

PSYCHODRAMA AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

DAN PAȘCA*

ABSTRACT. Research is a randomized clinical trial conducted on a group of 28 teenagers, mostly aged between 18 and 20 years (11 in experimental sample and 17 in the control sample). Independent variable was the participation/non participation in psychodrama group for personal development and dependent variables: the anxiety, the empathy, the personality traits. It was created and applied a questionnaire to evaluate the behavior of the group leader. Group members have established a hierarchy of Yalom's therapeutic factors, based on their experience in the group.

Keywords: *psychodrama, personal development, personal development group, adolescents*

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG. Der Forschung ist eine randomisierte klinische Studie durchgeführt an einer Gruppe von 28 Jugendlichen, meist im Alter zwischen 18 und 20 Jahren (11 in die experimentellen Gruppe und 17 in der Kontrollgruppe). Unabhängige Variablen war die Teilnahme/Nichtteilnahme in Psychodrama-Gruppe für die persönliche Entwicklung und abhängigen Variablen: die Angst, die Empathie, die Persönlichkeitsmerkmale. Es wurde geschaffen und angewandt einen Fragebogen, um das Verhalten des Gruppenleiters zu bewerten. Die Gruppenmitglieder haben den etablierten eine Hierarchie der therapeutischen Faktoren Yalom, basierend auf ihren Erfahrungen in der Gruppe.

Schlüsselwörter: *Psychodrama, Persönlichkeitsentwicklung, persönliche Entwicklung Gruppe, Jugendlichen*

1. Introduction

In a very broad sense, personal development refers to any activity designed to result in optimizing behavior of individual to better adapt to his or her social requirements, to achieve success in a particular area of its existence. Most often, personal development is presented as a self-awareness activity held under the guidance of psychologists or other mental health professionals in order to optimize behavior and improve quality of life of those involved. Mitrofan (2008, 14), for example, found that personal development is a “normal therapy” claimed by “existential problems of all kinds, stress and risks of modern life” and for the individuals “motivated to self-exceeding or to fulfill life, performing in their relationships with themselves and with others.”

* PhD Student Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences, Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, danpasca2000@yahoo.com

Between individual and group is a relationship of mutual interdependence. Thus, Anderson and Robertson (1985, 142) considered that “the personal development is essentially a social process” and, as such, the best environment in which it is held is that of a group. The essence of personal development groups is the “cultural permission” for self-disclosure and feedback, unprecedented in the social environment commonplace. Members of these groups are allowed, and afford one another, to self-disclosure, to express thoughts and feelings openly and honestly to the other, to give and receive feedback on how they interact in groups. They receive direct feedback from others, have the opportunity to validate consensual reality of interpersonal perceptions and can compare their self perceptions about themselves and perceptions of others to seek congruence of various perceptual content. When they “risk” to practice new behaviors, in the protector climate of a group that provides a sense of trust and psychological safety, they get the opportunity to improve efficiency and interpersonal relationship.

From meeting the interest to lead psychodrama groups for self-knowledge and personal development of teenagers with the desire to scientifically validate such an approach, emerging the idea to this research. Its aim was to learn, with an experimental design, whether the participation of adolescents in psychodrama group for personal development produces measurable psychological changes, which is their perception of therapeutic factors suspected to be responsible for these changes and the behavior of group leader in charge and if the theory of psychodrama can explain the results.

Psychodrama is a form of group psychotherapy in which participants put on stage, through role play, their past, present or future life situations, in order to resolve intrapsychic or interpersonal difficulties. Basic dictum of psychodrama is “Show us, do not tell us” on the premise that actions speak louder than words. May be put on stage events in the past (unresolved situations, trauma, dreams, etc.), current situations (conflicts, disturbed interpersonal relationships, inhibitions, etc.) and preparation for future situations (a job interview, negotiation or separation). Psychodrama deal with life situations involving the external manifestations, visible to all involved, and internal mental processes that are “tangible” by exteriorization.

Jacob Levi Moreno, founder of psychodrama, has formulated a theory of the role of the premise that man is a role player, that every individual has a repertoire of roles which dominate his behavior, and that each culture offers its members a very broad set of roles. Personality is the constellation of roles that the individual updates to cope with the everyday challenges, and the role is “the form in which an individual ... react to a specific situation involving other people or other objects” (Moreno, 2009, 125).

Moreno found that, for good adaptation, the individual requires to develop a sufficiently broad repertoire of roles. People who operate within a narrow repertoire of roles or have difficulty moving from one role to another live their lives in a limited, restricted, not enough spontaneous way.

Stimulating self-knowledge, psychodrama group for personal development provides opportunities for a better understanding of adolescents needs and desires and ways of meeting them, improves self and events control. Also encourages giving

up dysfunctional belief that there are not many choices to make and allows access to a world of many possibilities. Therefore, we considered that the participation of adolescents in psychodrama group activities for personal development is a useful approach, which they would benefit such as increased spontaneity (as evidenced indirectly by lowering anxiety) and increased cognitive and emotional dimensions of empathy.

2. Research

The *design of research* is experimental, with one independent variable and several dependent variables:

Independent variable:

- Participation/non-participation in psychodrama group for personal development.

Dependent variables:

- General anxiety and its components

- Cognitive and emotional components of empathy

- Personality traits.

General hypothesis of the research were:

1. If adolescents participate in the activities of a psychodrama group for personal development, then their anxiety level decreases.

2. If adolescents participate in the activities of a psychodrama group for personal development, then their empathy increases.

3. If adolescents participate in the activities of a psychodrama group for personal development, then changes will occur in their personality traits.

Specific hypothesis of the research were:

1. In pre-testing, no significant difference between scores of teenagers in the experimental sample and scores of adolescents in the control sample, for the Cattell Anxiety Questionnaire scales.

2. In pre-testing, no significant difference between scores of adolescents in the experimental sample and scores of adolescents in the control sample, for the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index scales.

3. In pre-testing, no significant difference between scores of teenagers in the experimental sample and scores of adolescents in the control sample, for the main personality factors of the Cattell 16 PF Questionnaire.

4. There is no significant difference between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the control group and their post-test scores, for the Cattell Anxiety Questionnaire scales.

5. There is no significant difference between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the control group and their post-test scores, for the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index scales.

6. There is no significant difference between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the control group and their post-test scores, for the personality factors of Cattell 16 PF Questionnaire.

7. Post-test scores of adolescents in the experimental sample are significantly lower than pre-test scores, for the Cattell Anxiety Questionnaire scales.

8. Post-test scores of adolescents in the experimental sample are significantly higher than pre-test scores, for the Davis Interpersonal Reactivity Index scales.

9. Post-test scores of adolescents in the experimental sample is significantly different than pre-test scores, for the personality factors of Cattell 16 PF questionnaire.

Personal development group was a closed group. There were 12 meetings, approximately 5 hours each, ie a total of 60 hours. I led all 12 meetings of the group.

Randomized clinical experiment was attended by 28 students, divided into two samples:

1. experimental sample, consisting of 11 students who participated in group activities for personal development
2. control sample, consisting of 17 other students.

All these students were enrolled in the study period, in the first year at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Brașov.

Distribution of participants in the two samples was achieved by a simple random sampling procedure.

The average age of the 28 study subjects was 19.57 years (19-23 years) with a standard deviation of 1.00.

The average age of adolescents in the experimental sample was 20.09 years (19-23 years) with a standard deviation of 1.38.

The average age of adolescents in the control sample was 19.24 years (19-20 years) with a standard deviation of 0.44.

Of the 28 study subjects, 25 are female and 3 male. The experimental sample are 10 females and a male, and in the control sample 15 females and two males. There is preponderance of female subjects and the similarity of the two samples based on gender distribution.

We used the following *instruments*:

- for the dependent variable anxiety: Cattell's Anxiety Scale
- for the dependent variable empathy: Davis's Interpersonal Reactivity Index
- for the dependent variable personality: 16 PF Cattell's Personality Questionnaire

For evaluation of Yalom's therapeutic factors we used Q-sort technique.

I created and used a questionnaire to investigate the behavior of group leader.

For Cattell's Anxiety Scale was calculate: gross note of overall anxiety, gross note of veiled anxiety, gross note of manifested anxiety, gross notes of the five primary factors: self-awareness (Q3), ego strength (C), paranoid inclination (L), propensity to guilt (A) and ergic tension (Q4).

For Davis's Interpersonal Reactivity Index, the first two scales, concern cognitive aspect of empathy, the other two emotional side of it, are the following:

- *perspective-taking scale* (SP) - assessing spontaneous attempts to adopt other people's perspectives and see things from their point of view

- *fantasy scale* (SI) - assesses the tendency to identify with characters in movies, novels, plays and other fictional situations

- *empathic concern scale* (PE) - assesses feelings of warmth, compassion and concern for others

- *personal distress scale* (PD) - evaluate personal feelings of anxiety and discomfort resulting from follow the negative experiences of others (Davis, 1980, 1983).

Cattell's 16 PF personality questionnaire measures 16 personality factors.

Yalom (1970) aimed to investigate the incidence of 12 therapeutic factors in different types of treatment groups or for personal development, based on rank ordering of the 60 items (five for each therapeutic factor) by the group members, to determine which therapeutic factors below are most highly valued by them.

Altruism refers to the opportunity which is afforded group members to provide support to others. With the experience of altruism, group members can improve their self esteem.

Group cohesion refers to group attractiveness for its members, encouraging participation, privacy and self-disclosure.

Universality refers to the discovery by the individual that is not the only one that has a problem that others have experienced similar problems. This discovery is often accompanied by a sense of relief.

Interpersonal learning input refers to the fact that the group allows members to optimize interpersonal learning, how they are seen by other people.

Interpersonal learning output refers to the fact that group members have the opportunity to experiment and validate new ways of relating to others.

Guidance refers to the instructions provided by the therapist, together with advice and suggestions about tackling life provided by the therapist and the other group members.

Catharsis can be defined, in a simple way, as the free expression of affect. Living and strong feelings make group members learn that emotional experiences can encourage feelings of closeness to others.

Identification refers to copying by members of certain features of other group members and leader. Group members often serve as role models for other members, through self-disclosure and honesty.

Family re-enactment refers to the awareness of group members transfer relations that come from their experiences of primary family, contributing to distortions in their interpersonal relations.

Self-understanding includes encouraging group members to recognize, integrate and express freely oneself parts previously kept hidden. Implies intellectual understanding of the relationship between past and present (genetic understanding).

Instillation of hope refers motivation to participate in group meetings by creating positive expectations about the results to be obtained.

Existential factors refers to reflection on existential issues, to deal with pain and ambiguity of life and accept that sometimes life is unfair and unjust and must take responsibility for the way we live.

In order to investigate how the leader carry out his duties related to the group management and his interpersonal style in the psychodrama group, I created a questionnaire. For this, I was inspired in the way Yalom and Leszcz (2008, 133-209) described the basic tasks of the therapist:

1. creating and maintaining group
2. building a culture of group
3. activation and the elucidation of the here-and-now.

The task of creating and maintaining group leader requires the attention in determining the place and times of meetings of the group, preventing friction between members, discouraging events that might threaten group cohesion: delays and repeated absences, various forms of subgroups, group tends to find a scapegoat for any unpleasant incident.

To build a culture of positive change in group, the group leader should establish, together with the group, an unwritten code of rules or norms of behavior, to promote “active involvement in the group, uncritical acceptance of others, extensive self-disclosure, desire to self-understanding and a strong desire to change current patterns of behavior” (Yalom and Leszcz, 2008, 137).

The third task is to help the group leader to put a strong emphasis on experience in the “here-and-now”. For this, he must show clearly enough that immediate events of group members have priority, both to their current existence outside the group, and to more distant events in their past. Is necessary to ensure a “self-reflexive loop” for examining and understanding behavior has just occurred (Yalom and Leszcz, 2008, 156).

Thus, the first part of the questionnaire (first 21 items) was dedicated to exploring the perception of personal development group members about how the leader perform to these elementary tasks and the second part (the other 21 items) focused on how was perceived his interpersonal behavior.

The 21 items of the first part of the questionnaire (7 items for each of the basic tasks of the leader) consist of statements which have expressed agreement/ isagreement on a 5-step Lickert scale from “disagree at all or agree very little”, to “agree totally or very much”.

The second part of the questionnaire consists of a bipolar type of behavioral anchors that personal development group members were asked to place perceived leader behavior on a 7-step Lickert scale, closer to one or the other (or the same distance) of the two opposing statements describing behaviors. For example: “It was cold, distant, unfriendly.” versus “He was warm, kind, friendly.”

A serious discussion of the performance of adolescents as a result of their participation in psychodrama group for personal development can not take place without, first, to discuss the group process.

Motivations and expectations of members in connection with the group were quite different. The group was seen, from the beginning, in ways quite different. If some group members viewed it as a way to relax, others considered it an opportunity to know the others or themselves. Finally, there was the belief that group work could be useful for professional development for the profession of psychologist. Expectations were generally positive, and assessments at the end of meetings on activities were also in the same direction.

Structured exercises and intensive activity during self-disclosure meetings hurried pace, so that since very first meeting, group members presented their concerns about lack of trust in people, the inability to speak before a group or excessive perfectionism, the separation of parents, the absence of a parent went to work abroad, the other parent's problems with alcohol or too authoritarian and harsh style of another, the lack of a partner in love.

Although structured exercise revealed many personal issues (mainly in the form of conflict), I encountered resistance from potential players at the request to bring these themes on stage psychodrama, to be explored. But excessive use of structured exercises carries risks, as stressed Yalom and Leszcz (2008). With such exercises, leaders become more popular within their groups. They are perceived to be more efficient and competent, but, paradoxically, studies (Lieberman, Yalom and Miles, 1972, 1973) showed that results of group members who used the more structured exercise were significantly less favorable than members of groups with the fewest such exercises. Likely structured exercise stimulated a relatively high level of self-disclosure, but the group members had not courage to address their personal issues by enactment.

Given the stages of evolution of groups described by Yalom and Leszcz (2008) one can say that psychodrama group that I led did not exceed the initial stage of development in which members participate reluctantly, are moving, looking for position in group and are relatively dependent on indications of the leader. In the group there were no conflict, no struggle for dominance behavior or revolt against the leader or any member. No negative comments, criticism or hostility to the leader, were expressed. The group had a smooth evolution, characterized by tact and kindness, acceptance and mutual support.

Due to the small size of experimental sample ($N_1 = 11$) and the control sample ($N_2 = 17$) for research hypothesis testing I used nonparametric tests.

For the first part of the *questionnaire to investigate the behavior of the leader of the group*, resulting hierarchy of behaviors performed by me, for basic tasks in the group management.

It may be noted, from the hierarchy of these behaviors, that the psychodrama group members appreciated in particular the fact that I managed to create a positive atmosphere within the group work, a warm and secure environment that encourages

interaction increasingly varied and rich among its members. Were appreciated, largely focus on the immediate needs of the group, addressing relevant topics and allocation of sufficient time for reflection on experiences and extracting lessons required.

In the second part of the questionnaire, subjects stood on a Lickert scale from 1-7, closer to one or other of the two bipolar behavioral anchors used to describe a continuum of group leader behavior (eg from confidence to uncertainty, from an ordered to a disordered approach, etc.)

Based on notes obtained, I can see that group members have greatly appreciated my honesty and transparency, unbiased way to treat them separately. It was appreciated my ability to be humble, to recognize my limits when the case was "not to lose my head" because of comments I received from group members. I say, then, that my attitude was rather one of "facilitator" of the group's work, not one of "expert". My style of leadership was democratic, but not necessarily nondirective, because some group members felt that, at certain times of work, I am offered appropriate advice or possible solutions. Most controversial aspects of my leadership style were: if I was conciliatory, courteous or rather challenging, whether or not we offer some tips or solutions, if we were strict enough to ensure punctuality of the members. My behavior as a leader, although calm, relaxed, informal, was described as fairly mild, not very expressive and reserved to physical contact with group members.

Q-sort technique was applied to assess the therapeutic factors in psychodrama the group members were considered to be important in explaining the results obtained by them.

Note that psychodrama group members were particularly valued the opportunity to learn new things about themselves, because honest and responsible feedback that they received. They found not only the impression creates of others, but also unknown parts, less acceptable of themselves, which were then in a position to accept. Sometimes, they could find the source, with origins in the past, of some of their present problems. They also appreciated that improved their ability to approach people, to be more assertive and able to express their feelings.

For each of the 12 Yalom's therapeutic factors were calculated means, from the average rank of items that compose them. Thus, in table 1 is highlighted hierarchy of therapeutic factors according to their importance was attributed to the psychodrama group for personal development members.

It is interesting to point out that members of psychodrama groups in Israel have indicated, at the end of their groups, as being the most important therapeutic factors: interpersonal learning, catharsis, group cohesion and self-understanding (Kellermann, 1985). Of these therapeutic factors (self-understanding and interpersonal learning - learning interpersonal divided into input and output interpersonal learning) are even therapeutic factors that take in even this order, the top three positions in the hierarchy of therapeutic factors to be considered most important by members of personal development group through psychodrama, who participated in this research.

Table 1

Hierarchy of Yalom's therapeutic factors

Hierarchy	Therapeutic factors	Means
1	Self-understanding	24,27
2	Interpersonal learning – input	26,47
3	Interpersonal learning – output	27,00
4	Existential factors	27,89
5	Instillation of hope	28,02
6	Catharsis	29,49
7	Family re-enactment	29,67
8	Group cohesion	30,70
9	Altruism	31,36
10	Guidance	33,98
11	Universality	36,38
12	Identification	41,61

According to Yalom and Leszcz (2008, 107): “The same trio of the most important therapeutic factors (interpersonal learning-input, catharsis and self-understanding) has been reported in studies of personal development groups.”

It can be appreciated therefore that members of psychodrama group for personal development appreciated, in particular, the opportunity to receive feedback from other members and learn some things about the effects of their behavior on other people in a social microcosm whence reproduced at smaller scale, the larger living space. They had the opportunity to optimize their relationships, to experiment and validate new ways of relating to others. They could also develop social skills by understanding that sometimes there are discrepancies between intentions and actual impact of behavior on others. Group members felt encouraged to recognize, integrate and express freely oneself parts previously maintained in shadow and to expand their understanding of itself.

Choice, for the last positions of the hierarchy of these items - the therapeutic factors as guidance, universality and identification - is relatively easily explained.

Guidance, the process of influencing the behavior of members by offering advice from leaders and group members is generally discouraged in psychodrama and so did the personal development group.

Universality, ie the discovery that the others may have similar problems, is a factor which was attributed little significance as personal development group members did not share common suffering, as in psychotherapy or self-help groups.

Identification is also a factor which psychodrama group for personal development members have given little importance. As group leader I have tried, wherever possible, to not offer myself as a model and not a focus on the activities. I took rather a role of facilitator rather than a charismatic leader that can be taken as a model. Group members were less likely to look to colleagues in the group, but were concerned to define their own way forward for their personal development.

Mann-Whitney U test was used to verify the null hypothesis that, before handling the independent variable (participation / non-participation in personal development group), there were not significant differences between the two samples (experimental and control) in terms of dependent variables considered in view (anxiety, empathy, personality traits).

For any of the dependent variables, p significance level (two-tailed) was not below the threshold $p = 0.05$, so I concluded that there were not, before their activities for personal development group, significant differences between scores of adolescents in the experimental sample and scores of adolescents in the control sample for any of the dependent variables. Random assignment of subjects in the experimental and control sample provided the similarity of the two samples in terms of dependent variables.

Testing hypothesis of experiment, ie that participation in psychodrama group produced measurable physiological changes (in the anxiety, the empathy and the personality traits), involved comparing pre-test data and post-test data, separately for each of the two samples (experimental and control). To this end, the Wilcoxon test was used. Null hypothesis is that there are not significant differences between pre-test data and post-test data.

Following the Z scores and significance levels of p (two-tailed), it was found that were not significant differences between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the control sample and their post-test scores for any of dependent variables.

Following the Z scores and significance levels of p (two-tailed), it was found that were not significant differences between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the experimental sample and their post-test scores for any of the scales of Cattell's Anxiety Questionnaire.

Although, after participating in psychodrama group for personal development, it was found, for the experimental sample, a decrease in average of general anxiety scale from 37.91, in the pre-test, to 36.27, in the post-test, this decrease was not significant. If, for the control sample, the average of general anxiety in the pre-test (33.76) remained relatively constant (33.88 in the post-test), we can assume that the decrease of anxiety level of adolescents in the experimental sample due to their participation in the psychodrama group for personal development. To obtain, however, a significant decrease in anxiety level of these subjects would be needed, perhaps, a more consistent handling of the independent variable, or by their participation in a psychodrama group for personal development with a significantly higher number of hours, or by focusing more on enactment of some personal issues and less on structured exercises (fun and beneficial for group cohesion, but superficial). In psychodrama, the most important means of generating change is involved in playing the protagonist, by enactment a personal themes. For this to happen, everyone in the group need time to gain confidence in the group, overcoming resistance and taking the risk (more or less imaginary) to play the role of protagonist.

Following the Z scores and significance levels of p (two-tailed), it was found that, for any of the Davis's Interpersonal Reactivity Index scales, were not significant differences between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the experimental sample and their post-test scores.

There is an increase in average score of adolescents in the experimental sample from 17.73 to 18.91, for the scale of adoption of perspective, while the average for control sample on this cognitive scale of empathy remained practically constant (to changed from 19.59 to 19.41). It can be appreciated, therefore, that by participating in group activities involving psychodrama, adolescents in the experimental sample improved (not very much) the ability to put in place of other people, to see situations from their perspective and take more account of their views.

For scale of imagination, I found between pre-test and post-test scores, a decrease, from 20.45 to 19.27, of average for the experimental sample, while the average for control sample remained relatively constant (from 19.65 in pre-test to 19.53 in post-test). Perhaps this drop in scores has to do with awareness among adolescents in psychodrama group about unlocking the necessary spontaneity to overtaking the difficulties of interpreting a role or another. Faced with the task to play spontaneously a variety of roles, they could realize that translating in the fictional roles (in movies, books, plays) is not an easy task to fulfill.

For empathic concern scale, if for the control sample we observed a decrease in the average, from 21 in pre-test to 20.24 in post-test, for adolescents in the experimental sample we found reversed so that the average in pre-test was 20.32 and increased to 22.64 after their participation in personal development group. The explanation for this trend may be that the environment of group psychodrama was warm and protective, guided by rules of self-help, which has encouraged some members to show empathic concern in relation to others. Psychodrama group, and personal development groups in general, encourages self-disclosure and constructive feedback on this self-disclosure, receiving and providing support. It is possible that after spending over 60 hours in such a group and had the opportunity to be useful, to help the others from the position of auxiliary, group members rank themselves higher on their cordiality and courtesy, empathy and concern towards other people.

For the personal distress scale, the average remained constant in the control sample (12.35 in pre-test to 12.41 in post-test), but in the experimental sample fell from 16 in pre-test to 14.73 in post-test. Decrease of anxiety and psychological discomfort experienced by adolescents as a result of attending the suffering of others, found at the end of psychodrama group, can be linked directly with reducing the general level of anxiety, but with a sort of "emotional desensitization" and the understanding that suffering is a universal phenomenon.

On personality factors, was found one significant difference between gross scores of adolescents in the experimental sample obtained in pre-test and their scores in post-test for G personality factor (superego strength versus weak superego), (Wilcoxon: $N1 = 11$, $z = -2.21$, $p = 0.027$).

It should be noted that for the G personality factor (superego strength versus weak superego), average scores of adolescents in the experimental sample in pre-test is 14.00 and the corresponding standard deviation is 2.53. In post-test average scores of adolescents in the experimental sample is 12.18, and standard deviation 2.75.

For the subjects in the control group, average scores in pre-test, for the same factor is 12.24, with a standard deviation of 3.77. Their average post-test scores is 12.76, with a standard deviation of 3.73. The difference between gross scores obtained in the pre-testing by the adolescents in the control sample and the scores obtained by them in the post-test, for G personality factor (superego strength versus weak superego) is insignificant (Wilcoxon: $N_2 = 17$, $z = -1.03$, $p = 0.304$).

We found, based on these data, that one effect of adolescent participation in the experimental personal development group was a significant decrease in gross scores obtained on personality factor G (superego strength versus weak superego). For adolescents in the control group is observed, however, a slight increase in scores for this factor.

This means that, after participating in psychodrama group, group members in the experimental sample were found to be more likely (than adolescents in the control sample) to accept that sometimes are not responsible, they are not always tidy, conscientious or persistent. They have recognized, more easily, that they have a low tolerance to frustration, that are sometimes inconsistent and changeable, that they can have a very casual attitude against the rules and social manners.

This trend for psychodrama group members, at the end group, to more easily assign a weak superego features may have as explanation in the process of self-disclosure initiate in group. Group members can see how others perceive them, without suffering any negative consequences because of that, which inspires courage to do, in turn, self-disclosure. They learn that being open does not necessarily make you vulnerable. Self-disclosure entails the opportunity to receive feedback from group members to discover and accept the existence of “blind spots” and “weaknesses” in their personalities.

For the other 15 personality factors, were not found any significant difference between the scores of adolescents in the experimental sample in the pre-test and their scores in post-test.

3. Conclusions

Since we found no significant differences between the scores of the two samples in the pre-test, confirmed the first three specific hypotheses:

1. In pre-testing, were not significant difference between scores of the teenagers in the experimental sample and the scores of the adolescents in the control sample, for the Cattell's Anxiety Questionnaire scales.

2. In pre-testing, were not significant difference between scores of the adolescents in the experimental sample and scores of the the adolescents in the control sample, for the Davis's Interpersonal Reactivity Index scales.

3. In pre-testing, were not significant difference between scores of the teenagers in the experimental sample and scores of the adolescents in the control sample, for the main personality factors of the Cattell's 16 PF Questionnaire.

For the control sample, there was no significant difference between the pre-test scores and the post-test scores so that the following specific hypotheses were confirmed:

4. There is no significant difference between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the control group and their post-test scores, for the Cattell's Anxiety Questionnaire scales.

5. There is no significant difference between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the control group and their post-test scores, for the Davis's Interpersonal Reactivity Index scales.

6. There is no significant difference between the pre-test scores of adolescents in the control group and their post-test scores, for the personality factors of Cattell's 16 PF Questionnaire.

For the experimental sample, the only significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores was for the G personality factor (strength superego versus weak superego).

Thus, the following specific hypotheses were invalidated:

7. In post-test, scores of adolescents in the experimental sample are significantly lower than in pre-test, for the Cattell's Anxiety Questionnaire scales.

8. In post-test scores of adolescents in the experimental sample are significantly higher than in pre-test, for the Davis's Interpersonal Reactivity Index scales.

Instead, specific hypothesis 9 is confirmed in part (for one of the 16 Cattell's personality factors: G factor - weak superego versus strong superego).

9. In post-test, scores of adolescents in the experimental sample is significantly different than in pre-test, for the personality factors of Cattell's 16 PF Questionnaire.

It can be said that adolescents scores in the experimental sample, for G personality factor (weak superego versus strong superego) are significantly lower in post-test (after their participation in psychodrama group activities) than in pre-test (before their participation in personal development group). This is the only significant difference found between the pre-test and post-test scores of adolescents in the experimental sample for the 16 personality factors of Cattell's questionnaire.

Confirmation of specific hypotheses 1 and 4 and 7 resulting in the refutation of general hypothesis 1: "If adolescents participate in the activities of a psychodrama group for personal development, then decrease their anxiety level."

In other words, while participating in group psychodrama has been a downward trend in the level of general anxiety of adolescents in the experimental sample, this decrease was not found to be significant.

Confirmation of specific hypotheses 2 and 5 and 8 resulting in the refutation of general hypothesis 2: "If adolescents participate in the activities of a psychodrama group for personal development, then increased their empathy."

For adolescents who were members of psychodrama group for personal development, I found a trend of increased their scores for scales of empathic concern

and perspective taking, but this increase was not significant. I also found a decrease in average score of imagination and personal distress scales, but this decrease was insignificant.

Confirmation of specific hypotheses 3 and 6 and partial confirmation of specific hypothesis 9 confirm partial the general hypothesis 3: "If adolescents participate in the activities of a psychodrama group for personal development will occur changes in their personality traits." I found a significant decrease in scores of teenagers, for the G personality factor (weak superego versus strong superego), as a result of their participation in psychodrama group for personal development. We can say therefore that the only significant change in the personality traits for adolescents in the experimental sample consisted in a greater willingness to accept that there are relatively many situations when they show a lack of consciousness, that sometimes avoid taking the necessary responsibilities, that may be inconsistent and capricious, relatively intolerant to frustration and do not always follow the rules and social manners.

Experience to produce the most significant change in psychodrama is playing the role of protagonist. By its nature, psychodrama group for personal development activities was centered successively on one member of the group so that members could be no more than once protagonists. When significant self-disclosure were made, they were not followed by the desire to explore the conflicts and difficulties involved on the psychodrama stage, most likely due to resistance, the members fear to be ridiculous, to lose a certain status in the group, to disclose weaknesses and to look vulnerable. My freedom for using a variety of techniques of psychodrama in very different contexts, was more restricted by the group members reduced propensity to engage in role-plays. Only at the tenth meeting of the group, taking advantage of a reduced presence of its members, I have had on the psychodrama stage three protagonists who engaged in exploring their inner conflicts, with the empty chair technique. Results showed that the simple self-disclosure of psychodrama group members do not produces change, unless it is accompanied by the desire to put on stage situations that illustrate the nature of intrapersonal or interpersonal difficulties.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L.F., Robertson, S.E. (1985). Group Facilitation: Functions and Skills. *Small Group Research*, 16, 139-152
- Davis, M.H. (1980). A Multidimensional Approach to Individual Differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85. Disponibil online la: http://www.eckerd.edu/academics/psychology/files/Davis_1980.pdf. Consultat la: 12.02.2008

- Davis, M.H. (1983). Measuring Individual Differences in Empathy: Evidence for a Multidimensional Approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126
- Kellermann, P.F. (1985). Participants' Perceptions of Therapeutic Factors in Psychodrama. *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama, and Sociometry*, 38, 123-132
- Liberman, M.A., Yalom, I.D., Miles, M.B. (1972). The Impact of Encounter Groups on Participants: Some Preliminary Findings. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 8, 29-50
- Liberman, M.A., Yalom, I.D., Miles, M.B. (1973). *Encounter Groups: First Facts*. New York: Basic Books
- Minulescu, M. (1996). *Chestionarele de personalitate în evaluarea psihologică*. București: Garell Publishing House
- Minulescu, M. (2004). *Psihodiagnoza modernă: chestionarele de personalitate*. București: Editura Fundației România de mâine
- Mitrofan, I. (2008). *Psihoterapie: repere teoretice, metodologice și aplicative*. București: SPER
- Moreno, J.L. (2009). *Scrieri fundamentale: despre psihodramă, metoda de grup și spontaneitate*. București: Trei
- Yalom I.D., Leszcz, M. (2008). *Tratat de psihoterapie de grup: Teorie și practică* (ediția a cincea). București: Trei