surplus Reality--The symbolic closure of the action segment of a typical psychodrama session. For example, the director might use chairs to symbolize the essence of the protagonist's psychodrama--the emotional "wall" between the protagonist and other people that has been created by the protagonist.

Sharing--The point at which the action segment of a psychodrama ends and the group shares experiences in their lives that are similar to those of the protagonist.

Dialogue--The optional fourth part of a psychodrama. It is the director's psychodynamic analysis which, depending upon the situation, can be presented at the conclusion of
the sharing, or at another time when appropriate for the protagonist.

**Role-Playing**—The acting-out, between protagonist and auxiliary ego(s), of a particular encounter which takes place in the psychodrama session.

**Role-Training**—The use of role-playing techniques in teaching a protagonist new behaviors for future use through repeated practice, instruction and director-group feedback. Such role-training is often used in assertiveness training.

**Role-Reversal**—A technique in which the director has the protagonist change positions with an auxiliary ego, to literally "become" that other person or symbolic object. This technique is often used to let the protagonist answer questions that the auxiliary ego cannot answer, to help the director obtain more information about the interaction, and/or to assist the protagonist in viewing the situation through the eyes of the other person, to eventually achieve new insight.

**Sociometry**—The systematic measurement and understanding of interpersonal relations, originated by J. L. Moreno, and greatly expanded by others. In a typical psychodrama session, sociometry refers to the patterns of interaction within a group—the various friendships, antagonisms, and preferences that develop spontaneously.
Tele—This term has been defined as a "mutual exchange of empathy and appreciation" (Greenberg, 1968, p. 89), and as the "feeling of individuals into one another, the cement which holds groups together" (Moreno, 1964, p. xi).

Systems-Related Terms

System—W. F. Buckley, in Sociology and Modern Systems Theory (1967, p. 41), refers to a system as a "complex of elements of components directly or indirectly related in a causal network, such that each component is related to at least some of the others in a more or less stable way within any particular period of time."

This writer's use of the word "systematic" will be generic, unlike its use by (Stewart, Winborn, Johnson, Burks, and Engelkes (1978) in Systematic Counseling. Stewart et.al., refer to a specific behavioral counseling theory, while here it will denote the process of interaction and organized relationships between elements of a system.

Input—The total resources which are put into the operation of a system to achieve a goal or cause some result to occur.

Output—The results or effects of the operation of a system.

Flowchart—In this writing, a graphic and sequential representation of the communication in a psychodrama or counseling/therapy session. Figure 1 is an example of a flowchart.
Figure 1. Flowchart of the Systematic Counseling Model (Stewart et al., 1978)
Subsystem—A smaller element of the total system. In the flowchart, the subsystem refers to each of the larger rectangles, such as PROCESS CLIENT REFERRAL, which includes a number of functions in smaller rectangles, such as RECEIVE REFERRAL AND ANALYZE APPROPRIATENESS OF REFERRAL (see Figure 1).

Function—A specific behavior or cognitive process. In this model, each function is enclosed by a rectangle.

Descriptor—The capitalized words which are used to describe a function in a system as pictured in the flowchart. PROCESS CLIENT REFERRAL is an example of descriptor words.

Signal Path—The direction of the flow of information on the flowchart, which is represented by an arrow, as in Figure 1.

Level of Detail—The degree of specificity of any function. For example in Figure 1, the first level of detail is PROCESS CLIENT REFERRAL (2.0), a second level of detail is RECEIVE REFERRAL (2.1), a third level of detail is COUNSELOR OBSERVATION (2.1.1), and a fourth level of detail is RECORDS (2.1.1.1). The more detailed the number level, (example 2.2.1 is more detailed than 2.2), the more specific the function.

Feedback—The inner control which helps a system to stabilize itself, similar to the process by which thermostats regulate temperature in a room. In the flowchart, it indicates "output from a subsystem and input to a preceding
subsystem" (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 59). Figure 1 is an example of feedback where EVALUATE COUNSELOR PERFORMANCE is fed back into COUNSELOR.

Recycle—The process of repeating one or more previously performed functions and/or subsystems in order to meet an established criterion. Recycling is continued until the standard has been met, or until it is determined that it cannot be met (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 58).

In Figure 1, the interaction between DECIDE IF GOAL CAN BE ESTABLISHED (6.1.2) and DISCUSS NEED FOR GOALS IN COUNSELING (6.7) indicate the use of recycling when it is necessary to clarify instructions in the DECIDE GOAL AND OBJECTIVE (6.0) subsystem.

Feedforward—A term applied to a signal path showing an output from a subsystem to a succeeding subsystem, where there are one or more intervening subsystems which are unaffected by that signal path (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 59).

In Figure 1, the movement from SPECIFY CONDITIONS TO REFERRAL SOURCE (2.2.4) by-passing PREPARE FOR INTERVIEW (3.0), to PURPOSE (4.3.1) is an example of feedforward.

Collection Dot—A symbol indicating that all data from the various points of a particular function are to be 'collected together' or summed and then carried as a unit to the next function (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 57-58).

In Figure 1, the RESPONSE (5.3.1), TEMPORAL (5.3.2) and SITUATIONAL (5.3.3) aspects of the IDENTIFY COMPONENTS
OF CONCERN (5.3) function are brought together to the next function, ESTABLISH BASELINE OF CONCERN-RELATED BEHAVIOR (5.4).

**Circle with a Point-Numeric Code Inside**--A short cut means of showing a relationship between two relatively distant functions, as opposed to connecting them with a signal path (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 57).

In Figure 1, the function of ASSIST IN LOCATING APPROPRIATE ASSISTANCE (2.2.5) is considered to be relatively distant from SELECT CONCERN FOR COUNSELING (5.2), so a circle with a point-numeric code inside is used to represent with movement.

**Performance Criteria**--The criteria which is used to specifically evaluate communication and behavior in the process of a system. In this model, performance criteria will consist of process questions about the behavior of the psychodrama director.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following review of the literature is an outline of the development of systems and counseling, with an emphasis on the Systematic Counseling model and the use of systems concepts in psychodrama.

Systems and Counseling

The systems approach to counseling is relatively new, as is the entire field of systems theory. The widespread use of systems analysis has existed since the original work of Ludwig von Bertalanffy in the 1930's. His General Systems theory was developed as an alternative to the narrow specialization which had existed in science, with the purpose of "identifying the common ways in which the components of different systems are organized or interrelated" (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 34).

As Bertalanffy and others developed aspects of General Systems theory, other scientists, notably Norbert Wiener, were constructing other systems models. During the period of rapid technological growth following WWII, Wiener presented his "cybernetic" model, which was "based upon the principle of feedback or circular causal trains providing
mechanisms for goal-seeking and self-controlling behavior" (Bertalanffy, 1962, p. 3).

These concepts of interrelated components and feedback for self-control have generally received limited attention in counseling and psychotherapy. Only since the 1960's has any technical analysis of counseling systems appeared, principally in the work of Cogswell (1962) and Friesen, Hurst, and Loughary (1966). The emphasis has been on assisting counselors in systematically critiquing their own counseling activity for the purpose of increasing their on-the-job effectiveness and providing better services to their clients.

**Systematic Counseling**

A most recent analysis of counseling has been provided in the book *Systematic Counseling* (Stewart et al., 1978). The authors contend that every counselor has a system which helps him/her to understand client behavior and develop strategies to facilitate client change. Their system is "an approach in which the various aspects of the counseling process are clearly identified and organized into a sequence designed to resolve the client's concerns efficiently as well as effectively" (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 50).

One of the distinguishing features of their approach is the use of the flowchart as a guide to the process of counseling (see Figure 1). Several advantages are cited
by the authors in their comparison of the flowchart with a simple narrative or single-case example (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 53):

1. A flowchart facilitates the visualization of relationships between closely-related, as well as far removed, elements in a process.

2. A flowchart makes possible the expression of relationships, such as recycling, feedback and feed-forward.

3. A flowchart is economical, efficient, and convenient.

The flowchart model aids the observer in understanding the interaction of diverse elements in a system and thereby facilitates the learning of a process.

In response to criticism that the flowchart is a cold, mechanical method for communicating a very warm, human interaction, the authors offer the following analogy:

A sheet of music is a cold, inanimate object or model that contains only lines and musical notation. This sheet of music can be used by a skillful musician to produce beautiful sounds for our enjoyment. One could, of course, play an instrument or sing in a very mechanical way. In fact musicians usually do perform in a mechanical fashion until they have received sufficient training and practice (Stewart et al., 1978, p. 31).

For the psychodrama student-in-training, the analogy is particularly helpful. Skillful psychodrama directors seem to perform "magic" even when using identical techniques. The student often forgets that skilled directors were once
unskilled and in the same position of learning and behaving in a "mechanical fashion."

A significant addition to the flowchart by Stewart et al., is the authors' use of performance criteria to evaluate the quality of the counselor's activity. For example, in the PROCESS CLIENT REFERRAL (2.0) subsystem in Figure 1, the counselor makes a major decision about whether or not to accept a client referral. The performance criteria in this situation would include questions about the evidence used by the counselor in making a decision and whether or not this evidence was adequate to support the decision. These criteria can then be used as a training tool whereby a supervisor or colleague can systematically evaluate a counselor's work and make specific suggestions for improvement. The system is completed when these improved skills are fed back into the COUNSELOR (1.0) subsystem and the counselor is more able to effectively meet the needs of his/her clients.

**Systems and Psychodrama**

The psychodrama literature contains little that can compare with such models as Systematic Counseling. However, models described by Carl Hollander (1974) and Ann Hale (1974) were identified in the introduction as exceptions to this statement.

Figure 2 presents a visualization of the Hollander Psychodrama Curve. The Curve was created for experienced
I. Sociometry

II. Psychodrama Enactment

III. Group Psychotherapy Group Dynamics

Warm-Up
a. Encounter
b. Phase (unnatural)
c. Process (natural)

Integration with audience
a. Self-Disclosure
b. Dialogue
c. Summary

Climax of Catharsis

Scene I
Emotional Continuum

Scene II
Reality-Based Diagnosis

Scene III
Surplus Reality

Positive Ending
Role-Training

Temporal Continuum

Figure 2. The Hollander Psychodrama Curve (Hollander, 1974, Figure 5, p. 9)
psychodrama directors and trainees in an effort to describe a "developmental evolution" of a psychodrama session (Hollander, 1974, p. 1).

The Curve, in addition to the narrative, portrays activity existing on both the horizontal and vertical plane. The horizontal plane is divided into three parts: the Warm-Up, the Enactment (Action), and the Integration (Sharing and Dialogue). The vertical plane conveys the emotional intensity which builds to a climax in the catharsis of the Enactment.

The Warm-Up is divided into three sub-parts: the Encounter, the Phase, and the Sociometric Process. The Encounter involves the initial group member's awareness of self (psychological/physiological) and others in the group. As anxiety tends to develop, the director, in the Phase segment, uses structured and/or unstructured exercises to increase group interaction. As this Warm-Up progresses, the interaction of the Sociometric Process increases, and a protagonist usually emerges.

In the Enactment or Action portion, the protagonist works toward the emotional catharsis, and towards developing creative options for action. The Enactment begins with the first scene, "anchored in the protagonist's reality" (Hollander, 1974, p. 5). As the psychodrama develops, the detail of scenes is deemphasized in favor of expressing emotions that are not integrated in the protagonist's personality. When this emotion has been externalized, the director
concludes the Action with the Surplus Reality and a "purposeful positive ending" (Hollander, 1974, p. 6). This "positive" ending can involve such processes as role-training to assist the protagonist in effecting change in behavior and feelings.

The Integration concludes the psychodrama in the Hollander Curve. It begins with group self-disclosure of experiences/emotions that were similar to those expressed by the protagonist, which helps the protagonist to be reinte- grated into the group. The Dialogue, which follows, is the clinical-objective analysis of the protagonist. Finally, the group concludes with a summarization, to help the group members understand the total experience.

Ann Hale's model, though principally involved with sociometry, and not necessarily psychodrama, offers another option in describing a related process. Figures 3, 4, and 5 represent the process whereby the director facilitates a sociometric exploration of the group. In comparison to the Hollander Curve, limited emphasis is needed on a companion narrative for the graphic image, because the specific steps of action are spelled-out in pseudo-flowchart fashion. This model also helps to delineate the critical decision points faced by the director and the group.

Both models, however, suffer from some shortcomings. The Hollander Curve is abstract and too general for the
Awareness of the need to explore the sociometric structure of the group. 

Discuss ways the suggested procedure applies to the here and now situation.

Selection of a sociometric procedure that is suited to the expressed needs.

Discuss the potential value of sociometric consciousness to the group.

Outline the procedure to be followed.

Answer questions.

Clarify what is expected of participants.

Reassure whenever possible.

Respect and recognize anxiety

Offer alternatives.

Obtain Consent.

Figure 3. Warm-Up Phase from Ann Hale's Sociometric Exploration Model (Hale, 1974, Plate 1, p. 15)
Select criteria: give time, space, and activity.

Declare choices.

Choose to; Choose not to; Choose to remain neutral.

Give reasons for choices.

Make perceptual guesses: Who chose me, and why; Who did not choose me, and why; Who chose to remain neutral, and why.

Check perceptual guesses against the sociomatrix.

Record all choices.

Share the data blanks with the participants.

Ascertain mutuality.

Ascertain incongruity.

Construct a sociomatrix.

Select aspects of the group you wish to have represented by sociogram (mutuality, incongruity, men's choices for women, etc.) Also encourage each person to draw their individual sociograms.

Making assignments: Assign each person to at least one other person on the basis of closest, positive mutuality. Give maximum satisfaction. All explorations are to be carried out in action.

Figure 4. Action Phase from Ann Hale's Sociometric Exploration Model (Hale, 1974, Plate 2, p. 16)
Did you expect this position?

What feelings do you have for it?

Where would you like to fit?

What unfinished business have you as a result of this exploration?

Evaluate your perceptiveness.

Are you better at perceiving positive choices than negative choices?

Are you better at perceiving choices for you or for others?

Are you better at perceiving mutuality or incongruity?

Where would you sharpen your awareness of group relations?

Evaluate this as a learning experience for you.

Are there changes that you would like to make in how you make choices for persons to relate to?

In what ways have you become more aware of your sociometric consciousness, and that of the group?

Figure 5. Sharing Phase from Ann Hale's Sociometric Exploration Model (Hale, 1974, Plate 3, p. 17)
less-than-very-experienced psychodramatist. It does not attempt to specify the critical decisions encountered by the day-to-day director, and the options available to the director and the group. It also does not denote criteria for evaluating the director's performance. Ann Hale's model offers more specific information, but is directed towards sociometry, which is only one aspect of concern for the psychodramatist. It also does not consider the connections between each of the three phases or feedback within the model, at least in the presented version. Performance criteria could be more readily abstracted from her model than the Hollander Curve, but they are not specifically mentioned as such.
CHAPTER 3

A SYSTEMATIC MODEL OF PSYCHODRAMA

The following model is proposed as an option for understanding the process of psychodrama, while still conveying the essence of Morenoan psychodrama. As in the Systematic Counseling model, a flowchart is used to represent the flow of communication and the activity of the director (see Figure 6).

Validity of the Model

The systematic model of psychodrama is a reflection of J. L. Moreno's conception of psychodrama. The similarities can be noted in comparing the general framework of Morenoan psychodrama with the systematic model.

The systematic model in Figure 6 will be compared with written descriptions of the basic components of psychodrama as presented by several experts in the field. Among the experts are Elaine Eller Goldman, Director of Western Institute of Psychodrama, Phoenix, Arizona and President of the Federation of Trainers and Training Programs in Psychodrama; Martin Haskell, Director of the California Institute of Socioanalysis, Long Beach, California and Past President of the American Society of Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama; Carl Hollander, Director of the Colorado
Figure 6. Flowchart of the Systematic Model of Psychodrama
Psychodrama Center, Denver, Colorado; the late J. L. Moreno, the originator of the psychodramatic method; and Lewis Yablonsky, noted author and Director of the California Theatre of Psychodrama, Los Angeles, California. All of these psychodramatists were trained under the auspices of J. L. Moreno at the Moreno Institute in Beacon, New York.

The essential elements of a group psychodrama are the protagonist, the auxiliary egos, the director, and the group (Moreno, 1953). This starting place is symbolized by the subsystem of THE DIRECTOR (1.0), which represents the psychodrama director and all the experience he/she brings to the group session. The presence of the other elements is assumed since this model is primarily intended to describe the performance of the director.

The director must in some way begin the group through a process of introduction and, if the group is unfamiliar with psychodrama, explain the principle components of psychodrama (Goldman, 1978; Haskell, 1967). In the systematic model, this is represented by the INITIATE GROUP PROCESS (2.0) subsystem (Figure 6).

With the initiation of the group the director facilitates the group Warm-Up (Goldman, 1978; Haskell, 1967; Moreno, 1964; Yablonsky, 1976), or interaction of group members. This same process is identified in the INITIATE GROUP WARM-UP (3.0) subsystem of the systematic model (Figure 6).
Following the Warm-Up is the Action portion of a typical psychodrama. The Action is the bulk of the session devoted to helping the protagonist(s) clarify and/or solve his/her difficulties (Goldman, 1978; Haskell, 1967; Hollander, 1974; Yablonsky, 1976). The Action segment is identical to the DIRECT ACTION (4.0) subsystem of the model (Figure 6).

The process of Role-Training is described in a variety of ways by experienced psychodrama directors. Haskell (1975, p. 283-287) differentiates Role-Training from psychodrama but does not specify when the techniques are to be used, other than after the initial psychodramatic exploration. Hollander (1974, p. 6) suggests the use of Role-Training at the conclusion of the Action segment before the initiation of the Sharing. Elaine Goldman (1978) generally considers the Role-Training to be a process that occurs after the Action portion, where the protagonist has clarified his/her situation to the point of desiring to learn new interpersonal skills through Role-Training. In the systematic model, Role-Training is seen as occurring after the Action, in the DIRECT ROLE-TRAINING (5.0) subsystem, prior to the Sharing (Figure 6).

After the completion of the Action or Role-Training, the director requests that the group members discuss the psychodrama session with the protagonist (Haskell, 1967;
Hollander, 1974; Yablonsky, 1976). Most directors further differentiate between the Sharing (personal experiences) and the Dialogue (analysis) portions of the discussion, with the Sharing preceding the Dialogue (Goldman, 1978; Hollander, 1974). This writer's model incorporates these differences in portraying the FACILITATE SHARING (6.0) and PRESENT DIALOGUE (7.0) subsystems.

Though the issue is not often considered in the psychodramatic literature, the process of terminating every session is inevitable. This process is presented in the TERMINATE SESSION (8.0) subsystem.

A final aspect of the typical psychodrama session, especially for the student-in-training, is the critique or "processing" (Goldman, 1978). This is represented by the EVALUATE DIRECTOR PERFORMANCE (9.0) subsystem in the systematic model. This model is completed with the process of feedback, in which the director utilizes the suggestions in the critique to improve his/her performance in future psychodramas.

The Systematic Model

The following model is an original synthesis of a variety of psychodramatic styles. It is important for the reader to understand that this model represents Morenoan psychodrama while including the preferences of this writer. As
A general rule, the more detailed the level of function, the more apt that function is to reflect the style of this writer.

A narrative and corresponding process questions are offered to facilitate the reader's understanding of the model. The process questions are similar to performance criteria in helping the director to evaluate his/her behavior. However, the process questions differ in that they do not specify criteria for director performance. Instead they are intended to challenge the director to present his/her rationale for a specific decision, which could in turn encourage the director to more carefully monitor his/her behavior. It is also important to note that only a limited number of process questions are presented, and that many more can be generated for consideration in the critique following the session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Process Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.0, Figure 6) The director is the initial subsystem. The director's input includes all his knowledge, skills, and behavior.</td>
<td>(1.0) Is the director aware of how the director-protagonist relationship meets his/her own needs? Does the director have sufficient training and experience if operating in a non-supervised position? (&quot;Sufficient&quot; experience would generally be assumed to be training and certification from an institute accredited by the American Society of Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The director begins by introducing him/herself to the group, (2.1) through a presentation of his/her professional background, (2.1.1) as well as disclosing relevant thoughts and feelings to the group in order to increase the trust in the relationship.

(2.1.2) If all group members are familiar (2.1.3.2) with the psychodramatic process, the director moves onto beginning the Warm-Up (Feed forward to 2.3), otherwise (2.1.3.1), the director explains the process by outlining the theory,

(2.2.1) through a brief history of psychodrama (2.2.1.1) and a presentation of basic concepts such as tele and sociometry (2.2.1.2). Another step before the formal Warm-Up involves presenting a general picture of the classical psychodrama components,

(2.2.2), including the Warm-Up (2.2.2.1), Action (2.2.2.2), Sharing (2.2.2.3), and Dialogue (2.2.2.4). Having accomplished this, the director decides to begin the Warm-Up (2.3).

(2.1.1) Does the director accurately share his/her professional experience with the group?

(2.1.2) Is he/she able to disclose thoughts and feelings to the group members?

(2.2.1) Is an outline of the concepts and history of psychodrama provided? If not provided, why not? How is group familiarity with psychodrama established?

(2.2.2) Are the four principle components explained? If not, why not?

(2.3) On the basis of what evidence did the director decide to begin the Warm-up? Give examples.
Figure 7. Initiation of Group Process Subsystem from the Flowchart of the Systematic Model of Psychodrama
(3.0, Figure 8) The Warm-Up is introduced (3.1) by explaining its purpose; (3.1.1), for example, to help the group members become more psychologically/physiologically aware of themselves as well as of their relationships with other group members. The director chooses a specific technique (3.1.2) and then gives instructions to the group members, (3.2.1), which are clarified when necessary (if NO, recycle to 3.2.1). The director begins by asking a question, (example: "What image would symbolize the way you are feeling right now?") or by introducing a structured exercise (3.2.3) to obtain a response from the group members. If a particular response "stands out" (based on tone of voice, nonverbal behavior, facial expression, etc.), then the director may choose to follow-up on the response (3.2.4.1). If the director decides NO (3.2.4.2), he or she continues with the group exercise until it is completed.

If the response is explored (3.2.5), the director will follow-up with further questions/suggestions that will help the group member increase his/her own subjective awareness of thoughts, feelings, and behavior.

(3.1.1) Was the purpose of the Warm-Up clarified for the group?

(3.1.2) What technique or exercise was used for the Warm-Up? Why? How effective was the technique? (3.2.1) What instructions were given for the Warm-Up? (3.2.2) Were instructions clear and understandable for the group? If not, were they clarified?

(3.2.3) How would you characterize the style of the director in initiating the group Warm-Up? (i.e., nervous, confident, callous, caring, etc.).

(3.2.4) Did the director explore any of the individual group member's responses? If no, state the rationale for the decision.

(3.2.5) In what manner was the response explored? How would you evaluate this response follow-up? What are some optional follow-up techniques the director could have used?
Figure 8. Initiate Group Warm-Up Subsystem from the Flowchart of the Systematic Model of Psychodrama
When the exercise is completed (3.2.6), the group can then move on to choosing a protagonist (3.3), or first sharing experiences from the Warm-Up (3.2.7), and then proceeding to select a protagonist.

In choosing a protagonist, the director utilizes a variety of options including his/her tele with the group members (3.3.1.1), choices made by the group (3.3.1.2), the availability of only one group member who desires to be protagonist (3.3.1.3), or a previous schedule in which a group member has signed up to be protagonist (3.3.1.4).

(The choice, whether made by the director, or the collective group, is based on "clinical judgment" or the selective attention to certain behavior on the part of the director). Once a person requests or is asked to be protagonist, there is a decision point (3.3.2).

If the prospective protagonist answers NO, then the director recycles to the previous options (3.3.1) until either a decision of YES is made by another group member, or until, after numerous attempts to choose a protagonist have failed, another decision is made to proceed to the Sharing (6.1).

(3.2.6) How did the director complete the Warm-Up?

(3.2.7) If there was sharing after the exercise, how did the director facilitate this group interaction?

(3.3.1) What options were/were not considered for choosing a protagonist? (3.3.1.2) If group choice was used, how was a protagonist chosen? Specify the strategy/techniques employed.

(3.3.2) Did the chosen protagonist agree to participate? If NO, why not?
If a YES answer is given, then the director makes a decision about proceeding (3.3.3). If he/she gives a YES answer (3.3.3.1), protagonist and director move on to the Action (4.1.1). If the director decides NO, (3.3.3.2, i.e., severely medicated patient who is hallucinating), the director recycles to the previous options (3.3.1).

(4.0, Figure 9) The Action begins with the director helping the protagonist to verbally identify his/her general concerns (4.1.1) and symbolizing (4.1.2) the concerns when necessary (i.e., using chairs to identify several problem areas that are confusing), or moving to select one concern (4.2), which involves the same process of verbalization (4.2.1) and symbolism (4.2.2). For example, the director may ask the protagonist to "sculpt" his/her body into the shape of the main feeling that he/she has about the selected concern. If there is one clear concern initially, the director can proceed from the initial verbalization (4.1.1) to select the initial scene (4.3).

(3.3.3) If the protagonist volunteered, did the director agree? If NO, why not?

(4.1.1) Were the concerns clearly identified?

(4.2.1) Were the relevant concerns selected? (4.2.2) If symbolism was attempted, what techniques were used? Was the symbolism clear to the protagonist?
Figure 9. Direct Action Subsystem from the Flowchart of the Systematic Model of Psychodrama
Once the concern is identified, the psychodrama is "anchored" by choosing a scene in which the concern is evident (4.3), which entails briefly stating the time (4.3.1, i.e., past, present, future), location (4.3.2, i.e., house, business, outdoors, etc.), and people who are present (4.3.3, i.e., mother, father, lover, etc.).

Once this information is acquired, the scene is described in detail (4.4). The time of the scene (4.4.1, i.e., past, present, or future), is established as is the time of day (4.4.1.2). If necessary, the atmosphere is determined (4.4.2.1, example "give me one word for the way you feel in this room"). Important objects, such as furniture represented through the use of props (4.4.2.2), and significant objects, if any, such as a special photograph, are identified in the scene (4.4.2.3).

If there are significant objects, the director may choose to further describe these objects (4.4.3), to obtain a better idea of the protagonist's feeling and/or to intensify the experience.

The protagonist is then directed to choose significant others in the scene, if anyone else is present (4.4.4). These auxiliary egos are then described (4.4.4). How were auxiliary egos chosen?

(4.3) What was the scene? Why was it chosen?
(4.3.1) Were the when, where (4.3.2), and who (4.3.3) components identified?

(4.4.1) Was the scene clearly "anchored" in time?

(4.4.2) Was the location established? (4.4.2.1) Was the overall atmosphere of the location identified?

(4.4.2.2) Were relevant objects, such as furniture, used in the scene? If not, why not?
(4.4.2.3) Were significant objects identified in the scene? If not, why not?

(4.4.3) If significant objects were identified, how were they explored by the director?
(4.4.5) in physical terms
(4.4.5.1, i.e., age, height, attire, etc.), in terms of personality characteristics
(4.4.5.2, i.e., caring, angry, humorous, etc.), and in terms of the relationship between the protagonist and the auxiliary
(4.4.5.3, i.e., honest, closed, enjoyable, etc.).

This descriptive information, the director helps the protagonist warm-up to the scene, to enhance the emotional experience (4.5). The director can use any variety of nonverbal/verbal techniques to help the protagonist ready his/herself for the scene (4.5.1). This process is important in obtaining information for the benefit of the director and auxiliary egos for the eventual intensification of the psychodrama (4.5.2).

When the director senses that the protagonist is ready (4.5.3), the scene is enacted (4.6). The enactment usually begins with a role-playing situation (4.6.1) involving the protagonist and the auxiliary egos. (However the scene may only be concerned with the soliloquy of the protagonist, and other people might not be present in the scene). During this process the director may need to encourage the auxiliary egos to verbalize a specific
message, and can use techniques such as role-reversal.

The director encourages the protagonist to intensify his/her feelings (4.6.2) in the encounter or soliloquy by focusing on "what isn't being said." An example might include an encounter between father and son where the protagonist (son) is verbally bantering with his father, but never really saying how much he needs his father's love.

In this intensification, the director helps the protagonist understand the essence of the encounter (4.6.3) by extracting the primary emotion (4.6.3.1), as well as accompanying behavior (4.6.3.2) and cognition (4.6.3.3).

Once the essence of the scene is derived, the director decides whether further enactment is necessary (4.6.4). A NO (4.6.4.1) or YES (4.6.4.2) answer is determined by the previously mentioned "clinical judgment" as well as by direct statements by the protagonist that further exploration is necessary.

If further enactment is deemed necessary (4.6.4.2), the director and protagonist recycle to selecting a scene (4.3). If further enactment is not necessary (4.6.4.1) the Action moves to the Surplus Reality.

(4.6.2) How was the activity of the scene intensified by the director? How effective were the techniques used by the director?

(4.6.3) What was the essence of the scene? (Include emotional (4.6.3.1), behavioral (4.6.3.2), and cognitive (4.6.3.3).

(4.6.4) On what basis did the director decide to enact further scenes? (4.6.4.2) How was the transition made from one scene to another? (4.6.4.1) If NO, what was the transition to Surplus Reality? How appropriate was this transition?
segment (4.7). For example, the protagonist may have portrayed a scene in which a decision must be made about continuing a relationship with a lover. Once the emotional essence of the scene is derived, the director may ask the protagonist to symbolically represent the choices involved. This symbolism is the Surplus Reality.

However, the director may decide to recycle to another scene. For example, if the lover-protagonist relationship reminds the protagonist of the relationship between his/her parents, the director may decide that it is important to "take a look" at this past relationship which is influencing the protagonist's perception of his/her present situation.

In the Surplus Reality (4.7) the director helps the protagonist to symbolize and define (4.7.1) the decision to be made.

Once the symbolism is established as accurate, the director facilitates an intensification of the experience for the protagonist (4.7.2), (An example might include a protagonist who feels he/she is "covering" him/herself with self-pity. The director could have several group members hold a blanket over the protagonist to emphasize the experience of "covering").

(4.7.1) How was the Surplus Reality defined and symbolized for the protagonist? Was this symbolism verified with the protagonist?

(4.7.2) How was the Surplus Reality symbolism intensified for the protagonist?
The protagonist is then asked to decide (4.7.3) what he/she is going to do in the symbolic circumstance. (In the previous example, this entails whether or not to shed the symbolic blanket.) Based on the protagonist's decision, the director helps the protagonist to evaluate his/her decision (4.7.4) in terms of appropriateness and previous enactment in the psychodrama.

Concluding this evaluation, the Action is terminated (4.8) and the director decides to proceed to the Role-Training (5.0) or move forward to the Sharing (6.1)

(4.7.3) What decision did the protagonist make? Was the decision coerced in any way by the director?

(4.7.4) On what basis did the director decide to conclude the Surplus Reality?

(4.8) How did the director terminate the Action? On what basis did the director decide to move to Role-Training (5.0) or Sharing (6.1)?

(5.0) What were the processes and techniques used in Role-Training? On what basis did the director decide to move on to the Sharing (6.1)?

(5.0, Figure 10) The direction of the Role-Training involves the same basic processes and techniques as the Action (4.0). However, the purpose is somewhat different, in that the activity is generally devoted to helping the protagonist improve his/her interpersonal adequacy from the present into the future, utilizing the feedback of the director and the group. In this presentation of the model, the process of Role-Training will not be outlined in any detail. After the Role-Training the director proceeds to the Sharing (6.1)
Figure 10. Direct Role-Training and Facilitate Sharing Subsystems from the Flowchart of the Systematic Model of Psychodrama
With the completion of the Action and/or Role-Training, the director begins the Sharing. The director asks the group to move in close proximity to the protagonist, (6.1) and then explains the concept of Sharing to the group (6.2).

If the group is familiar with the Sharing process, the explanation is omitted (move forward to 6.3). The director requests Sharing from the group (6.3), people in the group respond (6.4), and this continues until everyone who desires to share has done so (6.6).

However, if there is inappropriate Sharing (such as trying to give the protagonist advice), the director responds (6.5), and corrects the Sharing in terms of the originally defined concept (6.2).

Once the Sharing is completed (6.6), the director decides (6.7) to proceed to the Dialogue (7.1), or termination of the psychodrama session (8.0). This decision can be based on a number of factors including time constraints and the physical/mental exhaustion of the protagonist and the group.

Having completed the Sharing, the director presents the Dialogue, by explaining the concept (7.1) and then presenting his/her interpretation of the protagonist's behavior (7.1) If necessary, was the concept of Dialogue clearly explained?

(6.1) Was the group physically restructured after the Action? (6.2) If necessary, was the concept of Sharing explained?

(6.3) How did the director request Sharing? (6.5) How did the director respond to specific instances of inappropriate Sharing? (6.6) How was the Sharing completed by the director?

(6.7) On what basis did the director decide to proceed to the Dialogue (7.1) or termination of the session (8.0)?
Figure 11. Present Dialogue, Terminate Session, and Evaluate Director Performance Subsystems from the Flowchart of the Systematic Model of Psychodrama
to the protagonist and the group (7.2). This is verified with the protagonist (7.3), and clarified if necessary (recycle to 7.2.)

(7.2) How did the director present his/her analysis? Was it understandable for the protagonist? (7.3) Did the director verify the analysis with the protagonist? If not, why not?

The director can also request group feedback and questions (7.4), often focusing on the experiences of the group members who played the auxiliary roles, or proceeding directly to the summary (7.7).

(7.4) Was the group included in the Dialogue? If not, why not?

If the group responds (7.5), the director clarifies when necessary for the protagonist (7.6), and then moves to the summary (7.7). After the summary, the session is terminated (8.0).

(8.0) How did the director terminate the psychodrama session?

(8.0, Figure 11) The session is terminated by the director by simply explaining the need to end the session, and by thanking the group for participating.

(9.0, Figure 11) Once the session is terminated, the psychodrama director evaluates his/her own performance. This can be accomplished in a variety of settings with group members, students, and colleagues, using a critique form with specific process questions (see opposite process questions column).

(9.0) How did the director evaluate his/her own work as a director? Is the evaluation useful in improving the director's skills as a psychodramatist? If not, how can the evaluation be modified and made more useful? (Feedback to 1.0.)
This evaluation is feedback into the process of psycho­
drama (1.0) by helping the director improve his/her
skills, which in turn im­
proves the effectiveness by
which services can be ren­
dered to the protagonist
and group members.

**Implications**

This writer believes that the systematic model of psychodrama will be of use in the following ways:

1. This systematic presentation enables the student­
observer to more clearly understand the general
process of psychodrama without diminishing the
creativity of the method.

2. The systematic appraisal of psychodrama can be
used by each student or director to develop his/
her own model as a frame of reference.

3. This model can be adapted for training programs
in psychodrama, to assist the neophyte director
in monitoring his/her own progress.

4. The process questions aid the psychodramatist in
being more accountable to his/her protagonist and
group members.

**Summary**

A systematic model of psychodrama is presented to
facilitate an understanding of the complex psychodrama
methodology. It is intended to fill a void in the literature of psychodrama concerned with systematically appraising the behavior of a psychodrama director. The model can also be used as a complement to the vast amount of literature concerning psychodramatic rules, principles, theory, and techniques. This systematic model provides a formal presentation of the structure and coherence of a typical psychodrama session.

The systematic model of psychodrama is represented by a descriptive flowchart. The model is abstracted from previous attempts to outline the psychodramatic process, as well as from systems theory, and from a recently developed model of Systematic Counseling. In addition to the flowchart, both a narrative and a list of process questions are included to assist the reader in understanding the general processes in the decision-making behavior of the director.

The systematic model can be used as a reference for understanding the process of psychodrama, and can be adapted to the particular style of each director. It can also be employed as a training guide for neophyte directors and can aid directors in being more accountable to their protagonist-consumers.
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