



## The Effect of Group Counseling Based on Psychodrama Approach on Peer Relationships of Female Adolescents

Fatma Selda Öz Soysal <sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

The aim of this research was to examine the effect of group counseling based on psychodrama approach on peer relationships of female adolescents. 38 girl students from high school junior level participated in the research; 21 of these were in the experimental group and 17 were in the control group. "Peer Relationship Scale" and "Personal Information Form" were used for data collection. The research was a semi-experimental study based on the model with pretest, posttest and follow-up tests on the experimental and control groups. Psychodrama group application for experiment group has lasted for 16weeks, 180 minutes once a week. In the meantime, no study was conducted with the control group. Data obtained from pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests were tested by "Two- Way ANOVA for Mixed Measured" which is suitable for mixed designs. Findings have illustrated that the students' commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty scores in the experiment group have increased significantly when compared to the control groups. It has been observed in the follow up test that increasing commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty in scores has not lasted for three months.

### Keywords

Psychodrama  
Peer  
Relationships  
Female  
Adolescents

### Article Info

Received: 04.19.2019

Accepted: 08.28.2019

Online Published: 04.04.2020

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2020.8686

### Introduction

Adolescence is the period in an individual's life distinguished by fast developmental changes prior to adulthood. It is commonly observed that during adolescence children are less inclined to interact with their parents than with their peers (Giordano, 2003). Peer relationship is acknowledged as a crucial part of adolescence enhancing social and emotional growth, which may constitute a significant context for establishing close ties with peers (Way & Greene, 2006). Adolescents recognize the importance of providing some autonomy and independence to peers in the creation of strong friendship bonds (Parker, Low, Walker, & Gamm, 2005). They affirm the importance of intimacy and self-disclosure in peers in order to cultivate and retain a more effective and higher quality relation (Parker & Gottman, 1989). While intimacy has a critical role among peers, such close relationship in-between fosters the attempts to understand different social identities (Parker, Rubin, Erath, Wojslawowicz, & Buskirk, 2006). Peers behave as emotional companions, offer guidance and recommendations to each other, and represent models of behavior and attitude (Crosnoe, Cavanagh & Elder, 2003). Researchers suggest a significant correlation between the quality of peer relationship and personal well-being (Hartup, 1996). High- quality peer relationships are considered likely to promote positive developmental results, including higher levels of self-esteem, (Çevik Büyüksahin, 2007; Hartup, 1996;

<sup>1</sup> Dokuz Eylül University, Faculty of Education, Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Turkey, [selda.oz@gmail.com](mailto:selda.oz@gmail.com)

Wissink, Dekovic, & Meijer, 2009), self-confidence and sociability (Hartup, 1996), learning, adaptation and psychological health (Hussong, 2000; Wentzel, 2009), higher school achievement (Jacobson & Brudsal, 2012; Rabaglietti & Ciairano, 2008) and emotional adjustment (Demir & Urberg, 2004); and lower levels of internalizing behaviors such as loneliness and depression (Pittman & Richmond, 2008). On the other hand, studies have shown negative developmental outcomes such as loneliness (Bilgiç, 2000; Parker et.al, 2006), conduct disorder, aggressive behavior (Dishion & Kavanagh, 2003), deviant behavior (Selfhout, Branje, & Meeus, 2008; Weerman, 2011), substance use (Erdem, Eke, Ögel, & Taner, 2006; Shadur & Hussong, 2014; Steglich, Snijders, & Pearson, 2010) and externalizing behaviors (Laursen, Bukowski, Aunola, & Nurmi, 2007), when the quality of peer relationship is low.

The quality of peer relationships among girls and boys are considered to vary (Simpkins, Parke, Flyr, & Wild, 2006). While girl adolescents are inclined to more intimate peer relationships as pairs based on their needs of emotional contentment, intimacy, self-disclosure, empathy and interdependence, boys generally tend to join larger peer groups with an emphasis on comradeship, rivalry, control and strife (Galambos, 2004). Peer relationships among females are considered to be more assistive and focused on egalitarianism while in peer relationships of males, negative interaction and power-based conflicts are supposed to be observed more (Maccoby, 1990). Experimental studies indicated that peer relationships of females displayed higher levels of peer assistance (Colarossi & Eccles, 2000; Jenkins, Goodness, & Buhrmester, 2002). Furthermore, researches also indicated that scores of conflicts among boys were higher than those of girls while scores of assistance, sense of security and closeness among girls were higher than those among boys (Doğan, Karaman, Çoban, & Çok, 2012). Way and Greene (2006) asserted that girls could be more "relationship oriented" than boys and, thus, experience intimacy in their peer relationships at an earlier age than boys.

The majority of adolescents experience difficulties in establishing and maintaining close peer relationships (Schechtman, Friedman, Kashi, & Sharabany, 2002). Interpersonal or interactional type of group counseling (Yalom, 2002) is considered most viable for intervening in problems around intimacy and close relations in friendships (Shechtman, Vurembrand, & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1994). Group intervention is acknowledged as a useful prevention and interference approach in helping teenagers to make a smooth transition into adulthood (Corey, 2012). Shechtman and colleagues (1994) asserted that small groups of therapy might offer a social environment nurturing a sense of unitedness, belonging and acceptance, patterns of self-expressiveness and self-disclosure and constructive feedback for positive interpersonal communication. Empirical researches underline the positive impact of group therapy on cultivating a single, closely bonded friendship (Schechtman, 1991). However, empirical studies with adolescents, aiming at improving peer relationships are found inadequate both in Turkey and overseas (Bilgiç, 2000; Demir & Kaya, 2008; Schechtman, 1991, Schechtman et al., 1994; Schechtman et.al., 2002).

Psychodrama is one of the methods of group counseling and group psychotherapy. Psychodrama is a group psychotherapy approach, based on helping people to solve their problems by acting them out as well as talking about them (Moreno, 1985). The recent increase of interest in psychodrama can be largely attributed to the growing inclination towards learning by doing which is a more efficient way of learning than by solely verbal learning modes (Kim, 2003). By means of employing various role-reversal techniques, psychodrama offers its participants a number of opportunities to develop self-awareness and personal empowerment (Kellermann, 2007). Corey (2012) and Blatner (2007) summarized some of the studies and sample cases showing the effectiveness of psychodrama when implemented with teenagers, in schools, and in multi-cultural environments. In the school environment, role playing is found very helpful, and thus, is highly recommended: Observing and participating in the enactments help the adolescents to develop a sense of relatedness to each other in terms of common problems and difficulties. Corey (2012) stated the potential transformative impact of a psychodrama session when, especially, in a group of multicultural quality, protagonists are encouraged to speak in their native languages and experience powerful feelings pushed forward to the front. Psychodrama proves most effective when the awareness and new manners of behaving and communicating are carried into daily life. Within this context, the findings of the study of Kipper and

Ritchie (2003) validate the effectiveness of researches that employ psychodramatic techniques. Psychodrama based counseling activities with adolescents are commonly observed to focus on the following topics; psycho-behavioral disorders (Gatta et al., 2010); prevention of behavioral problems in adolescent immigrants (Smokowski & Bacallao, 2009); adolescents with eating problems (Diamond-Rabb & Orell-Valente 2002); mathematics anxiety (Dorothea, 2016); obsessive compulsive disorder (Cohen, Delaroche, Flament, & Mazet, 2014); substance use disorders, risky sexual behavior, and academic failure (Kruczek & Zigelbaum, 2004); adolescent delinquency (Kit & Teo, 2012; Kaner, 1993); female victims and survivors of sexual abuse (Springmeyer, 2013); experienced trauma (Carbonell & Partelano-Barehmi, 1999; Mertz, 2013); positive adolescent identity development (Bader, 2012); oppositional and defiant adolescent (Singal, 2003); dramatic engagement (Orkibi, Azoulay, Regev & Sinir, 2017); social anxiety disorder (Üneri, Yıldırım, Tanıdır & Aytemiz, 2016); aggression level (Karataş & Gökçakan 2009); anxiety level (Karataş, 2009); and conflict resolution skills of adolescents (Karataş, 2011). However, concerning the use of psychodrama approach to improve peer relationship among adolescents, no publications have so far been issued.

The purpose of this research was to examine the effect of group counseling based on psychodrama approach on peer relationships of female adolescents.

Within the scope of this research the following hypotheses were approved:

- 1) There will be a significant distinction between the pretest and posttest points for commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty, in support of the experimental group students who participated in the group counseling based on psychodrama approach, as compared to the control group students.
- 2) There won't be a significant distinction between the posttest and follow-up test points for commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty of both control group students and experimental group students who participated in the group counseling based on psychodrama approach.

## **Method**

### *Research Design*

This study is a quasi-experimental study, which aims to determine the effect of group counseling based on psychodrama approach on sub-dimensions of peer relationships of female adolescents, i.e. commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty. Quasi-experimental study designs are similar to experimental designs in terms of measurement of the dependent variables. However, they are different from experimental designs due to the fact that experimental and control groups may not be randomly selected. Quasi-experimental design must be used in any study to be conducted with participants with specific ages, genders or life experiences (Bulduk, 2003). In this study, 2x3 split plot experimental design was used, under which pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests were performed on the experimental and control groups. In this design, the first factor indicates the experimental process groups (experimental and control groups), and the second factor indicates the repeated measures for the dependent variables (pre-test, post-test, follow-up test) (Büyüköztürk, 2007).

### *Subjects*

The subjects of the study were 38 female students who attend 'Vocational High School for Girls' Karşıyaka District of Izmir Province during 2015-2016 academic year. The subjects were students of 9th grade. The experimental group included 21 students, all females. Ages of the experimental group students varied between 15 and 16 ( $\bar{x}$ =15.04; SD = 0.59). None of them were subjected to any diagnosis of psychological disorder and did not receive group psychological counseling/therapy before. The control group consisted of 17 female students. Ages of the control group students varied between 15 and 16 ( $\bar{x}$ =15.1; SD = 0.55) and none of them experienced group psychological counseling/therapy before.

### *Instruments*

#### *Peer Relationship Scale.*

The scale was developed by Kaner (2000) to investigate peer relationship among adolescents. The scale comprised four subscales and 18 items which are described as Commitment, Trust, Self-

Disclosure and Loyalty. The scale used in this study is a five point Likert type one. The student who have high scores in this scale tend to have better peer relationships. The principal component analysis with varimax rotation was used to test the structural validity of the scale. The internal consistency and test-retest method was used to test the reliability of the scale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the subscales and the total scale were in the range of .58 to .86. For the sample in this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .87, .61, .73, .64, and .87 for the Commitment, Trust, Self-Disclosure and Loyalty subscales, and the total scale, respectively.

#### *Personal Information Form*

Individual information regarding the experimental and control group members was gathered using a "personal information sheet" developed by the researcher, in which age of the participant, earlier participation in a group counseling/therapy process; and any history of psychological disorder were inquired.

#### *Procedure*

This study was a semi-experimental research on the effects of group sessions during which psychodrama techniques were employed for the analysis and improvement of peer relationship of adolescent girls. In the first phase, high school junior class counselors reported the school counseling service that students were having troubles in their peer relationships. Consequently, the school counselor decided to conduct group counseling activities to improve peer relationship among junior class students and the announcement was made to the classes. Firstly, school counselor started working with the students to identify the volunteers. The volunteering candidates were invited to the first interview in which they were informed about the psychodrama method its purpose. The candidates were questioned on their availability to participate in all sessions. They were also asked if they had experienced any psychological disorders, so those with such history were not included in the study. 43 students in total were interviewed among whom 38 were accepted as participants in the study. During the following stage the experimental and control groups were established by means of arbitrary selection from a pool of 38 students. The experimental and control groups were formed of 21 and 17 subjects, respectively. Secondly, before starting the experimental process Peer Relationship Scale (PRS) was given to both experimental and control groups to attain pretest scores. During the third phase, 16 group sessions were conducted with the experimental group using psychodrama techniques to improve peer relationships. In the meantime, no study was performed with the control group. Two weeks after the ending of the sessions with the experimental group Peer Relationship Scale (PRS) was applied to both groups as posttest. Finally, after three months following the completion of the study, peer relationship scale was applied to both groups as follow-up test. All groups sessions were administered by the researcher, who completed the advanced level psychodrama training at Abdülkadir Özbek Psychodrama Institute, carried out the individual and group supervisions, and is currently in the psychodrama dissertation stage. In terms of internal validity of experimental study, it is predicted that group members' expectations such as grade and recognition that may be caused by the fact that the researcher is not their teacher will not affect the result of experimental process. Also, other factors such as a new physical setting will not impact the result of experimental process, because the experimental process is to be conducted in the school environment in which students study.

#### *Psychodrama Training*

The purpose of this training is to examine the effect of psychodrama on the improvement of peer relationships of a group of female adolescents. With this aim, each week 180 minutes session was held totaling up to 16 sessions in the process. Every session included warm-up exercises, stage setting, acting and sharing. Furthermore, every session started with a summary of the previous session and the participants were asked to express, their emotions and their experiences during the previous week Group plays, protagonist plays, the used techniques and the objectives of these sessions are given in Appendix A.

In the first session group rules were established and the participants were given information on the purpose of this study and on psychodrama in general. It was observed that group members knew each other by their names as they were students in the same high school. Therefore, the first play was based on the meanings of their names and how these names were given. The second session aimed at continuing to develop the trust relationship and making the participants think about themselves by means of playing their own doctors. In the third play, empty chair technique was used. This technique is considered to prepare group members for the protagonist play to come afterwards. In the fourth and fifth sessions, protagonist play was employed. In all protagonist plays warming up, stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, mirroring and surplus reality phases were realized. During group sharing, first, feed-back was given regarding the participants' feelings within the role and then feelings based on the experience of identifying with that role were shared. In the sixth session, in order to view the sociometrist image of the relation network within the group and the internal role distributions, the social atom study was conducted. In the seventh and eighth sessions, the protagonist play was staged. In the ninth session, in order to increase group cohesion and observe internal group dynamics, the ship journey play was conducted. The protagonist play was acted again during the tenth and eleventh sessions. "I have a secret" play was acted in the twelfth session to improve trust and empathy among the group members. In the thirteenth session the social atom play was conducted again. In the fourteenth session the participants were encouraged to rehearse, just then and on the spot, any troubles they may experience in the future. The fifteenth session aimed at improving trust and awareness by means of acting "the place where you feel good" play. And the final session aimed at making the participants become aware of their emotions about the group, of how they look from outside; making them understand the sociometrist structure and say goodbye easily, by means of staging the group picture formation.

#### *Data Analysis*

The research showed that the pre-test scores of Peer Relationship Scale's sub-dimensions, i.e. commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty, were distributed normally and their group variances were equal to each other. According to these results, it was concluded that parametric tests could be utilized in the study. T-test was employed to evaluate whether there is a significant distinction between pre-test points of experimental and control groups before the process. In line with this result, Two-Way ANOVA for Mixed Measures was chosen to explore the effect of group counseling based on psychodrama approach on dependent variables and whether there is a difference between the measurement and groups. In order to determine the groups between which the difference obtained in the variance analysis was significant, Bonferroni test was used to compare the points of students from commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests. The data obtained from three tests (pre-test, post-test and follow-up test) were analyzed by SPSS 23.00 packaged software and significance level was accepted as .05.



## Results

This section covers the data obtained from the analyses performed to test the hypotheses of this research.

Skewness and kurtosis values were calculated using descriptive statistics for mean points of pre-test, post-test and follow-up test of commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty, which are the subdimensions of the peer relationship scale of experimental and control groups. The results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Descriptive Statistics for Sub-Dimensional Scores of Peer Relationship Scale

Measure	Scale	n	$\bar{X}$	S <sub>s</sub>	Skewness		Kurtosis	
					Coefficient	Ss	Coefficient	Se
Pre-Test	Commitment	38	18.7	3.73	-0.27	0.38	-.098	0.75
	Trust	38	12.1	2.23	0.92	0.38	-0.98	0.75
	Self-Disclosure	38	3.7	0.91	0.37	0.38	-0.98	0.75
	Loyalty	38	3.6	0.86	0.51	0.38	-0.61	0.75
Post-Test	Commitment	38	23.74	6.29	0.23	0.38	-0.12	0.75
	Trust	38	17.76	5.76	0.03	0.38	-0.98	0.75
	Self-Disclosure	38	9.45	5.42	-0.16	0.38	-0.98	0.75
	Loyalty	38	9.47	5.45	-0.20	0.38	-0.98	0.75
Follow-up	Commitment	38	23.71	6.21	0.21	0.38	0.98	0.75
	Trust	38	17.68	5.69	0.80	0.38	-0.98	0.75
	Self-Disclosure	38	9.45	5.31	-0.16	0.38	-0.98	0.75
	Loyalty	38	9.55	5.36	-0.19	0.38	-0.98	0.75

Table 1 reveals that mean scores of pre-test, post-test and follow-up test according to subdimensions of scale range from 23.74 to 3.6. It is seen that skewness coefficients range from 0.03 to 0.92 and kurtosis coefficients range from -0.1 to -0.98. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2015), skewness and kurtosis coefficients within these value ranges indicate a normal distribution of data. The values obtained suggest that the data meet the normal distribution presumption.

Mauchly's Test of Sphericity was used to find out whether presumption of sphericity is suitable to the implementation of Anova test for repeated measures, and when the presumption of sphericity was suitable, Greenhouse-Geisser correction (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2015) was used by preferring a single variant approach to accomplish the Anova test results. The findings of the Mauchly Sphericity Test performed to determine whether the presumption of sphericity is reached are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Mauchly's Test of Sphericity Findings for Scores from Experimental and Control Group Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Tests

Epsilon Scale	Within-group Effect	Mauchly W	X <sup>2</sup>	Sd	p	Greenhouse-Geisser	Huynh-Feldt
						Correction	Correction
Commitment	Time	0.35	36.1	2	0.00	0,605	0,632
Trust	Time	0.22	53.5	2	0.00	0,561	0,582
Self-Disclosure	Time	0.14	67.6	2	0.00	0.54	0.56
Loyalty	Time	0.08	89.87	2	0.00	0.52	0.53

As far as the findings of the Mauchly's Test of Sphericity presented in Table 2 are concerned, when the points acquired for the repeated measurements from the scales of commitment ( $W(2)=0.35$ ,  $p<.05$ ), trust ( $W(2)=0.22$ ,  $p<.05$ ), self-disclosure ( $W(2)=0.14$ ,  $p<.05$ ) and loyalty ( $W(2)=0.08$ ,  $p<.05$ ) are analyzed, it is found that the presumption of sphericity is not fulfilled. Therefore, the within-group effect was analyzed for the measurements obtained from these scales, while the F-ratios figured out by Spss were applied for Greenhouse-Geisser rectification.

Another assumption required for the repeated measurements is variance equality of group points obtained at the same time (Büyüköztürk, 2007). The Levene Test was utilized to analyze the variance homogeneity of the points acquired from the pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests of the experimental and control groups. The findings are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Findings of Levene Tests Performed on Points from Pre-test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Tests of Students in Experimental and Control Group

Scale	Measure	n	Sd1	Sd2	F	p
Commitment	Pre-test	38	1	36	0.067	0.8
	Post-test	38	1	36	0.09	0.7
	Follow-up test	38	1	36	0.0	0.9
Trust	Pre-test	38	1	36	0.16	0.7
	Post-test	38	1	36	0.01	0.9
	Follow-up test	38	1	36	0.18	0.9
Self-Disclosure	Pre-test	38	1	36	0.14	0.9
	Post-test	38	1	36	2.18	1.6
	Follow-up test	38	1	36	0.4	0.8
Loyalty	Pre-test	38	1	36	0.03	0.9
	Post-test	38	1	36	0.6	0.4
	Follow-up test	38	1	36	2.13	0.1

As a result of Levene test given in Table 3, the values obtained from the pre-test (Commitment  $F= 0.067$ ,  $p>.05$ ; trust  $F = 0.16$ ,  $p>.05$ ; self-disclosure  $F=0.14$ ,  $p>.05$ ; loyalty;  $0.03$ ,  $p>.05$ ), post-test (Commitment  $F= 0.09$ ,  $p>.05$ ; trust  $F = 0.1$ ,  $p>.05$ ; self-disclosure  $F=2.18$ ,  $p>.05$ ; loyalty;  $0.6$ ,  $p>.05$ ) and follow-up test (Commitment  $F=0.00$ ,  $p>.05$ ; trust  $F=0.18$ ,  $p>.05$ ; self-disclosure  $F=0.4$ ,  $p>.05$ ; loyalty;  $2.13$ ,  $p>.05$ ) show that there is a variance homogeneity between the groups. When the data obtained are examined, from which it's concluded that presumption required for Anova analysis for repeated measurements are fulfilled.

The equality of covariance matrices of dependent variables in the research was analyzed using the Box's M test. When the Box's M table is examined, it suggests that the presumption of multiple normality was encountered for commitment (Box's  $M=35.2$ ), trust, (Box's  $M=38.2$ ), self-disclosure (Box's  $M= 42.1$ ) and loyalty (Box's  $M=43.4$ ). Based on all these data obtained, it was deduced that presumption required for analysis of variance for repeated measurements were achieved.

T-test was employed to analyze whether the pre-test scores of experimental and control groups are homogeneous, and findings of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Findings of T-Tests Performed on Peer Relationship Scale Pre-Test Points of Students in Experimental and Control Group

Scale	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Commitment	Experimental	21	18.8	3.8	36	0.27	0.8
	Control	17	18.4	3.7			

**Table 4.** Continued

Scale	Group	n	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p
Trust	Experimental	21	12.2	2.3	36	0.25	0.7
	Control	17	12	2.1			
Self-Disclosure	Experimental	21	4.4	0.9	36	0.72	0.7
	Control	17	4.4	0.9			
Loyalty	Experimental	21	4.2	0.9	36	0.37	0.9
	Control	17	4.1	0.7			

Table 4 shows that there is no significant distinction among the pre-test point of commitment ( $t_{(36)}= 0.27, p>0.05$ ), trust ( $t_{(36)}= 0.25, p>0.05$ ), self-disclosure ( $t_{(36)}= 0.72, p>0.05$ ) and loyalty ( $t_{(36)}= 0.37, p>0.05$ ) between experimental and control groups. Accordingly, it may be suggested that commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty points of individuals in the experimental and control groups were equal prior to group counseling based on psychodrama approach.

The arithmetic means and standard deviations of commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty points of the students in the experimental and control groups before the process, after the process and 3 months following the end of process were estimated. The results are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of Pre-test, Post-test and Follow-up Test Points of Commitment, Trust, Self-Disclosure and Loyalty for Experimental and Control Groups

Scale	Groups	Pre-post-follow-up scores	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss
Commitment	Experimental	Pre-test	21	18.8	3.8
		Post-test	21	28.1	4.2
		Follow-up test	21	27.1	4.4
	Control	Pre-test	17	18.4	3.7
		Post-test	17	18.2	3.4
		Follow-up test	17	18.5	3.8
Trust	Experimental	Pre-test	21	12.1	2.3
		Post-test	21	22.3	2.8
		Follow-up test	21	22.1	2.9
	Control	Pre-test	17	12.00	2.1
		Post-test	17	12.05	2.07
		Follow-up test	17	12.1	2.05
Self-Disclosure	Experimental	Pre-test	21	4.3	1.6
		Post-test	21	14.1	1.3
		Follow-up test	21	14.04	1.4
	Control	Pre-test	17	4.4	1.3
		Post-test	17	3.7	0.8
		Control test	17	3.8	0.7
Loyalty	Experimental	Pre-test	21	4.1	1.1
		Post-test	21	14.4	0.8
		Follow-up test	21	14.4	0.8
	Control	Pre-test	17	3.8	1.1
		Post-test	17	3.8	0.8
		Follow-up test	17	3.8	0.9



When the descriptive Table 5 for the commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty pre-test, post-test and follow-up test points of the experimental and control groups are reviewed, the commitment pre-test mean point of students in the experimental group is  $\bar{x}=18.8$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=28.1$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=27.1$ . The commitment pre-test mean point of the control group is  $\bar{x}=18.4$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=18.2$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=18.5$ . The trust pre-test mean point of the students in the experimental group is  $\bar{x}=12.1$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=22.3$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=22.1$ . The trust pre-test mean point of the control group is  $\bar{x}=12.00$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=12.05$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=12.1$ . The self-disclosure pre-test mean point of the experimental group is  $\bar{x}=4.3$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=14.1$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=14.0$ . The self-disclosure pre-test mean point of the control group is  $\bar{x}=4.4$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=3.7$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=3.8$ . The loyalty pre-test mean point of the experimental group is  $\bar{x}=4.1$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=14.4$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=14.4$ . The loyalty pre-test mean point of the control group is  $\bar{x}=3.8$ , post-test mean point is  $\bar{x}=3.8$  and follow-up test mean point is  $\bar{x}=3.8$ . According to these results, there was no distinction in the control group, but there was an increase in the mean points of post-tests and follow-up tests regarding the pre-test mean points in the experimental group.

The Anova test was performed for repeated measures to find whether this distinction in post-test and follow-up test mean points was statistically significant, in comparison to the commitment pre-test mean points of students in experimental group. The results of test are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6.** ANOVA Finding for Commitment Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Points of Experimental and Control Groups

Source	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	$\eta^2$
<b>Between groups</b>	2683.85	37				
Group (Experimental/Control)	1185.48	1	1185.48	28.48	0.00	0.4
Error	1498.37	36	28.48			
<b>Within groups</b>	1247.5	76				
Measure (Pre-post-follow up)	525.63	2	262.81	100.7	0.00	0.73
<b>Group* Measure</b>	533.98	2	266.9	102.3	0.00	0.74
Error	187.89	72	2.6			
Total	3931.35	113				

As indicated in Table 6, Anova test conducted on the mean points of commitment pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures suggested that students in the experimental and control groups were determined to have a significant group effect ( $F_{(1,36)}= 28.48$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). There was a significant distinction between the mean points of the pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures of students, regardless of their groups. ( $F_{(2,72)}= 100.7$ ,  $p<0.05$ ). This result shows that commitment points of the students differentiation depending on the experimental process when there was no group distinction. It was also showed that the score acquired from analysis of the important element of common effect (group\*measure effect) was significant ( $F_{(2,72)}= 102.3$ ,  $p<0.05$ ).

Table 7 presents the findings of the Bonferroni test covering the mean points of commitment pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests of the students in the experimental and control groups as well as comparisons between groups and between measures, in order to identify the groups between which there is significant distinction based on these results acquired from the Anova analysis.

**Table 7.** Test Findings (Bonferroni) for Commitment Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Mean Points of Experimental and Control Groups

		Experimental			Control		
		Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)	Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)
Experimental	Pre test	-	9.33*	8.33*	0.6		
	Post test	-9.33*	-	0.2		9.9*	
	Followup test	-8.33*	-0.2	-			10*
Control	Pre test	-0.6			-	-0.7	-0.6
	Post test		-9.9*		-0.17	-	-0.4
	Followup test			-10*	0.11	0.4	-

Upon analysis of the Bonferroni test findings presented in Table 7, it is found that the distinction between the mean points of commitment pre-test ( $\bar{x}=18.8$ ) and mean scores of post-test ( $\bar{x}=28.1$ ) is significant in the experimental group (-9.33\*,  $p < .05$ ). Likewise, the distinction between the mean points of commitment pre-test ( $\bar{x}=18.8$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=27.1$ ) was significant in the experimental group (-8.33\*,  $p < .05$ ). Nevertheless, there was insignificant distinction between the mean points of commitment pre-test ( $\bar{x}=28.1$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=27.1$ ) in the experimental group (-0.2  $p > .05$ ). This means that the distinction between the mean points of commitment pre-test and post-test was significant; however, the distinction between the mean points of post-test and follow-up test was not significant in the experimental group.

The Anova analysis was performed for repeated measures to determine whether this distinction in post-test and follow-up test mean points was statistically significant, as compared to the trust pre-test mean points of students in experimental group. The test results are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8.** ANOVA Findings for Trust Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Points of Experimental and Control Groups

Source	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	n <sup>2</sup>
<b>Between groups</b>	1823.79	37				
Group (Experimental/Control)	1327.03	1	1327.03	96.17	0.00	0.7
Error	496.76	36	13.79			
<b>Within groups</b>	1432.44	76				
Measure (Pre-post-follow up)	649.59	2	324.79	150.51	0.00	0.8
<b>Group* Measure</b>	627.48	2	313.74	145.38	0.00	0.8
Error	155.37	72	2.15			
Total	3256.23	113				

As indicated in Table 8, Anova test conducted on the mean points of trust pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures suggested that students in the experimental and control groups were determined to have a significant group effect ( $F_{(1,36)}= 96.17$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). There was a significant distinction between the mean points of the pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures of students, regardless of their groups. ( $F_{(2,72)}= 150.51$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This result shows that trust points of the students differentiation depending on the experimental process when there was no group distinction. It was also showed that the score acquired from analysis of the important element of common effect (group\*measure effect) was significant ( $F_{(2,72)}= 145.38$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 9 presents the findings of the Bonferroni test covering the mean points of trust pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests of the students in the experimental and control groups as well as comparisons between groups and between measures, in order to identify the groups between which there is significant distinction based on these results acquired from the Anova analysis.

**Table 9.** Test Findings (Bonferroni) for Trust Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Mean Points of Experimental and Control Groups

		Experimental			Control		
		Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)	Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)
Experimental	Pre test	-	10.2*	10.00*	0.1		
	Post test	-10.2*	-	0.2		-10.25	
	Followup test	-10.00*	-0.19	-			-10
Control	Pre test	-0.1			-	0.05	-0.1
	Post test		10.25		-0.05	-	0.05
	Followup test			10*	0.1	0.05	-

Upon analysis of the Bonferroni test findings presented in Table 9, it is found that the distinction between the mean points of trust pre-test ( $\bar{x}=12.1$ ) and mean points of post-test ( $\bar{x}=22.3$ ) is significant in the experimental group ( $-10.2^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Likewise, the distinction between the mean points of trust pre-test ( $\bar{x}=12.1$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=22.1$ ) was significant in the experimental group ( $-10^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Nevertheless, there was insignificant distinction between the mean points of trust pre-test ( $\bar{x}=22.3$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=21.1$ ) in the experimental group ( $-0.1$   $p > .05$ ). This means that the distinction between the mean points of trust pre-test and post-test was significant; however, the distinction between the mean points of post-test and follow-up test was not significant in the experimental group.

The Anova test was performed for repeated measures to find out whether this distinction in post-test and follow-up test mean scores was statistically significant, in comparison to the self-disclosure pre-test mean points of students in experimental group. The test findings are presented in Table 10.

**Table 10.** ANOVA Findings for Self-Disclosure Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Points of Experimental and Control Groups

Source	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	n <sup>2</sup>
<b>Between groups</b>	1428.27	37				
Group (Experimental/Control)	1325.23	1	1325.23	462.97	0.00	0.9
Error	103.04	36	13.79			
<b>Within groups</b>	1175.79	76				
Measure (Pre-post-follow up)	528.37	2	264.17	412.30	0.00	0.92
<b>Group* Measure</b>	647.42	2	328.71	513.00	0.00	0.93
Error	46.13	72	0.64			
Total	3256.23	113				

As indicated in Table 10, Anova test conducted on the mean points of self-disclosure pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures suggested that students in the experimental and control groups were determined to have a significant group effect ( $F_{(1,36)}= 462.97$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). There was a significant distinction between the mean points of the pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures of students, regardless of their groups. ( $F_{(2,72)}= 412.30$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This result shows that self-disclosure points of the students differentiation depending on the experimental process when there was no group distinction. It was also showed that the score acquired from analysis of the important element of common effect (group\*measure effect) was significant ( $F_{(2,72)}= 513.00$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 11 presents the findings of the Bonferroni test covering the mean points of self-disclosure pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests of the students in the experimental and control groups as well as comparisons between groups and between measures, in order to identify the groups between which there is significant distinction based on these results acquired from the Anova analysis.

**Table 11.** Test Findings (Bonferroni) for Self-Disclosure Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Mean Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

		Experimental			Control		
		Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)	Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)
Experimental	Pre test	-	9.8*	9.7*	0.1		
	Post test	-9.8*	-	0.06		-10.4	
	Followup test	-9.7*	-0.06	-			10.2
Control	Pre test	-0.1			-	0.05	0.1
	Post test		10.4		-0.05	-	0.05
	Followup test			-10.2	-0.1	-0.05	-

Upon analysis of the Bonferroni test findings presented in Table 11, it is found that the distinction between the mean points of self-disclosure pre-test ( $\bar{x}=4.3$ ) and mean points of post-test ( $\bar{x}=14.1$ ) is significant in the experimental group ( $-9.8^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Likewise, the distinction between the mean points of self-disclosure pre-test ( $\bar{x}=4.3$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=14.04$ ) was significant in the experimental group ( $-9.7^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Nevertheless, there was insignificant distinction between the mean points of self-disclosure pre-test ( $\bar{x}=14.1$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=14.04$ ) in the experimental group ( $-0.06 > .05$ ). According to these results, there was no distinction in the control group whereas there was an increase in the mean scores of post-tests and follow-up tests in comparison to the pre-test mean scores in the experimental group.

The Anova test was performed for repeated measures to find out whether this distinction in post-test and follow-up test mean scores was statistically significant, in comparison to the loyalty pre-test mean scores of students in experimental group. The test results are presented in Table 12.

**Table 12.** ANOVA Findings for Loyalty Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Points of Experimental and Control Groups

Source	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p	n <sup>2</sup>
<b>Between groups</b>	1462.47	37				
Group (Experimental/Control)	1410.67	1	1410.67	980.23	0.00	0.9
Error	51.80	36	1.43			
<b>Within groups</b>	1365.67	76				
Measure (Pre-post-follow up)	612.02	2	306.00	430.92	0.00	0.9
<b>Group* Measure</b>	702.53	2	351.26	464.61	0.00	0.9
Error	51.12	72	0.71			
Total	39	113				

As indicated in Table 12, Anova test conducted on the mean points of loyalty pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures suggested that students in the experimental and control groups were determined to have a significant group effect ( $F_{(1,36)}= 980.23$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). There was a significant distinction between the mean points of the pre-test, post-test and follow-up measures of students, regardless of their groups. ( $F_{(2,72)}= 430.9$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This result shows that commitment points of the students differentiation depending on the experimental process when there was no group distinction It was also showed that the point acquired from analysis of the important element of common effect (group\*measure effect) was significant ( $F_{(2,72)}= 464.6$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

Table 13 presents the findings of the Bonferroni test covering the mean points of loyalty pre-test, post-test and follow-up tests of the students in the experimental and control groups as well as comparisons between groups and between measures, in order to identify the groups between which there is significant distinction based on these results acquired from the Anova analysis.

**Table 13.** Test Finding (Bonferroni) for Loyalty Pre-Test, Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Mean Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

		Experimental			Control		
		Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)	Pre-test mean difference (I, J)	Post-test mean difference (I, J)	Follow-up test mean difference (I, J)
Experimental	Pre test	-	10.3*	10.3*	-0.3		
	Post test	-10.3*	-	0.0		10.6*	
	Followup test	-10.3*	0.0	-			10.6*
Control	Pre test	0.3			-	0.0	0.0
	Post test		-10.6*		0.0	-	0.0
	Followup test			-10*	0.0	0.0	-

Upon analysis of the Bonferroni test results presented in Table 12, it is found that the distinction between the mean points of loyalty pre-test ( $\bar{x}=4.1$ ) and mean points of post-test ( $\bar{x}=14.4$ ) is significant in the experimental group ( $-10.3^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Likewise, the distinction between the mean points of loyalty pre-test ( $\bar{x}=18.8$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=14.4$ ) was significant in the experimental group ( $-10.3^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Nevertheless, there was insignificant distinction between the mean points of loyalty pre-test ( $\bar{x}=14.4$ ) and mean points of follow-up test ( $\bar{x}=14.4$ ) in the experimental group ( $0.0 p > .05$ ). This means that the distinction between the mean points of loyalty pre-test and post-test was significant; however, the distinction between the mean points of post-test and follow-up test was not significant in the experimental group. According to these results, there was no distinction in the control group, but there was an increase in the mean points of post-tests and follow-up tests in comparison to the pre-test mean points in the experimental group.

### Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

The aim of this research is to study the impacts of group psychological counseling activity based on psychodrama approach on peer relationships of female adolescents. With this purpose, experimental and control groups were established of 21 and 17 girls, respectively, and the study was continued for 16 weeks. Before starting the group sessions, Peer Relationship Scale (Kaner, 2000) (PRS) was applied to all participants to obtain pretest points. The statistical analysis showed that, scores of the two groups prior to psychodrama implementations did not display a significant discrepancy. At the end of the sixteenth week, when the sessions were all over, PRS was applied to both groups, namely experimental and control groups to obtain posttest scores. The findings of the research indicate that the experiment based on psychodrama approach had an impact on the points for commitment, trust, self-disclosure and loyalty, which were sub-dimensions of the Peer Relationship Scale. Three months later, the posttest points and the follow-up test points of the experimental group were compared. The findings yielded no significant distinction in the total points of the sub-dimensions of Peer Relationship Scale in posttest and follow up test, thus indicating that the effect was long lasting.

Group psychological counseling sessions conducted by Shechtman and colleagues (2002) for fifteen weeks demonstrated that group psychological counseling was effective on disadvantaged adolescents for developing close friendship bonds. Furthermore, Shechtman and Vurembrand (1996) conducted an experimental group study for twenty weeks which indicated that girls performed higher level of self-revealing behavior than boys. This was interpreted as an outcome of girls encouraging each other for expressing their emotions and self-disclosure. Shechtman and colleagues (1994) asserted that group therapy had the potential to create a sense of belonging, togetherness, acknowledgement of emotions, self-expression, self-disclosure and constructive feedback that generally promotes positive interaction. Hargrave and Hargrave (1983), stated that a group of same-sex individuals was most effective in the improvement of relationships among adolescents. This research was conducted solely



with female students and the results obtained are in accordance with the research findings of Shechtman and colleagues (2002), Shechtman and Vurembrand (1996), Shechtman and colleagues (1994).

Close peer relationships are considered necessary for the happiness, for the physical and spiritual wellbeing of all people, in particular, during difficult times in young people's lives (Myers, 2000; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Close peer relationships of an adolescent may provide him/her potential support during hard times in life offer a channel for mutual discovery of identity, sense of intimacy and a channel for expressing the emotions (Cooper & Cooper, 1992). Shechtman and Gluk, (2005) asserted that close peer relationships constituted a unique developmental function. Truthful conversations with peers could contribute to the improvement of self-esteem and self-worth of the adolescents and, also, help them lessen their fears and anxiety regarding the physical and emotional changes they go through during adolescence, encouraging them, thus, for true adaptation (Berndt, 1982). Good peer relationships may, also, contribute to the improvement of social skills and the sense of trust which will be required for developing intimate relations at later stages of life (Berndt, 1982). In the meantime, good peer relationships during adolescence are observed to be effective on the abatement of loneliness and depression (Parker et al., 2006), increase in school success (Jacobson & Brudsal, 2012; Rabaglietti & Ciairano, 2008), emotional adjustments (Demir & Urberg, 2004) and flirting (Demir, Baran, & Ulusoy, 2005). Considering the findings mentioned above, more experimental studies focusing on the the improvement of peer relationships need to be done in future studies

Researchers argue that group therapy is more effective than individual therapy (Tillitski, 1990), when implemented, in particular, with adolescents lacking social skills or those with low self-confidence (Mishna, Kaiman & Little, 1994). According to Mishna and colleagues (1994), group therapy provides adolescents social interaction enabling them with opportunities to make self-evaluation, help each other, have self-respect and mitigate the feeling of loneliness. Group therapy with children and teenagers demonstrates remarkable benefits (Chazan, 2001), some of which may be listed as follows: providing a sense of belonging; bringing them together with their peers with similar problems and, thus, helping them to see that these are not solely their problems and encouraging them to open up; making them aware of the impact of their own behaviors on others as well as the impact of others' behaviors on themselves; bringing them together with peers having different personal traits and supporting them to recognize and acknowledge the strengths and weaknesses of both themselves and the others; helping them to experience new approaches in terms of thinking, to feel and to behave within a group of peers in the protected environment of a group session and to implement the communication and behavior patterns tested within the group when they get outside (Chazan, 2001). Adolescents attribute value to group experience since they feel less isolated and feel encouraged to try new ways to cope with their problems and develop new skills for interpersonal relations within a group (Corder, 1994).

As a method of group psychotherapy, psychodrama is structured on creativity and spontaneity as a model based on action. Therefore, it is highly appropriate to be employed for children and adolescents (Gökler & Danişman Gökler, 2011). Role playing contributes to the behaviors of the children/teenagers helping them to develop a new perspective and insight, and to undertake more acceptable roles in their relations (Gökler, 2017). According to Blatner (1996), psychodrama techniques are effective in bringing out the emotions of adolescents and improving their interpersonal relation skills. It is effective on the adolescents, also because; it prefers interaction-based communication to introspection (Lippe, 1992). In the process of psychodrama, the individual has the chance to reevaluate his/her life. Psychodrama provides the teenagers the therapeutic conditions which support them to distinguish not only the real and the imaginary audience, but also the acting and the real self (Mitchell, 1996). In the meantime, psychodrama stage gives the adolescents the opportunity to rehearse socially acceptable new behaviors, and, thereby help them to resolve conflicts (Singal, 2003). The quantitative results of the study handled to examine the effects of psychodrama on peer relationships of girl adolescents may indicate that psychodrama is an effective approach in improving peer relationships among girl adolescents. Similarly, the group plays and psychodrama techniques such as stage setting,



role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, mirroring and surplus reality, as used in this study may be considered effective on peer relationship dimensions like self-disclosure, commitment, trust and loyalty for female adolescents.

This research is subject to a number of limitations. First of all, the fact that the research was carried through with girl adolescents of high school junior level affects the generalizability of the results. Researches that will follow will include participants from different class levels and comprise both male adolescent groups and heterogeneous groups including male and female simultaneously, and, thus, will contribute more to our understanding of peer relationship dynamics of adolescents. Another limitation of this study is that the group members are not all protagonists. The reasons why the group members didn't self-disclose can be expounded due to the fact that the members knew each other well and that the study took place in the school environment. The total number of the group sessions was limited to sixteen weeks. The sessions lasted for 180 minutes. In future studies, the total number of sessions can be increased according to the size of the group. It can also be recommended that the efficiency of the implemented group counseling based on psychodrama should be supported with qualitative data for a deeper assessment of the views of the participants. And finally, the fact that no study was conducted with the control group provides another limitation.

## References

- Bader, M. (2012). *Psychodrama and improve theater group: Positive adolescent identity development* (Unpublished master's thesis). Saint Mary's College of California, USA.
- Berndt, T. J. (1982). The features and effects of friendship in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 53, 1447-1460.
- Bilgiç, N. (2000). *The effect of friendship skills training on the levels of loneliness of students at second grade of elementary school* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Blatner, A. (1996). *Acting-in: Practical applications for psychodramatic methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Springer.
- Blatner, A. (2007). Morenean approaches: Recognizing psychodrama's many facets. *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama & Sociometry*, 59(4), 159-170. doi:10.3200/JGPP.59.4.159-170
- Bulduk, S. (2003). *Yeni başlayanlar için psikolojide deneysel araştırma yöntemleri*. İstanbul: Çantay Publisher.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara: Pegem Publisher.
- Carbonell, D. M., & Partelero Barehmi, C. (1999). Psychodrama groups for girls coping with trauma. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 49(3), 285-306. doi:10.1080/00207284.1999.11732607
- Chazan, R. (2001). *Group as therapist*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingley Publishers.
- Cohen, D., Delaroché, P., Flament, M. F., & Mazet, P. (2014). Case report: Individual psychodrama for treatment resistant obsessive-compulsive disorder, *Neuropsychiatrie De L'enfance Et De L'adolescence*, 62(1), 19-21. doi:10.1016/j.neurenf.2013.12.001
- Colarossi, L.G., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). A prospective study of adolescents' peer support: Gender differences and the influence of parental relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29(6), 661-678. doi:10.1023/A:1026403922442
- Cooper, C. R., & Cooper, R. G. (1992). Links between adolescents' relationships with their parents and peers: Models, evidence, and mechanisms. In R. D. Parks & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Family peer relationships: Modes of linkage* (pp. 135-158). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Corder, B. F. (1994). *Structured adolescent psychotherapy groups*. Sarasota, FL, US: Professional Resource Press/Professional Resource Exchange.
- Corey, G. (2012). *Theory and practice of group counseling* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Thomson Learning.
- Crosnoe, R., Cavanagh, S., & Elder, G. H. (2003). Adolescent friendships as academic resources: The intersection of friendship, race and school disadvantage. *Sociological Perspectives*, 43(3), 231-252. doi:10.1525/sop.2003.46.3.331
- Çevik Büyüksahin, G. (2007). *A study on friendship relations and the sense of self-respect among high school third year students with regard to some variables* (Unpublished master's thesis). Çukurova University, Adana.
- Demir, M., & Urberg, K. A. (2004). Friendship and adjustment among adolescents. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 88(1), 68-82. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2004.02.006
- Demir, N. Ö., Baran, A. G. & Ulusoy, D. (2005). Relationships of adolescents in Turkey with friend-peer groups and deviant behaviors: Ankara sample. *Bilig*, 32, 83-108.
- Demir, S., & Kaya, A. (2008). The effect of group guidance program on the social acceptance levels and sociometrist status of adolescents. *Elementary Education Online*, 7(1), 127-140.
- Diamond Raab, L., & Orrell Valente, J. K. (2002). Art therapy, psychodrama, and verbal therapy: An integrative model of group therapy in the treatment of adolescents with anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 11, 343-364.
- Dishion, T., & Kavanagh, K. (2003). *Intervening in adolescent problem behavior: A family-centered approach*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Doğan, T., Karaman, N. G., Çoban, A. E., & Çök, F. (2012). Predictors of adolescents' friendship qualities: Gender and family related variables. *Elementary Education Online*, 11(3), 845-855.
- Dorothea, G. (2016). Effectiveness of psychodrama group therapy on pupils with mathematics anxiety. *Zeitschrift fur Psychodrama and Soziometrie*, 15(1), 197-215. doi:10.1007/s11620-015-0299-4

- Erdem, G., Eke, C. Y., Ögel, K., & Taner, S. (2006). Friend quality and substance use among high school students. *Journal of Dependence*, 7(3), 111-116.
- Galambos, N. L. (2004). Gender and gender role development in adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 233-262). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc. doi:10.1002/9780471726746.ch8
- Gatta, M., Lara, D. Z., Lara, D. C., Andrea, S., Paolo, T. C., ... PierAntonio, B. (2010). Analytical psychodrama with adolescents suffering from psycho-behavioral disorder: Short-term effects on psychiatric symptoms. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, 37(3), 240-247. doi:10.1016/j.aip.2010.04.010
- Giordano, P. (2003). Relationships in adolescence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 257-281. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100047
- Gökler, B. (2017). Psychodrama as a group psychotherapy method. *Journal of Turkey Clinics Child Psychiatry-Special Topics*, 3(2), 77-83.
- Gökler, B., & Danışman Gökler, I. (2011). Group psychotherapy and psychodrama with children and adolescents. *Abdülkadir Özbek Psychodrama Institute Journal*, 3, 7-28.
- Hargrave, M. C., & Hargrave, G. E. (1983). Groupwork with preadolescents: Theory and practice. *Child Welfare Journal*, 62, 31-37.
- Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: Friendships and their developmental significance. *Child Development*, 67(1), 1-13.
- Hussong, A. M. (2000). Perceived peer context and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 10(4), 391-415. doi:10.1207/SJRA1004\_02
- Jacobson, L. T., & Brudsal, C. A. (2012). Academic performance in middle school: Friendship Influences. *Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice*, 2(3), 1-12.
- Jenkins, S. R., Goodness, K., & Buhrmester, D. (2002). Gender differences in early adolescents' relationship qualities, self-efficacy, and depression symptoms. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 22(3), 277-309. doi:10.1177/02731602022003003
- Kaner, S. (1993). Effect of psychodrama and reality therapy on the conception of self and empathy levels of delinquent adolescents. *Journal of Psychiatry Psychology Psychopharmacology (3P)*, 1(2), 165-172.
- Kaner, S. (2000). A study on developing a peer relationships scale and a peer deviance scale. *Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 33(1-2), 67-75.
- Karataş, Z. (2009). Effects of group activities based on psychodrama on continuing anxiety levels of adolescents. *Contemporary Education Journal*, 34(360), 31-37.
- Karataş, Z. (2011). A study on group activities based on psychodrama on the conflict resolving skills of adolescents. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 1(2), 601-614.
- Karataş, Z., & Gökçakan, Z. (2009). A study on the effects of group activities based on psychodrama on mitigating aggressive behaviors of adolescents. *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry*, 20(4), 357-366.
- Kellermann, P. (2007). *Sociodrama and collective trauma*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Kim, K. W. (2003). The effects of being the protagonist in psychodrama. *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama and Sociometry*, 55(4), 115-127.
- Kipper, D. A., & Ritchie, T. D. (2003). The effectiveness of psychodramatic techniques: A meta-analysis. *Group Dynamics Theory, Research and Practice*, 7(1), 13-25. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.7.1.13
- Kit, P. L., & Teo, L. (2012). Quit now! A psychoeducational expressive therapy group work approach for at-risk and delinquent adolescent smokers in Singapore. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 37(1), 2-28. doi:10.1080/01933922.2011.606557
- Kruczek, T., & Zagelbaum, A. (2004). Increasing adolescent awareness of at-risk behaviors via psychoeducational drama. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, 31, 1-10. doi:10.1016/j.aip.2003.11.004
- Laursen, B., Bukowski, W. M., Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2007). Friendship moderates prospective associations between social isolation and adjustment problems in young children. *Child Development*, 78, 1395-1404. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01072.x
- Lippe, W.A. (1992). Stanislavski's affective memory as a therapeutic tool. *Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama and Sociometry*, 45(3), 102-111.

- Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist*, 45, 513-520. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.4.513
- Mertz, C. (2013). *The effective of psychodrama for adolescents who have experienced trauma* (Unpublished master's thesis). Smith College School for Social Work, Northampton, Massachusetts, USA.
- Mishna, F., Kaiman, J., Little, S., & Tarshis, E. (1994). Group therapy with adolescents who have learning disabilities and social/emotional problems. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Group Therapy*, 4(2), 117-131. doi:10.1007/BF02548484
- Mitchell, J. J. (1996). *Adolescent vulnerability*. Calgary: Detselig, Enterprises Ltd.
- Moreno, J. L. (1985). *Psychodrama vol. 1* (7th ed.). Ambler, P.A: Beacons House.
- Myers, D. G. (2000). The funds, friends and faith of happy people. *American Psychologist*, 55, 56-67.
- Orkibi, H., Azoulaya, B., Regev, D., & Sinir, S. (2017). Adolescents' dramatic engagement predicts their in-session productive behaviors: A psychodrama change process study. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, 55, 46-53. doi:10.1016/j.aip.2017.04.001
- Parker, J. G., & Gottman, J. M. (1989). Social and emotional development in a relational context: Friendship interaction from early childhood to adolescence. In T. J. Berndt & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Wiley series on personality processes. Peer relationships in child development* (pp. 95-131). Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Parker, J. G., Low, C., M., Walker, A. R., & Gamm, B. K. (2005). Friendship jealousy in young adolescents: Individual differences and links to sex, self-esteem, aggression, and social adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 41(1), 235-250. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.41.1.235.
- Parker, J. G., Rubin, K. H., Erath, S. A., Wojslawowicz, J. C., & Buskirk, A. A. (2006). Peer relationships, child development, and adjustment: A developmental psychopathology perspective. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Theory and method* (pp. 419-493). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc. doi:10.1002/9780470939383.ch12
- Pittman, L. D., & Richmond, A. (2008). University belonging, friendship quality and psychological adjustment during the transition to college. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 76(4), 343-362. doi:10.3200/JEXE.76.4.343-362
- Rabaglietti, E., & Ciairano, S. (2008). Quality of friendship relationships and developmental tasks in adolescence. *Cognitive Crier Compartment*, 12(2), 183-203.
- Selfhout, H. W., Branje, S. J. T., & Meeus, W. H. J. (2008). The development of delinquency and perceived friendship quality in adolescent best friendship dyads. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36, 471-485. doi:10.1007/s10802-007-9193-5
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-13.
- Shadur, J. M., & Hussong, A. M. (2014). Friendship intimacy, close friend drug use, and self-medication in adolescence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31(8), 997-1018. doi:10.1177/0265407513516889.
- Shechtman, Z. (1991). Small group therapy and pre-adolescent same-sex friendships. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 41(2), 227-243. doi:10.1080/00207284.1991.11490646
- Shechtman, Z., & Gluk, O. (2005). An investigation of therapeutic factors in children's groups. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 9(2), 127-134. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.9.2.127
- Shechtman, Z., & Vurembrand, N. (1996). Does self-disclosure in friendship increase following group counseling/therapy? A different case for boys and girls. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 35(1/2), 123-130.
- Schechtman, Z., Freidman, Y., Kashti, Y., & Sharabany, R. (2002). Group counseling to enhance adolescents' close friendships. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 52, 537-553. doi:10.1521/ijgp.52.4.537.45519
- Shechtman, Z., Vurembrand, N., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1994). A dyadic and gender-specific analysis of close friendships of pre-adolescents receiving group psychotherapy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11, 443. doi:10.1177/0265407594113009

- Simpkins, S. D., Parke, R. D., Flyr, M. L., & Wild, M. N. (2006). Similarities in children's and early adolescents' perceptions of friendship qualities across development, gender, and friendship qualities. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 26(4), 491-508. doi:10.1177/0272431606291941
- Singal, S. (2003). *The efficacy of psychodrama in the treatment of oppositional and defiant adolescents* (Unpublished master's thesis). McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
- Smokowski, P. R., & Bacallao, M. (2009). Entre dos mundos/between two worlds youth violence prevention: Comparing psychodramatic and support group delivery formats. *Small Group Research*, 40(1), 3-27. doi:10.1177/1046496408326771
- Springmeyer, S. (2013). *Therapeutic acting: Psychodrama with adolescent female survivors of sexual abuse* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Azusa Pacific University, CA, USA.
- Steglich C. E. G., Snijders, T. A. B., & Pearson, M. (2010). Dynamic networks and behavior: Separating selection from influence. *Sociological Methodology*, 40, 329-393. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9531.2010.01225.x
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2015). *Çok değişkenli istatistiklerin kullanımı* (M. Baloğlu, Ed. & Trans.). Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Tillitski, C., J. (1990). A meta-analysis of estimated effect sizes for group versus individual versus control treatments. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 40, 215-224. doi:10.1080/00207284.1990.11490601
- Üneri, Ö. Ş., Yıldırım, E. A., Tanıdır, C., & Aytemiz, T. (2016). Use of psychodrama with adolescents having social anxiety disorder. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, 17(5), 347-353. doi: 10.5455/apd.207763.
- Way, N., & Greene, M. L. (2006). Trajectories of perceived friendship quality during adolescence: The patterns and contextual predictors. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16(2), 293- 320. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006.00133.x
- Weerman, F. M. (2011). Delinquent peers in context: A longitudinal network analysis of selection and influence effects. *Criminology*, 49(1), 253-286. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2010.00223.x
- Wentzel, K. R. (2009). Peers and academic functioning at school. In K. H. Rubin, W. M. Bukowskive, & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Social, emotional, and personality development in context. Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups* (pp. 531-547). The Guilford Press.
- Wissink, I. B., Dekovic, M., & Meijer, A. M. (2009). Adolescent friendship relations and developmental outcomes: Ethnic and gender differences. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 29(3), 405-425. doi:10.1177/0272431608322945
- Yalom, I. (2002). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy* (A. Tangör & Ö. Karaçam, Trans.) İstanbul: Kabalıcı Publisher.



### Appendix 1. Session content, techniques and aims

#### Group Sessions:

Session No	Content	The Technique Used	Aim
1	Introduction, setting the rules of the group, setting the objectives, presenting theoretical information on psychodrama	Verbal information transfer, the play of talking about the names of participants and how the names were given, group sharing	Supporting group members to get to know each other, creating a trustworthy environment, creating awareness on the expectations from the group and responsibilities.
2	Her own doctor play, role reversal, pairing.	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, group sharing	Enabling group members to think about themselves, to become aware of their cognitive distortion and clarifying that specific moment they experience. Making them express their problems as their own doctors.
3	Empty chair, protagonist play.	Stage setting, role selection, acting, mirroring, surplus reality, group sharing	Enabling group members to reveal their emotional relationships and conflicts with a significant person/ significant people in their lives, enabling catharsis and creating emotional and cognitive awareness.
4	Protagonist play	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, surplus reality, group sharing	Enabling the group members to reveal the conflicts they experience with their families and creating awareness on how these conflicts affect other relationships. Improvement of empathy and communication skills.
5	Protagonist play	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, surplus reality, group sharing	Creating awareness of the conflicts experienced in friendship relations and emotions. Enabling catharsis and improvement of communication skills
6	Social atom	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, group sharing	Getting to know significant people for group members and putting forth the socio-metric view of the relations network of the group, observing the role distribution within the group, creating emotional and personal awareness.
7	Protagonist play	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, mirroring, surplus reality, group sharing	Improving awareness on girlfriend, boyfriend relations, expanding role repertoire, improving assertiveness skills.
8	Mirror play, protagonist play	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, surplus reality, group sharing	Resolving conflicts with teachers experienced at school, improving motivation, skills of self-revelation and assertiveness.



## Group Sessions:

Session No	Content	The Technique Used	Aim
9	Ship journey	Stage setting, role selection, acting, group sharing	Increasing spontaneity, putting forth the sociometrist structure of the group, observing the relation dynamics among group members.
10	Protagonist play	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, mirroring, surplus reality, group sharing	Creating cognitive and emotional awareness regarding the difficulties experienced at school, resolving indecisiveness about future occupation and expectations from future.
11	Protagonist play	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, mirroring, surplus reality, group sharing	Resolving conflicts in family and peer relationships, enabling catharsis, control of aggression, improving skills of communication and empathy. Creating emotional, cognitive and relational awareness by means of reviewing the effects of past experiences on today.
12	"I have a secret" play	Paper, pen, plastic bag. Stage setting, verbal information transfer, group sharing.	Enabling the group members not to feel lonely, improving trust and ability to empathize, creating emotional awareness.
13	Social atom	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, mirroring, group sharing	Getting to know significant people for group members and putting forth the socio-metric view of the relations network of the group, focusing on the different outcomes than those obtained at the sixth session, developing awareness on the similarities and differences, observing the role distribution within the group, creating emotional and personal awareness
14	Future projection play.	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, group sharing	Rehearsing the future now and on the spot, as against any problems to be encountered in close and distant future, increasing spontaneity, developing creative solutions.
15	The place where you feel good.	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, group sharing	Bringing out emotional needs, developing awareness and confidence.
16	Creating the group picture.Closing.	Stage setting, role selection, acting, pairing, role reversal, group sharing.	Enabling the group members to become aware of their emotions about the group, observe themselves from outside, understand the sociometric structure and easily say goodbye.