



GUIDED GROUP INTERACTION AS PAROLE PREPARATION

Introducing F. Lovell Bixby, Ph. D.,
 Deputy Commissioner,
 New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies,
 and
 Lloyd W. McCorkle, Assistant Director,
 Division of Classification and Education,
 New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies.

* * * * *

The recent history of American penology is filled with descriptions and reports of various efforts to discharge the assumptions implied in the adoption of the principle so succinctly stated in the 1870 Declaration of Principles: "More systematic and comprehensive methods should be adopted to save discharged prisoners by providing them with work and encouraging them to redeem their lost character and regain their lost position in society." Thus, rehabilitation was adopted as a major objective of penal management, and administrators were confronted with a treatment-custody dilemma. In a paper presented at last year's annual Congress of Correction we outlined some of the practical implications of this dilemma and offered guided group interaction as a device through which some of the problems resulting from it might be resolved.

In the field of correction there has been considerable discussion of how we can design plans and programs structured to prepare and equip inmates for wholesome social life after release on parole. Most authorities agree that the single most important thing in parole preparation is to shape what we loosely refer to as attitude of the inmate in a beneficial direction. For the last two years New Jersey has been experimenting with guided group interaction as a technique for coming to close grips with this perplexing problem. Unfortunately, we have not had the funds or personnel to develop and expand the program as much as we would have liked, and as yet we have not been able to evaluate its benefit by quantitative methods. However, where tried, the program has had more than limited success in:

1. Making people - personnel as well as inmate - aware of one another as personalities;
2. Reducing tensions; although initially the introduction of the program may increase tensions;
3. Greater insight on the part of some of the inmates, as measured by psychiatric and psychological examination;
4. Opening channels of communication between the "world of inmates and the world of administrators". The number of "gripes" about the institution and its personnel decreased.

-
1. "Guided Group Interaction", F. Lovell Bixby, Ph. D. and Lloyd W. McCorkle; Proceedings of American Prison Association Congress of Correction, 1948.

974.90
 P859
 1949

5. Providing meaningful social experiences for a greater number of inmates.

As a result of the interest evidenced at the meeting in Boston last year and subsequent interest of persons in the application of guided group interaction to correctional populations, it was planned to present a program that would indicate some of the principles and techniques used in its development in New Jersey's correctional institutions.

Inmate groups tend, after the novelty of the first few sessions wears off, to request and/or demand that the leader correct what individual members conceive to be illogical or unfair in their institutional treatment. The leader will be bombarded to "fix the chow, improve the medical service, straighten out guards", etc. Individual members use the guided group interaction time to gripe and complain about courts, paroling authorities and the institution. There is a considerable ventilation of feelings and a good bit of hostility expressed at this stage of the group's development. At this time group members discover the purpose of the leader is not to "fix life" for them, and he is frequently ridiculed for his impotence, and members accuse him of "not being on their side". The verbal expressions of members are, during this time, aimless and disorganized, and behavior in the group becomes as disorderly as the general institutionalized patterns of behavior and the leader's definition of permissiveness permit. This stage in the development of the group seems to reflect the operation of two factors:

1. Group and individual testing to discover the role of the leader. Inmate participants in guided group interaction sessions have to acquire a conception of the role of the leader as an interested, sympathetic person who asks provocative questions, listens, does not respond to aggressiveness with counteraggressiveness, and who can accept even the most difficult members.

2. Resistance toward the examination of inmates' past behavior patterns and future prospects. For most inmates, direct examination is an especially painful experience since their pasts were highly traumatized and their future seems hopeless. Often, when the discussion in the group gets close to the life of participants, hostilities are liberated and in some cases anxieties activated.

It should also be remembered that groups of inmates and individual participants do not make steady progress toward the goals of self-understanding, self-discipline and social maturity. Rather, progress, if any, might better be represented by some movement forward, plateau, regression, and again, forward movement so that at any time in the first few months the group might relate itself to the leader and the members to one another, as these boys are doing.

Phew!

K - So he goes to lock-up.

J - It takes a good man to get in jail and a better man to get out.

I - So I go around talking, I say something (break). Then he goes to lock-up.

L - I don't hit anybody.

P - I didn't say you did.

L - Now I want to say something.

O - Go ahead.

L - Look, youngster, I never

B - That's me.

(Laughter, noise)

P - Look.

A - What's your name?

R - Walt.

P - Look, don't ever mention my name. I don't hit people on the head. I don't, and I don't intend to start. Understand me?

C - Understand me?

P - Understand? I talk to them, my voice does enough.

K - He's excited, excited.

P - No, I am not.

K - What, What?

As the last recording indicates, group and individual participants may be slow to develop the usages that make for sober, mature behavior in the group. In the next recording, a group of recidivists and technical parole violators are brought together with guided group interaction for their sixth session. The members are discussing parole procedures, and it is important to note that the leader does not express any personal opinions about either the institution or its release procedures. Also, note that he ignores two opportunities to personalize the discussion when (1) an inmate makes the accurate observation that "instead of people bothering S___ I think it is S___ bothering people"; (2) the wish of the other boys to beat down S___ for his constructive remarks. The leader did this, no doubt, because of his knowledge of the group and the belief that in either case the results would have been fruitless at this stage of the group's development.

It is cardinal principle that the leader must exercise care to keep variation between members' progress, as measured by willingness to participate in constructive analysis, equal between the participants in the group.

R - I can't explain it.

J - I can't see it.

A - That's the way with me, when I went to Rahway. We both had - my partner had seven years and I had seven years. I did thirty-eight months. He did twenty-two months.

S - Maybe it was the attitude, personal attitude.

Leader - Personal attitude.

S - It could be that.

R - The officers.

J - Ah. The officers, the officers. Shoot the officers.

E - They have something to do with it. They have a lot to do -

J - The officers.

Leader - Some of the fellows try to get at it by saying attitude.

What is the fellow's attitude and would that be an important thing.

S - Sure.

Leader - He says it would be an important thing. Don't you think it would be an important thing?

A - You're going on your past record.

S - No, I mean the attitude you take in here.

K - That's the way you treat indefinite terms.

A - On your past attitude.

K - Certainly.

Leader - Well, can you think of any reasons why this friend of yours got out before you at Rahway?

A - No, I have no reason whatsoever.

Leader - You can't think of a single one.

E - The way he behaves here. He's pretty good. He must have behaved the same way at Rahway. I mean he has been pretty good here as far as I know so he couldn't have got in trouble up in Rahway.

Leader - Well, we will ask him - you got along OK in Rahway?

A - Yes.

Leader - He did well and his friend probably did well, too.

E - And he did good.

Leader - Yes, and his friend got out before he did.

A - And we both had two convictions before that and he got in more trouble in the institution than I did.

Leader - All right, and he was actually in more trouble in the institution.

S - Could they call that jail wise?

Leader - Jail wise.

S - That's what I mean. They could use that, a guy is either a "hepster" or "jail wise". This guy is "jail wise" so keep him longer, they do do that.

J - So why should they give you more time because you are "jail wise"?

S - Because they do it.

J - So why should they, don't say they do that and that's the reason. That's a simple answer. Why should they? Give me the answer why they do. Everybody's "jail wise" if they stay here a certain length of time.

S - Not necessarily.

J - You got to learn a certain amount while you are here about jail do you -

S - Don't learn. Not everything.

J - The majority learn what jail is about and how to keep out of trouble and how to get in it.

S - All right, they figure a man ^{who} ~~amen~~ knows how to keep out of trouble, and keeps his nose clean right through the books is "jail wise" right off.

J - So where is your argument about doing what's right? If you do what's right you are "jail wise". There is no argument.

R - That's right.

Leader - Well, how do you think they put people out on parole?

E - That's what I am trying to find out. That's why I asked you. I don't know.

A - That's the only two things they say here. If you get in a little trouble you are a "hepster". If you keep your nose clean you are "jail wise".

J - So what do you do right?

A - You got to be one or the other - in their minds you got to be one or the other.

J - So it's better to be a "hepster".

Leader - What?

R - I say what he does. You got to be one or the other - either a "hepster" or "jail wise".

Leader - How do you think they put people out. We will take up "jail wise" in just a moment.

Z - Out of where? Out of here?

Leader - Yes.

Z - The way I heard it - on your behavior

J - That's a lie for sure.

R - That is a line.

S - I had a talk with Dr. ___ and that little subject was brought up and told me it was based mostly upon how you adjust yourself the way you are. In other words, say I am working for a transfer out of A Wing. All right, every time I put in for it they rejected it. So I asked him naturally, Why the hell can't I get transferred to a different wing? He says, Well, where do you want to get transferred to? I says, Well, some fellows in there don't like me and I don't like them and there is a conflict there. You know. He said, That is what we are trying to clear you up with by keeping you over there and making you adjust yourself to that, and if you can adjust to that which you don't want to then you are fit to go on parole. In other words. they want you to adjust yourself to what they want you to do and not what you want to do. See, you could pull an "easy bit" if they gave you everything you asked for in an institution. That ain't what they are looking for.

A - There is a hell of a lot you could ask for.

S - I know. (mutter)

R - I doubt that.

S - Even in a minor thing like getting transferred out of A Wing.

A - So you might want to do the same thing in some other wing.

S - Well, I might. But he wants me to adjust myself to the people in A Wing and learn to get along in A Wing.

J - Why can't you get along in A Wing?

S - Because I can't.

J - What makes you think you can get along in another wing?

S - Because I'd be by myself then.

A - Can't you be by yourself in A Wing?

S - No.

J - Why can't you make those fellows leave you alone? You want to stay by yourself.

S - That is not the point. The point is they'll turn around and bother you anyhow. At least in one of the lock-up wings, if you don't want nobody around, you go in your cell and lock the door, and the hell with them. Right?

O - Sure.

B - Do you mean to tell me people bother you, S___?

S - Yeah.

J - I think S___ bothers people if I know S___. I locked with you for three and a half months. If you come over to E-2 and pull the shit that you pulled on B-3.

S - Well, anyhow, that's what he said. I am just stating what he said, that's all.

Leader - Well, I think S___ made a point. He said that really what determines whether or not a guy is ready to go out depends on his ability to get along in any kind of situation.

A - That's what he said.

J - That's the point of the institution.

In the following recording we pick up a group of 12 inmates with whom the remainder of our time will be spent in an examination of one of their guided group interaction sessions. The case histories of the principal participants are as follows:

1. A young man, single, 22 years, who participated in a \$3500 payroll robbery in daylight. Family history shows divorce of parents when subject was still an infant - followed by rather complete rejection by the mother and over-protection by the father. While the record indicates no previous serious crimes, there is one instance of detention in a children's home at age 13 for petty thievery; subject has

been described as evasive, unreliable, shrewd, solitary, anti-social, superficial. Motive for robbery he gives as arising from unsteady employment and urgent need for money; however, his share of proceeds was spent mostly for pleasure. Prior to transfer to Bordentown from Annandale has made a difficult institutional adjustment; immediate cause for transfer was attempted bribery of prison officials for quick release.

2. A young white male of 19, single, who came from a large family (7), a broken unsupervised home, who started early living a life of irresponsible wandering. At the time of the present episode, Armed Robbery and Larceny of Auto, he was A.W.O.L. from the Navy, following some undescribed kind of disciplinary action there. He was very reluctant to give institution officials a straight story concerning his past or his family relationships. It appears that his mother had been married before and after the union that produced him - that he suffered almost complete rejection by his mother and was in continual conflict with his step-father. There is suspicion that he was involved in numerous delinquencies as an adolescent but there is only record of one stay, when he was 15, of not quite a year, in a Boy's School for a pocket-book theft.

He has been described as of average mentality - a shrewd opportunist, unstable, unreliable, lacking frankness, unable to learn from experience, etc. Record shows he has had difficulty in making an acceptable adjustment in the reformatory - he has been involved in a forgery incident and an attempted escape. At present assigned as book-binder in education department.

3. A colored man of 21, married, who has a long history of Juvenile Delinquency but up to the present incident of Atrocious Assault and Battery with Knife had been able to escape imprisonment for repeated instances of assault and battery. He is the product of a broken home, parents separated, insecure background, immoral environment. The present offense he committed on a man whom he suspects of consorting with his mother, and follows by only a few months the accidental death of his father. Apparently, he was quite attached to his father and unable to accept a substitute. (His young son carries on the father's name.) Subject's frequent brushes with the law, his marriage following the illegitimate birth of his son, his persistent habit of assaultiveness even in prison, would indicate his casual regard for his social responsibilities. He has been described as quick-tempered, with tendency to project blame onto victims, unstable, and overly-sensitive.

4. This young married man of 24 apparently has established a habit of motor car larceny, with this his third incarceration for this offense. A product of broken home, rejection by mother, raised by indulgent grandparents, this lad experienced no troubles in school but showed an unstable and restless work record. For several years preceding his arrest for the present crime he had roamed the world as a seaman - during his travels he acquired a Malayan wife and child in Australia. However, he was unable to bring his family to the States. He rationalizes his car-stealing by saying he was upset, paramour here had jilted him, wanted to get his mind off his troubles. He has been described as cooperative, alert, self-confident, with high regard for himself, amenable, unstable, good mental organization but with defective judgment.

5. A single, white young man of 25,, whose family history is broken at age of 6, by death of mother and total rejection by alcoholic father. His subsequent childhood exhibits no effective guidance other than from institutions. He has an overwhelming desire to drive cars and to work around them, and while he tends to blame his delinquencies on drink - his thefts of autos are committed with and without alcoholic influence. He has been described as passively antagonistic, hard and rigid in demeanor, evasive, opinionated, egocentric, callous, complaining and sensitive. In the present instance he is involved in a wreck in a stolen car in which his accomplice died. Witnesses report that he walked away from the smashed car even though his friend was still alive calling for help. Thus he has been described as basically unfeeling and diagnosed as a psychopathic personality. In recent institutional situations he has displayed an asocial, solitary attitude.

6. A young man of 26 who was a passive participant in armed hold-up of a gasoline station in which the victim was beaten with the gun. Well educated, emotionally unstable, quite unreliable. No particularly serious indications of early maladjustment, but does appear to have had a rather shaky personal integration which broke down following the failure of his marriage. Mother died accidentally when he was 10; father remarried. Father severely maladjusted, beat his children; drank heavily; father imprisoned by his second wife on a false charge of incest with step-daughter. This an important factor in break-up of marriage. He reacted to marital stress by running up debts, running away, flashy life, and drinking. Re-entered Army where met accomplices in present crime. This lad is the central figure in the recording.

At the start of the hour the leader summarizes the events of their last session, a technique that reduces time spent in aimless discussion. Also, to get the session under way, note how he polls the group's members on their opinion. This technique he uses to get the discussion from the third to first person, and in so doing elicits from a member a problem related to his appearance before the Classification Committee. Regardless of whatever plan the leader may have, or schedule he might use to coordinate the sessions, both he and his plan must be sufficiently flexible to consider problems as they are experienced by participants and verbalized in the group. As this part of the session continues, note a constantly recurring problem in working with delinquent groups--the reluctance of members to express an opinion they believe will in any way be considered derogatory of another inmate in the group. It seems that after members develop confidence in the leader they must spend an even greater period of time developing confidence in one another.

Leader - Well, how do you know when a guy is being sincere? Remember when we were talking the last time somebody said we are sensitive and know whether other people like us or not, and he made the statement, "I don't know how you feel about me". He was talking about me. He said he don't know how the other fellows in the group feel about me. And we went on from that and he said, "Well, the group depends upon us feeling about other people in the group that you can have confidence in them. You all agree with that? You know what he's talking about?

P - Yes.

Leader - Do you know what he's talking about? What's he's saying?

M - Yes, I understand him.

W - He is saying it's more important how you say it rather than what you say.

Leader - Well, can anybody here think of any cases where it's important about how it was said rather than what was said?

M - Yeah, with me, I went before the Classification Committee and they gave me time because I had a personality conflict.

Leader - Mmmm.

M - I didn't know what was going on. I didn't know what my personality problem was.

Leader - What was there in the way they said it that made you feel one way or the other?

M - The way he said it. Like he said, "I give you one year and in that time you can clear up your personality problem". That's all there was to it. No explanation. They didn't tell me what the problem was. He said it in an even tone, "We'll give you a year and maybe in a year you'll straighten out your personality problem."

Leader - What do you think your personality problem is?

M - I think a lot of times my emotions control me. I can't control my emotions.

Leader - Well, how many of us is that true of?

O - Most of us.

Leader - What? Is it true of you? Is it true of you and true of you and true of you? That's pretty general, that sometimes our emotions make us do things that our brains tell us not do. Aside from that, M__ has a problem, hasn't he? They told him he's got to do something about this in a year. Perhaps he'd better figure it out in here.

(break)

Leader - All I want to do is - we couldn't go ahead with M__'s problem until we first had most of the group here agreeing, to some extent, that what we do is tied up with the kind of people we are, and all we wanted to do is just get that straightened out a little bit in the group. Well, all right now, assuming that that's true, if you were going to recommend something for M__ to do to change this thing that we call personality that the committee told him that he had to change a little bit and work on, what would you suggest for him?

A - Well, I don't know M___ that well. What I know from him, he seems to be a pretty nice guy. Minds his own business. I couldn't say nothing.

Leader - You don't have any suggestions for him.

A - No, not offhand.

Leader - You don't know him long enough. You can't make a suggestion. You can't help him get out of Bordentown.

A - The best I can do is what the committee says.

Leader - What?

A - Check on his personality.

(laughter)

Leader - Well, he is trying to do that. He is coming to you and saying, "Help me, check on my personality so I can get out of this place that I don't like;" And you're saying, "swell guy, nothing wrong", and yet he has to figure it out.

A - That is my point of view.

Leader - If you were going to suggest something for M___, what would you suggest?

B - I'd tell him to watch the situation in here. He knows that the laws here and the regulations here are pretty strict. He can't get but so much. He has more laxity outside, and if he can live under restrictions here why not profit by it regardless of what they may be - when a rotten situation arouses in here, when he takes the easy way of, as he says, he follows the easy way. The easy way in here is to do as you're told.

Leader - Yeah.

B - Well, if you follow the easy way outside and do what's supposed to be right, use the same judgment that he would use in this particular situation that arises, why, he could get along better outside.

C - But the idea is to get outside.

B - That's one way he can adjust himself.

Note that at the beginning of the following part of the same session the men seem to be getting more accurate an objective in their observations of M___. It is significant to note that as the men get closer how he resists their probing at this point. The leader, sensing M___'s discomfort, turns the discussion from direct examination of M___ to a generalized discussion and uses a didactic approach. As this discussion continues, some of the members acquire intellectual insight into the concepts the leader has introduced.

Several apply the operation of the phenomenon to themselves which makes the operation of it non-unique when it is later returned to M____. Of incidental importance is the description of a penal institution "as a human wilderness" by one of the group members.

Leader - Look, why do you smile at that?

N - I am smiling at M____ trying to hold back a smile - that's all he has been doing since we started this.

Leader - Why would he want to smile.

N - I believe that when somebody says something that is the truth or near the truth, I believe that M____ can't help but smile, and it is hard for him to hold that smile back.

Leader - You think he was getting closer to the truth?

N - He's getting closer to the point that my friend P____ here made.

M - It's just a way of pulling time, go along with a few fellows, talk to them, associate with them, get along with them and respect their rights, and you expect them to respect yours. Some fellows you can talk to, get stuff off your mind, and get a mutual understanding, both of you.

Leader - Why is it that you make the statement that you haven't anything to offer anybody?

M - Well, I mean I have nothing in the way of material help. Any swag, any cigarettes, nothing like that. I'm talking about material value.

E - You have friendships to offer.

M - Well, yes, I mean talk to a guy and listen to him and try and help the guy out and do what I can. Talk to him.

B - That's what I meant when I said he contradicts himself to an extent. He said that, rather I believe that when he comes up here comes up with the intention of trying to help someone.

Leader - Mmmm.

B - I didn't take into consideration that he meant the material values.

N - I believe he's right when he said, when he said. I don't do anybody any good and nobody can do him any good. When you come in here you don't know hardly anybody in here. Most fellows in here don't know anybody else in here. When they get out of here they are expected not to get into any friendships made in here and hold them on the outside. More or less, we all look at it like M____ here. Live with the people in here, get along with them the best you can, and try to get out. You don't get any real close friends and you won't get any real enemies. It's just everybody getting along with everybody else because he has to whether he

wants to or not or it's best for him to do it. The guys that don't get along with anybody else, well, probably they didn't get along on the outside either.

Leader - Yes, but, well, let's leave M now for a moment. Why is it some people have difficulty in establishing very deep relationships with people.

N - Confidence.

Leader - Mmmmm.

N - Confidence in themselves.

Leader - Oh, they lack confidence in other people.

N - They might lack it in themselves or lack confidence in other people.

Leader - You all know people who, apparently in most of their relationships with other people, it's pretty much on the surface. They don't let others get to know them very well.

N - What is under the surface never comes up.

Leader - Why is it people are like that?

B - Well, I believe that a person in that particular instance has had some incident happen to him that took that confidence away from him. Perhaps at one time he was deeply attached, had a very deep friendship with someone and something happened to frustrate that friendship or affection. Some incident.

Leader - Then he's unable to have it any more.

B - He invested so much in that particular one. Well, I could say I was speaking from experience. He invested so much in that particular incident, in that particular person, rather, that when they upset friendship or that affection he just lost confidence in everybody else.

Leader - Everybody shakes their head Yes on that. Nobody seems to disagree. You are quite emphatic in your shaking your head. Why? Why do you feel so strongly that's true?

K - Same thing^{has} happened to me.

Leader - The same thing has happened to you. It's difficult to have confidence. All right. These things happen to some people. Then it's hard for them to make established relations with people. They think they're going to be hurt again.

K - That's right.

Leader - Well, then, what can they do when they meet people?

B - Well, that's the basis that he put it on. He advances a certain amount of friendship so that he doesn't cause any enemies and holds it to that basis. And, therefore, after that he avoids being hurt and he doesn't hurt anybody else.

As we continue with this session the leader continues to use a didactic approach, and after establishing his point turns the discussion back to M____. As M____ relates his story to the group, observe how this information is used in the discussion of him.

Leader - It's a way they have of meeting life. Might be like this. If I were to take a punch at you what would you do? What would be the first thing you'd do?

O - I would take it.

Leader - No, no. We're outside now. What would you do? The first thing you are going to do.

O - I would get into it.

Leader - No, no. You may hit back later but what would be the first thing you'd do? Suppose he let it fly at you. What would you do?

O - Duck.

Leader - He'd duck. Then what else would he do?

N - He'd stick up his hands.

Leader - What would you do that for?

O - I'd know something was going to happen. The blow was going to hurt.

Leader - All right, you knew the blow would hurt. Now supposing I called you a name that you don't like. What would you do? What do people do?

P - Call the name back.

Leader - What else do they do?

N - They walk away or start a fight.

Leader - All right, they may walk away. They may start an argument. They may do a whole host of things, and why do they do that?

B - They are hurt. You can be hurt that way.

Leader - All right, you can be hurt in a lot of ways, and people develop ways to handle these blows like a fellow learns how to "put his dukes up", and ways of moving his head about to protect his body, and people learn ways to protect their feelings inside. All right, now, let us get back to M____ as a person. We had to

pause. M___, how would you say you developed ways of meeting these things?

M - See, when I was a kid I put a lot of trust in my mother and she died when I was a kid and I put trust in my father, but he was sent to the State Prison and I didn't have anyone to fall back on. So, the only way for me to get along in life was to put up a flashy front and spend my time playing horses, gambling and running around with women. I did this, more or less, to cover up this feeling of being by myself.

B - The loneliness.

M - Not to depend on anybody, being afraid in time I was going to lose that trust and everything was going to blow up again and I would be right back where I started from.

Leader - All right, now, M___ has told us a very important and interesting thing about his life as he looks at it and he sees it sitting here thinking about it. One, he lost his mother that he had a great deal of feeling for and who trusted and around whom he had a great deal of warmth, and who had a great deal of affection for him. He found, as a result of bitter experience, that he couldn't depend on his father, that his father drank, he wasn't dependable. He let him down, so to speak, and he started to develop ways of getting along with people that consisted of, as he said, trying to be flashy, try to talk fast, play the horses, flashy clothes, booze, women. But he tells us about himself that as he kept doing it he felt deep down inside that something was missing. He was lonely. He was doing these things to be doing something, to satisfy something, and that he didn't really know what it was.

C - I think it was to satisfy something - the feeling was there and he had to keep occupied, and when his mind was blank or he was idle it would pop back.

M - Well, I found that after I got married and then I even lost confidence in my wife, because she confided more in her father than she did in me, and her father was doing things for her but not for me. I was just a guy, that's all.

At this point in the session, the leader uses an idea introduced by a member to aid in the further understanding of M___. Several members apply this to themselves in an interesting manner. As the group continues to discuss why M___ behaved as he did, the leader keeps the discussion related to M___ but steers away from attempts of an exhaustive analysis of his personality structure.

At the close of the hour the leader closes with an inspirational speech which serves to bind the group together and prepare it for further progress.

Leader - What we are trying to get at here is that, as he says, people use words like a shell. The words protect them from other people and from other people getting close to them. They may do it by talking about a whole host of things, most of which are not close to them. Isn't it amazing how much we do that in group therapy? You brought it out very vividly when you said we keep talking and talking but it has nothing to do with us. And isn't it interesting how when now we are close, M___ has led us a little closer to him. He isn't nearly as talkative. Isn't that interesting?

N - Then there is the fellow in the group who keeps in his shell. Only his shell is silence, and when we got in his shell a little bit he started talking.

Leader - Yes, that was right about you.

N - Well, I mean -

Leader - Wasn't that true of him a little bit? Remember, we said there are different kinds of shells. We didn't tell him that he had a shell of silence, but he got it for himself. And in our little group he had a shell of silence, and M___ has a little shell of words, and one of the purposes of the group is to be able for an hour a day, at least, to take off our shell and put it down. Another thing about shells. M___ has told us this about his shell. Maybe people feel about other people that the other people will like them if they give them certain kinds of things. I may think people will like me better if I tell them I have \$10,000 instead of the truthful statement that I only have \$10.

N - That's true.

Leader - That's true. They want people to like them and they say things to people, and I wonder if that might be true in some of the things you describe that you wanted people to like you. What did you say? Impress people.

B - I made a point that he was lonely because he was always afraid to trust anybody. Yet he went out of his way to impress people, to put up this front that in itself is the use of his shell, as you say, this shell of words, to give the person an impression that he is an intelligent, an extra intelligent person by the use of those words, which I realize is the case with myself. I have tried to gather a vocabulary of words so that I could express myself in the light of people I associate with and give them the impression I am on the same plane as they are.

Leader - We won't pick that up today, but we'll save it. We got to the point that people develop shells. Some shells are like his shell of silence. Other kinds are words and pushing out. Some take other forms. Some guys get it down here and it gets going in their "guts". That kind of thing may be related to a lot of other things, like his fighting, and his armed robbery, and his stealing an automobile. Those things are tied up, so when the committee told M___ that that is what they were trying to get

over to him, that he has to think about some of these things, and he has been with us, today, very honest, hasn't he? He hasn't thrown any words at us. He put his problem down and he was honest about it. He wanted to tell us about it, and most important of all, he asked us to help him. He felt about us that we would like him without any front. That's a very important thing. When we can feel about the other guy that he's going to like us without the front. When I can feel about you that you will like me whether I have \$10,000 or \$10, then I feel good with you, don't I? So M___ must have felt a little better with us today. Just as he felt better with us, we must have felt a little better because we started to be able to admit to one another and to ourselves that we had these shells and we have to look at these shells, and M___ has started to look at his shell. As he goes on, he is going to find some more things about himself, just as we go along we're all going to find out more things about ourselves and put them together. We can only go on if we feel people are going to like us without our shells. M___ can't go on unless he continues to feel we are going to like him without the shell.

September 1949