Editorial

Julie Hay

I am honoured to have been appointed Editor for this exciting new journal, impressed by the contributions made to the ‘birthing’ process by the members of the Editorial Board, and grateful for the assistance of others whose roles relate to what goes on behind the scenes.

I am appreciative that the Council of Delegates of the European Association for Transactional Analysis (EATA) decided to initiate and fund the project, confident that this journal will demonstrate that there is good research being conducted into the impact of transactional analysis across its many applications, and optimistic about it serving to stimulate more research.

I thank also our ‘hosts’ at Scholarly Exchange for providing a ready-made website for us to create the journal with access for all, and for being so responsive to our questions as we progressed through the setup stages.

And of course this issue would not exist without the authors and the reviewers. Getting a new journal into publication in less than 18 months from the initial meeting of the Editorial Board on 16th April 2009 has meant that we have all learned together – and the authors in particular have endured the birthing pains with infinite patience and goodwill.

You will see that the authors have provided a rich and varied collection of works to start us off.

We begin with an article by Thomas Ohlsson that sets the scene for TA research into the future. He has completed a major review of existing TA research articles, providing us with two lists – one of all articles classified by application and the other of those that are particularly relevant to TA psychotherapy.

Ohlsson also exhorts us to consider what makes for competent research methodology and to seek ways to rekindle the links with doctoral studies that used to exist in the early days of TA. The two lists produced by Ohlsson will be so useful to future researchers that we offer them as two separate Annexes, so that each can be accessed independently. We will also be making them available on a planned TA research website and look forward to receiving news of additions – including of course the articles published in this and future issues of IJTAR.

Having begun with Ohlsson, we end this issue with Pio Scilligo, with a translation of an article previously published in Italian. Scilligo also considers the status of TA-research, in his case commenting on moves within medicine towards evidence-based research and raising questions about how we can add a more interpretive approach when dealing with the nature of people and society. Although IJTAR does not expect to re-publish work that has appeared elsewhere, Scilligo’s article prompted us into deciding that we will publish translations of important works that have not appeared in English before.

Between these two meta approaches to TA research, we have three fascinating research studies.

Yang Mei reports on research in China, considering how college students respond to being taught TA as part of a psychology education. She uses ANSIE (Adult Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Control Scale) to measure changes in the students’ locus of control, and also includes intriguing extracts from students’ written assignments that show what they learned.

Cesare Fregola writes about research in Italy into the links between the application of the TA concept of
drivers and various methods for children to learn two-digit division. He produces some fascinating examples that include direct observations, a questionnaire and drawings made by the children themselves.

Roland Johnsson and Gunvor Stenlund describe their investigation in Sweden of the significance of the affective dimension within the client-therapist relationship. They use the CCRT (Core Confictual Relationship Method) and the Plan Diagnosis Method to provide both quantitative and qualitative results, and support the latter with transcript examples demonstrating appropriate and not so appropriate reactions by the therapist to ‘tests’ by the client.

So a nicely international set of articles – China, Italy and Sweden – from some different cultural settings, topped and tailed by contributions about TA research itself to get us thinking.

We have come a long way since Hobbs (1984) challenged the TA community, and Eric Berne, for so uncritically accepting Spitz’s (1945) flawed study about the importance of childhood stimulation.

I feel sure you will find the contents of this issue stimulating and look forward to receiving more of the same for future publication. We have just one issue planned for this year; at least two for 2011, and who knows how many issues we may achieve together in 2012!
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