• dangers – point out any risks there may be if they begin to apply the material in their personal or professional life (e.g. upsetting a partner or a colleague if they unilaterally change their stroking patterns, triggering a client regression if they use the concept professionally without sufficient training, etc)

• duplicate the key points – summarise the key points that you want them to remember

• dialogue – this is the required 5 minute question and answer session

Concluding comments

I hope you have found this material useful and I will welcome feedback.

Several years ago I analysed the competencies for the different fields and showed how they are not really that different – they are the competencies of a transactional analyst and what varies are the forms of evidence that are generated in different circumstances. Since then, I have mapped this general set of TA competencies against the competencies of some non-TA professional approaches, as well as against the criteria/learning outcomes used by some universities. This work may become the subject of a future article. I am also considering whether to map out the ways in which the competencies for the different fields of application are inconsistently presented in the various sections of the Handbook.

Julie Hay is TSTA Organisational, Psychotherapy & Educational, and in contracted training for the Counselling field. With TSTA colleagues, Julie runs TA 909s – otherwise known as ‘very advanced TA’ and exam preparation workshops. Julie is also part of the leadership team for ICTAQ - the International Centre for TA Qualifications – which operates a suite of TA awards and qualifications, including some with University accreditation, at various levels alongside CTA, CTA Trainer and TSTA – and which are all based on continuous competence-based assessment rather than exams.

Julie can be contacted on julie@juliehay.org

TA Referencing – Back to the Original Sources

© 2017 Julie Hay

I was intrigued by Marco Mazzetti’s (2017) article in The Script in April about how limited are the references to Berne in the Transactional Analysis Journal. It resonated with concerns I have frequently when I am assessing student submissions, including those for the CTA written exam but also others for the various qualifications provided by different training institutes including my own. There is a trend for students to reference recent books, such as TA Today (Stewart & Joines, 1987, 2012) where they often reference still the first edition), Widdowson’s (2010) book on 100 Key Points, and Tilney’s (1998) TA Dictionary. The recent Cornell, de Graaf, Newton & Thunnissen (2016) fails to reference the originators of several concepts, in spite of claiming to be a textbook. In addition to Mazzetti’s comments about referencing Berne in the Transactional Analysis Journal, I have noticed other examples such as in Joines (2016) where I was puzzled to see that he referenced rackets only to his own previous material in Stewart & Joines (2012).

Having become intrigued about this, I thought about the referencing in the International Journal of Transactional Analysis Research & Practice (IJTAR/ IJTARP), particularly because I am of course
the Editor! It did not make sense to compare the same year as that used by Mazzetti because 2016 included one issue that was a series of case studies with similar referencing. In addition, because the papers in IJTAR have been research articles which due to their nature tend to include a wide range of references including non-TA ones, I would expect the percentage of Berne versus other authors to be low.

I looked across the span of issues since IJTAR was launched in 2010. I excluded one issue because it was the Research Conference Proceedings and therefore contained many short papers, although I noted that there were a total of 14 references to Berne contained within eight of those papers (the range being from 1 to 4).

Excluding that issue and the article in the first issue that was a list of TA research projects, 48 articles have now been published. Within 29 of these, there were 70 references to Berne. Within these articles, the number of references to Berne were 1 reference (12 papers), 2 references (8 papers), 3 references (in 4 papers), 4 references (in 2 papers), and one article each with 5, 6 and 9 references.

In addition, although I have not counted them, there are references to other authors where Berne is specifically mentioned in the title of their material.

As the TA qualifications have become increasingly recognised by academia, it seems to me to be important that we direct our students back to the original ideas. This may not matter when TA is being shared with laypersons but when someone is seeking recognition as a professional, it is disappointing when they believe that the original ideas came from whoever’s material they have just read.

For my own students, and especially for those with insufficient knowledge of English language to be able to access easily the original materials, I have made a point of producing workbooks that summarise and credit the originators of the concepts. This has included summarising some of the early books; although I recognise that such summaries will inevitably be biased by my own interpretations, at least it means that the students know that the ideas are not my own.

As an afterthought, it has been pointed out to me (and I’m flattered to see it) that in the Cornell et al (2016) book there are nine constructs and 19 mentions of my material, compared to Berne who has 13 and 17, Clarkson with 10 and 12, Erskine with 7 and 10, Goulding & Goulding with 6 and 14, Steiner with 8 and 14, and of course Cornell who has 14 and 21 but is of course one of the authors . . .
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