Various therapeutical methods have been used by social scientists in their respective fields. They have varied their techniques keeping in view the types of people and the nature of their problems. The ultimate goal of all being the improvement of the human personality and its release from various stresses and strains.

Different names have been given to these processes. Some therapists prefer to call them group-psychotherapy while others refer to them as guided group interaction, guided group counselling, multiple group interaction, group guidance, group therapy, etc. Technically and procedurally these concepts may carry slightly varying meanings, but for workers engaged in the reformatory programmes for juvenile offenders, all these approaches can be synthesised into one process, better called group therapy.

Penologists and criminologists have used this method in the juvenile reformatory programmes in various forms suiting their own peculiar needs and situational demands.

The technique, though widely employed in the West, is rather new to India. Pioneer work on these lines, in India, was done by Khanna and Khanna (1958) and Sandhu (1961).

The Khannas worked with young delinquents in schools and colleges, whereas Sandhu's sample was drawn from adult
prisoners. They report that their group therapy programmes are satisfactory techniques for helping their subjects to understand their problems of life and to enable them to discover new and effective ways of dealing with people.

Apart from the two studies, the writer drew inspiration from the Western studies available to him. Their brief mention is considered desirable. Heckless (1956) has given some practical suggestion to handle adult and juvenile offenders. Gerstenlauer (1950) tried group therapy on institutionalised male juvenile delinquents and found that the subjects who participated in the group therapy programme showed measurable signs of greater progress towards adjustment, as compared with the control group. Traux and Wargo (1966) applied group psychotherapy on institutionalised female delinquents and found greater positive change in the experimental group in comparison with the control group, on each of 13 measures used in the study. Rogers and Dymond (1954) observed a definite increase in the maturity of the behaviour of the experimental group where group therapy was an independent variable. Bergin (1964) made a very strong case to show that psychotherapy can produce improvements which were beyond those occurring due to spontaneous remission. Jurjevich (1966) found that institutionalised delinquent girls, as compared with non-institutionalised subjects, had become less excitable, less ill at ease and anxious, and less hostile. Wolk (1963) tried group therapy with 101 inmates of a correctional institute and came to the conclusion that the programme helped the
individuals in adjustment, both in the institution and post-institutionally. Becker, Gusrae, and MacNicol (1963) and Persons (1966) affirm that adolescents with serious personality problems benefit quite a lot from group therapy. Wolk and Reid (1964) studied 40 inmates of a house of detention and found that they could be helped to improve their adjustment through short-term group therapy, and that this effect could be increased in longer periods of treatment. Nicholas (1962) has proved the group approach to be better than the individual approach. Keiichi (1952), on the basis of his study, with Japanese juvenile offenders, obtained positive results from group therapy. Ivanov (1966) arrived at similar findings with Russian juvenile delinquents. Smith and Dassin (1961) suggest that group therapy is the most promising available technique for the rehabilitation of offenders. Miller (1959) maintained that the primary objective of group therapy was to facilitate the formation of an ego-identity of the adolescents. Slavson (1950) designed and used effectively a variety of group-therapy techniques and reported positive results. Traux and Jarkhuff (1964) succeeded in getting better results through short term group therapy rather than long term psychoanalysis. Ohlien, Mosak and Dreikurs (1962) have also reported similar conclusions. Donald (1961) remarks that group therapy facilitates the learning of new attitudes towards people and new ways of dealing with people by actual practice in a group of fellow sufferers.
However, there has been so much of variety in the techniques used by the above mentioned workers, that group therapy, in its broader concept, is now taken to mean "something the therapist intends, it is something he does and it is something that happens to the person treated" (Korn and McCorkle - 1960). Somewhat similar views about group therapy have been expressed by Robison (1965) and Thorne (1946).

The salient features of the commonly used methods of group therapy are as under:

I) Enabling Method

The main objectives of this method, as pointed out by Wilson and Ryland (1949), are to help the members of the group to learn new ideas, develop new skills, change attitudes and deepen their personalities through participation in a social process. These objectives are attained through the media of group discussions in their manifold forms, and exploitation of spontaneous and extempore expressions by the members of the group.

II) Didactic or Pedagogical Method

The didactic technique of group therapy, as reported by Harper (1963), was first developed by J. W. Alapman and S. R. Slavson. In this method, important community leaders address the participants on topics of interest to them, initiate discussion on the topic and then read literature related with the topic of discussion. While reviewing this
technique Garfield (1955) reports that the practice of reading literature is very useful in this process. Barker (1933) and many other investigators have used films for initiating discussion and all that follows.

Each of the techniques used in the above approaches has its own utility and can be employed independently. In fact, in evaluation studies, most of the workers prefer to use one technique at a time. Similar views were expressed by Dr. Walter C. Heckless and Dr. Alan O. Ross, when approached to comment upon the group therapy programme designed for our subjects (Appendix V).

Their suggestion, however, could not be accepted mainly because the 'one method' technique had to be spread over a long period, which was not possible in the present study. It was, therefore, thought advisable to try a comprehensive type of group therapy programme, using a few therapeutic techniques simultaneously, and evaluate their collective impact on our subjects. It was hoped that the group therapy treatment given to the inmates of the reformatory institutes will prove better than the traditional approach of reforming the juvenile criminals.