

Sharing in Humanistic Psychodrama

Hans-Werner Gessmann

Literatures of the concept of *sharing* in classical psychodrama are presented as the third phase after a protagonist game. In the humanistic psychodrama, it is considered as the final group action after a protagonist-related work. Its significance for other schools of psychodrama, as well as its importance for the development of the group structure and the change of the individual in the group are also presented.

In the first part of this thesis I shall give a comprehensive presentation of scholars of classical psychodrama on their views on the subject of “*sharing*”, although I will allow myself to comment from personal experience at one point or another if the text is too entangled in certain models of thought and the psychodrama as a result is taken in genuine force.

The second part will deal with *sharing* in other schools of psychodrama developed from classical psychodrama, such as the depth psychologically founded psychodrama, the child and adolescent psychodrama and the like.

In the third and last part I will show the importance of *sharing* for humanistic psychodrama and thus will also be able to give concrete tips for leadership behavior in such a psychodrama group.

Sharing in Classical Psychodrama

Moreno describes *sharing* as the “group therapeutic part of the session”, a “third shift in strength”. As the third phase, it begins smoothly when the second phase—the play phase in psychodrama—comes to an end. The play is taken over by the audience (group drama). Just as the therapist—as the main actor of the first phase—has withdrawn in favor of the main actors of the second phase (protagonist with his co-actors such as auxiliary ego, etc.), the stage and the theater now dissolve into nothing.

The protagonist remains ambivalent about himself. He feels abandoned and betrayed by his fellow players (people who help clear up his confused feelings). He feels angry because he was the only one who “...made the sacrifice of self-exposure...” If he has forgotten the group during the presentation, he becomes conscious of its existence again. Feelings of guilt and shame—he has thus revealed his most personal feelings—peak.

But the protagonist also asks the group during his performance to identify with him. By identifying with the protagonist, the group comes into direct contact with one another.

The group expresses its own experiences and similar conflicts. The patient learns that the group shares their worries with him. This creates a new kind of catharsis—group catharsis, which includes everyone—“...he gave love and now they are giving him love...”

Moreno calls it the “...process of clarification” and points out that conflicts arise here. “Sharp criticism and hostility, especially against the therapist, are not uncommon. The whole group is in an uproar; it takes all the art of the doctor to find a solution.” (Moreno, 1973², p. 83)

15 years later, J. L. Moreno points out that group psychotherapy and psychodrama have went through two independent developments. Many group psychotherapists who do not work with psychodrama tend to analyze, interpret, discuss and confront verbally. Acting out is only used if there is a clear indication.

“An essential contribution of psychodrama is that one insists that even verbal exchange should not be entirely of specific quality, but should be based on the encounter, with the group participants *sharing* their self-revelation with one another instead of analyzing and interpreting it. This *sharing* has become one of the more important areas of practical application of group therapy and it prepares the group participant for the next step, from the verbal level to the action dimension, wherever appropriate and whenever the process is guided by a skilled psychodramatist.” (Moreno, 1989, p. 112)

Friedel Geisler's narrow view of the roots of Moreno psychodrama in Jewish culture leads to the fact that she compares the *sharing* of psychodrama with the Sabbath of the Jews. She quotes Fromm, who writes about the Jewish Sabbath: "...that the Jews...would hardly have survived if the poorest and most miserable among them had not turned into a dignified and proud person on one day of the week." (Fromm, 1972, pp. 156-161) and Heschel: "The Sabbath means the presence of eternity, a royal moment, radiant joy. ...Man is not alone, he lives in the presence of this day." (Heschel, 1980, p. 323) Geisler admits that not every psychodrama *sharing* can be expanded into such a festival, but the psychodrama session ends with the Sabbath, the "...partying and *sharing*, resting from work...". "In *sharing*, the person who has revealed his deepest pain, his greatest mistakes, his most secret feelings and thoughts on stage is brought back into the group. Everyone has a share, everyone has discovered a piece of the life of this individual. He processed something for all of them, for the group members and for the leader." (Geisler in Buer, 1989, p. 65) The gap between the participants (including the leader, therapist/patient) in a classic psychodrama session is resolved through *sharing*. The partially successful recovery of the group and of all individuals in the group structure contribute to group cohesion. (Geisler 1984, p. 20)

Grete Leutz also describes an important function of *sharing* in the final phase of psychodrama. The literal translation from English does not apply, but for them *sharing* means "...immediate post-psychodramatic participation in the protagonist's experience..." This is expressed in the communication of identification from the viewer's own life story with the experience of the protagonist. The communication takes the protagonist and the audience away from the idea that the suffering depicted is something unique. The awareness that arises in *sharing*, that painful but also joyful life experiences can be made by others in the same or a similar way and thus also "*shared*", allows understanding for "... one carrying the other's burden ..." and "...many bearing one's burden ..." arise.

After intense psychodrama games, the group may express its closure through silence or with warm words. A walk together can also be a special form of *sharing*. Leutz considers *sharing* so important that she considers it appropriate to limit the third phase of the psychodrama to *sharing* depending on the situation. She justifies this with the fact that the seriously suffering protagonist/patient feels particularly accepted. Buried feelings of affection stir, and this can lead to the love catharsis so called by J. L. Moreno, the breaking of the feelings of sympathy of those involved.

The third phase of the psychodrama offers the possibility of becoming more conscious of the experiences in the game, which often includes lifting the repression of events and circumstances, and enables the "me and you experience" to be retained, which was experienced in role reversal. Leutz sees the after-effects of the psychodramatic experience as decisive factors for psychodrama therapy and warns against rational and judgmental interpretations that a therapist who is intellectually compelled to perform, could succumb to. (Leutz, 1974, pp. 102-103)

A. Schützenberger-Ancelin, another student of Moreno, names the third phase as the "return to the group", without using the term *sharing* itself. She considers a third of the session time where the participants leave with the most varied of after-effects (from dreaming to painful) to be appropriate. Often occurring psychosomatic side effects can persist in the short to medium term. When the protagonist returns to the group, she formulates five sub-goals:

- a) The isolation of the protagonist is lifted by communicating with others with their experiences suffering from similar problems;
- b) The protagonist benefits from group's experiences and views on the problem being worked on;
- c) All participants can express their feelings (group catharsis);
- d) The technical aspect (here and now of the group) can be examined in training groups;
- e) This gives the training group an understanding of the group dynamic and therapeutic processes.

Schützenberger-Ancelin describes that by changing the scene (the group leader often sits down with the performers on the steps of the stage or everyone returns to the group and closes the circle, lights are fully switched on again, etc.) back into the psychotherapeutic group situation, the self-awareness or group dynamics returns.

In this situation, "personal feedback" occurs, where it means the expression of personal feelings. Schützenberger-Ancelin determines the order of the speakers. The players (double, auxiliary) and the protagonist begin and the

audience continues. Nobody has to speak, but she considers it advantageous if as many as possible express themselves. "Returning to the group" also means allowing the protagonist to give advice, express feelings of sympathy or to show closeness by keeping quiet. It is possible to "play" a problem again with a different cast or type.

Now the "discussion of the session" can begin, in which the "how" (course of the session) is dealt with. The aim is to help the participants understand what has happened to the individual. "Often there are echoes from the depths, psychosomatic changes that must not be ignored or stifled." This goal-oriented part of the "return to the group" shows that what is played is the "experience and feeling" not only of the protagonist, but also of the several group participants and viewers regardless of what was said verbally and non-verbally. "It is advisable to devote sufficient time to the analysis and personal feedback (at the end of the session and possibly a few hours after the session, during a part or the entire next session)." (Schützenberger-Ancelin, 1979, p. 59)

K. Zeintlinger-Hochreiter, too, in her dissertation (from 1981, published in 1996) on classical psychodrama divides the course into three temporal sections: warming-up phase, play phase and integration phase, in which process analysis, *sharing* and feedback are again differentiated and offer the possibilities of processing the psychodramatic representation. Like A. Schützenberger-Ancelin, she thinks that a third of the time available should be spent on this and integrates the "new experiences and findings" in the third phase.

She defines "feedback" as non-meaningful feedback on one's own experience of the behavior of others. She assigns three forms of feedback to psychodrama: role feedback, identification feedback and *sharing*.

In the "role feedback", the feelings that were felt in the assumed role are communicated. This can be from the other players such as the auxiliary ego to the protagonist, but also from the protagonist to the group. For the protagonist, the "role feedback" fulfills the therapeutic purpose where the effect of his behavior Hochreiter, like Schützenberger-Ancelin, often manifests in psychosomatic phenomena.

Zeintlinger-Hochreiter would like the form of *sharing* as the communication between group members about experiences from their own life story. In this way, the group takes away the feeling of the uniqueness of their suffering from the protagonist and thus experiences relief. Zeintlinger-Hochreiter uses the example of the mother who, as the protagonist, evaluates the hatred that sometimes arises for her children in such a way that she is not a good mother, that she gains relief by telling other group members that they too cannot always "suffer" their children. Sometimes hatred does not make her a bad mother.

The message is not limited to a verbal utterance. Non-linguistic sympathy such as affected silence, drinking coffee together, working out plans and much more can mean *sharing*.

Sharing is contraindicated when the group members "...only dutifully rummage through their biography for similar experiences without being internally involved..." The situation can also turn out where the *sharing* should be postponed. This is indicated when the protagonist is still so captured by the catharsis that he is not capable of any new perception.

Therapeutically, the *sharing* should show the protagonist that he is not alone with his problem. It is therefore the task of the therapist to convey this to the protagonist when group members cannot identify with the protagonist at all or only poorly. (Zeintlinger-Hochreiter, 1996, p. 36 and 196)

H. G. Petzold extends Moreno's "Triadic Psychodrama" by a fourth phase. It breaks down into

1. Initial phase - remembering/stimulating
2. Action phase - repetition/exploring
3. Integration phase - working through/integrating
4. Reorientation phase - changing/trying out

The *sharing* is located in the third phase after the catharsis/peak experience and before the feedback, analysis, interpretation and reflection. (Petzold, 1979, p. 78)

H. Petzold defines *sharing* "...as intense self-awareness in the encounter with others: Group members who have witnessed and helped shape a psychodrama tell the protagonist to what extent they could identify with him and where their own experience and their own existential experiences activated." (Petzold, 1979, p. 206)

Petzold gives *sharing* a central meaning within psychodrama. It is used to let the protagonist experience "...after a conflict-centered and emotionally charged game..." the "support and stability" of the group. This happens through the communication of the individuals in the group about their own experiences and feelings, which were triggered or remembered by the representations of the protagonist in the psychodrama play. The third phase is not limited to verbal statements. All non-verbal communications are included. For Petzold, the *sharing* is followed by feedback, analysis and cognitive integration. (Petzold, 1979, p. 183)

In connection with *sharing* (and feedback) of the assistant or co-therapist, S. Essen refers to Dreikurs (Dreikurs, 1961), which is a technique of multiple psychotherapy (a second therapist works with the first therapist and the patient every 3 - 4 sessions) practiced, which is comparable to the use of so-called auxiliary therapists at Moreno and has an important meaning for the therapist. In addition to his role in classical psychodrama as an auxiliary ego or double, it gives him important information about his relationship with the protagonist and the group and serves to clarify his own relationship. (Essen in Petzold, 1982, p. 203)

Binswanger is concerned with a contribution to the theoretical foundation of the classical psychodrama by means of psychoanalytic concepts and the renunciation of the therapy-related transference as an agent of treatment. In order to minimize transmission, "*sharing*" and the active participation of the therapist are of great importance.

Sharing has different functions: On the one hand, it is about taking away the feeling of standing "naked" from the protagonist, who has shown himself with his problems, conflicts and entanglements, while the other group members now share something about their problems, experiences and experiences.

In addition, the potentially disparaging analysis should be avoided and the protagonist should be reintegrated into the group.

The main reason for Binswanger, however, is that the *sharing* "enables the protagonist to be differentiated from his auxiliary ego experienced as introjection." By sharing these roles with him as group members "Jürgen" or "Ute", who they really are so as to speak, "they enable the protagonist to take back the intense transference and restore his ego functions. The regular and extensive *sharing* of the therapist also reduces the willingness to transfer them to him.

"Expressed in the terminology of the psychoanalytic theory of narcissism [...] the group members become narcissistic objects or 'self-objects' in the game phase by assuming roles and doubling (the latter mainly by assuming certain ego functions of the protagonist) [or] to introjection [of the protagonist]. They are [...] no longer demarcated from [his] self, they belong to his, 'expanded self'. It is characteristic of this state of the "self-object" in the "narcissistic relationship" that the person in the relationship is no longer experienced as a "center of one's own initiative". [...] Through *sharing*, the group members bring themselves back as their own people, separated from the protagonist, as 'centers of their own initiative', as people with their own historicity." This creates the possibility of restoring an objective relationship, it can be clearly seen to what extent their own conflicts have flowed into the roles and the protagonist is enabled to critically examine their role feedback.

"At the same time, the tele-process that is effective in choosing roles becomes transparent." Often, group members are chosen by the protagonist to portray certain roles, whose own conflict situation is related to the role to be portrayed. (Binswanger, 1980, p. 237)

Springer believes the time to initiate the reflection phase is when "... insight into action and/or action catharsis ..." is no longer possible. The *sharing* is part of four reflection phases. (cf. Leutz, 1974, p. 99 ff.; Zeitlinger, 1982, p. 112ff) "... *Sharing* is the immediate, spontaneous feedback from group participants. They tell the protagonist to what extent they have experienced similar suffering or at least can understand their situation. The protagonist thus

experiences a feeling of connection and solidarity. He learns that he is neither alone with his problems, nor that his problem is unique..." (Springer, 1995, p. 89)

"... However, as he was warming up to the production, the audience before him was warming up too. But when he came to the end they were just beginning. The tele-empathy-transference complex undergoes a third realignment of forces; it moves from the stage to the audience, initiating among the audio-egos intensive relations. As the strangers from the group begin to rise and relate their feelings as to what they have learned from the production, he gains a new sense of catharsis, he has given love and now they are giving back love to him. (This phase is now called 'Sharing'.) Whatever his psyche is now, it was molded originally by the group; by means of psychodrama it returns to the group and now the members of the audience are *sharing* their experience with him as he shared his with them." (Hare & Hare, 1996, p. 48)

P. Hare and J. R. Hare paraphrase Moreno and his "Third Conversion of Forces". In the auditorium, experiencing one's own emotional sympathy creates a relationship intensity that allows the protagonist to experience how closely the individual group members are connected to him, which reintegrates him into the group.

"The *sharing* is the final closure for the group as well as the protagonist. This takes place when the action portion has concluded for the protagonist. The director, in essence, returns the protagonist to the group. The group is now asked to share something of themselves, of their own lives, their own feelings, as they relate to the experience of the protagonist. The dialogue is the time for the director / therapist's feedback and discussion. This can be presented at the conclusion of the *sharing* or at another time when the protagonist is better able to integrate that information. The dialogue usually depends upon the therapeutic and philosophical orientation of the director, Freudian, Jungian, Adlerian etc. (Goldmann/Schramm Morrison, 1984, pp. 6/7)

The *sharing* is the end of the psychodrama session and begins after the game. The therapist initiates the *sharing* and asks the group about their own experiences, sensations or experiences that are similar to those portrayed by the protagonist in the game. Through the communication of the group, the protagonist receives information that releases him from his isolated situation and reconnects him with the group. He experiences a new orientation under the guidance of the therapist.

"Psychodrama sessions consist of three portions: The warm-up, the actions portion and the post-action *sharing* by the group." Disturbance in any one of these areas reflect upon the total process. However, "*sharing*" may at times be of a non-verbal nature instead of verbal. In any event, the director must see that all three portions evolve form session. (Goldmann / Schramm Morrison, 1984, pp. 10/11)

The triadic system (warm-up, action portion and post-action) is referenced and it is pointed out that a disturbance in one of the three phases will change the whole process (session). *Sharing* has its firm place in the triad, although it is not restricted to verbal expression. It is the task of the leader to recognize from the result of a phase when it has been completed in order to develop then the next phase from the situation.

"The final portion of the psychodrama is the *sharing*. Here the group or audience is encouraged to relate to the protagonist in a non-analytical and non-judgmental manner. They are asked to identify with him, relate those aspects of their own experience which are similar to or have a bearing upon the experience of the protagonist as brought out in the process of the psychodrama. This process of *sharing* thus helps to link the protagonist with his environment rather than alienating him from it". (Moreno, Z., 1965, pp. 73-86)

In *sharing*, in the last part of the psychodrama session, the group / audience is encouraged to tell in a non-analytical and non-judgmental way where they have identified themselves and / or their own experiences are similar to what the protagonist has portrayed. This process helps the protagonist to bridge the experienced alienation and to come back into the group, whereby the group members also come into the state of being able to accept the protagonist again.

Summary

The *Sharing* in Classical Psychodrama

Sharing forms the third phase (or at least an important part of the third phase) of a classic psychodrama session, takes up about a third of the available time and begins in a smooth transition after the play phase. As in, the therapist in the warm-up phase, the protagonist and his fellow players in the game phase, and the group in *sharing* with the audience, are the main actors respectively.

After the game phase, the protagonist is in a critical situation. He feels abandoned, is angry and ashamed because he alone has shown his innermost feelings and conflicts.

In *sharing*, the group expresses its own experiences; thus the protagonist learns that the group shares their troubles with him:

- The group members share their self-revelations with one another instead of analyzing and interpreting it.
- It is about communicating experiences from one's own life story that have been touched by the game.
- This shows the protagonist that his (portrayed) suffering is not unique, so it relieves him and reintegrates him into the group.
- Feelings break up (group catharsis) and a greater bond of the group develops.

In addition to verbal exchange, *sharing* can take different forms: sympathetic silence, walking, drinking coffee, etc.

The psychodrama therapist ends the game phase at the appropriate moment and moves on to *sharing*, he participates and brings in his own life experience; he is challenged to find solutions to conflicts that arise and gives the protagonist a new orientation.

***Sharing* in other variations of psychodrama**

The psychodrama therapist, who is oriented towards depth psychology, can be heard from the background of the event, introducing the section of the conversation with clear pronunciation but without particular emphasis. Since play and conversation alternate in depth psychological therapy with psychodrama methods, it is recommended to always use the same words at the beginning of the discussion. The monotony should lead to the patient not being asked any questions even if they did not understand the words. After a longer course of therapy, the request is perceived subliminally and does not require any attention.

After they have come together in a circle, they wait to see what spontaneous utterance occurs. The “Association Circle” strategy is appropriate for this part of the session. The aim is to see what the game triggered in the individuals in the group or what was suggested. It is the therapist's task to find the right time and the right technique to activate the latent dynamics; "...His procedure is therefore an 'activation' ...".

Despite the fact that patient groups are artificially put together, the conversation may of course be conducted. This is possible because the group discussion is based on shared experiences, feelings and needs. As a result, the group will appear more confidential than it will be in reality, where groups will always come together for conversation. In the therapeutic situation, the participants are expected to take advantage of the opportunity to express themselves without particular consideration for norms required in society, but rather according to their current state of mind. The lack of certainty of goal and convention leads to patient insecurity. “...This uncertainty is desirable because, like any uncertainty in perception or orientation, it stimulates unconscious processes of communication—especially projection and transmission—with which the TFPT works ...”

Ploeger considers the game, which is based on an “act as if”, to be a “...Moreno trick...”

The game leads to the effect that is called “psychological provocation” (from organic medicine: artificially transforming an inflammatory process into an acute inflammation, so that it can then be treated effectively with medication).

Ploeger points out that "... the affective environment of actions expressing psycho-reactive conflicts emerges more clearly when the patient repeats his actions in play than when he just talks about them." Observations on this have also been proven empirically (Ploeger, Grevelding, Steinmeyer, 1972), whereby the cautious conclusion could be drawn that particularly schizoid, less phobic and hysterical patients benefit from psychodrama therapy. *Sharing* in the sense of classic psychodrama (*sharing* has the “non-analytical” claim) cannot take place. (Ploeger, 1983, p. 200)

The presentation of the importance of *sharing* in psychodramatic supervision should be dispensed with in this article. The diversity of the supervision work (individual, group, collegial supervision to name just a few) requires that you deal with this in your own work. The same applies to the importance of *sharing* in child and adolescent psychodrama. (Bosselmann et al., 1993) In psychodramatic work with children, there is a contrarian discussion about the extent to which “reflecting and raising awareness” is indicated. The importance of language as a means of expression, depending on the age of the children, must be taken into account, whether *sharing* and how *sharing* must be individually considered by the therapist, depending on the situation and the age and level of development of the group.

***Sharing* in Humanistic Psychodrama**

In order to clarify the meaning of *sharing* in humanistic psychodrama, some basic features of humanistic psychodrama regarding the relationship of the individual to the group should first be outlined with a view to the final phase of *sharing*.

Psychodramatic work in the sense of humanistic psychodrama is to be understood as expressive work of the individual in and with the help of the group. (Gessmann, 1995, p. 8) In addition to the therapist, “the group is of great importance which, as an auxiliary ego or double, enables and shapes the expressive work.” (Gessmann, 1995, p. 8)

After the individual group members have found a topic in the warming-up phase, brought the topics into the group and a common level of expression and willingness to play have developed, the protagonist is chosen.

More or less well-known thematic parts of the group members have an important meaning. “The choice of protagonist is a crystallizing compression of certain specific thematic parts of the group members, which are then represented by the selected group member.” (Gessmann 1995; 2, p. 37)

The protagonist becomes the representative of the group or functions as an individual representative of a group topic. This sociometric choice corresponds to and manifests the relationships in the group. It is “at the same time a therapeutic contract, a promise to take part in a game [...] and thus has a binding and connecting function within the group.” (Gessmann, 1995; 2, p. 35f)

“The protagonist game that follows now represents an intensive form of communication with the group and is thus part of a path towards developing congruent relationship structures within the group.” (Gessmann, 1995; 2, p. 37)

“The protagonist finds the expressions for his difficulties in thinking and feeling, perceiving and moving towards the group [...] but at the same time the group approaches the protagonist by providing the protagonist with elements of expression through their participation in role play and in doubles. [...] The protagonist plays in the atmosphere of trust that the group provides.” (Müngersdorff, 1987 / cf. Gessmann, 1994a, p. 72)

The representation and design of the protagonist is always an explanatory conversation with the group. The group participates in this conversation intrinsically in the game through doubles and the auxiliary ego game, as well as in *sharing* through the submission of their own, especially emotional connection.

In humanistic psychodrama, *sharing* is not so differentiated from the protagonist's play with regard to the participation of the group, since the group process takes place during the entire session and also in the choice or in the game phase—albeit with different priorities group work takes place. Against this background, the specifics of *sharing* in humanistic psychodrama can now be shown.

In *sharing* as a connection to the protagonist game, the group participants can emotionally communicate with the main actor, can tell when they have experienced something similar and have identified themselves. The other players can express how they fared as the chosen auxiliary ego in the respective role.

Last but not least, in *sharing* there is also recourse to the motifs of the individual group members, which were only partially known in advance, and which were incorporated into the choice of the protagonist.

“Without these parts being made conscious (when choosing the protagonist), in the final phase of the group work, the so-called *sharing*, a return to this takes place. The protagonist experiences a renewed integration into the group through the messages of the group members who are also experiencing and acting, and the group is completed by the resumption of the protagonist from his exposed position as a player. The protagonist experiences the importance of his game for the other group members and also a social acceptance of his problem. The mutual give and take in the group connects and creates a—also future—atmosphere of mutual [...] trust.” (Gessmann, 1995; 2, p. 37)

After the psychodrama play, the protagonist does not remain as an individual isolated from the group, who “has exposed himself in the game and is now dominated by feelings of shame and anger”. Rather, with the help of the group and as their representative(s), he has worked on a problem and possibly experienced a change that gives space in which feelings of relaxation, joy, sympathy and warmth predominate.

This is why he experiences *sharing* as a "phase of open expression" on a new (direct) level, being in the group.

“The mutual trust between the group and the protagonist is confirmed by this expression of the participation of everyone in the protagonist's creation. It is precisely in this phase that future protagonists experience through their own participation, which corresponds to that of the others that they can get involved in the group and are accepted by it because the group and protagonist work together on the topics.” (Müngersdorff, 1994, p. 101)

For this reason, the final round in the humanistic psychodrama is not separated from the action-related topic work.

The now no longer immanent exchange about their own thematic connection enables the players to express how they experienced themselves in the role they assumed, which feelings and memories were awakened in them, with which feelings and thoughts they took on the role and have behaved in it. For example:

Eva: “I am still thinking about the end of my role of being sent away. And then I thought for myself, I'd actually much rather be able to go. [...] I have experienced for myself that the feeling of being sent away is also something very unpleasant and painful. On one hand, it was now separated in the psychodrama, so it didn't affect me to be sent away as sadness. It has been much differentiated. In the past, I think I would have been very personally affected to be sent away like this.” (Gessmann, 1994a, p. 69f)

Each player can further consider how he experienced the role in relation to the protagonist or other players, with the group members reporting to the protagonist about their identification with one or more of the roles shown. How did you feel about him in the role, how did you get on playing this particular role for the protagonist? For example:

Jacob: “My role was very difficult for me to play because I knew that it would hurt you. [...] In my heart I hoped, when I had to tell you the bad things, that you would get over it and actually be completely independent of me.” (Gessmann, 1994a, p. 69)

The changes initiated by the game are also addressed. Which new perspectives and perspectives were developed and made tangible through the game, which options for dealing with the problem areas could be opened up? What emotional change has taken place in everyone?

In *sharing*, the interaction network—the sociometry of the group forms anew: “The group is put together with the protagonist around the crystallization point of the experienced psychodrama.” The protagonist is brought back into the group with his new experiences, the group moves with their new experiences to him. “The *sharing* [...] is always an encounter of the group members after something new has happened and so is always the interactive, sociometric confirmation of the change.” (Müngersdorff, 1994b, page 218)

In order not to endanger this network of interaction between the group members, which is restructured in a trusting encounter in its development towards an intensified group cohesion, the *sharing* should remain free of evaluation and analysis and be determined by the reflective attitude of each individual group member to open up to himself. In this situation, the group leader or therapist is more sensitive, but also a corrective supervisor, if there is a possibility that a group member, due to his participation or for his own protection, e.g. chooses aggressive, judgmental, derogatory, rejecting forms of expression and no other forms of communication are available to him. If, in the opinion of the group leader, the group and the protagonist are able to tolerate such messages without major damage to the overall interactional structure, he has the opportunity to allow evaluation and analysis for the clarification process of the individual. Such approval requires managerial skills with extensive practical experience, since the emerging, still unstable sociogram threatens to become entrenched at an early stage with reduced group cohesion.

The leader himself—as a group member in a special sociometric position—gives a model for the other group members with his contributions about his own emotional involvement in the game and the personal experiences associated with it and can thus also help to establish an integrated position of the protagonist in the group structure to justify difficult topic treatment (those that are in contrast to the moral norms of other group members) by catalyzing relationships between the group members and the protagonist.

Summary

Sharing in Humanistic Psychodrama

1. *Sharing* is the time of group activity that concludes the protagonist game. The group members share their emotional involvement and knowledge about the plot of the game with each other and thus with the protagonist in a self-reflective manner.
2. Through *sharing*:
 - a sociometric re-integration of the protagonist into the group is achieved;
 - a connection is established between the game experiences of the group members and their everyday biographical life experience;
 - an affective relief is created for the group members and the protagonist;
 - an expansion of biographical knowledge is achieved among each other;
 - and the expansion of the individual's horizon of experience in an open encounter with the other group members;
 - group cohesion is increased by condensing the interpersonal relationship structures;
 - leadership role is sociometrically repositioned.
3. The extent and type of participation of the individual group member in the *sharing* is up to each group member and depends on, among other things, on his personal involvement (personal closeness/distance to the protagonist and his thematic components) and the identification with his assumed role during the game.
4. Talking to one another and acting with one another during the *sharing* should take place in a socially responsible manner towards the protagonist and the other group members. The leader ensures that there are no

hurtful, derogatory statements or actions towards the protagonist or other group members (especially those who have played auxiliary ego roles).

5. *Sharing* enables:

- messages about identifications with the game of the protagonist or thematic parts of it;
- notifications about the perception of the role played in relation to one's own, otherwise assumed roles outside of the game setting, as well as about the role interaction during the game;
- notifications of perceived changes in the way the topic is viewed during the game

6. Tasks of the psychodrama leader during *sharing*:

- He initiates the *sharing*;
- It enables everyone to participate in *sharing*;
- He leads the communication and interaction process during the *sharing* in the sense of increasing group cohesion (e.g. he also pays attention to the temporal balance of individual contributions so that there are no unwilling counter-reactions among other participants; he accompanies the *sharing* contributions with the aim an integration of the individual group participants into the group structure);
- He completes the *sharing*.

Literature

- Binswanger, R.: Widerstand und Übertragung im Psycho-drama. Zeitschrift Gruppenpsychotherapie, Gruppendynamik 15, 1980, S. 222-242
- Bosselmann et al.: Variationen des Psychodramas – Ein Praxisbuch - nicht nur für Psychodramatiker. Limmer, Meezen, 1993
- Buer F (Hrsg.): Morenos Therapeutische Philosophie. Leske+Budrich, Opladen, 1989
- Dreikurs, R.: Adlerian Psychotherapy. In: J. L. Moreno, F. Fromm-Reichmann: Progress in Psychotherapy. New York, 1956
- Essen, S.: Individualpsychologie und Psychodrama. In: Petzold, H.G. (Hrsg): Dramatische Therapie. Hippokrates, Stuttgart, 1982, S. 188-204
- Fromm, E.: Psychoanalyse und Religion. Gütersloh, 1972
- Geisler, F.: Der religiöse Mensch Moreno. (Zertifizierungsarbeit) Solingen, 1984
- Geßmann, H.-W.: Humanistisches Psychodrama Band 1. Verlag des PIB, Duisburg, 1994a
- Geßmann, H.-W.: Das Humanistische Psychodrama. Internationale Zeitschrift für Humanistisches Psychodrama, Heft 1, Verlag des PIB, Duisburg, 1995
- Geßmann, H.-W.: Aspekte von Erlebens- und Handlungswiderständen in der psychodramatischen Praxis und Möglichkeiten der Überwindung. Internationale Zeitschrift für Humanistisches Psychodrama, Heft 2, Verlag des PIB, Duisburg, 1995
- Goldmann, E.E. / Schramm Morrison, Delcy: Psychodrama - Experience and Process -. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, Dubuque, Iowa, 1984
- Hare, A. Paul & Hare, June Rabson: Moreno, J. L. Sage Publication, London, 1996
- Heschel, A. J.: Gott sucht den Menschen. Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1980
- Leutz, G.: Psychodrama - Theorie und Praxis. Springer Verlag, Berlin - Heidelberg - New York, 1974
- Moreno, J. L.: Gruppenpsychotherapie und Psychodrama. Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart, 1973;2
- Moreno, J. L.: Psychodrama und Soziometrie. Edition Humanistische Psychologie, Köln, 1989
- Moreno, Zerka T.: Psychodramatic Rules, Techniques and Adjunctive Methods. Journal Group Psychotherapy, XVIII, New York, 1965
- Müngersdorff, R.: Über die Doppeltechnik im Psychodrama. In: Geßmann, H.-W. (Hrsg.): Humanistisches Psychodrama. Band 2, Verlag des PIB, Duisburg, 1994
- Müngersdorff, R.: "Doch Gott wollte nicht helfen." In: Geßmann, H.-W. (Hrsg.): Humanistisches Psychodrama. Band 2, Verlag des PIB, Duisburg, 1994
- Petzold, H.: Integrative Therapie, Beiheft 3. Junfermann-Verlag, Paderborn, 1979
- Petzold, H.G. (Hrsg): Dramatische Therapie. Hippokrates, Stuttgart, 1982
- Ploeger, A.: Tiefenpsychologisch fundierte Psychodramatherapie. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart, 1983
- Schützenberger-Ancelin, A.: Psychodrama. Hippokrates Verlag, 1979
- Springer, R.: Grundlagen einer Psychodramapädagogik. Dissertation. inScenario Verlag, Köln, 1995
- Zeintliger-Hochreiter, K.: Kompendium der Psychodrama-Therapie. inScenario Verlag, Köln, 1996