

could run with you on the grass like I didn't the other day. We were doing a blind walk on Primrose Hill after an encounter group. Suddenly I stopped and said: I've done it for a while. I've seen the point so I needn't do it any more. Why indulge, why go on and on? There's no new experience here, no danger. But look what I missed. The freedom of being and expressing myself. Why do I always sit and criticise? I hold myself back and worry about how foolish I may look. Oh, the sum of my sins, when it comes to bottling myself up, is incredibly large.

I want to burrow into you and fling you to the four winds, kick you to the five continents, smash you into kingdom come! All you bottling up impulses and hurt feelings. Why can't you be free and hit a cushion and be ridiculous or insane if you like? Express yourself! You have capabilities, you have a brain. You're always fuzzing it up with nonsense. You used to be intelligent, you are intelligent. You can do whatever you want. You can be a writer. You're writing now! Don't you see it?

Yes, I see it.

It's been wonderful. What an incredible session. I must stop talking about it.

Yvonne Brock

HOW P ARE YOU

Back in the 1950s I was engaged full time in the selection exercise. As a Personnel Selection Officer on the staff of the Senior Psychologist to the Admiralty I was dressed as a WRNS officer but my working day was spent exclusively with young males; both those who had already been accepted for naval service and, as a member of Artificer Apprentice Selection Boards, with those school leavers who had passed various educational hurdles and hoped to be accepted for that particular entry to the Royal Navy.

As PSOs we were a mixed bunch, partly naval, partly WRNS officers and, as members of selection boards, we worked with and for the industrial psychologists employed in the Senior Psychologist Department of the Admiralty. A mixed bunch indeed; of the three other women I did my training with in 1950 two (including myself) were fugitives from the teaching profession, while the other two had the requisite social science qualifications, though none of us had what was ideally required, namely a degree in psychology. In these days of increasing emphasis being placed on paper qualifications it is interesting to note that my fellow school ma'am and I were far happier and more successful than the two 'qualified' entrants who escaped fairly speedily, one into matrimony and the other into WRNS administrative work.

The whole emphasis of our training was on the 'scientific' approach. In those days tests of intelligence - or more in our case of aptitudes and attainments - were rather more revered than they are today, and it was a kind of heresy to question in any sense their validity. I think I always retained a faint scepticism here, realising that the brilliant if slightly unorthodox candidate might easily misunderstand the nature of a testing session and perhaps fail to treat it with sufficient seriousness. However, on the whole we were not dealing with brilliant though unorthodox characters but with young men who approximated more to the 'norm' postulated by the Senior

Psychologist department, and in that sense, and in my selection and assessment duties, I feel bound to acknowledge the usefulness of the 'tools' with which I was equipped.

During our training an empirical approach was encouraged and, rightly to my mind, any attempts at amateur psychiatry were frowned upon. Nevertheless it was recognised that as we were dealing with human beings we should from time to time come up against personality problems, in some cases to render the new entrant unfit for service life. Therefore, among the battery of intelligence and aptitude tests which we administered at the new entry establishments was a set of fifty questions, known as the P (psychiatric) questions.

Our instructions were to administer these with a matter-of-fact insouciance, to suggest that most responses would be negative and that therefore only a dash was required against the number (the questions were read out, not printed on the form) and to take the whole business at speed. By these means insufficient time would be left for reflection, let alone introspection.

The questions fell into two main categories. The first concerned health and health worries - (Do you have headaches? Do you worry about your health? Have you or any of your family ever had a fit?) and the second was concerned with personality problems and mild phobias - (Do you ever feel lonely? Are you either nervous or shy? Do things ever seem unreal to you? Are you afraid of snakes, insects, telegrams or opening letters? etc.) A form completed only with dashes indicated either inattention or a certain wooden insensitivity, perhaps combined with extreme dullness. Conversely, a high number of positive responses suggested either a mischievous nature and a desire to tease the tester, or a highly neurotic and introspective personality for whom service life would probably be purgatory, and who would be unlikely to be much use to the service anyway. During the subsequent interview these matters were investigated, and a few left the Navy via the psychiatrist. I would like to think that we thus prevented a few nervous breakdowns and possible lapses into delinquency.

What is it then to be 'P' - or 'a raving P case', to use the inelegant jargon of our department? A highly intelligent actress friend, sensitive but not overtly neurotic, said when I explained the procedure to her that she could answer 'yes' to most of the questions! This possibility was indeed recognised by the department, hence the insistence on speed and a matter-of-fact approach by the tester.

It would be over-simplifying to state baldly that introverts are 'P' and extroverts 'norm', though there is some truth in this, as also in the suggestion that higher intelligence combined with literary or artistic bent tends to produce more Ps, whereas less gifted people, together with those blessed with high intelligence but who pursue scientific rather than imaginative truth and occupations, tend more towards the norm. Physical make-up, heredity, and (to a lesser extent) family circumstances enter into it also.

I suppose the real question we should ask is - Does it matter? Do Ps represent more hazards to their employers than Norms? Do they have more or less capacity for deep and satisfying human relationships than their apparently more stolid and stable opposites?

Questions like these invariably provoke the late C.E.M. Joad's most frequent response - 'It depends what you mean,' - and indeed there are no firm answers. In a military or naval service situation the problem was simplified, in that an extremely sensitive and highly-strung boy would be unlikely to survive without personal damage the rough and tumble of life in the ranks or on the lower deck. Indeed, to some extent this applied to officer entry; alertness was called for but introspection could lead to problems. There were, of course, exceptions. I remember interviewing one highly intelligent young man for a National Service commission who was also 'a mass of nerves'. Remembering my training, I had scruples (which I overcame) about recommending him. In fact he did very well during his short period of service.

In general, I suppose one might safely say that the more intelligent and well-educated P can be happy and successful in many walks of life, but that difficulties arise in accommodating the less well-equipped person of similar temperament. However the class of P whose main characteristic is hypochondria does seem to encounter difficulties at almost all levels.

R. E. SHUTTLEWORTH

PSYCHODRAMA IN THE REHABILITATION OF CHRONIC LONG STAY PATIENTS

The term 'psychodrama' is used in the literature in two forms: One as an all encompassing term which includes under its umbrella sociodrama, role play and other 'action methods.' The other form is more specific. Blatner (1970) describes it as *a form of psychotherapy in which the patient or subject enacts his conflicts instead of talking about them*. The problem looked at is one in which the individual is privately involved.

In sociodrama the collective aspects of the problem are looked at, e.g. the social structure of a psychiatric ward. In role play the individual can look at ways of dealing with more specific problem tasks: e.g. applying for a job, being assertive. The 'action methods' include art, dance, games, play forms, guided fantasy, sensory awareness exercises, meditation and 'encounter' techniques.

I will use examples from work with chronic schizophrenics to illustrate some of these techniques later in the paper.

The technique is flexible enough to be applied from most theoretical viewpoints, ranging from that developed by the father of modern psychodrama - Moreno, with his philosophy of spontaneity, creativity, the moment and theories of role and interaction (Yobelsky and Enneis, 1956) through analytic applications (Polansky and Hawkins, 1969) to the behaviouristic schools, particularly those related to modelling theory (Bandura, 1970).

I use psychodrama with quite a wide variety of patients including disturbed in-patient adolescents of mixed diagnostic types, out-patient neurotics and chronic schizophrenics. With the two former groups I find it useful to work within the general