SOCIODRAMA & TEAM COACHING: A case study

Pablo Alvarez Valcarce, M.D.
Grupo de Estudios de Psicodrama de Madrid, Spain
grupoestudios@psicodrama.info
Abstract:
Two team coaching processes in the same organization are described using sociodrama method. Technical proceedings are focused. Organization and team roles dynamics are described in a systemic framework. Sociometric evaluation and evolution of team configurations are described. Specific sociodramatic techniques are applied to different team conflicts. Some theoretical considerations are stated to define the specific sociodramatic approach to team coaching. Near Sociometric and Hidden Agendas phenomena are described and resolved. Specific changes in team rules, team roles, accountability and commitments are reached.
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When using Sociodrama in a process of **Team Coaching** (Álvarez Valcarce, P. 2011) some of the purposes are:

- to develop a diagnosis of the role structure and sociogenetic levels of teams;
- to set out the organizational constellations of teams;
- for team-building, where ‘the age’ and maturity of the team will influence my chosen intervention
- to create specific action techniques for specific transitional moments in teams;
- for enacting the power relations within a team and in inter-team conflicts;
- to make explicit, explore and aid the process inside real team meetings;
- to explore issues of time management;
- to enable change in role dynamics and role boundaries;
- to bring about changes in team culture and values, using axiodrama;
- to build new project teams, using sociometry;
- to develop triangle and circular relationships, in order to overcome stereotyped ‘us-and-them’ polarities;
- to surface transference, counter-transference and family metaphors, using team sociodrama;
- to develop team creativity and innovation.

Team coaching using sociodrama focuses on developing the collective efficiency process of the group as a whole and as a role system with well-defined boundaries, on its journey to experiential maturity. The types of interaction between different task roles (for achieving goals) and maintenance roles (to foster emotional stability) are the immediate targets of sociodrama when applied to team coaching (Álvarez Valcarce, 2008).

The basic procedures of a team coaching sociodrama are to look at actual meetings to focus on the roles in the communication system, coupled with workshops for the development of procedures and the resolution of any difficulties in the team’s situation and its relationship to its’ environment (Álvarez Valcarce, 2011).

Established teams have a long history of inter-relationships. Sociodrama works with teams that score high in the ‘acquaintance test’, where members meet each other almost every day and develop their own specific group culture (Moreno, 1960, p.200).

The key is to help that specific and unique team to mature in a sociogenetic and sociometric way.

Sociometric maturation is the process whereby this shift is carried out, from low cohesion between team members (who make choices to interact only in pairs) to high cohesion structures such as triangulation (choices in trios), circularization (where all team members make choices to interact with each other) and hierarchies (where the team successfully establishes agreed-upon internal structures, such as roles or sub-groups with specific responsibilities and different sociometric status). That kind of
movement requires one to work with all the members of an established team that meets frequently (Álvarez Valcarce, 1995, 2011).

Sociogenetically, team maturity (the sociodramatic goal) is a kind of evolution that can be diagnosed by sociometric and behavioral objective methods (role testing). Highly developed teams have sociometric configurations of circularization and hierarchies, where the tele factor is operating widely. Sociogroup task roles and psychogroup maintenance roles are all enacted with special emphasis in those roles that enhance the tele factor and the team is able to operate within well-defined role boundaries. Here, dysfunctional roles will have almost disappeared (Álvarez Valcarce, 2009, 2011).

Working in team coaching, sociodrama can have an equally important social active learning function of empowering the team, and can also contribute to the development of the sociometric status rates of the team in the wider organizational net. Team sociometric status rate is the degree to which an established team is chosen by other teams in the organization, and is also the degree of integration of team members with the members of other teams, into a new organizational network with a common value base, mission and vision of ‘higher axiological field value’ (Álvarez Valcarce, 1997). Moreno’s ‘Social Gravitation Law’ (Moreno, 1960, p.300) talks about the alternate rhythm between the differentiation process that separates groups and the transmission processes between them. This rhythm depends on sociometric attractions and rejections. (Álvarez Valcarce, 2011)

There are many sociodramatic techniques to be applied to team coaching. I usually design specific techniques for specific team situations and conflicts. But there are some general sociodrama techniques for dramatic production, which are available to the sociodrama director and can be adapted to team coaching (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011):

• Link the on-stage dramatic conflict to the vision of the rest of the team, to achieve some degree of audience participation.

• Perform an enactment with two subgroups in concentric circles, exchanging in turn their subjective perceptual impressions of each other, followed by any objective reflections to let down the communication barriers between team subgroups and resolve conflicts;

• Include organizational and cultural rituals, looking for the analogies between them and for any symbolic implications.

• Introduce a chaotic phase into the dramatic context, to force transgression of actual team stereotypes, and to creatively develop new needed roles. Give value to the chaotic part of the performance: chaos will remain chaos unless actors and spectators have found a way to find a meaning in it.

• Focus on the processes by exploring the ways in which role behaviors affect others in the organizational environment of the team members.
• Perform two scenes simultaneously, to relate symbolic scenes to actual organization scenes

• Uncover the team and organization generational myths deeply grounded in the organization’s history, to cure the underlying trauma;

• Use a sudden slow down of rhythm and simplicity to allow reflection on team collective responsibility;

• Enable team members to find their own place in the whole space as a spontaneous occurrence, to show the systemic constellation.

• Focus on the team tempo or inner rhythm that creates the atmosphere in the here-and-now: for this, the team members that are not dramatizing at the moment (the audience) must be on stage, experiencing the rhythm with their own bodies.

• Create a context of freedom;

• Help team members understand that, in order to create freedom in the sociodrama, they must act spontaneously in the constant stimulus-response play rule;

• Make use of any unexpected event to add even more dynamics to the plot, as we will see later in the second workshop of the Change Office team coaching.

• Experiment with all the roles, without identifying with any particular one;

• Focus, during the performance, on the dynamics between roles, positions, parts of an image, vectors and zones;

Elsewhere, I have described ninety-five different sociodramatic techniques for use with established groups (family, team & community) (Álvarez Valcarce, 1995).

REPORT ON A SOCIODRAMATIC TEAM-COACHING PROCESS WITH THE MANAGEMENT TEAM & THE CHANGE OFFICE TEAM OF AN INTERNATIONAL COMPANY

Inside a process of Coaching for an Organizational Transition Development, I was asked to create a workshop for the Management Team:

• to foster motivation for personal development and active learning;

• to bear in mind both individual and group needs for change inside the company;
to change habits and implant new tasks;
• to activate skills in the leaders, as motivators and activators of teams;
• to achieve balance between effective team role functioning and individual motivation;
• to create the systems and methodologies required by work teams;
• to improve communication techniques and the quality of communication in the workplace;
• to introduce people, in an engaging way, to personality models and psychological theories about how people function;
• to give feedback about individual communication skills. (Alvarez Valcarce,2011)

The workshop began with various sociodramatic techniques applied to:

• the recognition and analysis of the different role task functions (using sculpting and the dramatization of real scenes, incorporating doubling, mirror and role reversal);

• accessing other bases of knowledge and their models together with a “sociodramatic discussion” of questions such as ‘what have you learnt about your way of thinking, perceiving, evaluating ,etc. from each role’.

• creating the different team roles and their structural relationships – setting out the system.

It emerged that the Financial Operations Manager (CFO) had a special link to the CEO, but was distant from his peers. This was crucial and became the focus of the sociodrama. The team created different scenes, aimed at finding strategies to achieve a change in the relationship with this team member. This was done by inviting the group to reflect on questions such as:

• How can you create a new type of interaction with...?

• What ideas can you add to...?

• How is this team structure a parallel to other areas of company functioning?

• What solutions would you suggest to...?

• Why is this so significant to you?

• Can you design a new...?

• To what extent is this situation responsible for the excess of complex products?

The team acted out scenes about confidence, distrust and cheating in the communication processes. Then they discussed sociodramatically the psychological
contract established in the team, finding a new group stimulus to change and look for global solutions inside the team.

Then they explored sociodramatically the question “what would happen if we did something differently?”

A hidden agenda appeared, related to the privileged information gained by the CEO from his special link with the Financial Operations Manager (CFO) (a sociometric isolate within the team) and the pseudo-cohesive phenomena related to this clique.

Hidden Agendas in sociodrama had to be with the power of other superimposed groups or subgroups (legal power). In my experience, this last type of power is based in a hidden dysfunctional role: the role-holder is upholding the values and ideologies of other groups to which he belongs and then superimposing such values and ideologies onto the actual, here-and-now group, structure or team (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011). The CEO of this organization represents the power of a superimposed capital-risk group of stockholders, who want to make money in the short term and then could sell the company out. CEO-CFO clique has to be with this hidden agenda.

The specific sociodramatic action that is appropriate here is to turn these sociometric power dysfunctions into concrete organization structures, so as to achieve change and innovation, cohesion and the development of a socioemotional matrix. Hidden agendas may be performed in space or brought to light by using intermediary situations to show their existence. A poorly understood team history will often underpin the existence of hidden agendas. (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011) (Wiener 2008)

I invited team members to perform the sociodramatic history of the team into the company. Old and unprocessed injuries appear and could be aired. At other times, I ask members to write down taboo themes on anonymous pieces of paper, after which they have to defend any paper randomly assigned to them, as if it were their own. Then I can work sociodramatically with the now-acknowledged taboos.

As a result of this sociodramatic active learning work with hidden agendas, the team developed proactive functions to promote integration and co-operation between team members through future-focused sociodramatic scenes.

The CEO changed his leader role as motivator and activator of the team. Sociodrama helped the team to diminish their anxiety around delegated leadership. Fears of rivalry, of being attacked by followers, of accountability etc. were diminished through the use of family metaphors and sociodramatic techniques to explore power status. The team compared the relative merits of making individual and group decisions, through sociodrama scenes.

On returning to the real team meetings, they could experiment with strategic changes of role. In the next workshop, management team members asked for a sociodramatic analysis of their own fearful imaginings as leaders of their own teams. This way, the change spread out through the organization. (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011)

The organization went on a changing process during several years, gaining presence in the global market. A few years later, just when the company was coming out to Stock Exchange, I was asked to conduct a process of Team Coaching to solve a grave
conflict situation in the Change Office Team engaged in cross projects management. I was told about lack of respect and almost a bulling situation. Team manager was a middle age “old maid” woman, quite workaholic, with obesity and a very demanding character according to her oral avidity and attention necessities. She was an expert in project management coming from informatics but had no skills on people management. Trying to push the team to accomplish new and complex reporting documents, there had been a very angry scenario of rebellion with insults and lack of respect.

I wrote to the Regional European Central Organization Change Office Manager asking for his point of view and he answer this way:

“My starting point with all team members was the following: where are we now and what can you do to improve? It was not about pin pointing to (or blaming) someone else. With all the team members I came to the same conclusion. There are 3 parties: PMO/CMO Head, the PM and the BB. These parties are not acting as a team. Everyone agreed that there were barriers between the parties and even within the BB group. I encountered that even the most common rules of behavior or engagement were lacking (e.g. trust, respect, listening, communicate not shout, constructive feedback ...). Confronting everyone with this was not a shock but recognition. The positive news was that all involved told me that they want to change the situation, continuation of the status quo was not an option. During the wrap-up I told CEO, CFO and CHRO that we must work on this team behavior. Forget the past, start all over again and start with the creation of a list with rules of behavior. I advised to keep CFO out of the loop. It's PMO and her team. If CFO is part of the discussion I have the feeling that it will even be more difficult for PMO to play her role.

I know I asked all PMO’s in Central and the rest of Europe to improve their way of working. We set several standards and reporting structures, introduced training programs, etc. This was and is a huge change process for all involved and sometimes PMO wants to go to fast. I already see an enormous improvement so let's not to go to fast. And this is sometimes difficult for she. For me the team building is much more important than making a next step to improve the project management capability.”

Having several interviews with Human Resources Director(CHRO), CFO, CEO and the Team Manager(PMO), I raised a sociometric systemic hypothesis: the idea about a ChO department come from the Regional European Central Organization, and was no clearly understood nor accepted by local executives. Project managers were chosen to be team members without any sociometric considerations, based only on their technical skills and coming from informatics, dataware-statistics and financial operations departments. Team Manager(PMO) was chose by CEO as a reward but also for her personal strengths to push against main stream. Hierarchically the team was under CFO authority, who doesn’t accept such a responsibility because he openly distrust new ChO methodology. So Team Manager(PMO) was used by the CEO as a front lance to implant a new methodology imposed by the Regional Organization in which nobody neither he believes. Inside the team, one of the project managers feels rivalry to the leader, another one openly said she didn’t want to belong and the rest felt ambivalent.

Working in sociodramatic team coaching, we have to be aware to focus on an urgent and real team task, so using actual action sociometric criteria for the sociodramatic
enhance of needed chooses between members. The ambivalent organizational position about Change Office was a resistance to a new way of distributed leadership. If pretended changes could be achieved throughout cross project teams, what of the organizational dimensions (task, management, identity) will be affected? The anxieties related to these changes can press the coach to use “near sociometric” criteria in the sociodramatic intervention.

Moreno wrote about “near sociometric” criteria, when facing the manner in which the criterion-questions, once the criteria are chosen, will be worded. When the criterion-question is worded in a hypothetical manner putting the respondent into an imaginary situation or in a level of recall—that is asking the respondent to report on their past associations with others, it results in “pseudo-sociometric” or “near sociometric” data. In contrast, each criterion-question may be worded on the actuality level—that is to anticipation on the part of the subjects of actual realistic associations. The respondent realizes that his choices and rejections may affect a real situation in the near future. That is “actual action sociometric criteria”. These concepts can be applied not only to sociometric test but to actual new choices and rejections made by team members into the sociodramatic stage situation. (Moreno, 1941; Moreno, 1960, pp.88-93) (Nehnevajsa,J.1956) (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011)

When in the situation of a team facing an urgent task in the actuality level, a “near sociometric” criteria is used, the coach misunderstand team sociodynamics by using hypothetical criteria about interactions that neither he nor the team has any real possibility of achieving in the concrete organization system here and now. So there is not a real active participation in a real actual situation by team members. That kind of “near sociometric” questions or “pseudo-sociometric” sociodramatic assignment, does not give the members the occasion to begin an immediate action into their real organization context.

When “near sociometric” phenomena occur, there are serious distortions of the sociometric configurations of the team. It becomes more difficult to achieve real, highly developed and cohesive sociometric and sociogenetic levels of team communication and interactivity. Such phenomena frequently result in poorly thought through strategies, roles and actions.

From my experience, these phenomena can be minimized, when working sociodramatically with an established team, by focusing on actual and urgent roles and task group problems, keeping in mind the overall system. We have to be aware that only teams which meet regularly can enable members to use “actual action sociometric criteria” in their choices, rejections and indifferences over the sociodramatic stage first and in their real team and organizational context later. (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011)

When we design the workshop sociodramatic techniques, we try to be aware to use actual action sociometric criteria.

We began with an all day workshop running on warming up physical exercises and games in which they have to find joined rhythms and strategies in pairs, trios and quintets. Just from the beginning they showed a high potentiality of cohesion and
flexibility in situational leadership. When performing a sociodramatic team dynamics where they have apparent contradictory role targets, they last only few minutes to find the way to transform role dynamics into a complementary one, reaching a situation where team and individual goals were completed.

Then they dramatized several scenes of kick off meetings to start new and actual projects. Using doubles, mirrors and resistance interpolation from other network key roles, focus was put on the dialogue about a wider examination of all hypothesis, without reaching too quick decisions. A psychodramatic arbiter role was included showing the yellow card to any team member who tries to press others or impose his own decision. Subjects to be examined were aspects of projects within scope, on budget and on time. Also what personal capabilities where going to be offered to other team members, what other roles where going to be affected by the project and so on other specific systemic implications. These scenes were followed by intense reflection over sociodramatic project manager role.

After eating, in the afternoon, a cooperative game was used to warm up the team again. Then they were asked to sculpt a symbolic image of the team. Various members made different images that were transformed into sociodramatic dramatizations. Lack of clear goals, disorganization, individuality and resentment for have been attacked by the leader were the main outcomes. Traumatic conflictive team scenes were dramatized, but with the inclusion of some non active but present systemic elements that made the team understand the influence of the ambivalent position of ChO into the whole organization and the origin and effects of the high pressure lived by team’s leader. Changing roles, a wider understanding of the whole situation were possible. Ventilation of resentment feelings doubt to historic facts was possible by dramatizing the scenes of different members and the systemic implications about the moments in which they become team members. So team boundaries were discussed.

The day finished with the consensual writing of new Team Behaviour Rules and the setting of the main points to be worked in the next standard team meeting to be accompanied by the team coach. Sociodramatic Active Learning (SAL) helped the group to communicate about difficult issues in an open way:

- Searching for Team rules
- Trying to be transparent but without hurting others.
- Wanting to improve our capability to be tolerant.
- Visualizing in scenes the barriers to pass through.
- Trying to repair the confidence that was broke out.
Established Team Rules were: 1º. Respect defined as: no offensive words; don’t spur others; don’t interrupt; don’t make public critics to others; ask other members about the meaning of discomfort gestures. 2º Mutual Responsibility (also trying to speak using the words “we”, “our”, etc.)

In this workshop we realized the lack of existence of well defined role dynamics into the team. We use Moreno’s role theory concepts about role clusters, for a wide and operational understanding of the sociodramatic role dynamics in this team (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011):

• space between roles; (Ex: too much space between joined roles in couples of this team members, had to equilibrate with too much segregated roles into the whole organization)

• role boundaries; (Ex: poor level of differentiation between different PM roles into this Team: there were no custom paths, no segregated functions, low degree of delimitation, no frontier signs, etc)

• overlapping roles; (Ex: the CFO overlapping over himself the Financial, Operations and ChO Supervisor roles)

• the operational dissociation of roles (the way in which a sociodramatic role is played, as part of a systemic net of roles, without contamination by other non-pertinent personal role contents); (Ex: the Change Office Director couldn’t dissociate operatively her sociodramatic role in the Project Managers Office nor in the Project Committee, letting her voracious “psychosomatic ingest” role contaminate the whole ties situation)

• low degree of complementary roles in the team.

• lack of role mutuality; (low degree to which one role can assume for a while some functions of other weak role of team role’s matrix, and also low degree to which a role can mutually facilitate other’s role performance)

• low role congruency (integration of thinking, feeling and action in team roles) (Ex: team has not reach the point to share the vision and mission, so role identity is still based upon individual singularity not yet on group specification necessities)

• medium degree of roles developing;

• the sociometric choices of movement towards-away-against of the organization coping roles were too much on the “against” side.
Next week we went to a real Team Meeting where the coach asked members to take one of these three meeting roles: Meeting Leader, Decision Controller and Moderator. These roles were interchanged during the meeting. After 50 min. of spontaneous interaction with occasional open reflection questions made by the coach, an objective role test was done to assign peers task, emotional and dysfunctional team roles. This leads to a second loop reflection on the way each one act, think and feel. After this the meeting continued to the end with occasional questions by the coach about avoided subjects, suggested changes, pointing out ways of interaction, manipulative strategies, needs for recognition, systemic utility of dysfunctional patterns, and other critic reflections.

At the end of the meeting, team members who had enacted the Decision Controller role, started to make the Team Board, where decisions about project actions were noted with responsible members and death times. The team had to report each two weeks to the coach about roles, rules and team board, during the next two months until the second part of the sociodramatic team coaching intervention. During these two months every team member had an individual coaching session to enhance role changes. A new member arriving was announced who had a coaching session to test and prepare him for actual team group dynamics.

From individual coaching sessions, where sociodramatic and psychodramatic techniques were used, arose some systemic issues. How the CEO pressed to make benefits from ChO actions. The necessity to find the own local rhythm, different from the regional rhythm and avoid pressure. There was absence of common objectives. The CEO didn’t believe in ChO. He didn’t want to delegate neither analysis nor decision making capability. Department Directors had actually these capabilities, and from a sociometric point of view, the Project Managers were merely attached secretaries. The actual PMO were used only to press for death ends. The rivalry between actual PMO(S) and a medium sociometric status team member (JO) who was told he will be the PMO but finally not. One team member (P) openly rejects PM role and didn’t want to belong. The existence of serious resistances in Back Office members to implant the new custom relationship management through web tools and the failure of CFO to overcame such a resistance. The existence of a team dysfunctional rule: “if you don’t hold me in my project now ,I won´t hold you in yours when needed”. The younger member of the team (M) played a role of group tensions deposit and PMO emotional holder.
Also in the two months interlude, a sociodramatic workshop was performed with the Projects Commission, formed by CEO, CFO, CHRO & PMO. All the systemic contradictions were enacted in a sociodrama and the different visions and missions of ChO department were getting nearer. But it was understood that the pessimistic positions of the CFO and other team members had to be seen inside that complex system. The avidity role of PMO pushing against the stream was a complementary role to those played by CFO and rivalry team members showing lack of mutual responsibility but being justified by the rage feelings provoked by PMO pushing role. A consensus Action Plan for ChO was finally established. The CEO decided to have an individual lunch with all the team members to give them personal instructions.

After two months we had the second workshop with the team. There was a casual event that the coach made use of it. The room reserved at a hotel was too small so the team had to move to another hotel in the nearby area. The coach and others members doesn’t know how to reach the new hotel. A car’s caravan was organized and members with low sociometric status (P & G) proposed themselves as leaders of the caravan. Finally the member with lowest sociometric status in work and emotional criteria (P), takes the role of caravan leader. She was driving at her own, without taking care for the rest not to get lost, and making some dangerous traffic transgressions forcing others to take risks. The coach was at the end of the caravan and only the official leader(S) was waiting for him not to get lost. This team performance, in an outdoor spontaneous and urgent mission, was sociodramatically explored as a symbol of other indoor team dynamics and roles.

Workshop began by exploring team’s reports to the coach. There were advances in flexibility, meeting roles, respect for team rules, and mutual responsibility. Team Board was in use and most tasks were ended on time. Most people think these advances were the result of the presence of the coaching process, but will disappear when the coach is gone. As a result of this, the team decided to have a special meeting to define best and simple practices in the process of reporting to regional requirements. To be the leader of this meeting, the team chose the medium sociometric status member (JO) who had rivalry with PMO( S). That was a recognition of his sociometric status and was accepted by the official leader, and so a beginning of the resolution of the traumatic scene where there was lack of respect when dealing with this reporting subject.

Team members were asked to draw and then to sculpt the systemic constellation of the Change Office inside the organization. Several sociodramas were performed using role reversal, doubles and soliloquies. Dramatic insight was gained about the autocratic power role of the CEO, the low sociometric status and commitment of the CFO, the existence of high pressure over the PMO, and the real position of each team member. A
reflection question was started by the coach: ¿What is what team members ask me to do more or to do less? As a result of the reflection each member made a commitment:

S (PMO) – be less inflexible with tools
JO – be more part of the team crowd
P - more understanding to PMO(S) trying to put into her position.
JE - Define more his position, be less ambivalent and talk about this with PMO(S).

G - Increase the communication with PMO(S) and work more for team visibility( inner marketing)
M - Increase communication with all members.

After this work, the team went for lunch in a relaxed atmosphere and react in a very warm way taking care for a member who had received news about the death of a relative so far abroad.

After lunch team was asked to sculpt a team image as if it was a Family Metaphor. This rend to a situation where there was no Father role. The “Mother”(S) was burned out having to pick up others things and wants to escape. The “older sister” (P) was at the door trying to escape and don’t wanting to belong. The “young sister” (M) was supporting the mother, and the “young boy” (G) was isolated at his room. The “older brother” (JE) was present but ambivalent. There was an “Uncle” (JO) who lives far away and “teach” family.

In another spontaneous sculpted image, there was a “Husband” (S) with a “young spouse” (M) and a “lover” (JO) who wants to usurp the leader role at the very moment the “husband”(S) leaves the scene, becoming a stirrer. Stirrers thrive by hiding in the group, disguising their actions among the reaction of others. Render their actions visible, as was done in the “family metaphor” sociodrama, and they lose their power to upset. Give them a recognized role adjusted to their sociometric status, as it has been done by choosing him to be the leader of the Process of Reporting Meeting, and they become collaborative.

The coach started a reflection question: ¿What changes in my role is the team asking me for?

Everybody made a commitment:
S (PMO)- under pressure & crisis situations, if she decides to keep out, try to do that slowly, out of the “all or nothing”.

JO – predicate by showing his best practice. Don’t be the “teacher” that gives lessons.

P – be more present in the here and now (until I get my desire to go out)

JE – don’t navigate “between two waters”

G – be less isolated

M – Give myself permission to reject the role of being the PMO(S) emotional support when everybody is gone.

When working with Sociodrama techniques applied to team coaching workshops, a sociodynamic progress analysis, at the end of the performance, will fully put team coaching workshop into the sociodramatic framework. It does this by looking at (Alvarez Valcarce, 2011):

• how the attraction and rejection forces, that were organized in different ways during the work, have changed the sociometric configurations;

• how the process of creating roles and rehearsing encourages the development of new sociometric criteria in the team, thus reducing isolation and altering the intensity of the choosing;

• how any “near sociometric” difficulties can be minimized whenever social, team and dramatic contexts are articulated;

• how events in the team context are reflected in the dramatic context, in the theme the team finally chooses and in the roles members choose to enact;

• how the organizational implications of the performance are integrated into the concrete organizational network of the team.

• how the beliefs, assumptions, attitudes and preferences of the participants are related to their experiences, roles and sociometric status;

• how the assumptions in the performance are socially and personally created in a specific historical and organizational context.

During the coaching process, sociometric perceptual and objective test were performed.
For the Sociogroup Work Criteria the leader was the younger & newer member (M)
followed by the PMO(S). There were two isolated (P & G) with no elections. There was a Chain between S – M – JO – JE, that couldn’t be closed as a quartet, because the negative of PMO(S) to choose JE for his ambivalent position. The perceptual/objective correlation was about 33%, with the resistance leader (JO) hopping to receive plenty of chooses from the weak members, and leaders (M & S) feeling as rejected.

For the Psichestgroup Emotional Criteria, the leader was also the younger & newer member (M) followed by the ambivalent member (JE). The resistance leader (JO) was a medium status member and the PMO(S) and the not belonging member (P) were isolated. The perceptual/objective correlation was about 41% with elections well perceived by leaders but with lack of conscience about their position by isolates.
One week later we had the last team meeting accompanied by the coach. The meeting ran very well and issues about leadership delegation and accountability were assessed. To deal with systemic resistances and pressures, and protect the team, a new rule was established: If there are clear strong resistances in a project, decide to postpone date ends. If PMO receives a suddenly pressure from the CEO, she waits to consult the team before giving an answer. There will be a one hour meeting to try to reach a consensus answer. If consensus is not reached, the PMO will decide the answer to the CEO and the team member’s tasks.

The team stated a new way to select and design Project Team members in the organization. To evaluate the role’s repertory of the future project team members, and the realistic amount of time he/she will be able to dedicate to the new role. Then make sociometric test between future team members before choosing them for the project team. The ChO team sociometric status in relation to other organization teams was evaluated. A sociometric methodological approach to inter-team conflicts was started for organizational diagnosis. Inter-team conflict is one of the main arenas for sociodrama interventions. In fact, when doing multi-disciplinary team building in an organization, it is frequently the most difficult task. In my experience of using “sociodramatic action learning” (SAL) for leadership and team development in companies, the failure of many project teams to achieve their goals is often attributable
to the fact that team members are chosen for their professional specialized task skills alone, when they may belong sociometrically to different and opposing groups.

Working sociodramatically with teams, it is essential to make a sociometric diagnosis of any conflict between teams, so that the director can assign sociodramatic roles according to each team’s sociometric status in the intersected team networks of the overall organization. This way, the director can foster changes in the sociometric configuration, through promoting encounters on the sociodrama stage. The key is to find the action sociometric criterion that allows positive tele attractions to generate new creative role networks.

With a little resistance by himself, a date was decided for the meeting leaded by the chosen medium status member (JO, the resistance leader) about report standards, and included in the Team Board.

The meeting finished with the news about a meeting with the CEO next day. PMO offers the team to share the ChO Action Plan stated by the Projects Committee, and team members asked why it has not been shared before.

This way the coach handed the process back to team leader who takes the responsibility of whatever happens next.

In the next year the team continue to report the coach about rules keeping, team board, team roles development, new commitments, etc., with occasional presence coaching interventions.

During this last year, JO, the resistance leader, asked to go out of the team and was allowed to go to commercial department. PA, a isolated member, also asked to go out but have troubles to find a team that accept her. G, the other isolated member, ask to go abroad to meet his family and was allowed to. Two new members enter the team and were well accepted by the leader, increasing the team cohesion.

These leader´s words are examples of the new situation reached:

“G has gone. JO is going to Commercial Department and the new one looks well. We have begun to select the JO’s substitute. Now team members have begun to change in a natural manner, and talking with the CEO and the CHRO it is as if we have decided to regenerate the department step by step. The CFO has less resistance and only asks for a correct transmission of knowledge to assure the project’s continuity. Tomorrow we have the first auto-evaluation of rules and commitments. I have told the new one about our crisis and coaching intervention and he agree with commitments”.
“P has asked to go to Marketing Department but there has been a mutual rejection. Our first auto-evaluation was very difficult. We needed four meetings of one hour, but we did it. The more difficulty was new rules and anyway we have stated a good dialogue setting. The new member is playing well and M is feeling better from his arrival. We have started the other new member’s selection process”.

These kind of team’s members departures and arrivals after a team coaching intervention is quite common when a low sociometric status is diagnosed and the true sociometric criteria for chooses and rejections become objective for team members as in this case.
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