

The Use of Collaborative Writing to Enhance Cohesion in Poetry Therapy Groups

Karina M. Golden, Ph.D.^{1,2}

Collaborative writing is used as a therapeutic technique in poetry therapy groups. This article describes a study on the effect of collaborative writing on cohesion in poetry therapy groups with 33 graduate students. Participants were randomly assigned to poetry therapy control groups without collaborative writing or experimental groups with collaborative writing. After six sessions, posttest scores on the Group Environment Scale (Moos & Hanson, 1974) indicated a significant difference in cohesion for those groups using collaborative writing. Previous research on collaborative writing and suggestions for future studies are discussed.

Poetry therapy is a creative arts therapy modality that “employs poetry and other forms of evocative literature to achieve therapeutic goals and personal growth” (National Association for Poetry Therapy, 1993, p.1). It is used in a range of settings, including mental institutions, nursing homes, and schools (Leedy, 1973; Lerner, 1975; Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Gladding, 1992; Mazza, 1999). It is suitable for individual and group work with clinical and normal populations, including children, adolescents, and youths (Mazza, 1989; Berger & Giovan, 1990; Meyers, 1998), alcohol and substance abuse (Mazza, 1979; Howard, 1997), family therapy (Gladding, 1985; Chavis, 1986; Mazza, 1996), forensic patients (Berger & Giovan, 1990; Denberg, 1990), psychotics (Rossiter, Brown, & Gladding, 1988), and the sexually abused (DeMaria, 1991; Williams, 1991). In essence, poetry therapy appears to be suitable for use with all of the major therapeutic populations.

One of the many strengths of poetry therapy is its success as an intervention in group work (Buck & Kramer, 1974; Goldstein, 1989; Gladding, 1999; Mazza, 1999). Poetry therapy has been demonstrated to increase group cohesion (Ross,

¹Dr. Karina Golden is a writer, psychotherapist, and assistant professor of counseling psychology at Bowie State University in Bowie, MD.

²Correspondence should be directed to Dr. Karina Golden, 7236 Talisman Lane, Columbia, MD 21045.

1977; Mazza, 1981; Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Gorelick, 1989), one of the most essential factors for effective group process (Yalom, 1995). Group cohesion, the feeling of comfort and safety among the members of the group, has been identified as a necessary and therapeutic factor in group therapy (Yalom, 1995; Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Corey & Corey, 1987). When cohesion occurs, members feel involved in and committed to the group. Cohesion in group therapy has been equated to the importance of relationship in individual therapy and has been isolated as a necessary precondition for effective therapy (Yalom, 1995). The literature in group therapy cites the need for additional research on cohesion (Evans & Jarvis, 1980) and analysis of group process as opposed to treatment outcomes (McGrath in Ross, 1977; Yalom, 1995; Corey & Corey, 1987; Hastings-Vertino, Getty, & Wooldridge, 1996; Gladding, 1999).

Although poetry therapy has been identified as an effective therapy technique, there is a scarcity of empirical research on poetry therapy (Lerner, 1978; Mazza, 1981; Cohen, 1992). Empirical studies that have been done have focused primarily on comparing poetry therapy with other forms of therapy such as traditional group therapy (Ross, 1977; Mazza, 1981), feminist therapy (Talbot-Green, 1988), and other modalities (Schrank & Engles, 1981). Limited research has been reported on the dynamics of the poetry therapy process. The need for further research on the poetry therapy process, including isolating the variables which contribute to its effectiveness, remains an important issue (Ross, 1977; Mazza, 1981; Lerner, 1978; Talbot-Green, 1988; Cohen, 1992; Mazza, 1994).

Two important studies have responded to this need. In 1977, Ross compared posttest scores on the Group Environment Scale (GES) (Moos & Hanson, 1974) in traditional group therapy and poetry therapy groups for mental hospital inpatients. He found that there was a significant difference in posttest scores on the Cohesion subscale. Mazza (1981) explored the use of poetry therapy as a treatment modality by comparing the effectiveness of poetry therapy and traditional group therapy sessions with college students. Using the GES, Mazza found that the poetry therapy groups had significantly higher posttest scores on the Cohesion subscale of the GES than the traditional groups. Since some of the poetry therapy sessions were conducted with collaborative writing and others without collaborative writing, Mazza recommended that further research be conducted to isolate collaborative writing as a treatment variable. This suggestion was made based on narrative reports by subjects indicating that collaborative writing increased their feelings of group cohesion. Although these two studies yielded valuable information, the need for further research exists.

This brief overview of poetry therapy demonstrates its value as a treatment modality with recognized positive outcomes. It has been used successfully in a variety of therapeutic settings with diverse clinical populations. Despite its recognized utility, there is a paucity of research that explores the dynamics of the poetry therapy process that make it effective. The present study (Golden, 1994) was conducted

to address this need. Building upon previous research by Ross (1977) and Mazza (1981), it was designed to determine whether collaborative writing enhances group cohesion in the therapeutic environment. It was hypothesized that there would be higher posttest scores ($<.05$ probability level) on the Cohesion subscale of the Group Environment Scale (Moos & Hanson, 1974) in poetry therapy groups that used collaborative writing than in those groups not using collaborative writing.

METHOD

Participants

Participation in this study was presented as an optional developmental learning experience for 33 students in a graduate group counseling class at an urban university. The participants were randomly assigned to two experimental and two control groups. For the purpose of data analysis, the two control and the two experimental groups were combined to create a total of 16 (8 male and 8 female) participants in the experimental group and 17 participants (8 male and 9 female) in the control group. To control for participant bias (Borg & Gall, 1988), students were not informed until after the study (in a debriefing session) that the pretests and posttests would be used primarily to measure group cohesion. Participants were told that the GES was being used to measure their general perceptions of the group.

Instrumentation

The Cohesion subscale of the Group Environment Scale (GES) (Moos & Hanson, 1974) was used in this study as a pretest and posttest to measure group cohesion. The Cohesion subscale assesses the degree of members' involvement and commitment to the group, and the concern and friendship they show for one another (Moos, 1986, p. 2). The GES is a standardized instrument comprised of three dimensions with ten subscales that measure the social-environmental characteristics of task-oriented, social, and psychotherapy and support in groups (Moos, 1986). The Relationship dimensions consist of Cohesion, Leader Support, and Expressiveness subscales. There was a significant difference on the Cohesion subscale for participants in poetry therapy groups as compared to traditional therapy groups in previous studies conducted by Ross (1977) and Mazza (1981). The Personal Growth dimensions of the GES measure Independence, Task Orientation, Self-discovery, and Anger and Aggression. In the studies conducted by Ross (1977) and Mazza (1981), participants in the poetry therapy groups also showed a significant increase in posttest scores on the Self-discovery subscale. The third dimension of the GES, System Maintenance and Change, measures Order and Organization,

Leader Control, and Innovation. Significant differences on these scales were not found in previous poetry therapy studies.

The GES has been shown to have high reliability, ranging from a moderate Chronbach's Alpha of .62 for Independence to a strong .86 on Cohesion (Moos, 1986), and high validity, especially the Cohesion scale. The Cohesion subscale has been shown to be significantly correlated to the Perceived Depth of Interaction Scale, an index of quality in groups (Ross & Bednar as cited in Moos, 1986). In addition, the instrument is easy to administer (Nezu in Corroley & Kramer, 1989). It consists of 90 one-sentence true or false items.

The GES has also been used in a variety of group settings including self-help and psychotherapy groups (Toro & Rappaport, 1985; Goetzal, Shelov, & Croen, 1984) counseling and consultation groups (Mazza, 1981; Wilcox, 1980; Bernier, 1980). Most importantly, its use by Ross (1977) and Mazza (1981) in previous poetry therapy studies measuring cohesion suggested its appropriateness for this study.

Procedure

The design of this study was a pretest-posttest experimental group design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Borg & Gall, 1983). The GES (Moos & Hanson, 1974) was used as a pretest and posttest for each treatment. A t-test was used to show whether there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest means for the control and experimental groups.

GROUP LEADERS

The two group leaders in this study were one male and one female upper level graduate students, both of whom had over 30 graduate school credits in counseling/mental health, had taken at least one graduate level group counseling course, and had at least 30 hours of supervised group therapy experience. Each leader had experience participating in poetry therapy sessions and had read extensive poetry therapy literature. Both leaders used a nondirective leadership style. To minimize the effect of group leader bias, each leader conducted one control and one experimental group.

Since many students were not familiar with poetry therapy, the group leaders met with the class as a whole to discuss the general definition and goals of poetry therapy. After signing a release form, participants were randomly assigned into two control ($N = 8 + 9$) and two experimental groups ($N = 8 + 8$). The two control groups combined resulted in a total of 17 subjects and the two experimental groups combined resulted in a total of 16 subjects. Group leaders then met with participants to discuss group process and ground rules and to encourage participants to talk about their fears and expectations.

The two control groups participated in poetry therapy without collaborative writing. The two experimental groups received poetry therapy combined with collaborative writing. To ensure the confidentiality of the groups, groups were conducted in separate classrooms. The groups met once a week for six one-hour sessions. Since the wording of the items on the GES assumes that the participant has participated in a group session, in this study, as in the study by Mazza (1981), both leaders administered the pretest after the first poetry therapy session in each group. The posttest was administered at the end of the sixth poetry therapy session in each group. Leaders then met with their groups for a debriefing session.

POETRY THERAPY TECHNIQUES

Poetry therapists employ three major techniques when working with clients: the use of preexisting literature, the use of individual writing, and the use of collaborative writing. These techniques may be used alone or in combination. In this study, the control groups used preexisting literature and individual writing. The experimental groups used these two techniques plus the additional technique of collaborative writing.

The first technique, the use of preexisting literature, is used most frequently by poetry therapists. This technique is used with both individuals and groups. Preexisting literature is poetry and literature which has been written before a poetry therapy session. Poetry therapists use the terms "poetry" and "literature" interchangeably and in the broadest sense: they include poetry, song lyrics, plays, short stories, fairy tales, novels, essays, magazine articles, and film. In essence, for a poetry therapist, poetry or literature is essentially any material which "involves language and has internal coherence" (Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986, p. 13). The poetry or literature evokes a response in the client, for "the dynamics by which people experience literature reveals a highly subjective recreation of the work" (Holland, 1989, p. 2).

A critical task for the poetry therapy group leader is choosing appropriate literature in order to meet therapeutic goals (Hynes-Hynes-Berry, 1986; Rolfs & Super, 1988). Poetry therapists choose preexisting literature that is relevant to treatment goals and then encourage participants to respond to the literature through discussion (Lerner, 1973; Leedy, 1985; Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Rossiter, Brown, & Gladding, 1990). There are several theories on guidelines for appropriate literature selection. Leedy (1973, 1985) suggests that poetry therapists should select literature which is similar to client moods, but contains an element of hope. This technique, called the isoprinciple, is borrowed from the field of music therapy where music therapists are trained to select music which is similar to patient moods. Taking a different position, Lerner (1975, 1976, 1985) believes that literature selection should be based solely on the effectiveness of the literature as a vehicle for communication. Hynes and Hynes-Berry (1986) give yet

another recommendation for literature selection; they believe the best literature for poetry therapy has themes which are universal and positive. Schloss (1976) suggests that the literature that is most suitable for poetry therapy is open-ended rather than didactic. In spite of their differences, each of these approaches maintain that the effectiveness of poetry therapy depends on the facilitator's ability to choose material that speaks to the individual participant's needs and interests and to make accurate, empathic interpretations of the participant's responses (Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986).

The second technique is the use of individual writing as a way of eliciting client responses (Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986). Writing has been shown to promote self-awareness, to increase group interaction, and to improve self-esteem (Lauer & Goldfield, 1970, Harrower, 1972; Mitchell & Campbell, 1972; Brand, 1979; Wenz & McWhirter, 1990; Adams, 1996). The poetry therapist usually begins by using a preexisting poem with clients and then encourages them to discuss it. Clients are then invited to write individual written responses to the literature. The poetry therapist may lead clients in writing responses which may take the form of unstructured creative writing and journal writing techniques such as freewriting and poetry, or more structured techniques such as writing acrostics, sentence completions, or completing modified versions of existing poems (Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Mazza, 1996). This technique may also be used in individual and group settings.

Unlike the first two techniques which can be used with either individuals or groups, collaborative writing is used only in group poetry therapy. The poetry therapist usually combines it with preexisting literature and individual writing. The sessions often begin with the poetry therapist sharing the preexisting literature, encouraging participants to discuss it, and then asking them to write individual written responses to the literature. Next, the therapist leads the group in combining these individual written responses into a collaborative (group) poem composed of individual words or lines contributed by each member of the group (Mazza, 1981; Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Gorelick, 1989; Mazza, 1996). Each member therefore contributes to the creation of the collaborative poem. As with individual writing responses, the form of the collaborative poem may be structured or unstructured. The leader writes down the collaborative poem and then reads it aloud. Usually the leader makes copies of the collaborative poem and gives it to the group at the next session. Variations on this technique include omitting the preexisting poem and using some other prompt such as an object or a song or omitting the individual writing and leading the group directly into a group writing exercise.

SELECTION OF PREEXISTING LITERATURE FOR THIS STUDY

Poetry selection for this study was based on the general criteria for the selection of poetry therapy literature: the leaders' comfort level with the poems, their

perceptions of group members, and whether they thought the poetry would meet group goals (Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986). Based on research by Brown (1977) and recommendations by Rolfs and Super (1988) which indicated that poetry therapists should be free to assign poems based on their assessment of the group's mood rather than through rigid preplanning of selected poems, group leaders met prior to administering the treatment and agreed on 12 poems (see Appendix) from which they could choose one for each of their 6 sessions. As in Mazza's study (1981), the ability to choose the appropriate literature, an important aspect of poetry therapy (Hynes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Rossiter, Brown, & Gladding, 1990), was encouraged by providing more poems than could be used in the sessions. In this study, group leaders were given the 6 poems which were actually used in Mazza's research plus 6 additional poems (see Appendix). The 6 additional poems agreed on by the leaders (see Appendix) were chosen based on recommended criteria for literature selection such as the clarity of the language, the perceived needs of the group, and the organization of the poems (Margolis as cited in Mazza, 1977). The inclusion of 6 of the poems used in Mazza's study helped to control for the variability in responses that could be possible with different poems.

Group leaders met after the first session with the participants and before administering treatment to determine which of these 12 poems would be used for the 6 sessions conducted with the group (See Appendix). Although poetry selection was based on Leedy's isoprinciple which suggested matching poems to group mood (Leedy, 1969), his suggestion to use poems with an upbeat ending was abandoned in favor of recommendations by Schloss (1976) that the poems selected should be less didactic and more open-ended. It was agreed that they would begin each treatment group with Stephen Crane's "If I Should Cast Off This Tattered Coat" (as cited in Dore, 1970) because of its nonthreatening subject matter and its open-endedness. The leaders would use the other poems in whatever order they felt was appropriate based on their perceptions of the group.

TECHNIQUES FOR POETRY THERAPY GROUPS

The treatment for each poetry therapy group began with the use of a pre-existing poem chosen before the group session. Both leaders began control and experimental groups with "If I Should Cast Off This Tattered Coat" by Stephen Crane because it is an open-ended poem that can invite participants to imagine possibilities in their lives. Each group leader shared a written copy of the poem with the group, read the poem, and encouraged group responses to the poem. Toward the end of the session, each leader passed out a structured poetry therapy writing exercise based on the preexisting poem. The structured writing exercise consisted of a modified copy of the preexisting poem in which key words such as nouns and verbs were deleted and replaced with blanks which could be filled in with words by the participants. Once the participants filled in the blanks based on their own

personal responses to the session, the leaders encouraged the participants to share their writing with the group.

This procedure was followed in both control and experimental groups. In the experimental groups, however, the individual writing by participants was followed by collaborative writing. After the group members had written individual responses to the poem, the leader invited each participant to contribute a word or a line from his or her individual writing to create a collaborative poem. These words or lines were recorded by the leader on a blank copy of the altered version of the preexisting poem which was given to the participants for their individual response. The leader then read the collaborative poem created by the collaborative writing process and invited the group to respond to the poem. A typed copy of the collaborative poem was handed out to each group member at the beginning of the next poetry therapy session. The group was invited to comment briefly on the collaborative poem, and then the leader began the session with a new preexisting poem. During the sixth and final session, the group leaders administered the GES as a posttest. Based on recommended procedures for group practice (Association for Specialists in Group Workers, 1989, p. 9), the group leaders held a debriefing session after the sixth session to discuss the poetry group therapy experience for the participants.

RESULTS

This study was concerned with the following hypothesis: There will be higher posttest scores ($<.05$ probability level) on the Cohesion subscale of the Group Environment Scale (Moos & Hanson, 1974) in poetry therapy groups using collaborative writing (experimental) than in poetry therapy groups not using collaborative writing (control).

This hypothesis was tested through the use of t-tests. To control for the small sample size and to minimize leader bias, when the data were analyzed, the scores for the two experimental and two control groups were combined. A one-tailed t-test was computed to determine whether the pretest means of the control and experimental groups scores in Cohesion were equivalent. It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the pretests of the control (6.18) and experimental groups (7.38) at the .05 level and they were deemed equivalent. A t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest scores on Cohesion. Although the posttest means in both the control (6.71) and experimental groups (8.13) indicate posttest gains, these gains were not significant.

A t-test was used to test the hypothesis that there would be a significant difference between posttest scores on Cohesion in poetry therapy control and experimental groups. The mean of the posttest scores in the poetry therapy control groups without collaborative writing was 6.075 and the mean for the experimental

poetry groups with collaborative writing was 8.125. The t-value computed was 1.95, indicating a significant difference ($p > .032$) on the posttest scores. Therefore, the hypothesis that there would be a significant difference between the posttest scores in Cohesion for the control group and the experimental groups was accepted.

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to determine whether the difference would be significant ($p > .05$) between posttest scores in Cohesion on the Group Environment Scale for poetry therapy control groups without collaborative writing and experimental groups with collaborative writing. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between posttest scores in Cohesion for the control and experimental groups. The hypothesis that there would be a difference between posttest scores in Cohesion on the Group Environment Scale was accepted.

These findings are consistent with previous research on poetry therapy and cohesion. The relationship between poetry therapy and cohesion has been discussed in Goldstein (1989) and Cohen (1992). In 1977, Ross compared poetry therapy and group therapy on the Group Environment Scale (Moos & Hanson, 1974) and determined that there was a significant difference in Cohesion in poetry therapy groups. In 1981, Mazza also compared poetry therapy groups and psychodynamic groups on the Group Environment Scale. The poetry groups in Mazza's study utilized collaborative writing as a poetry therapy technique. Mazza's research revealed that the difference between posttest scores in Cohesion on the Group Environment Scale for poetry and non-poetry groups was significant. Narrative reports by participants in his study suggested that the use of collaborative poetry might have been one of the variables that contributed to the higher scores in group cohesion. In his recommendations for further study, Mazza suggested that there was a need to research collaborative writing as a therapy technique.

The present study isolated collaborative writing as a variable in poetry therapy and compared it to poetry therapy without collaborative writing by examining posttest scores on Cohesion in the GES. Although generalizations between these studies cannot be made, the increased posttest scores on the GES in this study for both control and experimental poetry therapy groups, while not significant, support the findings of both Ross (1977) and Mazza (1981) that poetry therapy, with or without collaborative writing, results in an increase in cohesion among group members.

In addition, the significant difference between posttest scores in poetry therapy groups with collaborative writing and poetry therapy groups without collaborative writing support the findings in Mazza's study, which suggested that the use of collaborative writing may have a significant effect on cohesion. It is worth

noting that the scores on Cohesion for both the control and the experimental groups increased from the pretest to the posttest. Even though the increase in pretest and posttest scores was not significant for either group, the posttest gains suggest that poetry therapy may increase cohesion, with or without collaborative writing.

This study supports previous findings regarding a positive relationship between cohesion and poetry therapy in general and collaborative writing. The posttest scores on the Group Environment Scale (Moos & Hanson, 1974) were the main measures of group cohesion for the poetry therapy groups. Journal entries kept by participants in this study also suggested increased cohesion, expressing increasing comfort with the poetry therapy groups and with the leaders. In addition, leaders also observed greater cohesion in the groups from earlier to later sessions based on the increased verbal participation of the group in discussing the preexisting poem, sharing individual writing, and engagement in the collaborative writing of a group poem. These findings support those of Mazza (1981, 1985) and are consistent with reports by Hynes and Hynes-Berry (1986), Gorelick (1989), and Yochim (1994).

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

The use of collaborative writing in poetry therapy groups includes a variety of collaborative writing techniques such as the writing of acrostics, sentence completions, completing modified versions of preexisting poems, and freewriting (Hyes & Hynes-Berry, 1986; Mazza, 1996). Research which examines the effects of these different collaborative writing techniques would be beneficial. Studies could be done with different populations and cohesion and other group processes could be examined. For example, it would be interesting to know whether some techniques work better with developmental populations or if some are more effective with clinical populations. Future studies might also address the question of whether gender or age differences are significant. Other factors such as race or attitudes toward poetry and writing might also be explored.

Based on Leedy's (1985) isoprinciple and research done by Brown (1977), further research on the collaborative poem as an expression of group mood would also be valuable. A study which measures leader's perceptions of group mood independent of the use of collaborative poems and with the use of collaborative poems could establish the efficacy of using collaborative poems as a diagnostic technique. The use of collaborative poems as an indicator of group mood and therefore as an aid to appropriate poetry selection for subsequent sessions could also be explored.

Additional empirical research on the effect of poetry therapy and collaborative writing on behavior change also needs to be done. Much of the literature on poetry therapy and behavior change remains anecdotal (Mazza, 1994).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study support previous anecdotal and experimental studies which suggest that the use of poetry therapy seems to enhance group cohesion. Since cohesion has been identified as a necessary condition for therapeutic growth, the use of poetry therapy appears to be an important modality in counseling both developmental and clinical populations. The increase in cultural diversity combined with scarce allocation of resources in many school and institutional settings has resulted in more heterogeneous counseling and therapy groups. Persons with differing communication abilities and developmental and clinical needs are often combined in heterogeneous groups. Poetry therapy with or without collaborative writing might be used as a modality to increase feelings of cohesion among dissimilar group members.

In summary, this study supports previous research which indicated that poetry therapy has a positive effect on group cohesion and the use of collaborative writing enhances this effect. The increase in posttest scores on the Cohesion subscale of the Group Environment Scale was significant for poetry therapy groups using collaborative writing. Observations by group leaders as well as journals by participants supported the results of the quantitative research. These results are consistent with previous research which has been done in this area. Thus, while further research is needed, it appears that poetry therapy and collaborative writing hold promise as therapeutic techniques.

REFERENCES

- Adams, K. (1996). Journal writing as a powerful adjunct to therapy. *Journal of Poetry Therapy, 10*, 31-37.
- Association for Specialists in Group Work. (1989). *Ethical guidelines for group counselors and professional standards for the training of group workers*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Berger, A., & Giovan, M. (1990). Poetic interventions with forensic patients. *Journal of Poetry Therapy, 4*, 83-92.
- Bernier, J. E. (1980). Training and supervising counselors: lessons learned from deliberate psychological education. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 59*, 15-20.
- Borg, W., & Gall, M. (1983). *Educational research*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Brand, A. G. (1979). The uses of writing in psychotherapy. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 19* (4), 53-72.
- Brown, D. H. (1977). Poetry as a counseling tool: The relationship between response to emotion oriented poetry and emotions, interests, and personal needs. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 38*, 4575A.
- Buck, L., & Kramer, A. (1974). Poetry as a means of group facilitation. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 14*, 57-71.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental design for research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Chavis, G. (1986). The use of poetry for clients dealing with family issues. *Arts in Psychotherapy, 13*, 121-128.
- Cohen, L. J. (1992). Bibliotherapy: The experience of therapeutic reading from the perspective of the adult reader. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53* (8), 4027B.

- Corey, M., & Corey, G. (1987). *Groups. Process and practice*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Corroley, J., & Karamer, J. (1989). *The tenth mental measurements yearbook*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Curtis, M. in (1985). Mitchell, J., ed., *The ninth mental measurements yearbook*. Lincoln: Buros Institute.
- Denberg, Ken. (1990). Poetry in the prisons: Coming back up with light. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*, 4, 21–26.
- DeMaria, M. (1991). Poetry and the abused child: The forests and the tinted plexiglass. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*, 5, 79–93.
- Dore, S., Ed. (1970). *The premier book of major poets*. Greenwich, CT: Fawcet Publications.
- Evans, N., & Jarvis, P. (1980). Group cohesion: A review and evaluation. *Small Group Behavior*, 11, 359–370.
- Francis, R. (1976). *Collected poems*. Amhurst: University of Massachusetts.
- Frost, R. (1964). *Robert Frost's Poems*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gilbert, S. M., & Gubar, S. (1985). *The Norton anthology of literature by women*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Gladding, S. (1992). *Counseling as an art: The creative arts in counseling*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Gladding, S. (1999). *Group work: A counseling specialty*. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
- Goetzel, R., Shelov, S., & Croen, L. (1984). Evaluating self-help support groups for medical students. *Journal of Medical Education*, 59, 331–340.
- Golden, K. M. (1994). The effect of collaborative writing on cohesion in poetry therapy groups. *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 56 (3), 867–868A.
- Goldstein, M. (1989). Poetry and therapeutic factors in group therapy. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*, 2, 231–241.
- Gorelick, K. (1989). Poetry on the final common pathway of the psychotherapies: Private self, social self-in-the-World. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*, 3, 3–17.
- Harrower, M. (1972). *The therapy of poetry*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Hastings-Vertino, K., Getty, C., & Wooldridge, P. (1996). Development of a tool to measure therapeutic factors in group process. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 10, 221–228.
- Holland, J. (1989). *Poems in person: An introduction to the psychoanalysis of literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Howard, A. A. (1997). The effects of music and poetry therapy on the treatment of women and adolescents with chemical addictions. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*, 11, 81–102.
- Hynes A., & Hynes-Berry, M. (1986). *Bibliotherapy: The interactive process. A handbook*. New York, Westview Press.
- Ignatow, D. (1964). *Figures of the human*. Middleton, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press.
- Joseph, J. (1987). Warning. In S. Matz, (Ed.), *When I am an old woman I shall wear purple*. Watonsville: Paper Mache Press.
- Kavanaugh, J. (1979). *Walk easy on the earth*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Lauer, R., & Goldfield, M. Creative writing in group therapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7, 248–252.
- Leedy, J. J. (Ed). (1973). *Poetry the healer*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Leedy, J. J. (Ed). (1985). Principles of poetry therapy. In J. J. Leedy Ed. *Poetry as healer: Mending the troubled mind*. (pp. 82–88). New York: Vanguard.
- Lerner, A. (1975). Poetry as therapy. *APA Monitor*, 6 (4), 9–10.
- Lerner, A. (1976). An Editorial: A look at poetry therapy. *Arts in Psychotherapy*, 3, 1.
- Lerner, A., Ed. (1985). *Poetry in the therapeutic experience*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Matz, S. E., Ed. *When I am an old woman I shall wear purple*. Watonsville: Paper Mache Press.
- Mazza, N. (1979). Poetry: A therapeutic tool in the early stages of alcoholism treatment. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 40 (1), 123–128.
- Mazza, N. (1981). Poetry and Group Counseling: An Exploratory Study. Florida State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42 (6), 2305A.
- Mazza, N. (1989). Poetry and therapy: Preventing adolescent suicide. In S. Deats & L. Lenker, Eds. *Youth suicide prevention: Lessons from literature* (pp. 49–67). New York: Plenum Press.
- Mazza, N. (1994). Poetry therapy: Toward a research agenda for the 1990's. *Journal of Poetry Therapy*, 7, 121–137.

- Mazza, N. (1996). Poetry therapy: A framework and synthesis of techniques for family social work. *Journal of Family Social Work, 1* (3), 3–17.
- Mazza, N. (1999). *Poetry therapy: The interface of the arts and psychology*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Meyers, J. E. (1998). Bibliotherapy and DCT: Co-constructing the therapeutic metaphor. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 76*, 243–250.
- Mitchell, D. W., & Campbell, J. A. (1972). Creative writing and counseling. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 50*, 690–691.
- Moos, R., & Hanson, B. (1974). *Group Environment Scale Form B*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Moos, R. (1986). *Group Environment Scale Manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- National Association for Poetry Therapy (1993). Membership brochure. Port Washington, NY.
- Piercy, M. (1988). *Circles on the water*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Piercy, M. (1999). *Early grrrl*. Wellfleet, Mass.: The Leapfrog Press.
- Rolfs, A. M., & Super, S. I. (1988). Guiding the unconscious: The process of poem selection for poetry therapy groups. *The Arts in Psychotherapy, 15*, 119–126.
- Ross, D. L. (1977). Poetry therapy versus traditional supportive therapy: A comparison of group process. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 38* (3), 1417B.
- Rossiter, C., Brown, R., & Gladding, S. (1990). A new criterion for selecting poems for use in poetry therapy. *Journal of Poetry Therapy, 4*, 5–11.
- Schrank, F. A., & Engles, D. W. (1981). Bibliotherapy as a counseling adjunct. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*, 143–147.
- Schloss, G. A. (1976). *Psychopoetry: A new approach to self-awareness through poetry therapy*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap.
- Sewell, M., Ed. (1991). *Cries of the spirit*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Talbott-Green, M. (1988). A comparative study of feminist group psychotherapy and poetry therapy as an adjunctive treatment to increase self-actualization. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 49* (08), 3425B.
- Toro, P., & Rappaport, J. (1985). *Social climate comparison of mutual help and psychotherapy groups*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, Ca.
- Wenz, K., & McWhirter, J. J. (1990). Enhancing the group experience: Creative writing exercises. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 15*, 37–42.
- Wilcox, M. R. (1980). Variables affecting group mental health consultation for teachers. *Professional Psychology, 11*, 728–732.
- Williams, M. B. (1991). Verbalizing silent screams: The use of poetry to identify the belief systems of adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Poetry Therapy, 5*, 5–20.
- Yalom, I. D. (1995). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy* (4th ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Yochim, K. (1994). The collaborative poem and inpatient group therapy: An inpatient report. *The Journal of Poetry Therapy, 7*, 145–149.

APPENDIX

Complete List of Poems Available to Poetry Therapy Group Leaders

Poems	Authors	Sources
If I Should Cast Off This Tattered Coat	Stephen Crane	Dore ^a
The Poison Tree	William Blake	Dore ^a
I'm Nobody	Emily Dickinson	Gilbert & Gubar ^d
Summons	Robert Francis	Francis ^b
The Road Not Taken	Robert Frost (1964)	Frost ^c
Ego Tripping	Nikki Giovanni	Sewell ^j
Harlem	Langston Hughes	Dore ^a
Two Friends	David Ignatow	Ignatow ^e
Warning	Jenny Joseph	Martz ^g
This Above All	James Kavanaugh	Kavanaugh ^f
Ache's End	Marge Piercy	Piercy ^h
The Meaningful Exchange	Marge Piercy	Piercy ⁱ
Complete List of Poems Used in This Study		
If I Should Cast Off This Tattered Coat	Stephen Crane	Dore ^a
Harlem	Langston Hughes	Dore ^a
Summons	Robert Francis	Francis ^b
Warning	Jenny Joseph	Martz ^g
Ache's End	Marge Piercy	Piercy ^h
The Meaningful Exchange	Marge Piercy	Piercy ⁱ

^aDore, A. Ed. (1970). *The premier book of major poets*. Greenwich, Ct.: Fawcett.

^bFrancis, R. (1986). *Collected poems*. Amhurst: University of Massachusetts Press.

^cFrost, R. (1971). *Robert Frost's Poems*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

^dGilbert, S. M., & Gubar, S. (1985). *The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women*. New York: W. W. Norton.

^eIgnatow, D. (1964). *Figures of the human*. Middleton, Conn: Wesleyan University Press.

^fKavanaugh, K. (1979). *Walk easy on the earth*. New York: E. P. Dutton.

^gMartz, S., Ed. (1987). *When I am an old woman I shall wear purple*. Watsonville: Paper Mache Press.

^hPiercy, M. (1988). *Circles on the water*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

ⁱPiercy, M. (1999). *Early grrrl*. Wellfleet, Mass.: The Leapfrog Press.

^jSewell, M., Ed. (1991). *Cries of the spirit*. Boston: Beacon Press.