ARTICLE · 2012

# Relational TA — Mark Little

By Mark Little

By Mark Little. An exploration of how Transactional Analysis can be developed in a genuinely relational direction — moving beyond TA's tendency to present a relatively clear map of psychological functioning and therapeutic action, towards a more uncertain, paradoxical, and intersubjective understanding of what happens between therapist and client.

KEY THEMES

— TA moving in a relational direction
— The limits of TA's foundational framework
— Intersubjectivity and mutual recognition in TA
— Developmental origins of relational patterns in TA
— The relational challenge to TA orthodoxy

## TA's Relational Potential

Transactional Analysis has always had the potential to become a genuinely relational discipline — its emphasis on the analysis of transactions between people, its attention to the quality of contact in the I-Thou encounter, and its understanding of how scripts arise from early relational experience all point in a relational direction.

What has limited the realisation of this potential is the way TA's foundational frameworks have been applied — often in ways that make the therapy more didactic and directive than its theoretical principles would require. The script concept has tended to be used to establish the therapist as the authority on the client's psychological dynamics, rather than as a shared exploration of how early relational experience shapes current patterns.

Little's article represents a significant attempt to develop TA's genuine relational potential — to take seriously the implications of an intersubjective, mutual, non-hierarchical understanding of the therapeutic encounter for how TA is practised.

## The Developmental Foundation

The sections on psychological development, psychopathology and characterological structures in this article represent a growing consensus across various developmental approaches, supported by neuroscience and infant research. Although the traditions use different terms, there is large overlap in theoretical understanding of how intolerable experiences in early development are internalised and become the internal blueprint through which later relationships are perceived.

Little brings together a range of humanistic and psychoanalytic ideas concerning the developmental origins of what we deal with in therapy. His formulations are rooted in TA concepts but draw in a depth-psychological consensus across divergent traditions as to how a person's 'primary scenario' continues to shape their identity and being-in-the-world.

This developmental foundation is important for relational TA precisely because it grounds the relational approach in something more than a theoretical preference for 'nice' relating — it shows that the quality of the therapeutic relationship is not merely instrumentally valuable but constitutive of the healing process itself.

## What This Means for Practice

If the therapeutic relationship is understood as constitutive of healing rather than merely instrumental to it — if the therapist's own relational patterns, script beliefs, and

countertransference are as clinically significant as the client's — then TA practice needs to change in important ways.

The therapist can no longer position themselves as the objective analyst of the client's script; they are a participant in an intersubjective process in which their own script is inevitably activated. The ego state model, rather than providing a transparent map of the client's psychology, becomes one lens among several — one that can illuminate certain aspects of the relational field while potentially obscuring others.

Most importantly, the therapeutic relationship itself becomes the primary vehicle of change — not the correct application of TA techniques to the client's ego states and transactions, but the quality of genuine human contact that is available within the therapeutic encounter. This is a significant shift for a tradition that has often presented itself as a relatively clear and teachable set of analytical tools.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

— Little, M. (2012) Relational TA. Transactional Analysis Journal

— Berne, E. (1961) Transactional Analysis in Psychotherapy. New York: Grove Press

— Mitchell, S. (1988) Relational Concepts in Psychoanalysis. Cambridge MA: Harvard

— Soth, M. (2013) We are all relational. Transactional Analysis Journal

— Cornell, W.F. (2008) Explorations in Transactional Analysis. TA Press

Published at soth.co.uk · © 2012 Mark Little · All rights reserved