

Integrating Sociodrama Techniques with Restorative Justice Principles:  
A Socio-Justice Model

Brittany Portia Dahl

A Research Paper

In

The Department

of

Creative Arts Therapies

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Master's Degree of Creative Arts Therapies  
Concordia University  
Montréal, Québec, Canada

April 2005

© Brittany Portia Dahl, 2005



Library and  
Archives Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file    Votre référence*

*ISBN: 0-494-04209-5*

*Our file    Notre référence*

*ISBN: 0-494-04209-5*

#### NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

#### AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

## ABSTRACT

### *Integrating Sociodrama Techniques with Restorative Justice Principles: A Socio-Justice Model*

This research project theoretically explores how a culture of community conflict resolution may develop through the integration of *sociodrama* techniques with *restorative justice* principles. The integration of these two approaches is termed *socio-justice*. The *socio-justice* model seeks to create a culture of community conflict resolution by educating community members about the benefits of participating in *restorative justice* programs and encouraging them to take a collective approach to responding to instances of crime.

A limitation of this paper is that evaluative methods need to be present in order to substantiate a theory or program. This limitation is addressed by providing sample *socio-justice* questionnaires that may assist facilitators in evaluating the effectiveness of *socio-justice* programs. Notwithstanding, the *socio-justice* model is presented as a preliminary work for further exploration. Facilitators are encouraged to use the *socio-justice* program as a creative method of exploring and understanding community members' ideas, feelings, needs and concerns about crime.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special gratitude is extended to my research supervisor, Brian McDonough, for his guidance, insights and enthusiasm. I thank you for your willingness and ability to support and encourage me during this arduous process.

I would like to thank my grandmother, Evelyn Lambert, for her love and support as it greatly enhances the quality of my life. To Catherine Toman, Tobi Klein, Marie-Christine Morel and the Department of Creative Arts Therapies, I am appreciative of your support and kindness during the course of my studies.

Acknowledgment and appreciation is given to Stephen Snow and Jane Scribner for assisting me in completing this work. Jean-Jacques Goulet, Linda Cook and Lou Furman supported me in this endeavor by providing valid, relevant and constructive feedback and being forthcoming about their professional experiences. I am pleased about being member of such a generous and supportive profession.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction: Purpose of the Research Project	1
1.1	Intended Use of Project	2
1.2	Research Methodology	3
1.3	Summary	6
2.0	Sociodrama: An Overview	7
2.1	Principles, Goals and Objectives	9
2.1.1	Principles	9
2.1.2	Goals	9
2.1.3	Objectives	11
2.2	Stages: Planning, Warm-up, Enactment and Sharing	11
2.2.1	Planning	11
2.2.2	Warm-up	13
2.2.3	Enactment	15
2.2.4	Sharing	19
2.3	Educational and Therapeutic Benefits	20
2.4	Conflict Resolution and Community Development	22
2.5	Summary	24
3.0	Restorative Justice: An Overview	26
3.1	Principles, Goals and Objectives	29
3.1.1	Principles	29
3.1.2	Goals	30
3.1.3	Objectives	32

3.2	Stages: Pre-Session, Session and Follow-up	32
3.2.1	Pre-Session	34
3.2.2	Session	36
3.2.3	Follow-up	38
3.3	Educational and Therapeutic Benefits	39
3.4	Conflict Resolution and Community Development	43
3.5	Summary	46
4.0	Socio-justice: An Integrated Model	48
4.1	Principles, Goals and Objectives	49
4.1.1	Principles	49
4.1.2	Goals	50
4.1.3	Objectives	50
4.2	Five Stages of Socio-justice: Program Structure	51
4.2.1	Stage One: Preliminary Planning	51
4.2.2	Stage Two: Pre-Session Meeting and Rehearsal	53
4.2.3	Stage Three: Socio-justice Performance: Inclusion, Warm-up, Enactment, Sharing and Closing Ritual	56
4.2.4	Stage Four: Plan of Action and Evaluation Meeting	57
4.2.5	Stage Five: Follow-up and Assessment	58
4.3	Five Stages of Socio-Justice: Theoretical Overview	58
4.3.1	Stage One: Preliminary Planning	58
4.3.2	Stage Two: Pre-Session Meeting and Rehearsal	59
4.3.2.1	Pre-Session Meeting	59
4.3.2.2	Rehearsal	62

4.3.3	Stage Three: Socio-Justice Performance: Inclusion, Warm-up, Enactment, Sharing and Closing Ritual	63
4.3.3.1	Inclusion	63
4.3.3.2	Warm-up	63
4.3.3.3	Enactment	64
4.3.3.4	Sharing	66
4.3.3.5	Closing Ritual	70
4.3.4	Stage Four: Plan of Action and Evaluation	71
4.3.4.1	Plan of Action	71
4.3.4.2	Evaluation	72
4.3.5	Stage-up Five: Follow-up and Assessment	72
4.4	Educational and Therapeutic Benefits	73
4.5	Conflict Resolution and Community Development	75
4.6	Summary	78
5.0	Closing Statement	79
6.0	Supervisor Commentary	81
7.0	Bibliography	82
8.0	Appendix A: Inclusion, Warm-up and Closing Ritual Activities	86
9.0	Appendix B: Directions for Socio-Justice Facilitators	90
10.0	Appendix C: Sociodrama Techniques	91
11.0	Appendix D: Needs Assessment Sample Questionnaire	93
12.0	Appendix E: Plan of Action and Evaluation Questionnaire	94
13.0	Appendix F: Follow-up and Assessment Questionnaire	95

14.0	Appendix G: Recommended Readings	96
15.0	Appendix H: Operational Definitions	97
15.1	Constructivist Inquiry	97
15.2	Sociodrama	101
15.3	Restorative Justice	102
15.4	Socio-Justice	102



## **1.0 INTRODUCTION: PURPOSE OF RESEARCH PROJECT**

This research project theoretically explores how a culture of community conflict resolution may develop through the integration of *sociodrama* techniques with *restorative justice* principles. The integration of these two models is termed *socio-justice*. The *socio-justice* model seeks to create a culture of community conflict resolution by educating community members about the benefits of participating in *restorative justice* programs and encouraging them to take a collective approach to responding to instances of crime.

Using *restorative justice* principles as a means of creating programs that respond to crime is undertaken in countries like New Zealand, Canada, Australia, and United States. However, Canada and the United States are experiencing difficulties in obtaining community support for this conflict resolution strategy. A primary problem includes, but is not limited to, lack of victim and community participation. Meanwhile, the United States, England, Canada, and Australia are using *sociodrama* as an action method to resolve conflict and create change in the broader community.

Jacob Levy Moreno (1953) the creator of *sociodrama*, defines this model as “a deep action method of dealing with inter-group relations and collective ideologies.” Current definitions of *sociodrama* include the reference that it is a group action method whereby “participants can act out agreed-upon social situations spontaneously” (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Howard Zehr (2002) a leading voice in *restorative justice*, contends that there is only a general agreement about how to define this approach. Zehr (2002), defines *restorative justice* as a “process to involve, to the extent possible, those

who have a stake in a specific offense and to collectively identify and address harms, needs, and obligations, in order to heal and put things as right as possible.”

*Socio-justice* is an educational model that encourages participants from all ethnic, religious, socio-economic, and age groups to participate in achieving its main goal of educating the community about the benefits of participating in *restorative justice* programs. *Socio-justice* has five primary objectives. First, maximize the participants’ experience by building a safe environment that is conducive to achieving effective communication and dialoguing. Second, develop insight about how to take on a personal and collective responsibility for crime. Third, develop empathy for the victims and offenders of crime. Fourth, achieve catharsis; finally, develop and implement conflict resolution plans of action that will extend to the broader community.

### 1.1 INTENDED USE OF PROJECT

The *socio-justice* model reflects professional experience with *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* methods and extensive empirical knowledge in these fields. This research paper, or product, provides facilitators with an educational model to promote public awareness about *restorative justice* measures in the effort of increasing participation and developing a community of conflict resolution. The *socio-justice* program can be implemented in communities the effort of promoting, developing, and maintaining the culture of community participation in *restorative justice* programs. Due to the limitation of not having implemented the *socio-justice* model in a case study, constructivist inquiry methodology supports the project’s proposal through accurately presenting empirical literature in the fields of *sociodrama* and *restorative justice*.

Research methodology is used due to the similarities in goals between *sociodrama*, *restorative justice*, and constructivist inquiry. The primary goals are accurately presenting first person information, truth telling, and motivating people to act. The following description serves to outline the how constructivist inquiry methodology is used to create my theoretical project and demonstrates how the models are interrelated. The description of constructivist inquiry is summarized as all operational definitions are provided in Appendix H.

## 1.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Constructivist inquiry methodology provides a scheme of analyses based on a comprehensive literature survey. Creating in-depth understanding for motivating one to act is the mandate of this methodology and is complementary to *restorative justice* and *sociodrama* goals. A common goal of these three approaches is to provide participants with an opportunity to express their own subjective truths and realities. Stringer (1999) asserts that constructivist inquiry provides a method of research suitable for examining constructions, different truths and realities, held amongst individuals and groups rather than establish an objective truth or make descriptive statements. Stringer's (1999) views are premised on the belief that people who have identical facts of an issue, like crime, will interpret them differently based on their experiences, worldviews, and cultural backgrounds.

*Restorative justice* and *sociodrama*'s principles take into account Stringer's ideas about the human condition and work to build community understanding, which results in individual and collective action through an interaction and sharing process. These approaches provide guidelines that describe the processes involved in creating a program

through the sharing of personal truths toward creating societal change. This research project's primary goal is to develop a theoretical educational model that may increase the level of participation in *restorative justice* programs thus creating change in the way communities respond to crime.

Constructive inquiry research methodology will also assist in reflecting personal truths by demonstrating methodological rigor through trustworthiness and authenticity (Rodwell & Byers, 1997). Manning (1997) asserts that trustworthiness developed as a parallel to the empiricist ideas of internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Trustworthiness addresses methods that determine whether the research process is carried out correctly (Manning, 1997). According to Rodwell and Byers (1997), trustworthiness uses credibility, transferability, dependability, and conformability and it assesses the research product for truth, value applicability, consistency, and neutrality.

Rodwell and Byers (1997) assert that authenticity focuses on the process of research rather than the product, and subsequently assesses the criteria of fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, catalytic authenticity and tactical authenticity. If these criteria are not met, the quality of research including its meaningfulness, usefulness, and ability to enact social change is called into question (Manning, 1997). This research project's approach will satisfy the criteria of trustworthiness and authenticity by seeking to honestly representing the views of the resources used in the creation of this project with the goal of creating social change. Honest representation of literature and interview information will provide credibility by providing criticisms about the ideas outlined in this project.

Stringer (1999) asserts that a limitation of constructivist inquiry is that although this methodology attempts to provide researchers with new ways of comprehending the nature of the social world, descriptions of the historic, cultural and interactional complexity of social life, even if people's lived experiences are more fully represented, fail to provide any essential link between theory and practice. Stringer (1999) describes understanding the nature of the social and cultural context as interesting but inadequate in connecting the facilitator with the everyday world. These general explanations rarely provide the means to effect change (Stringer, 1999).

Assisting facilitators in using their understanding of the social and cultural context of *restorative justice* and *sociodrama* to implement the practical *socio-justice* model would address Stringer's limitations. By involving community members in *socio-justice* programs, facilitators are directly connected with the everyday world enhancing their ability to effect change. This project serves as a guideline for facilitators and community members to work together to explore social issues that are unique to that region. Racism might be a primary issue concerning criminal activity in one, whereas poverty might be a core cause of crime in another community. What is important is that, when appropriate, community members participate in conflict resolution strategies inspired by *restorative justice*.

The following two chapters examine the strengths and limitations of the *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* approaches. The *socio-justice* chapter provides the means of enhancing the positive aspects of these approaches, while addressing the challenges involved in implementing the educational model. The appendixes provide operational definitions, *socio-justice* inclusion, warm-up and ritual closure activities,

evaluation questionnaires, needs assessment questionnaires, directions for facilitators and offers suggested readings to enhance understanding of *sociodrama* and *restorative justice*.

### 1.3 SUMMARY

*Socio-justice* is a theoretical project that seeks to provide facilitators with an educational method of developing a community of conflict resolution by promoting *restorative justice* practices and increasing participation in these forums. Constructivist inquiry aids in establishing credibility for this project due to the mandate of authentically representing empirical literature and providing an opportunity for truth telling. Constructivist inquiry is similar to *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* as these methods seek to create change in the broader community. *Socio-justice* shares this goal.

The next two chapters provide a theoretical examination of *sociodrama* and *restorative justice*. Practical examples of how to conduct *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* sessions provide facilitators with a basis of understanding how to direct a *socio-justice* session. The *socio-justice* chapter outlines a session and provides a theoretical basis for the project.

## 2.0 SOCIODRAMA: AN OVERVIEW

Jacob Levy Moreno created *sociodrama* between 1921 and 1923 as a way of assisting people to encounter one another in the present moment. Moreno's intervention model creates ways of discovering that the truth about humanity resides in accepting that we are more alike than we are different (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000a). The assumption is made that the participants in a *sociodrama* program are a reflection of the social and cultural roles already existing in the broader community (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000a). Moreno (1953) based *sociodrama* on:

“the tactic assumption that the group formed by the audience is already organized by the social and cultural role which in some degree all the carriers of the culture share. It is therefore incidental who the individuals are, or of whom the group is composed or how large their number is. It is the group as a whole which has to be put upon the stage to work out its problem (p.88).”

This perception aids in the development of conflict resolution strategies as a variety of issues are addressed and illustrated during the *socio-justice* program. Diverse participation should enable facilitators and participants to understand crime and develop conflict resolution methods that should effectively create change in the broader community. The issue is discovering how to “bring a cultural order to view by dramatic methods” (Moreno, 1953, p.88). Moreno (1953) asserts that observation and analysis are not sufficient in understanding more sophisticated aspects of inter-cultural relations, and that deep action methods are essential. Deep action methods, like *sociodrama*, have value and merit because they can, “explore as well as treat in one stroke, the conflicts which have arisen between two separate cultural orders and at the time, by the same action, undertaking to change the attitude of the member of one culture versus the members of the other (Moreno, 1953, p.88).” Furthermore, deep action methods can

reach millions of local groups and communities during any point of conflict, such as open warfare or dormant issues, through radio and television (Moreno, 1953). Moreno (1953) contends that there are great potentials for drama research to provide information about the methods in which “public opinion and attitudes can be influenced or changed (p.88).” *Socio-justice* seeks to encourage public participation in *restorative justice* programs by influencing community members to develop a culture of conflict resolution.

Societal change of opinions and attitudes can occur through *sociodrama* as it deals with social problems and attempts to achieve social catharsis (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000a). Through a sharing of personal experience, social problems are defined and solved (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000a). Social problems like crime affect people on an individual basis, which in turn forms personal biases. An effective way to respond to personal bias and create change is to develop mutual understanding and empathy for others. For example, during a *socio-justice* program, one topic the participants may explore is the issues surrounding domestic violence. Through this exploration, participants may gain an appreciation for the views and feelings of both the aggressor and victim. After the enactment, they can process their insights during the reflection component of the program. Change occurs when participants explore ways of responding to crime and conflict within their community. Some examples of change can be creating anger management programs for perpetrators of domestic violence and petitioning the government to increase the number of shelters or programs for women at risk.

Moreno believed that a *sociodramatists'* tasks are to:

Organize preventive, didactic and reconstruction meetings in the community in which they live and work; to organize, upon call, such meetings in problem areas as everywhere; to enter communities confronted with emergent or chronic social issues, to enter mass meetings of strikes,



race riots, rallies of political parties, and so forth, and to handle and clarify the situation on the spot. (Wiener, 1997, p.106)

In *sociodrama* the subject is constituted by the group, the theme emerges from the agreed upon group problem, and the aim is education that promotes creative social change (Wiener, 1997).

## **2.1 PRINCIPLES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES**

### **2.1.1 PRINCIPLES**

Sternberg and Garcia (2000) note that *sociodrama* applies a kinesthetic modality to create change through using the intellectual, emotional and physical aspects of our being. Goals of *sociodrama* then must address the mind through insight, emotions through catharsis and the physical through role-training (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b).

### **2.1.2 GOALS**

Sternberg and Garcia (2000) cite *sociodrama*'s goals as catharsis, insight, and role-training. It is then the director's task to assess the group's need for these during the warm-up and then facilitate the group process in reaching them in the enactment and sharing (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Moreno contends that in *sociodrama*, catharsis is a purging of emotions that are experienced by the actors as well as the audience (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). When feelings are hidden, pent-up or go unexpressed people are limited in their ability to deal effectively in life's situations; catharsis removes emotional barriers and begins the process of viewing difficult situations in alternate ways (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). The director's task will be to clearly explain to the group that expressions of feelings are not personal attacks, confrontation, judgements, or statements of opinions (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Expressing one's feelings requires one to own and understand personal feelings and communicate them in a respectful manner

(Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). In *restorative justice* programs, participants are interviewed in order to ascertain whether it is appropriate for them to participate. An indication that an offender is prepared to participate is when they accept responsibility for their actions (Goulet, 2005). This acceptance assists the victim because they are provided with an opportunity to confront an offender and express their thoughts and feelings without being negatively challenged (Goulet, 2005). Through the expression of thoughts and feelings, the second goal of insight development may occur.

The goal of insight occurs when people experience becoming aware of something that was previously hidden; it is the “Aha!” of personal understanding (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Insight is beneficial because it enables people to examine problems in a new way (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). In *sociodrama*, insight is developed in the action, whereby understanding is experienced through role relationships (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). A participant playing the role of an abused wife might gain insight into reasons why a battered woman might chose to stay in a violent relationship. Role-playing leads to role training, which is Sternberg and Garcia’s final *sociodrama* goal.

Role training is achieved by practicing new behaviours in a safe environment. A person is able to experience a simulated problem with an other who reacts spontaneously to what is being said or enacted (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). This in turn, provides an opportunity to gain insight, comfort with playing a different role, and receive honest and immediate feedback about the role being played (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Role training involving domestic violence can address appropriate and inappropriate uses of anger. It is healthy to feel anger, but is unhealthy and destructive to express that anger

through violence. By reenacting various roles, participants can learn that there are different ways of coping with anger.

It is through the achievement of *sociodrama*'s three goals of insight, catharsis, and role training that change can occur. Change through *socio-justice* occurs when participants improve their understanding of their social environment in order to increase their desire to participate in *restorative justice* programs.

### **2.1.3 OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of the director and the group are to guide the educational process in accordance with the *sociodrama* theme, encourage group enactment, and develop social action in the broader community (Sprague, 1998).

## **2.2 STAGES: PLANNING, WARM-UP, ENACTMENT, AND SHARING**

### **2.2.1 PLANNING**

*Sociodrama* is led by a director, whose task is to achieve the group's goals within a safe and creative manner (Wiener, 1997). The qualifications of a director include group work experience or group work training, creative training techniques, and counselling or psychodrama or *sociodrama* training (Wiener, 1997).

Wiener (1997) asserts that the director, when properly conducting a *sociodrama* session, must keep five points in mind. The first is to be aware of the group type and to determine if *sociodrama* is an appropriate intervention (Wiener, 1997). Appropriateness depends on group culture; some groups are resistant to participate, a 'we are not here to play' attitude; other groups, being learning outcomes, as a very task-oriented, may not see the relevance (Wiener, 1997). When choosing *sociodrama*, the director needs to have confidence in his or her skill level ensuring that issues that arise can be properly dealt

with (Wiener, 1997). The contract between the director and the group should include experiential learning (Wiener, 1997).

Wiener's (1997) second point relates to power dynamics and anti-discriminatory considerations: the room must be accessible to all participants, e.g., wheel-chair users. The director also needs to consider how his or her background might effect his perception of the group's experience and take into consideration how the group members may respond to the director (Wiener, 1997). The director must create an environment where all participants, especially those from "less powerful societal groups" can feel physically and emotionally safe and empowered so that all will participate fully in the *sociodrama* process (Wiener, 1997).

Third, the room needs to accommodate the number of group members, props for proper change of scenes, and privacy so the members do not feel exposed (Wiener, 1997). Physical safety in limiting the risk of bodily harm is another important consideration (Wiener, 1997).

Wiener's (1997) fourth point relates to the director preparing him or herself for the session. This preparation can be achieved by finding out about the group, reflecting upon how the day might proceed, and doing any necessary research to assist the group in the social learning process (Wiener, 1997). This preparation servers as a means of guiding the action (Wiener, 1997).

Finally, the director must prepare him or herself in order to "hear the group at work" (Wiener, 1997). The director must identify the groups' verbal and non-verbal messages, in order to determine the groups themes or issues (Wiener, 1997, p.112). In

order to be aware of what is said and what is inferred the director needs to be able to monitor his or her own reactions and respond accordingly (Wiener, 1997).

### **2.2.2 WARM-UP**

The warm-up stage creates the environment in which general themes are determined, a shared central issue is selected, and the group becomes prepared to participate in the enactment (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). The warm-up may be cognitive, affective, structured or unstructured and can be initiated by the group or the director (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Cognitive warm-ups provide intellectual information, such as a discussion or lecture (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). An affective warm-up begins once the members of the group explore the feelings they have in relation to the material presented and once they are prepared for the affective issues that may occur in the enactment (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b).

The director can prepare a structured warm-up. He or she may ask the group to divide into two smaller groups and have their members' state the reasons they are for or against the death penalty. The emotional aspect of the death penalty debate is affective and can be used positively in a warm-up by creating interaction and getting the group emotionally and physically active. An unstructured warm-up is spontaneous and emerges from the interaction of the group and director with each other (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). The director may then ask a group member to begin by commenting on his or her experience with crime. If other group members discuss this topic, then a central issue may emerge. The role of the director then is to move away from the groups' personal experiences and work toward discussing similar issues on a generalized level (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b).

Wiener (1997) contends that the group warm-up has five components that need to be fulfilled in order to prepare the group for the enactment. The first steps deals with creating the group, which must include inclusion and a review of *sociodrama* aims and methods; this can be achieved by conducting a variety of exercises, such as story telling (Wiener, 1997). Second, the group needs to be warmed-up to the room in order to achieve a productive comfort level (Wiener, 1997). Comfort can be developed through movement exercises, for example getting participants to move around the room and find a space that feel most or least comfortable and share the reasons with a person near them (Wiener, 1997). Third, in order to take risks in the action and sharing process of the *sociodrama* the group needs to feel safe with each other, with the director and with the room (Wiener, 1997). Safety can be attained in a variety of ways, such as, setting up group norms (Wiener, 1997). Fourth, if the energy level is low, a physical warm-up including movement exercises, can energize the group (Wiener, 1997). Finally, relevant acting warm-ups can alleviate the worry of having to do something silly or feeling uncomfortable with acting (Wiener, 1997). In a *socio-justice* session, an example of a relevant acting exercise might be to have a parent and child discuss peer pressure and drug usage.

According to Sternberg and Garcia (2000), before the enactment can begin, a series of preparations need to be achieved. First, the group needs to vote on the central issue to be explored (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Second, the scenes need to be created to reflect the shared central issue (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Finally, the focus moves away from personal experiences to an exploration of shared societal roles that does not seek to solve an individual's emotional problem (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). The

warm-up stage serves the valuable purpose of preparing the participants and director for the *sociodrama* enactment.

### 2.2.3 ENACTMENT

The enactment stage creates the scene and roles which illustrate the collective story (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). The aim of this phase is to make the enactment more advanced and effective (Sprague, 1998). The enactment enables the group to express their feelings fully by interacting in ways that are not planned so that feelings, thoughts and reactions to situations emerge spontaneously and honestly (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Benefits of spontaneous enactment is that intellectualizing issues is limited, feelings are felt and expressed without fear of reprisal, and people are able to try new behaviours in a safe environment (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b).

Enactment is developed through the *sociodrama* theme or central issue. By using newspaper stories, photographs or by talking, the director assists the group in selecting a general theme (Wiener, 1997). Once the theme has been chosen, it needs to be given a focus (Wiener, 1997). Focus in an enactment is a scene that captures essential aspects of the central issue (Wiener, 1997). Second, participants can work together to build a proper physical space like the stage area (Wiener, 1997). Finally, roles must be created and assigned (Wiener, 1997). The director can enhance the participants understanding of each other by asking people questions while they are in role (Wiener, 1997).

According to Wiener (1997) after the scene has been set, the director needs to structure the action so that the group focus is not lost and chaos does not occur. The action can be structured by indicating when people can join in the scene and which part of the action is the focal point of the action (Wiener, 1997). Wiener (1997) states that

when the action begins, the director needs to consider a number of scene choices. First, the action to highlight (Wiener, 1997). This is necessary for monitoring the flow of action by deciding when the scene is finished (Wiener, 1997). Second, what direction the scene can go (Wiener, 1997). Finally, what scene can follow (Wiener, 1997). These decisions are based on determining the learning that is taking place, action energy, and logic of the scene (Wiener, 1997).

Wiener (1997) further maintains that the director needs to monitor the participants in order to assess who wants to satisfy his or her act hunger, but cannot find a way into the scene. The director must identify signs of distress from the participants who might be stuck in role who by changing roles can gain insight (Wiener, 1997). The director can respond to these types of challenges by applying a variety of techniques (Wiener, 1997). First, pausing the action so that a participant can express what is happening to him or her (Wiener, 1997). Second, suggesting a role to be played (Wiener, 1997). Finally, selecting a role reversal so that a person triggered by memories can be moved out of the role and benefit from observing the action as opposed to being overwhelmed by it (Wiener, 1997).

In regard to role playing, the director also needs to prepare participants to play two difficult types of roles, the abhorrent role of an 'evil' person, and the alien role, a man playing a woman (Wiener, 1997). Cook (2005) questions why a facilitator within a *restorative justice* or *socio-justice* session would want to play out abhorrent or alien roles. Cook's (2005) maintains in her work, these role types were usually dealt with during the discussion whereby participants identified that the person was "evil, dangerous, wrong or mean."



Participants are usually reluctant to play negative roles and since *sociodrama* relies on volunteer participation, the director needs to make the role safe, properly de-role the individual and ensure that the group separates the character from the individual playing the abhorrent role (Wiener, 1997). When people play roles that are alien to them, they may have a tendency to play it on a stereotypical level (Wiener, 1997). The director can create an atmosphere of respect and improving the depth of role-play by using a number of techniques (Wiener, 1997). First, by asking relevant questions, having other group members double the person in the role, group discussing the role and second, using role reversal (Wiener, 1997). The facilitator in a *socio-justice* program needs to assess the group members' readiness to play out the roles suggested in order to properly prepare the participants for the enactment.

Once the roles are assigned and the participants are involved in the enactment, the energy level must be maintained. If the energy is low at the beginning or during the scene, then the director can deploy a variety of techniques to re-involve the group in the enactment. A lack of energy at the beginning can be attributed to a number of reasons. First, the selected theme did not adequately reflect the needs of the group; second, the scene was not conducive to the expression of feelings; third, engagement of roles did not occur; and lastly, the roles were too limited for the scene to unfold (Wiener, 1997).

In *sociodrama* there are a number reasons why the energy is lost during the scene. First, the scene is completed (Wiener, 1997). Second, the feelings or issues are too powerful and the group may not feel safe enough to participate in the action (Wiener, 1997). Finally, the scene may be dominated by one or two participants (Wiener, 1997). To deal with lack of energy the director must trust his or her intuition and make the

necessary interventions (Wiener, 1997). Another tactic is to create a general or universal theme that can be brought back to the group by including them in reflecting upon the scene and encouraging them together to determine the next action (Wiener, 1997). Linda Cook (2005) recommends that the director avoid the problem of lack of energy by not allowing the scene or improvisational work to continue too long. Cook (2005) contends that a “lack of energy suggests the scene work is wandering, and that can present some group problems.”

The director keeps the energy flowing, monitors the group process, and creates an advanced and effective action by using various techniques, such as, sculpting, doubling, voices, role reversal, and soliloquy (Wiener, 1997). When *sculpting*, the underlining dynamics of a situation can be illustrated by using people or objects to create poses that represent what needs to be addressed in the action (Wiener, 1997). *Doubling* is used as a way of taking on the mannerisms of the person playing the role and giving voice to the role players unspoken thoughts and feelings (Wiener, 1997). *Voices* is a form of doubling in which participants can give voice to different perspectives that can be present in a scene (Wiener, 1997). A director can encourage participants to be a voice in order to create a societal viewpoint (Wiener, 1997). *Role reversal* is a process that enables a participant to move out of one role into another. This technique is used when it is important for participants to achieve an understanding of a situation from a different perspective or when they need protection, or when they find themselves in a confrontational state (Wiener, 1997). The technique of role-reversal, which is playing someone else’s role, also assists participants to empathize with each other (Emunah, 1994). Finally, the *soliloquy* technique allows participants, while in role, an opportunity

to express their thoughts and feelings, and can allowing people to explore a role in ways that the scene does not enable them to (Wiener, 1997).

Sternberg and Garcia (2000) use Wiener's techniques, but they also include the technique of the aside, mirroring, the empty chair, future projection, freeze frame, and walk-and-talk. These techniques allow participants to "shift perspectives, develop empathy in action, express a wide range of thoughts and/or emotions which would remain underdeveloped and unstated in a straight role play" (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b, p8).

In summary, Wiener (1997, p.121) asserts that *sociodrama* is circulatory in that "it starts with a scene, moves out to broader issues, then comes back and give fresh insight to the first scene and theme it represents." It is not necessary to struggle to create a happy ending, the sharing process will process the *sociodrama* in a way that provides exploration of thoughts and feels and will create closure for participants.

#### **2.2.4 SHARING**

The sharing stage provides an opportunity for participants to express their personal truths about how the enactment affects them personally and it offers suggestions to resolve conflict (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). The aim of the sharing process is to assist the participants to de-role and return to a normalized state (Sprague, 1998). It also enables participants to share any thoughts and feelings that were not expressed in the enactment or their views of other people's experiences (Sprague, 1998). Individual experiences is again discussed, as in the initial warm-up phase, but now it is done so in relation to what they have experienced in the enactment (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b).

According to Wiener (1997), there are at least four different aspects to the sharing process. First, sharing from role explores what was learned from playing different roles,

for example, awareness and understanding of roles (Wiener, 1997). Sharing also provides the necessary step of de-roling, which is to release the thoughts and feelings associated with playing their role (Wiener, 1997). Second, sharing out of role explores the experience and memories that are evoked during the enactment; as such, the aim of catharsis, or emotional release is achieved (Wiener, 1997). Third, sharing about the theme enables people to express what they have learned about the group theme or issue worked on (Wiener, 1997). Subsequently, social situations can be discussed properly if viewpoints are respected to ensure that alternate views will not be censored in favor of the majority (Wiener, 1997). Finally, sharing about the process, after the general sharing and perhaps a break, enables the director and group to more objectively reflect on how the *sociodrama* was conducted and to explore what was learned from the experience (Wiener, 1997).

A concluding benefit of the sharing process is finding new solutions to old problems. When other members in the group share similar experiences, participants tend to feel less isolated and more willing to explore alternative solutions to the problems explored in the enactment (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). *Socio-justice* seeks to motivate community members to take responsibility in finding viable conflict resolution strategies. This involves understanding that no one is isolated in communities and solutions may involve altering the way people view issues and solutions to crime.

### **2.3 EDUCATIONAL AND THERAPEUTIC BENEFITS**

Educational and therapeutic benefits are reflected in the goals of *sociodrama*. Educational benefits through *sociodrama* are similar to the principles of adult learning as it “draws on people’s experiences; is relevant to their concerns; it engages people in the

learning process and follows the learning cycle of people being involved in a learning experience, which they have time to reflect and theorize upon afterwards before planning new actions” (*Arts on the move*, 2000). Without have to undergo a real experience, *sociodrama* provides participants with an efficient and safe method of obtaining information area of psychic emotional experience (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000a).

*Sociodrama* is educationally and therapeutically beneficial because it enables participants to achieve catharsis, insight, and receive role training (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). During the therapeutic process, problems are explored for trying out a variety of responses within a safe environment. Role training occurs when the target behaviour becomes known, problems are clarified, a change in attitude occurs and some insight has been achieved (Blatner, 2000). Blatner (2000) claims that role training enables a participant to re-play and re-evaluate her responses in the effort of developing more effective behavioural responses. Skill building is another benefit of role training that provides people with an opportunity to practice the desired behaviour until they have mastered the desired skill (Blatner, 2000). Group members also take on roles with the implicit understanding that the role being played does not represent the actual views of the player (Blatner, 2000).

Play is also a therapeutic component of *sociodrama* through the concept of creativity and spontaneity. Jones (1996) claims that playing enables people to discover or create access to their own spontaneity. Spontaneity enables people to act, think, feel, and respond to new ideas and situations within a safe play space. The element of play enables people to have a positive relationship with reality, ultimately assisting participants to play with aspects of their life, rework issues, and try new behaviours. The

play shift occurs when participants applies these new experiences to their life outside the play space (Jones, 1996).

Interestingly, the idea of play is intimidating to most people, perhaps due to the need of social acceptance. Spontaneity is suppose to be fun, however society tends to limit this pursuit due to ideas that fun leads to destructive behaviour or self-indulgence (Goetze, 1994). Goetze (1994) maintains that, when denied an opportunity to play and to understand the difference between harmful and beneficial fun, adolescents tend to move toward socially unacceptable means of enjoyment (e.g., intoxicant abuse, truancy, etc). The paradox occurs when their dysfunctional fun, on a long-term basis becomes boring (Goetze, 1994). *Socio-justice* attempts to make the educational and therapeutic benefits of examining *restorative justice* measures more playful and interactive.

## **2.4 CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Conflict, as demonstrated through instances of crime, is present within all communities. Community problems can be contributed to ineffective communication and understanding of social issues (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Oftentimes people are reluctant to share their beliefs in a public program; however, *sociodrama* enables people to voice their opinions openly (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). Open dialogue is encouraged in all stages of *socio-justice* by providing clear and safe methods of examining potentially sensitive community issues in a public forum. Views can be expressed during the enactment when participants play roles that represent a variety of perspectives on social issues. Safety occurs by examining opinions in a general rather than specific context. A participant playing a victim can express their feelings as an actor more easily than a victim openly stating how it felt to be victimized by crime. Real

issues can be discussed without having to publicly providing information about ones personal history. Participants from diverse backgrounds can come together and explore issues by using the acting and sharing process as a unifying guide.

White (2002) asserts that *sociodrama* brings different social groups together so that opinions can be expressed and roles of others in different social systems can be played out. The benefits of expressing opinions include developing insights that expands understanding and stimulating the creativity needed to generate shared meaning and cooperation (White, 2002). Finding new responses to old problems within communities can be achieved through creating a surplus reality that enables groups to encounter each other. White (2002) contends that this encounter enables people to acknowledge important issues and change harmful attitudes like personal grievances, hopelessness, and being stuck in ones' personal roles. *Restorative justice* involves an actual encounter not surplus reality. *Socio-justice* examines issues surrounding crime through the identification of real issues as part of a surplus reality. Participants for example, can examine domestic violence and substance abuse without having to reenact a participant's personal story. The group takes the real issue of violence and creates a story to enact and reflect. The sharing assists the group in changing harmful attitudes.

Wiener (1997) asserts that in many conflict situations, *sociodramatists* will seek to help people understand the world from other people's roles. However, understanding another person's position might be counterproductive as it may make a group hesitant to act; politically, it may not be beneficial to see both sides of the coin (Wiener, 1997). A sociodramatist operating in the wider community needs to be clear about the political dimensions and who these relate to one's personal views (Wiener, 1997). Sociodramtists

are always concerned about the wider social, political and economic factors present in any situation (*Arts on the move*, 2000). Finding solutions do not always reside in textbooks as people often make decisions based on a number of internal and external factors (*Arts on the move*, 2000). *Sociodrama* gives people the opportunity to explore these different facets (*Arts on the move*, 2000).

*Sociodrama* is similar to *restorative justice*, as the focus does not only relate to present issues, but seeks to account for community needs and long term change. If people are hesitant to express honest opinions, then the group attempts to find conflict resolution strategies will be based on a limited amount of information that may not be accurate. Open collaboration is required in order to address both internal and external factors involved in the decision making process.

## 2.5 SUMMARY

*Sociodrama* is a group action method that uses collective issues in order to create the understanding that people are more alike than different. This education model provides many therapeutic benefits to the participants. The stages of the warm-up, enactment and sharing are necessary in order to achieve *sociodrama*'s goals of insight, catharsis and role training. Moreno sought to create change in the broader community by using *sociodrama* techniques to motivate action. *Restorative justice* also attempts to create change by having appropriate parties come together to repair the harms caused by crime and to develop a balance of power in relationships. *Socio-justice* combines *sociodrama* techniques with *restorative justice* principles in order to create change in the broader community. This may be accomplished by educating communities about the



benefits of participating in *restorative justice* forums and motivating individuals to take personal and collective responsibility in finding viable solutions to crime.

### ***3.0 RESTORATIVE JUSTICE: AN OVERVIEW***

The Department of the Solicitor General Canada outlines the history of *restorative justice* practices in Canada as originating in the cultures of Aboriginal peoples. Although they tend to have a broader cultural scope, the principles that underline Aboriginal practices are consistent with *restorative justice* models (Cormier, 2002). Modern application of *restorative justice* practices began in the mid-1970's with the Mennonite society in Kitchener-Waterloo which offered victim-offender facilitation in the courts (Cormier, 2002). Since then, non-governmental organizations and faith communities have taken the initiative of implementing a variety of *restorative justice* programs (Cormier, 2002). Jean-Jacques Goulet (2005) is a member of the faith community in Montréal and he works in the surrogate offender and victim field of *restorative justice*.

By the late 1980s the government was considering studies like the Daubney Report recommending that government support and promote victim and offender participation in all stages of the criminal justice process and also enable victims to receive assistance through effective victim services (Cormier, 2002). The Daubney Report also recommended that sentencing legislation reflect reparation of harm to the victims and community members of crime, thus encouraging offenders to take responsibility for their actions (Cormier, 2002). In 1996, the Criminal Code of Canada outlined sentencing objectives to include “providing reparations for harm done to victims or to the community” and “to promote a sense of responsibility in offenders, and acknowledgement of the harm done to victims and to the community” (Cormier, 2002, p.4). In the 1990's, studies, by organizations such as The National Associations Active in

Criminal Justice were exploring how *restorative justice* practices can be applied to the existing criminal justice system as a way of making society more responsible in instances of crime (Cormier, 2002). Provisions in the new Youth Offender Act, in effect since 2003, formally included *restorative justice* measures as a means for finding alternatives to sentencing.

*Restorative justice* promotes the notion that crime violates victim, offender and community relationships; as such, responses to crime should involve all participants; justice approaches are most effective when a consensus is reached (Cooley, 1999). The facilitation process is a core component in a *restorative justice* session through which terms of agreement are negotiated. The facilitation process attempts to build understanding, to create a balance of power permitting truth-telling, to repair the harm done to the victim, to support the offender in fulfilling the contractual agreement, to restore relationships, and to encourage community members to take an active approach in reintegrating victims and offenders into society (Latimer & Kleinknecht, 2000).

Correctional Services Canada, as having *Restorative Justice* Week 2004, outlined four *restorative justice* models that are widely used in Canada to respond to instances of crime; victim-offender facilitation, surrogate victim-offender *restorative justice* dialogue, peacemaking circles, and community conferencing. Victim-Offender facilitation, used in serious and violent crimes as well as for less serious crimes, prepares and provides victims and offenders with the opportunity to engage in a facilitation session that enables victims to speak openly about the harm experienced and about the financial ramifications. Offenders can take responsibility for their actions through reparations and achieve personal growth.

Surrogate victim-offender *restorative justice* dialogue is similar to victim-offender facilitation, except that the participants are not directly associated together with a particular offence (Correctional Services Canada, 2004). Offenders and victims can benefit from the dialogue by expressing their concerns and feelings about their personal experience, as closure is possible even if direct contact between the victim and his or her offender is neither possible nor appropriate (Correctional Services Canada, 2004).

Peacemaking circles, originating in traditional Aboriginal practices, encourage the community to take responsibility for crime instead of placing the burden directly on the primary participants (Correctional Services Canada, 2004). The objectives, whether the program is a healing circle, community circle, or sentencing circle, are to restore the balance of power and to explore the underlying issues related to crime in an effort to take preventive measure and to extend the findings to the broader community (Correctional Services Canada, 2004).

Community conferencing, known in Canada as family group conferencing, invites both victims' and offenders' support persons, who may or may not be family members, to participate in dialoguing about the criminal offence and in finding ways to repair harm caused by crime (Correctional Services Canada, 2004). This approach is beneficial as it assists offenders in being held accountable for their actions by addressing the harms committed, taking responsibility for their actions, and reducing the likelihood of repeat offences (Correctional Services Canada, 2004). Notwithstanding the unique aspects of various models, facilitators and participants need to respect the principles of *restorative justice* measures and appropriate session goals and objectives.

### 3.1 PRINCIPLES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1.1 PRINCIPLES

The Department of Justice Canada (2003) has created a document entitled *Restorative Justice Program Guidelines* containing the basic principles and procedural safeguards relating to the use of *restorative justice*. These principles are outlined as follows:

1. Participation of a victim and offender in a *restorative justice* process should be based on their free, voluntary and informed consent. Each party should receive a clear explanation of what the process might involve and the possible consequences of their decision to participate. Consent to participate may be withdrawn at any stage.
2. The victim and offender must accept as true the essential facts of the offence, and the offender must accept responsibility for the offence.
3. The facts must provide sufficient evidence to proceed with a charge, and the prosecution of the offence must not be barred at law.
4. The right of each party to seek legal advice before and at all stages of the process should be recognized.
5. Referrals to a *restorative justice* process can occur at all stages of the criminal justice system, from pre-charge diversion through to post-sentencing and post-release from custody in appropriate cases, and taking into account relevant prosecution policies.
6. Referrals to and conduct of a *restorative justice* process must take account of the safety and security of the parties and any power imbalances between victim and offender, with respect to either person's age, maturity, race, gender, intellectual capacity, position in the community or other factors. In particular, implied or explicit threats to the safety of either party, and whether there is a continuing relationship between the parties must be of paramount concern.
7. It is intended that all discussions within the *restorative justice* process, other than those conducted in public, be confidential, unless:
  - i. the parties agree otherwise
  - ii. their disclosure to authorities is required by law; or,
  - iii. the discussions reveal an actual or potential threat to human life or safety.

These discussions may not be used in any subsequent legal process other than in the circumstances described above.

8. The admission of responsibility by the offender for the offence is an essential part of the *restorative justice* process, and cannot be used as evidence against the offender in any subsequent legal process.
9. All agreements must be made voluntarily and contain only reasonable, proportionate and clear terms.
10. The failure to reach or to complete a *restorative justice* agreement must not be used in any subsequent criminal proceedings to justify a more severe sentence than would otherwise have been imposed on the offender.
11. The *restorative justice* program should be evaluated regularly in order to ensure that it continues to operate on sound principles and to meet its stated goals.

These outlined principles are essential in maintaining the integrity of *restorative justice* processes and the safety, confidentiality and protection of the participants.

### 3.1.2 GOALS

Susan Sharpe in her work, *Restorative justice: A Vision for Healing and Change* states that *restorative justice*'s three main program goals include: first, those most affected by crime undertake the decision-making process; second, justice becomes more healing and transformative, and finally, there is a reduction in recidivism rates (Zehr, 2002).

Jean-Jacques Goulet (2005) states that in surrogate victim offender facilitation, the goal is to provide victims with the opportunity to speak about the impact of the crime on their lives. This is extremely empowering for the victims because in the traditional justice system they do not have this possibility other than to make an impact statement (Goulet, 2005). For a victim, an offender can often grow in size and become larger than reality, more like a monster, from a psychological emotional perspective (Goulet, 2005). By meeting with an offender, even if not the actual offender, the victims grasp that the offender is also a human being who has had a particular life journey, just like them or

perhaps different (Goulet, 2005). Regardless, victims are able to find a voice to speak about their pain and to free themselves of turbulent feelings that may have been taking more space that they would want in their lives (Goulet, 2005). This freedom is in part due to their appreciation that the offender is more human than once believed (Goulet, 2005).

For offenders the experience is similar they need to hear the victim's story as they often do not see the victim as human but as an institution: "I robbed a bank, I did not hurt anyone." Or "I robbed a home, the insurance pays for it" (Goulet, 2005). So hearing the impact of these types of crimes or serious crimes - for example, a bar fight, where they have to hear from the victim's mother - gives them a deeper awareness of the impact of their crime (Goulet, 2005). The goal is to have the people meet so that a relationship with the victims can develop and a deeper understanding of self can be achieved (Goulet, 2005). Without using the language of forgiveness, victims and offenders can achieve a growing respect and understanding of each other that happens as a result of the process (Goulet, 2005). This can be extremely freeing for an offender because people from the outside, after their feelings of anger are worked through, can treat them like a human being (Goulet, 2005). Offenders, who have perpetrated such crimes as incest, have an incredible amount of shame for what they have done. Through the process of healing may occur during the six-week process, the offender can feel more at peace with themselves, laugh and joke with the other participants (Goulet, 2005). Although they may not leave with a developed friendship, they do tend to have more concern with each other (Goulet, 2005).

### 3.1.3 OBJECTIVES

The goals identified by Sharpe (2002) are achieved when the following four objectives are attained: first, the victim's participate in the process and they are satisfied by the outcome; second, the offenders take responsibility for their actions by understanding how their behaviour affects others; third, resolutions express the commitment to repair the harm done and to address the causes of the offense; and finally, reintegration and closure is felt by both the victim and the offender (Zehr, 2002).

### 3.2 STAGES: PRE-SESSION, SESSION, AND FOLLOW-UP

Most victim and offender *restorative justice* cases are initiated by a referral from the police, or the court or from a chaplain. The case is assigned to an organization that is acknowledged as competent in *restorative justice* practices. Generally, the facilitator meets first with the offender, as the process is voluntary. If the offender agrees with the terms of the process and is willing to meet with the victim, then the victim is contacted. The order of contact is created in order to avoid re-victimizing the victim by, for example, the offender choosing not to participate. Wemmers and Canuto's (2002) research has determined that there are concerns about how victims' needs are "systematically neglected" thus calling into question the adequacy of *restorative justice* practices. When victims are invited to participate in a program they do have an opportunity to obtain reparation. Yet many victims find the prospect of meeting with their offender overwhelming (Wemmers & Canuto, 2002). In some instances victims may feel pressured to participate in the *restorative justice* process because they feel pressured to help their offender to avoid adverse future problems (Wemmers & Canto, 2002). In other instances they participate because the traditional justice system does not provide an



opportunity for restitution in any practical way (Wemmers & Canuto, 2002). Wemmers and Canuto (2002) report that contacting the victim months after the offence has taken place and asking whether he or she would be interested in participating in a *restorative justice* program with the purpose of meeting with the offender, might trigger memories of the crime, thus adding to the suffering and victimization already experienced.

Wemmers and Canuto's (2002) research shows that *restorative justice* programs ensure that victims' interests are better met by allowing them to take an active role in the process by making demands and by accepting or rejecting a decision. The issue of victims being able to participate in the decision making process and exercising power in this regard is very appealing due to the absence of this ability in the traditional criminal justice system (Wemmers & Canuto, 2002). Regardless of the position one may have about the strengths and challenges of the *restorative justice* process, facilitators agree that in all stages of conflict resolution, whether it be traditional or restorative, victims and offenders need to be protected and all parties need to be treated with respect and compassion. In order to limit the amount of risks taken by victims and offenders in *restorative justice* programs, governmental and non-governmental organizations have created basic principles and guidelines for conducting *restorative justice* programs.

The types of *restorative justice* programs vary. However, there are underlying procedures and preparations that need to be completed before the session ensues. The two following guidelines from the Department of Justice Canada and the Fresno victim offender reconciliation program process are included to provide facilitators with a guide to structuring proper *restorative justice* sessions.

Regardless of what type of model is being used, the process is facilitated by third party. Department of Justice Canada (2003) has created three main guidelines to program facilitation of criminal cases. They are:

1. *Restorative justice* processes must be facilitated by fair and respected third parties known as 'facilitators'. In Aboriginal communities these may be elders. Facilitators should receive solid training in leading *restorative justice* processes. This training may be both formal and informal in nature. They should demonstrate sound judgement and effective interpersonal and communication skills. They will be responsible for establishing and maintaining a safe, respectful environment, which is sensitive to vulnerabilities.
2. Facilitators may be recruited from all sectors of society and should possess an understanding of the local cultures and communities in which they are working.
3. Ideally, the training of facilitators would provide the following skills and knowledge:
  - The values and principles of *restorative justice*
  - *Restorative justice* processes
  - Skill set of conflict resolution
  - How to effectively work with victims and with offenders
  - How to recognize and deal with issues of power imbalances
  - Understand the impact of crime on victims and the dynamics of victimization
  - The workings of the criminal justice system
  - The operation of the program in which they will work
  - The objectives of the particular model of *restorative justice* which is being used in the program

These guidelines are useful as they provide facilitators with an overview of the necessary concerns for the interests and needs of all the victims, offenders, and the public at large.

### **3.2.1 PRE-SESSION**

The pre-session prepares the victim and offender for the encounter. Ron Claassen (2002), co-director for the Center for Peacemaking and Conflict Studies wrote about the Fresno victim and offender reconciliation program process. It assists facilitators in preparing the victims and offenders of crime to meet with each other in the effort of finding viable solutions to their grievance. The facilitator will meet with the

offender and his or her support people. Another meeting will take place with the victim and his or her support people for the purpose of providing information about performing the following tasks (Claassen, 2002, p146-147):

1. The facilitator listens to their experience, trying to understand it and trying to put themselves in the other person's shoes as much as possible.
2. The facilitator informs them what a victim offender reconciliation program joint meeting process usually includes by:
  - Listening to each person's perspective on what happened and what its impact was/is and summarizing for each other to be sure that each is heard and understood.
  - Deciding on how to repair the damage (physical and relational) as much as possible.
  - Deciding on how to move forward in ways that create a safer, more just and even joyful future.
  - Deciding on how accountability will be handled (usually with a specific trusted person and with follow-up meetings).
3. They discuss the ground rules that will guide the meeting.
  - Allow the facilitator to lead the process.
  - Tell the facilitator if the process seems like it is not fair or is not covering what you thought you agreed to.
  - Agree to no name-calling or profanity.
  - Be willing to summarize when requested by the facilitator.
4. They discuss the purpose for meeting: to listen to each other and search for ways to repair the damage and make things as right as possible.
5. They discuss any questions they might have about the process and purpose.
6. They invite them to consider who should be at the meeting.
7. They discuss the need for voluntary participation for a cooperative process like this to be constructive.
8. An invitation is offered to participate in a Victim Offender Reconciliation Program meeting.

9. If they decide to participate in a Victim Offender Reconciliation Program meeting, they discuss future convenient dates, times, and places.
10. If they are unsure or if they do not want to participate, they discuss alternatives. Preparation is not necessarily limited to one meeting, so it is important the facilitator have a clear understanding of the needs of the participants and extend the preparation phase until necessary.

Umbreit (2000) maintains that preparing the parties does not mean explaining the process and securing their participation; rather, a culturally sensitive approach means to listen to their story, attempt to understand their communication style and areas of comfort, and identifying the impact the crime had on the people involved. The principle aim of the pre-session is to reduce any anxiety parties may have in respect to the process and have the participants build a rapport with the facilitator so that they feel safe enough to lead an honest and respectful discussion with minimum intervention from the facilitator (Umbreit, 2000). When the parties have decided which support people should be present, how large the group should be, the time and place of the session, the potential benefits and risks and describe how the session is conducted (Umbreit, 2000), then they can proceed to the *restorative justice* session itself.

### 3.2.2 SESSION

In Claassen's (2002) victim offender reconciliation process, the participants usually meet for one session during which time they describe their experience and history of the offence and the impact the crime has on their life. To maximize the participants' understanding of the personal stories being told, they summarize each others' statements (Claassen, 2002). If the victim chooses not to re-tell the offender's story, then a support person may perform this task (Claassen, 2002). When the story is summarized it is important for the participants to be cognizant of how their verbal and non-verbal

communication might be perceived by others. It is necessary that a person's story be mirrored in a non-confrontational and respectful way.

Gehm (1998) explains that using narration requires the facilitator to re-frame the stories by examining its logic (plot), characters and shared themes. The aim is to have all parties identify a common theme in order to create a new narrative that moves away from the content of the story to the process that the story ignites in both the teller and the listener (Gehm, 1998). It is important to consider the multi-dimensional aspects, such as unique sense of injury, personal history, and perception of events because the characters will not possess identical stories (Gehm, 1998). It is important to understand the differences between story and discourse.

Narration theory holds a two-level model that consists of story and discourse; story deals with surface issues, whereas the discourse refers to the deeper and unique aspect of the story (Gehm, 1998). Gehm (1998) provides an example of a house being burglarized: the story is the house was burglarized, property destroyed, belongings taken, anger felt; discourse of the same story will be unique to each person telling the story depending on his or her personal meaning of house, property, anger. Aboriginal approaches to peacemaking use storytelling as a universal component of conflict resolution as it creates understanding among people (Gehm, 1998).

When people understand the essential aspects of each others stories through the sharing, then the issues of restoring equity and creating a safer and respectful relationship between the parties can be explored. Equity can be restored in as much as it is reasonably possible (Claassen, 2002). This varies from victim to victim (Claassen, 2002). Reparation can include an apology, financial compensation, or community service; what

is important are that the participants are able to discuss what is relevant to their own needs. Restoring equity in some cases simply means that the victim at some point needs to let go. It is reported that if the offender makes a serious effort at fulfilling his or her responsibilities then the process is made easier for the victim (Claassen, 2002). The creation of a safer and more respectful and civilized future for all those concerned is discussed (Claassen, 2002).

The final task of a *restorative justice* session is to prepare the contract that must be respected by the offender and agreed to by everyone. This is a concrete measure of how a balance of power can be achieved as it outlines how reparations can be made to the victim and assists the offender in taking responsibility. When the contract has been fulfilled, closure can be more readily achieved. The follow-up stage is designed to assist the offender in completing the contract.

### **3.2.3 FOLLOW-UP**

The follow-up stage is essential and the same amount of time that was invested in the preparation phase and in the actual session should be given to this stage (Claassen, 2002). If an agreement is created but not kept, then the trust that was developed can evaporate (Claassen, 2002). Family members play an important role in assisting the offender in achieving his or her goal; facilitators provide further support by maintaining regular contact with all those involved (Claassen, 2002).

Umbreit (2000) asserts that the facilitator will be considered dependable if they, first, monitor the completion of the agreement and makes themselves available to be of assist if necessary; second, notify the victim when the agreement has been completed or inform the victim if any changes are made; third, schedule any additional sessions if

requested; and finally, maintain phone contact with all parties and continue contact with the victim for up to six months, even if the contract has been completed.

### **3.3 EDUCATIONAL AND THERAPEUTIC BENEFITS**

Gehm (1998) uses the theoretical framework of narration to explain how story telling serves as a therapeutic process and as a means of creating greater self-awareness, especially in many aboriginal cultures. Aboriginal cultures believe that the power of stories can heal and bind communities together and these stories are a ritualistic process that is associated with healing conflicts (Gehm, 1998). Concerning criminal victimization, the effects of story-telling still need to be better understood. It is important, however, that participants are provided with an opportunity to “begin to construct new stories in the presence of the very ‘de-constructor’ of the original one” (Gehm, 1998).

The use of storytelling is therapeutic as it organizes information and the process of discourse in a way of “accessing, experiencing, and verbally expressing the stored meaning surrounding past events” (Gehm, 1998). Even if the idea of sharing a personal trauma is overwhelming, when people engage in storytelling that contains concrete examples, often a reduction in anxiety is felt (Gehm, 1998). This urge to share personal trauma, likened to wanting to tell others about a nightmare upon waking, enables us to make the experience memorable in the same way as a dream and not just a haze of undifferentiated fears (Gehm, 1998). If one does not organize and process the trauma, then he or she risks the experience will emerge later through new fearful associations with the experiences that were thought to be forgotten (Gehm, 1998).

When applying narration theory to victim-offender facilitation programs, it is consistently found that “a generalized reduction in fear and anxiety among participants

victims, both fear of being re-victimized by the particular offender as well as more free floating anxiety” (Gehm, 1998). Narration theory findings are not conclusive enough to suggest that *restorative justice* programs use narration as a macrosystem; narration simply offers a useful tool for facilitators, researchers, and policy makers to explore the multi-dimensional aspects of conflict resolution (Gehm, 1998).

*Restorative justice* provides the victim with a meaningful voice and satisfies the need to be consulted and understood (Latimer & Kleinknecht, 2000). Wilma Derksen is a secondary victim of homicide. In 1989, her thirteen-year-old daughter was taken to a shack where she was victimized, tied and left to die. Derksen explains that victims’ needs include truth-seeking, prevention and assurance that the crime will not happen again, as well as remorse and repentance from the offender in the effort of creating a feeling of safety. These needs are not typically addressed in the traditional court system (Campbell & Joy, 2001). For offenders, the process becomes therapeutic when they begin to speak out of truthfulness and to take responsibility for their actions and repair the harms caused to others (Latimer & Kleinknecht, 2000). Offenders, when summarizing the victim’s story gain valuable insight and develop empathy when performing this task (Claassen, 2002). The community receives benefits from the criminal justice system becoming humanized, and the degree of fear is lessened because more accurate information about offenders and crime in general are provided (Latimer & Kleinknecht, 2000).

According to Jean-Jacques Goulet (2005), the majority of victims who participate in these programs do not know their actual offender yet they still have the wounds resulting from the event. Goulet offers a program called *Face-to-face*. This program gives victims an opportunity to talk about the impact the event had on their lives. Crimes



such as breaking-and-entering or bank robberies do not provide an opportunity for the victim to confront the offender because he or she has not yet been caught (Goulet, 2005). Victims however, can deal with their wounds by speaking with offenders who have committed similar types of crimes (Goulet, 2005). Incest crimes are different as the victim knows the offender but may not be ready to confront them, or the offender is dead. Regardless, victims are at the point in their healing journey where they can meet with an incest offender in an effort of working on their wounds (Goulet, 2005).

Offenders also have an opportunity to experience therapeutic benefits from participating in *Face-to-face* encounters. Goulet (2005) explains that offenders are selected by chaplains, psychologists or social workers from the prison center who are familiar with their clients' file and who understand that their clients' interest in participating stems from a desire to move beyond past criminal behaviour. In incest cases, offenders undergoing a program at the penitentiary can develop remorse for their actions. These offenders are often not permitted to have contact with their victims (Goulet, 2005). Programs like *Face-to-face* can provide the offender with a surrogate victim to dialogue with (Goulet, 2005).

When examining therapeutic benefits accorded to victims of serious crimes, Goulet (2005) explains that facilitators who work with victims have a valid concern of not revictimizing them. Goulet (2005) further states that in some cases however, their concern resembles that of an overprotective parent in not giving the victims the right to decide: "Do I want to do something about this, do I want to express my anger?" In *Face-to-face* groups, victims have a certain amount of anger they are going to be expressing (Goulet, 2005). When cases involve incest murder, their feelings can be a lot more

intense (Goulet, 2005). *Face-to-face* facilitation gives victims an opportunity for healing that they may not be able to achieve in the traditional justice system (Goulet, 2005).

Secondary victims of secondary murder, for example, can direct their anger toward the justice system because the sentencing imparted was not harsh enough, but even a harsh sentence may not help them cope with their pain (Goulet, 2005). Goulet (2005) believes that it would be beneficial to give these victims an opportunity to meet the offender or surrogate offender, express their anger and tell them how their life has worsened because of their actions. Offenders who are willing to participate are ready to hear these feelings because they are not in denial, accept their responsibility and do want to benefit from hearing victim statements (Goulet, 2005).

Goulet (2005) states therapeutic benefits for the offender includes more serenity, peace, and self-acceptance. Victims, feel more empowered and offenders develop more awareness of others, self-awareness and self-acceptance (Goulet, 2005). These benefits on a broader level are demonstrated by, for example, incest offenders in prison being less angry and able to be more at peace. Other benefits experienced by some victims and offenders experienced after a *Face-to-Face* meeting are physical changes like less tightness in their bodies, feeling more at peace, courage to speak up for themselves and no longer being victims in other parts of their lives (Goulet, 2005).

In reference to educational benefits, Goulet (2005) states that when victims and offenders become more aware of each other as human beings and understand the pain in each other's lives, participants can meet together in each other's pain and become more connected. This educational benefit is important as crimes tend to make people lose touch of the reality that we are all human beings (Goulet, 2005).

Therapeutic benefits are outlined by Bira Huculak, a Saskatchewan provincial court judge. In circle sentencing Bira Huculak states that three to seven hour process is very demanding as participants need to listen, hear and respect what others have to say (as cited in Campbell and Joy, 2001). When the process is respected, a space is opened for healing (as cited in Campbell and Joy, 2001). Huculak mentions that circle sentencing is a very emotional experience and all participants need to be open to emotion and feelings in an effort to develop empathy and understanding. During this process, Huculak notes, a Gestalt-like shift, a spiritual or magical change develops from within, enabling participants to feel a sense of connectedness, which is absent in the traditional justice system (as cited in Campbell and Joy, 2001). Huculak contends that the circle process combines aboriginal concepts of healing with western concepts of sentencing: this results in honoring both aboriginal traditions while honoring the western tradition of rights and procedures (as cited in Campbell and Joy, 2001).

Education and therapeutic benefits are sought in non-traditional approaches in an effort of serving the needs of victims, offenders and community members. Conflict resolution and community development strategies, in faith and aboriginal communities seek to develop a sense of connectedness and long term resolution.

### **3.4 CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Dr. Michael Haley describes *restorative justice* as being a philosophical and spiritual movement reflecting on criminal justice reform (as cited in Campbell and Joy, 2001). According to Dr. Haley crime in breaks human relationships, destroys the peace and security held in a community and impacts on victims and offenders living in peace

and security (as cited in Campbell & Joy, 2001). Dr. Haley asserts that these issues will not be resolved unless the harms have been healed through peaceful measures.

The types of crimes that *restorative justice* programs have mediated vary from minor infractions like mischief and theft under \$5000.00 to serious offences of assault, and in some instances, homicide. The issue of what types of crimes can be appropriately mediated within a *restorative justice* framework is of concern to facilitators and the public. Although the idea of mediating serious crimes may seem potentially harmful as it may re-victimize the victim, Wemmers and Canuto (2002) remind us that victimization surveys indicate that 74% of violent crime involves a relationship between the victim and offender. The fact that a relationship exists makes *restorative justice* measures suitable, but the seriousness of the crime may make facilitation less appropriate due to the fact that most *restorative justice* programs are designed to respond to non-violent cases (Wemmers and Canuto (2002). The pre-session process will assist facilitators in determining what cases are suitable for facilitation.

In regard to conferencing sessions, Umbreit's (2000) research indicates that a wide range of minor offences like property infractions and simple assault charges are appropriate to mediate. Zehr (2002) writes that conferences are being created to deal with violent crimes like aggravated assault, rape and murder. Often the offender is already in prison and therefore the goal is not to impact on his or her case or parole opportunities, but is used after appropriate preparation as a means of creating a powerful and positive experience for all parties (Zehr, 2002). In some cases the conference was held between direct victim and offender; however, surrogate victim-offender conferences are also used within the prison system as a type of victim-oriented offender rehabilitation

(Zehr, 2002). Under this format, offenders can begin to understand and take responsibility for what they have done and victims have an opportunity to share their stories with offenders (Zehr, 2002).

The *Community Holistic Circle Healing* (CHCH) process, used by the Hollow Water First Nation, uses Aboriginal teachings and traditions to address sexual abuse in an holistic manner and includes victims, offender (victimizer) and their respective families and community members (Solicitor General Canada, 2002). Native communities often have more of a need to address more serious crimes due to their strong community culture and high level of co-existence. Their traditions outline the conflict resolution process as demonstrated by the *Community Holistic Circle Healing* process' 13-step format. It begins with "disclosure by the victimizer or the victim and ensuring safety and support for the victim, followed by circles with the victim and the victimizer and preparatory meetings with their families, leading to a special gathering/healing circle and ending with a cleansing ceremony" (Solicitor General Canada, 2002). The underlining theme is "healing as a return to balance" (Solicitor General Canada, 2002). Research studies on *Community Holistic Circle Healing* practices, over a ten year period, indicate that only 2 of the 107 offenders re-offended (Solicitor General Canada, 2002).

In order to resolve conflict in a lasting and meaningful way, all parties, offenders, victims, support people, community members, and justice professionals must take an active role in responding to the instances and aftermath of crime. Offenders need to be welcomed back into the community and victims need to receive proper support to assist them in coping with their suffering. *Restorative justice* programs serve the community by providing mutually agreed conflict resolution procedures and obligations. Claassen

(2002) acknowledges that trust and forgiveness can develop when injustices are recognized and negotiated agreements attempt to restore equity and are fulfilled.

Glen Flett, convicted of homicide, describes his experience in circle sentencing as demanding and humbling: he now recognizes that he will never be able to take back the pain he has caused to his victims; but he can find ways of seeking reparation by helping kids, and participating in crime prevention programs so that he can make his community safer, and become a better father and community member (as cited in Campbell and Joy, 2001). Although Flett was not able to have contact with the victim's family, he was able to deal with another secondary victim: his own family (as cited in Campbell and Joy, 2001).

Judge Barry Stuart, Yukon territorial court judge states community participation in circle process, which includes the offender(s), victim (s), family members and their support network (e.g., hockey coach, school teacher, people at work) need to be present in an effort to unravel the dysfunctional relationships and breakdown of relationship that crime has committed (Zannis, 1997). Judge Stuart describes circles as a very natural way of people being able to feel like equals in dealing with the issues that they share (Zannis, 1997). Judge Stuart contends that communities heal and grow stronger when people participate in taking responsibility for their own problems (Zannis, 1997).

### 3.5 SUMMARY

Umbreit (2002), a specialist in creating victim sensitive *restorative justice* conferences, and Moreno (1953), the creator of *sociodrama*, as well as other facilitators all recognize that to dialogue with the other means to look at the world through the eyes of another. This core theme underlines *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* principles.

When using *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* interventions, the seriousness of the crime is secondary to how the participants are prepared for the session. As Wemmers and Canuto (2002) write, violent crime predominately involves people who are in a relationship. Judge Stuart has personal experience in witnessing Aboriginal communities take responsibility for crime due to the understanding that they, as a people, are interconnected (as cited in Zannis, 1997). An important goal of *restorative justice* is to repair the harm caused by crime. In order to facilitate this process, communities must be motivated to participate. Victims however choose not to participate in *restorative justice* forums for a variety of reasons like fear of revitalization (Wemmers and Canuto, 2002).

The *socio-justice* project aims to combine *sociodrama* techniques with *restorative justice* principles and practices in an effort to provide facilitators with an educational model that promotes understanding about *restorative justice* methods and to provide participants with a forum to dialogue about crime and healing within their community.

#### **4.0 SOCIO-JUSTICE: AN INTEGRATED MODEL**

*Restorative justice* and *sociodrama* aim to develop strong community relations through effective communication and sharing of personal truths. *Sociodrama* is a group action method that focuses on providing practice in solving human relations' problems through acting out agreed-upon social situations spontaneously (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). *Restorative justice* promotes the notion that crime violates victim, offender, and community relationships (Cooley, 1999). Responses to crime should involve all parties and justice approaches are most effective when a balance of power is created and consensus is reached. *Socio-justice* programs involve victims and offenders of crime, their support people, facilitators, like police officers, clergy, and social workers and the community at large. *Sociodrama* is the technique that the *socio-justice* program uses to educate community members about *restorative justice* and provides an opportunity for participants to dialogue about how to heal from the harms caused by crime.

The theoretical integration of *restorative justice* measures with *sociodrama* techniques may enhance the conflict resolution process by increasing community participation in responding to crime by providing a structure that transcends cultural barriers and examines personal and collective prejudice. *Restorative justice* measures provide an opportunity to develop understanding and create solutions to crime through sharing personal truths, developing a balance of power and negotiating the conditions of resolution through a balance of power. Despite the opportunity to dialogue, however, miscommunication can occur because it is difficult to truly appreciate another's personal constructs (Neimeyer, 1993). Community conflict occurs as a result of inadequate



communication or misunderstanding because the information has not been processed efficiently (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b).

People are often reluctant to voice their opinions in public, but when *sociodrama* is the format for communication, participants have more of a tendency to speak freely (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). *Sociodrama* is an excellent means of understanding personal constructs within a community setting. As Moreno (1941) wrote, the purpose of *sociodrama* is to mobilize people around social issues and provide a place to explore these problems and the human interaction and feelings surrounding those concerns.

The setting of *socio-justice* is similar to *sociodrama* as they both add the element of ritual to the session. Lewis (2000, p.425) describes a ritual as the ability to establish a “ceremonial frame, space, time and demeanor for transformative purposes.” *Socio-justice* is also a group action method and uses the community to “celebrate or explore or heal through ceremonial and artistic action” (Lewis, 2000, p.425). The *socio-justice* process is based on creating physical and emotional safety for participants. The process provides guidelines for facilitators to follow. Facilitators however, need to take into consideration their unique community and participant needs and make changes accordingly.

## **4.1 PRINCIPLES, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES**

### **4.1.1 PRINCIPLES**

The primary principle of *socio-justice* is to do no harm, especially to those members of society who already feel vulnerable and are, in reality or otherwise, oppressed. The concept of doing no harm is cited in clinical codes of ethics like the *American Psychological Association*. It is the basis of any social service intervention.

Although *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* procedures are not therapy, there are therapeutic elements present due to the sensitivity of the subject matter. Protection against harm also includes establishing group norms, such as confidentiality practices and respecting the personal dignity of others. Facilitators need to collaborate with participants in establishing physical and emotional safety guidelines.

#### **4.1.2 GOALS**

*Socio-justice* goals are to reach a broad cross-section of society and have these cultures represented in a *socio-justice* program. This may increase the likelihood that diversity of needs, beliefs, ideas and feelings are heard and responded to. *Socio-justice* seeks to provide communities with an educational tool that provides creative methods of building mutual understanding, cooperation, and healing that transcend cultural differences, personal bias and ineffective communication. The idea of creating change in the broader community by the creation of a culture of community conflict resolution, which can be demonstrated by individuals taking responsibility for there self and others, is another *socio-justice* goal.

#### **4.1.3 OBJECTIVES**

*Socio-justice* will approach goal achievement through creating an environment of security, sharing, learning, and fun. *Sociodrama* is an educational enactment method that uses spontaneity, dialogue, and dramatic interaction as a motivational tool. Historically, theater has been a means for people to experience catharsis, gain insight into another person's experience, and motivate society to action.

## **4.2 FIVE STAGES OF SOCIO-JUSTICE: PROGRAM STRUCTURE**

### **4.2.1 STAGE ONE: PRELIMINARY PLANNING**

If an organization or facilitator is interested in conducting a *socio-justice* program, the following are recommended guidelines:

- 1) Develop an in-depth understanding of *sociodrama*, *restorative justice* and how to facilitate a *socio-justice* program.
- 2) Develop extensive knowledge about the various cultures represented in the community (e.g., approaches to conflict resolution, social perceptions, communication styles, social history, and collective needs)
- 3) Begin to contact community and social service organizations in the area conduct a needs assessment (see appendix D). Once the needs assessments are returned, compile the findings to determine general interest and their concerns and reasons for supporting this endeavor as a means of estimating the potential dynamics and risks involved.
- 4) Develop precautionary measures to respond to the issues raised by the needs assessment. For instance if a women's group is concerned about the experience triggering negative past experience(s), the facilitator can have a contact list of mental health workers, social service organizations and crisis hotline numbers available to participants. It would also be beneficial to have social service workers or volunteers to speak with people after the session is completed (as 12-step programs offer after meetings, e.g., Alcoholic Anonymous).
- 5) Advertise the *socio-justice* program in the community through:
  - Media: radio, television, newspapers

- Community Organizations: church groups, YMCA, St. Leonard's Society, John Howard Society, ethnic centers, youth groups
- Judicial & Social Service: police, Children's Aid Society
- Victim Organizations: RCMP, Elizabeth Fry Society, Women's Shelters

At this stage, advertising does not need to have meeting dates set. Interested parties will contact your organization directly and it will provide the opportunity to conduct a needs assessment with an organization or individual. You will also establish a contact list and will inform them of up-coming dates.

- 6) Begin the preliminary process of structuring the *socio-justice* program by:
  - i. Developing a contact list of organizations and individuals that have asked about the program. On the list, make brief notes about whether or not there was interest or concerns about participating and tentative meeting dates.
  - ii. Scheduling any meetings that need to take place before the pre-session meeting. The purpose of these meetings is to prepare any participants who may feel apprehensive about attending a pre-session meeting. Participants need to be informed that if they attend the pre-session meeting, it is not assumed that they will commit to the program. The number of meetings will impact on when the pre-session meeting can take place.
  - iii. Estimating an approximate number of people who might be willing to participate in order to select an appropriate venue, tentative date, and time to conduct the pre-session meeting(s), rehearsal(s), performance night, and plan of action and evaluation meeting. Have these tentative dates available during the pre-session meeting.

- iv. Contact everyone on the contact list and inform him or her of the pre-session meeting date, time and venue. Since the planning of the program is to take into consideration of the needs assessment, also contact those people who did not express an interest and explain how their needs have or will be addressed and re-invite them to attend.

#### **4.2.2 STAGE TWO: PRE-SESSION MEETING AND REHEARSAL:**

**PRE-SESSION MEETING** – Schedule based on a maximum of 30 participants

**TIME: 2 HOURS**

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| 20 Min.  | Inclusion Games – (e.g., name game – see Appendix A)  |
| 10 Min.  | Reviewing <i>socio-justice</i> brochure   |
| 40 min.  | Questions and answer period   |
| 15 Min.  | Coffee Break  |
| 15 Min   | Establishing <i>socio-justice</i> program dates. If there are not enough people present (at least 12 to 15 participants are needed) allow for further advertising if necessary. The rehearsal date however should be held within the following two weeks in order maintains group motivation. |
| 20 min.  | Closure Ritual: This activity should remain the same in all meetings as it creates familiarity and it lets group know the session is over (see appendix A).   |
| Handout: | <i>Sociodrama</i> techniques – To be reviewed by the rehearsal date (see appendix C).   |

### **Purpose of Pre-Session Meeting:**

1. To determine interest and willingness to commit to the process, take care of issues or concerns raised and set dates
2. Make alternate plans. If, for example, not many people attended the meeting and/or not many people have expressed an interest in participating further in the program, one can advertise again and hold a separate meeting. Note: If this option is selected, the participants will need to know before leaving that further advertising will be conducted. This may impact negatively on the group dynamics, as a group environment will have already begun. It is important to explain to the group that a certain number of people are needed in order to conduct the program, so accepting more people will be beneficial to the group process. If there seems an adequate and committed number of participants willing to attend the rehearsal, then delaying further advertising until you see how many people attend the rehearsal.
3. If the group requests another meeting to obtain more information before committing to participate then schedule one. Keep in mind that this is the core group and their needs must be addressed. If only a few people require further information, take a break, ask them in private if they are will to meet or speak with the facilitator individually. Adjust the schedule according to the response received.

### **REHEARSAL**

#### **TIME: 3 HOURS**

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 10 min. | Inclusion: Theater name game   |
| 20 min  | Safety & Security: Setting-up group rules/norms of conduct and respect |
| 15 min  | Review <i>sociodrama</i> techniques hand out                           |

- |         |  |
|---------|--|
| 15 min. | Coffee break   |
| 80 min. | <i>Sociodrama</i> : Emphases on practicing techniques                                      |
|         | 25 min - Warm-up to determine group theme (see appendix A).                                |
|         | 30 min – Enactment   |
|         | 25 min – Sharing   |
| 15 min. | Coffee break   |
| 15 min  | Debriefing: To determine if the group would like another rehearsal before the performance. |
| 10 min  | Closure Ritual: Follow previously selected closing ritual.                                 |

**Purpose of Rehearsal:**

1. To develop group cohesion, thus enhancing the level of safety and familiarity of *sociodrama* techniques that will increase the level of honest and genuine sharing of feelings and experiences during the performance night.
2. Determine if the group requires another rehearsal.
3. Confirm performance night date and assess interest in further participation. If interest in further participation is minimal, discuss and address participant concerns.
4. Reevaluate the needs of the group and take appropriate action. If the group rules were not respected and a participant expressed, either directly or indirectly, concern or displeasure then take action by having the group review the norms and talk about the importance of establishing trust through respect and cooperation, etc.

### 4.2.3 STAGE THREE: *SOCIO-JUSTICE* PERFORMANCE: INCLUSION, WARM-UP, ENACTMENT, SHARING AND CLOSING RITUAL

#### Materials Required:

- Private large work space with a stage and audience area. If no stage is available, then the space can be converted to a theater Black Box (audience area/chairs forms the outline of the stage area – on 3 sides, sides and front of the actors).
- Table (placed away from stage) of refreshments and snacks
- Contact list of mental health and social service organizations in the area, and if available, emergency care service information (e.g., suicide hotline, sexual assault clinic). If there is a volunteer support person, introduce them to the group.

#### Time: 3 Hours

15 min.	Inclusion Activity: Use a game that builds group cohesion and trust (see Appendix A).
10 min.	Review of group norms
2 hrs / 20 min.	<i>Sociodrama</i> : Warm-up, Enactment and Sharing
	25 min. - Warm-up
	45 min. - Enactment
	20 min. - Coffee Break
	50 min. - Sharing
15 min.	Closure Ritual: Follow previously selected closing ritual.

#### Purpose:

1. To prepare the group for the enactment and select a central theme and group issue.
2. To enact the group issue and develop a collective story.



3. To engage the group in the sharing process in order to provide an opportunity to achieve the therapeutic benefits of insight, catharsis and role-training practice.

#### **4.2.4 STAGE FOUR: PLAN OF ACTION AND EVALUATION MEETING**

Meeting should be held within two weeks after the performance

##### **Materials Needed:**

- Flip chart paper, markers of different color, tape
- Large room that small group work can be performed
- 6 large tables

##### **Time 3 hours & 30 min:**

- |         |   |
|---------|---|
| 15 min  | Inclusion Activity: (see appendix A)  |
| 30 min  | Small group work (maximum 5 people per group) – Brainstorming about how to create a community culture of conflict resolution, both individually and as a collective. Post flip chart on the wall by your workspace. |
| 15 min  | Coffee Break  |
| 20 min  | Large group walks around the group reviewing other groups' findings. The flip charts are brought to the front of the group after 20 minutes.  |
| 30 min. | Large group discussion  |
| 10 min. | Closure Ritual: Follow previously selected closing ritual.  |
| 30 min. | Evaluation Questionnaire  |

##### **EVALUATION**

After the closing ritual, ask the participants to fill out the evaluation form before leaving the meeting. This will ensure that all participants provide feedback (see appendix E).

This evaluation can provide information about participant needs, concerns, conflict resolution strategies and resources available.

**Purpose:**

1. To process the performance experience
2. To discuss how to create a culture of community conflict resolution

#### **4.2.5 STAGE FIVE: FOLLOW-UP AND ASSESSMENT**

A follow-up should be implemented three months after the plan of action and evaluation meeting. The follow-up is a procedure to assess feelings and to meet the concerns of the participants. This can be done in a letter, e-mail or by telephone. If however, there are concerns about a participant, based on observations made in the previous stages, then he or she should be contacted immediately. If the group desires, another meeting can be scheduled in order to process their experience collectively and attain closure. The assessment determines the effectiveness of the *socio-justice* program. The main goal is to determine if there are signs of change created in the broader community (see appendix F).

### **4.3 FIVE STAGES OF SOCIO-JUSTICE: THEORETICAL OVERVIEW**

#### **4.3.1 STAGE ONE: PRELIMINARY PLANNING**

One way of educating community members about the benefits of participating in programs inspired by restorative justice is to promote *socio-justice* sessions in communities. Promotional tools include, but are not limited to, television, radio, and newspaper coverage, internet sites, canvassing, telephone soliciting, community meetings, and through dialogue with community professionals. It is essential that all participants be properly informed about the purpose and procedures involved in

participating in a *socio-justice* program. Safety, respect, and confidentiality must be protected. By conducting these sessions, it is assumed that, with proper promotion, knowledge of *socio-justice*, *restorative justice*, and *sociodrama* will be more widespread.

#### **4.3.2 STAGE TWO: PRE-SESSION MEETING AND REHEARSAL**

##### **4.3.2.1 PRE-SESSION MEETING**

The pre-session meeting begins the group process called *inclusion*. The inclusion process is an essential part of group work as it creates a shared understanding of why participants have come together, defines the tasks to be accomplished and performed, develops a sense of belonging and acceptance, begins the process of trust formation, and outlines the possible benefits of participating in the group. In *socio-justice*, the why of participation relates to understanding *restorative justice* and to learn how to create a culture of community conflict resolution. Benefits of participation can include, empowerment, healing, developing a stronger feeling of personal safety, taking responsibility for self and assisting and motivating others to do the same, and creating change on a broad level. The time allotment for the inclusion phase will depend upon the following: number of participants, how often the community has previously participated in a *socio-justice* program, number of new participants, assessment of group cohesion, and recommendations from the director and participants.

In order for the group to achieve their goals and receive benefits, trust formation is essential and the process of developing group trust begins in the inclusion stage. J.R. Gibb has advanced a theory of trust formation known as *TORI* (*Trust* being who I am; *Openness*, showing who I am; *Realization*, doing what I want; and *Interdependence*, being with others) (as cited in Kass, 2002). This theory of trust formation in groups

maintains that trust is the “peacemaker variable” in growth development, whereas, fear is the crippling force working against trust building (as cited in Kass, 2002). Gibb maintains that people entering groups do so with either trust or fear (as cited in Kass, 2002). Gibb describes these polar opposites in this manner:

*Trust* creates the flow and gentles the mind-body-spirit. When I trust myself I am able to enter fully into the process of discovering and creating who I am. When I trust my own inner processes I am able to allow you in. And when I trust the processes of living I am able to join others in the life journey.

*Fear* stops the flow and arouses the defences. I direct my energies not into discovering and creating, but toward protecting myself from seen, expected or fantasized dangers. I am not sure of who I am, cover up and put on protective masks, become concerned about how I ought to meet the expectations of others, and find it difficult to be with others. (Kass, 2002, p.25).

*Restorative justice* deals with people who may have been victimized by crime, have negative or fearful opinions of others: their needs are more related to wanting to feel safe rather than engaging in dialogue. Anger might be used as a coping mechanism for a deep felt sense of loss. *Socio-justice* seeks to engage participants in a cooperative trust building that attempts to repair harm, to achieve a balance of power, to develop empathy and understanding, and to create change in the broader community.

Gibb claims that if a person has a high or healthy degree of trust assumptions, he or she is more likely to take risks even if the group has not yet established a “climate of psychological safety” (as cited in Kass, 2002, p.33). It is the person who entrusts him or herself to others who can significantly aid in creating a trusting group climate (as cited in Kass, 2002). Once this climate is created then a free flow of open communication is maximized and feedback given is provided in order to respond effectively to goal formation and decision-making (as cited in Kass, 2002).

Benefits of a trusting climate include a shift from humour to warmth; diversity is accepted and members are able to spontaneously express opinions which aids in generating data for problem-solving (as cited in Kass, 2002). Gibb further maintains that conflict is openly expressed and is responded to appropriately, member involvement is increased, the group has confidence in the work being done, tasks and roles are optimally distributed, and cooperation is in evidence (as cited in Kass, 2002).

Gibb also suggests that the facilitator can assist participants in reducing their fear in five ways: first, by creating and communicating the need to have a climate of psychological safety present; second, participants are encouraged to express their fears as these fears become owned and shared, they become more accepted and are easier to deal with; third, members are made to understand that they are not alone (the idea of commonality aids the group, especially during the natural mistrust and fear stage of group involvement); fourth, the participants' use of maintenance roles is developed to enable them to clarify ideas, support others, to highlight what is not only expressed, but what is wanted by the group members; finally, the director/facilitator can aid in nurturing a participant's ability to be spontaneous as individuals can develop and ability to "learn from the inside out" (as cited in Kass, 2002).

Gibb notes that growth of the group is reflected by an member's ability to grow which in turn creates a reciprocal dynamic (as cited in Kass, 2002). Gibb's ideas of reciprocity moves "toward trust and personal relationships and away from fear and impersonal relationships" (as cited in Kass, 2002, p.43). Goulet (2005) has experienced this dynamic in his *restorative justice* work, whereby participants leave the group with a real concern for the other. *Socio-justice* seeks to motivate individuals to make a change

in the broader community. If personal interest in one's self and others is not established, then the likelihood of change being created is significantly lessened because a change requires a cooperative effort. The *socio-justice* program is created with trust building components. The rehearsal aids in trust development on an internal and external level.

#### **4.3.2.2 REHEARSAL**

The inclusion phase also includes the rehearsal part of stage-two. The function of the rehearsal is to teach the participants *sociodramatic* techniques, such as, role reversal, doubling, mirroring, and freeze frame. Rehearsals are used in theater in order to prepare the actors for dramatic activity and improvisation is a part of this process (Jones, 1996). What differs between theater rehearsals and dramatherapy or *sociodrama* is that rehearsal, as used as part of the warm-up phase, assists participants in determining the area of content they want to work with and it begins the process of creating a special and clearly definable dramatherapy or *sociodramatic* space (Jones, 1996).

In *socio-justice* the director and the group determine the number of rehearsals. On a task level, the participants need to learn *sociodrama* techniques as it is essential to audience participation and quality of work being done. The maintenance benefits include trust formation and fear reduction. This will impact on participants' comfort in performing and willingness to engage in honest and open dialogue. The issue of trust development is essential, especially in the inclusion phase and when working with a medium like *sociodrama*, as it may assist in lessening the feelings of apprehension associated with performing.

Although the rehearsal will follow the *sociodrama* format of warm-up, enactment, and sharing, a clear distinction needs to be made between the rehearsal and the

performance. The rehearsal aims to teach *sociodrama* techniques and processes which enhance the opportunity to achieve insight, catharsis and role training and develop a comfort in performing and sharing of personal truths. The expectation for in-depth dialogue is heightened during the performance due to participants improved *sociodramatic* skills, developed sense of creative expression, established environment of safety, mutual respect and concern for other people's feelings.

### **4.3.3 STAGE THREE: *SOCIO-JUSTICE* PERFORMANCE: INCLUSION, WARM-UP, ENACTMENT, SHARING AND CLOSING RITUAL**

#### **4.3.3.1 INCLUSION**

The first step of inclusion is to review the session rules making sure that confidentiality will be respected and that everyone will be treated with respect. Second, the director will need to prepare the group for the sharing and to review what appropriate disclosure is within the context of the *socio-justice* program. The goal is to inform the participants of their responsibilities to one another, create a safe and supportive environment through the establishment of clear and mutually agreed upon program, group and individual boundaries.

#### **4.3.3.2 WARM-UP**

The warm-up is used to determine the group theme to be enacted. Similar to *sociodrama*, the director will not select a specific group member's real-life problem; instead, a hypothetical issue is selected so the group can explore its shared underlying theme (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). The director will know when the group is ready to participate in the enactment, when they are at ease with him or her, and with each other, and when there is a readiness to move on to the next level (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b).

#### 4.3.3.3 ENACTMENT

Jean-Jacques Goulet (2005) questions whether victims and offenders would want to be on stage performing, even if they are open to participating in the process. Goulet's (2005) skepticism reflects his idea that they might not be the type of persons who would want to be on stage performing. This apprehension may be representative of people's perception of performance or stage actor. However, *sociodrama* is improvisational and less formal, which results in less pressure to 'get it right' or 'perform' and the performance would not be held before an audience of strangers. The director/facilitator would have made attempts to establish trust, thus reducing inhibitions and increase the desire for play.

Leveton (2001) cautions that without a successful warm-up, resistance to participate becomes "highly infectious." Resistance can be overcome with three ideas: first idea conveys that anyone can participate; second, there will be support from the director/facilitator and she or he will take responsibility for the functioning of the group; finally, there are no specialized skills necessary (Leveton, 2001). Leveton (2001) also responds to resistance in two other ways. If a participant clearly expresses a disinterest in participating, the director can respond by first, letting the participant know that it is okay if they do not want to participate and second, by letting the participants know that there will be more opportunities to participate later (Leveton, 2001). It is also important for the director/facilitator to review the functions of the *sociodrama*, to explain insight, catharsis and role training so that the participants can be mindful that they are not actors whose goal is to entertain others, but rather to work with each other to achieve a goal that is human relations based.



The achievement of insight, catharsis and role training is not used as a way of learning how to become a victim or an offender, but rather, to understand the motivation, personal life experiences, and feelings of the other. Moreover, the mandate of *sociodrama* and *socio-justice* is to explore general role relations and create dialogue. If the enactment focuses on individuals and requires them to make personal revelations, boundaries might be violated and people may feel “put on the spot”; this could result in feelings of exposure and betrayal (Blatner, 2000). To avoid this problem of role relations and personal role taking, the group must be informed that the role being played is not a reflection of the stance of the player (Blatner, 2000). During the sharing, however, he or she has the opportunity to disclose how the role played relates to his or her own personal experience. One must be mindful of how to disclose personal information appropriately.

The type of enactment being played is an important issue to examine. The director needs to be aware of the needs and comfort level of the group. *Socio-justice* themes relate to *restorative justice*, crime and healing. The group, during the warm-up, may talk about community crime themes like drug dealing, breaking and entering, armed robberies, impaired driving, assault, or domestic violence. Discussions may also be issue related, such as, prejudice and crime, abuse of power, recidivism, and poverty. The director’s responsibility in selecting a central group issue is not only to listen to what the group is discussing, for example sexual assault but also determine what is most suitable for the group. The director can choose to enact a secondary issue to sexual assault. A group member or director can provide a narrative of the crime that took place, and the group could enact the victim of sexual assault speaking to the police, his or her family, about the crime or enact a court scene. Perhaps a narrative of a sexual assault case

explored in the enactment can illustrate a healing journey. I assert that no topic is unsuitable or inappropriate when the director assesses the needs of the group and selects the appropriate and safe way of determining how the enactment will be structured. The sharing phase will provide an opportunity for participants express how the enactment affected them. The director needs to ensure that disclosures are respected and participants are being protected.

#### 4.3.3.4 SHARING

In order to share one's experiences and feelings, one must self-disclose. The issue becomes what types of disclosure are appropriate? Unlike *restorative justice* models, *socio-justice* does not mediate an actual conflict. It is not necessary to reveal personal experiences and behaviours that one has not properly processed or that one does not feel safe enough to share with others. What is of importance is that people delve beyond the superficial. Speaking about how one identifies with the enactment or story begins the sharing process. Disclosing general personal information begins the process of creating an atmosphere of trust and openness. The purpose of sharing is to move the participants to an in-depth dialogue about the group issue. Dialogue examines underlined feelings and creates understanding, empathy, insight and catharsis. These achievements serve to motivate participants to have a positive impact on the broader community. The following exploration of appropriate self-disclosure will assist facilitators in preparing participants to engage in the sharing process of *socio-justice*.

Self-disclosure is based on self-awareness, which involves the ability to identify the actions that need to be made, and the ability to present oneself in a positive manner. This increases social understanding and sensitivity, develops more effective interpersonal

communication, assists in problem solving, and leads to self-acceptance (Johnson, 2003). In the sharing phase it is not encouraged for participants to disclose actions and thoughts that one is ashamed of or fears that others may find objectionable (Johnson, 2003). The general rule is to disclose what you accept about yourself (Johnson, 2003).

The nature of *socio-justice* is to provide a program for discourse and this may involve disclosing information that might have been shameful (e.g., selling drugs to teenagers) or extremely sensitive (e.g., victim of sexual assault). What is necessary to understand is that acceptance as a means of appropriate self-disclosure entails that one is not feeling judged by others. For example, a former drug dealer, who has taken responsibility for his actions and has begun the process of creating positive personal change, shares this information to the group in the spirit of discourse. Acceptance does not mean justifying his behaviour. Accepting means that he acknowledges that his behaviour is a part of his history, that his behaviour has impacted on himself and others and that he sincerely seeks to change his present day approach to life.

The ideas of the present-day reality are an important part of appropriate self-disclosure. Self-disclosure does not mean sharing intimate details of past experiences or making private confessions which may initially provide a temporary feeling of intimacy (Johnson, 2003). Rather, trust and relationships are built on understanding one's feelings, behaviours or experiences in a present-day context. It may be appropriate to reveal one's past history if it aids another in his or her current understanding of you (Johnson, 2003). In *socio-justice* the sharing can become discourse if participants are able to relate past experiences, concepts of crime, emotional response to crime and victimization and emotional growth to their present day context.

These guidelines serve to create safe boundaries, yet this will understandably vary depending on the unique needs and dynamics of the group. It is the facilitator's responsibility to understand what the group's needs are and monitor the discourse. If a participant wants to talk about his or her experience in being an incest offender, but other members of the group are not willing or able to cope (as made visible through verbal or non-verbal communication) with this disclosure, then it is the responsibility of the director/facilitator to make an appropriate intervention. At all times, the needs of an individual must be viewed in relation to the needs of the group. This does not mean that an individual is not given a voice; rather, the intervention will provide the necessary precautions, suggestions, and needs of all concerned. What is important to note is that the nature of a group is not static, so the director/facilitator must have an excellent knowledge of group dynamics.

These guidelines may also provide a variety of benefits for the participants. First, they serve to limit the risk of revictimization due to participants revealing what they have accepted and feel safe enough to disclose. Second, the facilitator at the beginning of the session outlines group established boundaries; this may limit any feelings of apprehension because participants feel a sense of security knowing what is expected of them. Third, trust and openness is created due to acceptance. If one is accepting of him or herself, this increases his or her capacity to accept other people and their personal truths in a respectful and sensitive manner. Fourth, the failure to respect the commitment to confidentiality may have less of a negative impact because participants only disclose what they are comfortable in sharing. Finally, creating change in the broader community

might be more attainable because participants are not trying to convince others of their 'rightness', but are working collaboratively to explore means of change.

Problems of feigning remorse and having difficulty in feeling empathy for others are a valid concern and are difficult to detect. Integrating *restorative justice* measures with *sociodrama* techniques might minimize these problems due to the opportunity for participants to play a variety of roles and share their experiences with each other.

Empathy is developed in *restorative justice* programs when participants are able to express their relationship to the conflict and how the experience has affected their lives. This sharing of thoughts and feelings enable participants to understand each other, thus assisting them to feel empathetic (Cooley, 1999). *Sociodrama* is an effective tool for developing empathy because of the non-identifying method of choosing a group theme during the warm-up phase. The action created from the warm-up is a safe exploration of collective issues as distance and anonymity have already been established. Cook (2005) maintains that *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* approaches are similar because hearing the group at work as described by Wiener (1997) is a common thread that is critical to the process of developing empathy which is the key to success of *sociodrama* and *socio-justice*.

Charles E. Osgood developed a sharing or reconciliation theory called Gradual Reciprocated Initiative in Tension-Reduction (GRIT) that focuses on truth-telling (Redekop, 2002). Charles E. Osgood's developed this theory during the Cold War after the Cuban Missile Crisis. Osgood's development outlined that parties can reconcile their differences if one side makes a positive gesture, that is safe for the initiator, and if the reciprocator responds in kind; this pattern is then reciprocated in a "mimetic dance" that

has a “long-term end rather than an immediate reality” (as cited in Redekop, 2002, p.295). In Osgood’s GRIT process, self’s willingness to see the world through the eyes of the other, encourages the other to see his or her own inner self, which in turn enables the other to see the self’s world (as cited in Redekop, 2002). This exchange as demonstrated in *sociodrama* and *restorative justice* is present in true dialogue.

Truth-telling as part of Osgood’s GRIT has two parts. Table, or private, truth that is shared with family and trusted friends because of the degree of emotions associated with it and because of the pressure of “stereotypes and attitudes, that if shared in public”, would be considered “politically incorrect” (as cited in Redekop, 2002, p.296). Public truth however may include a minimal portion of the table truth and for the sake of safety or expediency, may contain a distortion or fabrication of private feelings or thoughts (as cited in Redekop, 2002). The goal of sharing in *socio-justice* is to promote the revealing of appropriate private truths that are conveyed in a manner that do not result in negative or harmful consequences.

#### **4.3.3.5 CLOSING RITUALIZED ACTIVITY**

Closing ritualized activity is not an aspect of *sociodrama* but has been included in the socio-drama program due its benefits. Jones (1996) suggests using a ritualized closing activity as a way of marking an ending to a group. This assists the director in maintaining control over the group by providing a clear indication of when the session will be concluded. Group members learn the structure of the session and this may enhance their ability to focus on what is happening in the present rather than thinking about when the session is going to end.

Accordingly in *socio-justice* sessions, a simple ritualized activity can mark the ending of a group meeting. White (2002) writes closure activities are effective when the structure of the activity is simple and provides a brief and focused comment (see appendix A). Emunah (1994) uses dramatic ritual throughout her drama therapy series but, during the final and culminating phase of the group, dramatic ritual is highlighted. For Emunah (1994, p.22), “rituals serve as a container for the powerful and often untranslatable feelings, images, and unconscious associations that emerge during the therapeutic process.” Ritualized activities provide the recognition that the group’s journey should be celebrated.

The final session is an important event in group work because it marks the conclusion of a termination process. Emunah (1994) notes that rituals reflect the unity and kinship felt within the group. In Emunah’s (1994, p.44) work, rituals are included in the process to assist “clients review the series, evaluate progress, give each other feedback, experience the rewards of accomplishment, and express the sadness and joy of completion. It is important for the director/facilitator to understand that people respond differently to terminating relationships. These reactions ranging from not wanting the group to end to quitting the group and becoming distant. It is the director/facilitator’s to contain the group’s emotional and behavioural responses and prepare the group for the closure.

#### **4.3.4 STAGE FOUR: PLAN OF ACTION & EVALUATION**

##### **4.3.4.1 PLAN OF ACTION**

Action in *restorative justice* processes usually includes the offender being required to take responsibility by making restitution of one kind or another (e.g.,

community service, fines, letter of apology), with, when necessary, the aid of a family member, support people, or facilitators. Action in *socio-justice* includes all participants in creating and implementing ways of developing a culture of community conflict resolution. *Restorative justice* and *sociodrama* goal is to create change in the broader community. *Socio-justice* seek to create this change through educating the community of the benefits of participating in *restorative justice* programs, increasing community participation in *restorative justice* sessions, sharing of resources, or personal development. Plan of action strategies can include ideas for funding, sharing of resources, mentoring youth, or seeking counseling services.

#### **4.3.4.2 EVALUATION**

By evaluating the *socio-justice* process, a director/facilitator can determine if program goals were achieved, participant expectations were met, assess whether the participants have any remaining needs or concerns, and develop a series of follow-up and assessment criteria (e.g., participants applied the plan of action strategies).

#### **4.3.5 STAGE FIVE: FOLLOW-UP AND ASSESSMENT**

The follow-up, which should take place at least within three months after the program has concluded, will enable a facilitator to assess how the participants have been affected by the program on an emotional, cognitive, spiritual and behavioural level. It will also provide valuable feedback about whether or not the participants followed through with their plan of action strategies. The idea of creating change in the broader community by the creation of a culture of community conflict resolution, which can be demonstrated by individuals taking responsibility for self and other, is a primary goal of *socio-justice*. Change creation is vital as it may provide a variety of educational and



therapeutic benefits to the community like developing strategies to resolve and heal from conflict.

#### 4.4 EDUCATIONAL AND THERAPEUTIC BENEFITS

Educational and therapeutic benefits can be provided directly to those who participate in a *socio-justice* program and indirectly to the community through the participants implementing their plan of action strategies. Educational benefits include understanding how crime affects everyone in the community, thus motivating people to not only protect themselves but others as well.

Censorship of thought and feeling impede educational benefits because an honest sharing of truth is artificial and limited. Drama limits a person's ability to censor his or her responses because he or she is acting in the moment. Using *sociodrama* enhances educational and therapeutic benefits of the *socio-justice* approach because it limits a person's ability to intellectualize their emotional experiences (Emunah, 1994). Assisting participants' in getting in touch with their emotions may help them become freed from past events, from negative present-day views, and from dysfunctional ways of coping and behaving as a result of their experiences of crime.

*Socio-justice* seeks to create therapeutic benefits by using the themes of conflict resolution, reconciliation, empowerment, healing, empathy, catharsis, insight and creating change in the broader community. Although the issues being explored are not related to a specific event, as in *restorative justice* programs, the group determines the issues examined. Participants should be able to relate personally to the creative stories being shared which will provide an opportunity to participate in the reconciliation or group process.

As Ken Wilber states, the reconciliation process involves an inside and outside circular process (as cited in Redekop, 2002). Inside, as Wilber explains, people have their own unique experience of harm, and feel the affects of harm; subsequently, during the recovery process they experience what it is like to feel better (as cited in Redkop, 2002). Wilber explains that the experience is felt internally, inside, and can be observed by others, outside (as cited in Redekop, 2002). Accordingly, Wilber notes that these two elements of reconciliation are developed circularly – “as one is reconciled within one’s Self, it contributes to reconciliation with one’s Other, and as reconciliation begins with one’s Other it helps one be reconciled within” (as cited in Redekop, 2002, p.287).

Wilber further notes, harm caused to one is harm caused to all when one further examines the idea of the reconciliation process in terms of observable behaviours and internal affect, all of which can be circular (as cited in Redekop, 2002). If harm is experienced by one, he or she may choose to retaliate through overt violent acts which may be returned by the other “in kind and with interest” (as cited in Redekop, 2002, p.287). The internal conflict can range from feeling hurt, traumatized, feeling like a victim and using one’s energy to externalize his or her hostile feelings toward the perpetrator (as cited Redekop, 2002).

*Socio-justice* may assist this inside and outside reconciliation process by providing an opportunity to interact, understand, and empathize with people that may represent the ‘others’ who have perpetrated real or perceived injustices and may impact on breaking down harmful stereotypes, biases and prejudices. Role training provides an opportunity for participants to take on the role and character of a person they fear or mistrust. Empathy and understanding for the other can occur when one plays that role

and gains an appreciation for the others experiences. The sharing process assists in processing the physical, emotional and intellectual aspect of the *socio-justice* session. Throughout the *socio-justice* program the facilitator must be cautious in maintaining the focus on collective themes or issues. Cook (2005) maintains that, as the *socio-justice* program progresses, there is a risk that the work might become therapy rather than educational process. The facilitator must be cautious about not “opening doors” that deal with an individual situation rather than a collective story (Cook, 2005).

#### **4.5 CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

The purpose of *socio-justice* is to promote a collective response to conflict resolution. In order to respond effectively, community members need to understand and have empathy for others. Moreno believed that in conflict situations it is crucial that the “warring parties spend time in each other’s shoes, to experience the life situation through the eyes of the other, and to recognize the feelings and perspectives that differed from one’s own (White 2002).” *Restorative justice* seeks to enhance community development by balancing power amongst all cultures within society. Power in this context means to develop new ways of coping with the instances of crime empowering persons whose real or perceived sense of power was harmed as a result of the crime committed against them.

The goal of *socio-justice* is to develop a culture of community conflict resolution by having the community understand the benefits of participating in *restorative justice* programs and by creating broader change within the community. The creation of this culture begins in recognizing that conflict situations can be either cooperative or competitive. Morton Deutsch’s work examined situations reflecting either cooperative or competitive culture considered the interdependence established between the parties

involved. Deutsch asserts that this interdependence is either *promotive*, gains or losses experienced by one will impact on all, or *contrient*, where one's gain will result in losses for others. Deutsch claims that promotive represents a cooperative culture, whereas, contrient approach indicates that the culture is competitive (as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman 1997).

Deutsch maintains that the results of promotive, or cooperative interdependence is positive as people will focus on mutual interests, engage in open and honest dialogues, display trusting and friendly attitudes, coordinate tasks, and will find similarities in beliefs and goals (as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 1997). If the culture of interdependence is contrient or competitive, Deutsch claims that people will have antagonistic interests that constraining each other, communication will be misleading and restrained, people will reveal suspicious and hostile attitudes and will over emphasize differences (as cited in Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 1997). These views, either cooperative or competitive, are cyclical according to Deutsch, as they create the climate which allows the person's "trust, attitudes and beliefs, and so on rebound to influence interaction and reinforce themselves" (Folger, Poole, & Stutman, 1997, p.21).

Deutsch's theory of culture of interdependence to the *socio-justice* program explores the issue of developing the understanding that the effects of crime transcends cultural, political, spiritual and individual differences. Communities as such are dependent on the well functioning and safety level of the environment in which we live. An understanding of this collective responsibility and cooperative interdependence is demonstrated through aboriginal healing and sentencing circles commonly held in rural communities. Heino Lilles (2002), a territorial judge from Whitehorse writes that victims

and offenders and their extended families have an ongoing relationship so it is necessary that they play a role in finding viable solutions to crime and conflict. Crime also affects others in the community; thus, they are invited to attend the circle in order to hear about the crime, provide feedback about how to restore relationships, make restitution and develop preventive measures (Lilles, 2002).

In urban areas, this interdependence is still an issue, but the need to get involved might be less apparent than in rural communities. Crime committed in other areas of the city between persons from other cultures might evoke the belief that if you have not been affected directly by crime that it is not necessary to take responsibility and remedy the outcome of it. This view is legitimized by those who view that “the world is a just place where people generally get what they deserve”, so if a person is robbed then he or she must have deserved it because they were careless (Johnson, 2003, p.361). Victim blaming, even when the situation appears unjust, is perpetuated through discrimination, stereotyping, or prejudice, as people tend to convince themselves that no injustice has occurred and the person being treated unjustly is perceived as doing something wrong (Johnson, 2002). Victim blaming occurs because people seek to create predictability, control and safety over their environment (Johnson, 2002). The view that “they deserved it” is a simple way of coping with the stress of possibly becoming a victim. This blaming the victim as a way of avoiding taking responsibility does not address the underlining causes of crime. Progress cannot be achieved if people refrain from taking responsibility until crime affects them directly.

As with circle sentencing, *socio-justice* seeks to bridge culture gaps and community prejudice by creating understanding between minority and dominant cultural

beliefs by encouraging and supporting all cultural groups to participate in *restorative justice* programs. Informing these cultural groups about *restorative justice* may result in having any cultural differences and expectations understood and satisfied within their respective ethnic communities (Lilles, 2002).

#### 4.6 SUMMARY

The main goal of *socio-justice* is to create a culture of community conflict resolution. This may be achieved by educating community members about the benefits of participating in *restorative justice* programs and motivating community members to take responsibility for oneself and others by playing an active and consistent role within the community. *Sociodrama*, *restorative justice* and *socio-justice* are models that share common goals like developing insight and empathy, balancing power relations, engagement in the healing process and creating change in the broader community. These models are educational in structure. However; they also provide therapeutic benefits of healing, insight, catharsis and feelings of empowerment. These models are not intended to provide therapeutic services for the participants. Facilitators are responsible for ensuring that group norms are established and respected as this provides the basis of personal and group safety, respect, trust and cooperation.

## 5.0 CLOSING STATEMENT

The purpose of this paper is to theoretically explore how a culture of community conflict resolution, where members of the community demonstrate a collective approach to responding to instances of crime, can be developed through the integration of *sociodrama* practices with *restorative justice* principles. The integration of these two models is termed *Socio-justice*. The *Socio-justice* model seeks to develop a culture of community conflict resolution by educating community members about the benefits of participating in *restorative justice* programs. The *Socio-justice* model uses *sociodrama* techniques in an effort to collectively develop understanding, empathy, and conflict resolution strategies by acting out simulated experiences that can be immediately examined, and later applied to the broader community.

*Restorative justice* and *sociodrama* attempt to develop strong community relations through effective dialoguing and sharing of personal truths. *Sociodrama's* goals are catharsis, insight, and behavioural practice through role training and creating change in the broader community. *Restorative justice* promotes the notion that crime violates victim, offender and community relationships. When appropriate, responses to crime should involve all participants, and justice approaches are more effective when a balance of power is created and consensus is reached. *Restorative justice* provides an opportunity for victims and offenders of crime, their support people and community members to participate in conflict resolution strategies. *Sociodrama* provides the participants with a program through which personal experience and ideas about how to effectively resolve conflicts can be shared, resolved and spread to the larger community.

*Restorative justice* measures provide an opportunity to develop mutual understanding and create resolutions to crime through facilitation and dialogue. Despite the opportunity to dialogue, miscommunication can occur because it is difficult to truly appreciate another's personal constructs (Neimeyer, 1993). Community conflict often occurs as a result of inadequate communication and/or understanding of information that has not been efficiently processed (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000b). *Sociodrama* is an excellent means of understanding personal constructs within a community setting. As Moreno wrote, the purpose of *sociodrama* is to mobilize people around social issues while providing a place to explore problems, human interaction, and feelings surrounding those concerns.

Directors/facilitators are encouraged to use *socio-justice* as a creative method of exploring and understanding community members' ideas, feelings, needs and concerns about crime. This project outlines a method for promoting *restorative justice*. Facilitators need to assess community, group and individual participant needs and determine the most effective ways of implementing the *socio-justice* model.

In conclusion, a limitation of this paper, as mentioned by Lou Furman (2005) is that the *socio-justice* program is not premised on clearly supported arguments. This limitation is addressed by providing sample *socio-justice* questionnaires that may assist facilitators in evaluating the effectiveness of *socio-justice* programs (see appendixes F, G and H). Notwithstanding, the *socio-justice* model is presented as a preliminary work for further exploration.



## **6.0 SUPERVISOR COMMENTARY**

In this major research paper, the author has presented an innovative approach to promoting a culture of conflict resolution. She has shown how techniques emerging from Moreno's *sociodrama* and principles derived from *restorative justice* can give rise to an approach, which she has called *socio-justice*.

The strategy that she is advocating could be especially helpful in situations where human relations within a community or neighbourhood have been strained or even broken as a result of serious criminal acts. Her approach not only draws upon significant research in different cultural settings, but also provides practical suggestions for implementing activities that can significantly reverse the erosion of social trust.

I hope that social workers, community organizers and faith-based communities active at the grassroots level will try out the approach that Portia Dahl has developed and test its effectiveness in promoting social justice and reconciliation.

Brian McDonough

## 7.0 REFERENCES

- Arts on the move. (2000). *Sociodrama – A brief outline*. A Q-ten site:  
[www.artsonthemove.co.uk/resources/sociodrama.html](http://www.artsonthemove.co.uk/resources/sociodrama.html)
- Babbie, Earl. (2000). *The practice of social research* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA:  
 Wasworth/Thomson Learning.
- Blatner, Adam. (2000). *Foundations of psychodrama: History, theory and practice* (4<sup>th</sup>  
 ed.). New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Campbell, Peter, C., Joy, Penny. (Producers), & Penny Joy (Director), & Mandy Leith  
 (Editor). (2001). *Spiritual roots of restorative justice* (Video Recording). Victoria:  
 Gumboot Productions Inc.
- Claassen, Ron. (2002). Building Peace: The victim offender reconciliation program  
 approach and its growing role in communities. In John Perry (Ed.), *Restorative  
 justice: Repairing communities through restorative justice*. Lanham, Maryland:  
 American Correctional Association.
- Cook, Linda. (2005). *Sociodrama, restorative justice and socio-justice reflections*.  
 Internet: Interview
- Cooley, Dennis. (1999). *From restorative justice to transformative justice: Discussion  
 paper*. Ottawa: Law Commission of Canada.
- Cormier, Robert. (2002). *Restorative justice: Directions and principles – Developments  
 in Canada*. Ottawa: Department of the Solicitor General Canada.
- Department of Justice Canada. (2003). *Values and principles of restorative justice in  
 criminal matters*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Department of Justice Canada. (2003). *Restorative justice program guidelines*. Ottawa:  
 Department of Justice Canada.
- Emunah, Rene. (1994). *Acting for real: Drama therapy process, technique, and  
 performance*. Levittown, PA: Brunner/Mazel.
- Folger, Joseph, P., Poole, Marshal, Scott., & Stutman, Randal, K. (1997). *Working  
 through conflict: Strategies for relationships, Groups, and organizations* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.).  
 New York: Longman.
- Furman, Lou. (2005). *Reflections about the socio-justice program*. Internet: Interview

- Gehm, John, R. (1998). *Victim-Offender Facilitation Programs: An exploration of practice and theoretical frameworks*. Western Criminology Review 1 (1) [Online]. Available: <http://wcr.sonoma.edu/v1n1/gehm.html>.
- Goetze, Herbert. (1994). Process in person-centered play therapy. In Joop Hellendoorn, Rimmert Vanderkooij & Brian Sutton-Smith (Eds.), *Play and intervention* (63-40). Albany: State University of New York.
- Goulet, Jean-Jacque. (2005). *Educational and therapeutic benefits of surrogate victim offender restorative justice facilitation*. Montreal: Interview.
- Johnson, David, W. (2003). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self actualization* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Jones, Phil. (1996). *Drama as therapy: Theater as living*. London: Routledge.
- Kass, Raye. (2002). *Theories of small group development* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Montreal: The Centre for Human Relations and Community Studies Concordia University.
- Latimer, Jeff & Kleinknecht, Steven. (2000). *The effects of restorative justice programming: A review of the empirical*. Ottawa: Department of Justice Canada.
- Leveton, Eva. (2001). *A clinician's guide to psychodrama* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Montreal: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lewis, Penny. (2000). Method of comparison and research process. In *Current approaches in drama therapy*. (2000) Penny Lewis and David Read Johnson (Eds.). Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, Ltd.
- Lilles, Heino. (2002, August). *Circle sentencing: Part of the restorative justice continuum*. Speaker at the Third International Conference on Conferencing, Circles and other Restorative Practices.: [www.restorativepractices.org/Pages/mn02\\_lilles.html](http://www.restorativepractices.org/Pages/mn02_lilles.html)
- Manning, Kathleen. (1997). *Authenticity in constructivist inquiry: Methodological considerations without prescription*. Qualitative Inquiry, 3(1), 93-115.
- Moreno, J.L. (1941). *The words of the father*. New York: Beacon House.
- Moreno, J.L. (1953). *Who shall survive*. New York: Beacon House.
- Neimeyer, Robert, A. (1993). An appraisal of constructivist psychotherapies. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(2), 221-234.
- Redekop, Vern Neufeld. (2002). *From violence to blessing: How an understanding of deep-rotted conflict can open paths to reconciliation*. Ottawa: Novalis.

- Restorative justice Branch and Dispute Resolution Branch. (2004). *Some models of restorative justice*. Ottawa: Correctional Services Canada  
[www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/forum/restore2004/kit/3\\_e.shtml](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/forum/restore2004/kit/3_e.shtml)
- Rodwell, Mary, & Byers, Katharine, V. (1997). *Auditing constructivist inquiry: Perspectives of two stakeholders*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(1), 116-134.
- Rudestam, Kjell Erik & Newton, Rae R. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Solicitor General of Canada. (1997). *The four circles of hollow water*. Retrieved March, 12, 2005, from:  
[www.pespecsppcc.gc.ca/publications/abor\\_corrections/199703\\_e.pdf](http://www.pespecsppcc.gc.ca/publications/abor_corrections/199703_e.pdf)
- Sprague, Ken. (1998). Permission to interact: A who, how and why of sociodrama. In *The handbook of psychodrama*, (1998). Marcia Karp, Paul Holmes and Kate Bradshaw Tavon (Eds.) Preface by Zerka T. Moreno. London: Routledge.
- Sternberg, Patricia., & Garcia, Antonina (2000a). *Sociodrama*. In *Current Approaches in Drama Therapy*, (2000). Penny Lewis and David Reed Johnson (Eds.) Springfield: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, Ltd.
- Sternberg, Patricia., & Garcia, Antonina (2000b). *Sociodrama: Who's in your shoes* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Forward by Zerka T. Moreno. London: Praeger.
- Stringer, Ernest, T. (1999). *Action Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Umbreit, Mark, S. (2000). *Restorative justice conferencing: Guidelines for victim sensitive practice "Adapting conferences, facilitations, circles and reparative boards to people, communities and cultures"*. Florida: Community Justice Institute Florida Atlantic University.
- Wemmers, Jo-Anne., & Canuto, Marisa. (2002). *Victims' experiences with expectations and perceptions of restorative justice: A critical review of the literature*. Montreal: Research and Statistics Division Department of Justice Canada.
- White, Liz. (2002). *The action manual: Techniques for enlivening group process and individual counselling*. Toronto: n/a
- Wiener, Ron. (1997). *Creative Training: Sociodrama and Team-building*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Zannis, Mark (Producer), & Zannis, Shanti (Director). (1997). *Circles* (Video Recording). Montreal: National Film Board of Canada.

Zehr, Howard. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

## 8.0 APPENDIX # A

### ***INCLUSION, WARM-UP AND RITUALIZED CLOSURE ACTIVITIES***

#### **INCLUSION**

##### ***Activity One: Name Game***

Name games are beneficial in the first session. Sternberg and Garcia's (2000b) name game description is as follows:

The first person is to say her name. The second person is to say the first person's name and then his own. The third person is to say the first person's name, the second person's name, and then her own. And so on. It is important when doing this exercise to follow the order. Otherwise, the folks with the most names to remember become hopelessly confused. After you have gone around the whole group, you might want to ask if anyone could go around backwards, saying all the names. Or ask people to change seats and ask for volunteers to say all the names. A variation of this exercise is to ask people to tune in to what color they feel most like today. When they say their name, they also say what color they feel like: "I'm Sarah, and I feel like mint green."

##### ***Activity Two: Your Own Best Friend***

Sternberg and Garcia (2000b) provide another activity that teaches peoples' names while disclosing personal information to the group. Your Own Best Friend is as follows:

Introduce yourself as if you're introducing your own best friend.

What that means is you'll talk about yourself in the third person, example, "I'd like you to meet Pat. She's bright, energetic, has a good sense of humor and

generally enjoys life.” The trick here is to make sure the group member keeps the introduction in the third person and talks about herself as “she” rather than “I”.

This offers the individual an element of distance that makes it easier to talk about self.

## **WARM-UP**

### ***Activity One: Spectrogram***

The spectrogram is useful during the pre-session meeting because there is no acting involved, only moving from one area of the room to another. Participants are able to select the degree of distance and honesty involved with their participation and disclosure. Sternberg and Garcia (2000a) outlines the benefits of using the spectrogram in-group work:

The action spectrogram promotes group cohesion, is a great icebreaker, and is often a lot of fun. The spectrogram is a continuum representing how much we like something, ranging from 0% indicating “not at all” to 100%, indicating “completely” (or it can also be an either/or – yes/no based question). It gives group members an opportunity to explore degrees of emotional intensity, interest, and investment. The process of the spectrogram involves the participants choosing a spot on the floor that represents their internal intensity about a place, a thing, an activity, or an idea. The director tells the group that she is going to ask the participants how they feel about the items presented and will let the group have an opportunity to talk about the reasons for their choices. The questions can range from non-serious, “Do you prefer winter or summer sports?” to a serious question; “Do you believe in the death penalty?” The director needs to assess the group’s trust level, openness to sharing opinions and

emotional maturity before asking personal questions. This is an excellent way of selecting a central issue for the *sociodrama* action phase.

### ***Activity Two: The Well of Confidentiality***

White (2002) states the *Well of Confidentiality* activity verbally reinforces the need for confidentiality during the initial stage of group work. People are able to discuss their own process with others outside the group, but they do not have the right to refer to other group members' work in any way (White, 2002). White (2002) recommends that this game be played immediately before the closure exercise of the first session. White's (2002) activity is as follows:

- Gather in a circle, shoulder-to-shoulder. Extend your right arm toward the centre of the circle, with the palm facing down and your thumb sticking out toward the person on your left. Then grasp the thumb of the person on your right, creating a well in the centre.
- Make the following or similar statement and invite the group to say it together after you: "I have shown myself and told my story. I trust that all that I have given will stay in this room."

## **RITUALIZED CLOSURE**

### ***Activity One: Candle Pass***

The purpose of this activity is to provide an opportunity for participants to share their feelings about the session. This disclosure is not a critique of others, rather it is an opportunity for personal expression. Each person in sequence has an opportunity to



Speak, or state that he or she would like to pass from speaking. A discussion or interruption is not permitted. The candle pass is as follows:

- Have the group members sit in a circle.
- Have a participant hold the lit candle and describe in a word, sentence or brief statement how he or she is feeling.
- After the participant has spoken, have him or her pass the candle to the person on the right. That person repeats the ritual.
- The process is repeated until everyone has had an opportunity to respond.
- The group leader should conclude the session by thanking everyone for their participation and encourage participants to come to the next session.

## **9.0 APPENDIX # B**

### ***DIRECTIONS FOR SOCIO-JUSTICE FACILITATORS***

- Facilitators must be knowledgeable about sociodrama, restorative justice and socio-justice principles, practices and techniques.
- Facilitators need to conduct a community needs assessment in order to structure the socio-justice program.
- Facilitators are required to screen individuals in order to assess the appropriateness of their participation.
- Facilitators need to establish group norms at the beginning of the socio-justice session and ensure that the group practices the rules created.
- Facilitators are responsible for ensuring that the socio-justice program does not become a therapy session. Focusing the enactment of group issues rather than an individual experience will assist in maintaining focus on a collective story.
- Facilitators are required to explain the process of appropriate self-disclosure.
- Facilitators need to balance individual and group concerns and takes appropriate measure to resolve any conflict that may arise during the sessions.
- Facilitators must conduct follow-up procedures in order to respond to participants' needs.
- Facilitators can include questionnaires in the program in order to receive feedback about the effectiveness of the socio-justice process.
- Facilitators are ethically and morally responsible to follow the principle of 'doing no harm' throughout the stages of the socio-justice program.

## 10.0 APPENDIX # C

### *SOCIODRAMA TECHNIQUES*

Sternberg and Garcia's (2000b) *sociodrama* techniques are as follows:

- Aside:** The *aside*, similar to the soliloquy, is a technique in which the actor turns aside from the action and makes a brief statement. This is often either contradictory to what the person just said in the scene or is in some way a comment on what is happening.
- Concretization:** A *concretization* is a literal portrayal of figurative symbolic language or feelings.
- Doubles:** When a person *doubles*, for another, he or she expresses that person's unexpressed thoughts and feelings.
- Empty Chair:** The empty chair technique is one in which a chair is used as a projection tool. Group members are to suspend disbelief and imagine someone is sitting in the chair. They are then to speak to or double for that person as if he or she were actually present.
- Freeze Frame:** With *freeze frame*, the director freezes the action so that either the actors or the audience can examine the scene differently.
- Future Projection:** *Future projection* allows actors to try out imagined scenes from the future.
- Mirror:** The *mirror* is a technique in which a player comes into the action, takes the actor's place, and mirrors the actor's verbal and nonverbal communication. Meanwhile, the actor steps out of the scene to observe how he looks and sounds to others.
- Role Reversal:** With *role reversal* two people change places with each other in an effort to better understand themselves, the other, and their situation.
- Sculpting:** *Sculpting* is a technique in which an actor places other actors in frozen positions, making a living tableau representing interrelationships.
- Soliloquy:** In a *soliloquy*, an actor steps out of the action and speaks his or her thoughts aloud at length.

**Walk and Talk:** In the *walk and talk technique*, the director stops the action and brings one of the actors out to walk and have a discussion about what is occurring in the scene.

These descriptions are not extensive and it does not explain how and when to use these techniques. It is important that the facilitator is educated with the sociodrama process before using these techniques in a group setting.

## **11.0 APPENDIX # D**

### ***NEEDS ASSESSMENT SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE: ORGANIZATIONS AND PARTICIPANTS***

#### ***Organizations***

- How familiar are you with restorative justice measures and sociodrama practices?
- Would your organization and/or clients be interested in participating in a socio-justice?
- Would your organization and/or clients be willing to act in the performance?
- Do you have any concerns about participating in a socio-justice forum?
- Do you have any suggestion that will help us make the socio-justice forum beneficial to your organization and participants?

#### ***Participants***

- What are your reasons for wanting to participate in a socio-justice program?
- Do you have any concerns about your personal physical or emotional safety in regard to participating in a socio-justice program? If so, what are they and how would you like them addressed?
- Have you been a victim of crime?
- If you have been a victim of crime, do you have any concerns that may hinder your willingness to participate in a socio-justice program?
- Have you ever been charged with a criminal offence?
- If you have been charged with a criminal offence, do you have any concerns that may hinder your willingness to participate in a socio-justice program?
- Would you like to speak with a staff member prior to the pre-session meeting (e.g., opportunity to express any concerns or raise important issues or express any personal needs)?

## **12.0 APPENDIX # E**

### ***PLAN OF ACTION AND EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE: SOCIO-JUSTICE PROCESS***

#### **PLAN OF ACTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

- During the course of the program, did you identify any ways that you can contribute individually to creating change in the broader community? If so, what are the ways you can contribute?
- As a member of the community will you assist others in creating change? If so how? If not, why?
- Do you require assistance in contributing to creating change? If so, what assistance is required?

#### **EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**

- Were your expectations of the program met? If so, how? If not, why?
- Do you think the facilitator conducted the session appropriately? If so, how?
- Did you experience any difficulty in participating in the socio-justice program? If so, what was difficult?
- Did you have any positive experiences in participating in the socio-justice program? If so, what was positive?
- What are the strengths of the socio-justice program?
- What are the challenges of the socio-justice program?

### **13.0 APPENDIX # F**

#### ***FOLLOW-UP AND ASSESSMENTS QUESTIONNAIRE***

- Has your knowledge of restorative justice increased significantly by participating in the socio-justice program? If so, how? If not, why?
- Would you participate in a restorative justice program? If so, why? If not, why?
- Would you participate in another socio-justice program? If so, why? If not, why?
- Did you implement the plan of action strategies? If so, which strategies were implemented?
- Do you require assistance in achieving your plan of action strategies? If so, what assistance do you need?
- What were the observable emotional and behavioral responses that occurred from implementing the plan of action strategies?
- If you did not implement the plan of action strategies, why not?
- Do you have any comments you would like to make? If so, what are they?

## 14.0 APPENDIX G

### RECOMMENDED READINGS

#### SOCIODRAMA

White, Liz. (2002) *The action manual: Techniques for enlivening group process and individual counselling*. Toronto: n/a

Sternberg, Patricia., & Garcia, Antonina (2000). *Sociodrama: Who's in your shoes* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Forward by Zerk T. Moreno. London: Praeger.

Wiener, Ron. (1997). *Creative training: Sociodrama and team-building*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

#### RESTORATIVE JUSTICE:

Umbreit, Mark, S. (2000) *Restorative justice conferencing: Guidelines for victim sensitive practice "Adapting conferences, facilitations, circles and reparative boards to people, communities and cultures"*. Florida: Community Justice Institute Florida Atlantic University.

Zehr, Howard. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.



## 15.0 APPENDIX H

### OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

#### 15.1 CONSTRUCTIVIST INQUIRY

##### Accessibility of the Inquiry Product

If the researcher provides *accessibility of the inquiry product* she is more likely to add to the purposefulness of the research and gain valuable feedback from the respondents and stakeholders (Manning, 1997).

##### Authenticity

*Authenticity* is based upon the process of research rather than the product, and subsequently assesses the criteria of fairness, ontological authenticity, educative authenticity, catalytic authenticity and tactical authenticity (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

These criteria commits the researcher to a set of actions that if not met, the quality of the research (e.g., meaningfulness, usefulness, and ability to enact social change is questioned (Manning, 1997).

##### Caring and Trusting Relationship

*Caring and trusting relationship* is based on the researcher guaranteeing that the respondents that the purpose of gaining their story is to obtain their perspective, not to confirm an existing theory (Manning, 1997).

##### Catalytic Authenticity

*Catalytic authenticity* is a process that assesses the degree of change that has occurred after the inquiry is concluded (Rodwell & Byers, 1997). Elements of catalytic authenticity include joint construction of interpretations, accessibility of the inquiry product and practical use of research findings and product (Manning, 1997).

##### Conformability

*Conformability* is a reflection on the quality of the data management and the data analysis found in the raw data, interview summaries, documentary evidence and methodological and reflexive journals (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

### **Credibility**

*Credibility* relates to activities like triangulation (using multiple sources, theories or methods to test for the presence of consistent, distortion-free information); thus, increasing the probability that credible results will be produced (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

### **Dependability**

*Dependability* is accomplished by documenting, in the inquirer's methodological log, any accounts of instability and emergent design-induced changes in the research process (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

### **Dialogical Conversations**

*Dialogical conversations* are interview or guided conversations between the researcher and respondent and are conducted in a manner that they perceive reality as an evolutionary process (Manning, 1997).

### **Educative Authenticity**

*Educative authenticity* is similar to ontological authenticity in that the respondents' understanding are increased, but in educative authenticity the respondents build more in-depth constructions due to an increased comprehension of others (Manning, 1997).

### **Emic Perspective**

*Emic perspective* is a researcher's ability to discover and interpret the insider's or respondent's view point, which provides the facilitator with a space to tell her story and give it authority and validity (Manning, 1997).

### **Fairness**

*Fairness* must present all viewpoints from an even-handed perspective (Rodwell & Byers, 1997). Also included is informed consent, member checking, prolonged engagement, persistent observation, reflexivity, peer debriefing (Manning, 1997).

### **Informed Consent**

*Informed consent* is almost an impossible goal because the researcher has minimal control over the uses of her findings once the results become public; however, there is an obligation to discuss any anticipated circumstances to the respondent (Manning, 1997).

### **Internal Audit**

An *internal audit* occurs when the product's final draft is almost completed for gaining valuable insights about the research finding (Manning, 1997).

### **Internal Validity**

*Internal validity* relates to the validity of a casual inference and can be assessed through structural corroboration, such as, prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation and peer debriefing (Rudestam & Newton, 2001).

### **Joint Construction of Interpretations**

*Joint construction of interpretations* is a process whereby the hypothesis is constructed by the researcher and the respondents through the process of negotiation, compromise and understanding (Manning, 1997).

### **Member Checking**

*Member checking* is a collaborative process that assures that the themes arising throughout the project come from the respondent's lives, words, and experiences (Manning, 1997).

### **Ontological Authenticity**

*Ontological authenticity* represents the increased awareness of the complexities of the research in that the participants' participation is monitored for things like consciousness raising (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

Aspects of ontological authenticity that support reflexivity, coherence and interpretive potency of constructivist inquiry include dialogical conversations, openness of purpose, emic perspective, caring and trusting researcher/respondent relationship and respondent's statements attributing growth to the research process (Manning, 1997).

### **Peer Debriefing**

*Peer debriefing* occurs when the researcher dialogues with other peers, not directly related to the study, as a means of gaining knowledgeable information from viable sources (Manning, 1997).

### **Persistent Observation**

*Persistent observation* enables the researcher to discover the important issues in the research process through depth and effort (Manning, 1997).

### **Practical use of Research Findings and Product**

*Practical use of research finding and product* is used in order to achieve catalytic authenticity, the research product's interpretations and conclusions are relevant to the research context and respondents' meanings and the findings is useful (Manning, 1997).

### **Prolonged Engagement**

*Prolonged engagement* is an assessment of the respondent's perspectives, ways of life and culture (Manning, 1997).

### **Reliability**

*Reliability* is that quality of measurement method that suggests that the same data would have been collected each time in repeated observations within the same context (Babbie, 2001).

### **Reflexivity**

*Reflexivity* is the process through which the researcher lets the respondents and consumers of the research know about her beliefs and values (Manning, 1997).

### **Respondent Statements**

Researchers can gain ontological authenticity by incorporating *respondents statements* about their insights into the inquiry product or methodological appendix of a research project (Manning, 1997).

### **Tactical Authenticity**

*Tactical authenticity* is reached when the participants undertake meaningful action (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

Tactical authenticity also relates to empowerment and whether the participants can act on the finding of the research process, but in order for empowerment to occur, the researcher must fully appreciate that the respondents' meaning is not hers for the taking. Negotiated use of data and outcomes are a necessary element of the research project because the respondents own their data and subsequently have a right to say what is printed and how the information is used. A researcher also has an obligation to protect the respondents' identity through adhering to confidentiality procedures (Manning, 1997).

### **Transferability**

*Transferability* ensures that an application of findings can be applied to other contexts and in order to do this an extensive description of case-study information must be included in the product (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

### **Trustworthiness**

*Trustworthiness* was developed as a parallel to the empiricist ideas of internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity. Trustworthiness addresses methods that determine whether the research process has been carried out correctly (Manning, 1997).

Trustworthiness is based upon credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability and it assess the research product for truth, value, applicability, consistency and neutrality (Rodwell & Byers, 1997).

## **15.2 SOCIODRAMA**

### **Auxiliary**

A participant who plays a supportive role in a sociodrama session.

### **Double**

An auxiliary who expresses the protagonist's possible inner thoughts and feelings.

### **Enactment**

The section of the socio-drama forum that creatively explores the selected issue.

### **Group-Centered Sociodrama**

All the roles being enacted are of interest to the participants.

### **Improvisation**

A spontaneous method of role-play.

### **Mirroring**

Enabling the protagonists to step outside of the enactment in order to gain insight, and distance from the scene.

### **Person-Centered Sociodrama**

Participants are interested in exploring one of the enactment roles.

### **Protagonist**

An individual who enacts his or her issue in a present-day context.

### **Role Training**

A method of enactment that enables participants to gain experience and understanding of other types of roles within society, for example, a victim can play the role of an offender.

### **Role Reversal**

Provides a participant to take on the role of another by switching places for the purpose of gaining insight into others' feelings and thoughts, and seeing one's own as other may see him or her.

### **Sharing**

A closure process through which participants are encouraged to share their thoughts, feelings, and ideas about the issues raised in the socio-justice session. The purpose is to relate to the material on a personal level, which creates mutual understanding, empathy, catharsis, and solutions to problems.

### ***Sociodrama***

An enactment and sharing model that examines issues relevant to a broad society, rather than focuses on individual concerns.

### **Warm-up**

A process through which issues are explored and one is chosen to be the focus of the enactment. The scene and characters are selected for the improvisational enactment. Participants use acting exercises to maximize their comfort in performing on stage.

## **15.3 RESTORATIVE JUSTICE**

### **Restorative justice**

A conflict resolution process that enables participants to restore the balance of power, negotiate conditions of restitution, and obtain closure from the incident being addressed.

## **15.4 SOCIO-JUSTICE**

### **Socio-justice**

An educational method of developing community participation in restorative justice forums by using sociodrama to enhance understanding, empathy, and catharsis about crime in society.