

IDTA Newsletter

Vol 3 Issue 2
March
2007

Institute of Developmental Transactional Analysis
Wildhill, Broadoak End, Hertford SG14 2JA
Tel: 07000 234683 Fax: 07000 234689 email: instdta@adinternational.com

webpage: www.instdta.org

A bumper edition! Three thought-provoking articles, an interesting biography and news of workshops for career development

Editorial

This really is indeed a packed issue.

Annie Murray writes about her experiences in teaching TA to Outdoor Experiential Learning Facilitators in India. She describes how TA can be applied to enhance the transfer of learning from the outdoors into the workplace and home lives of participants. This article represents for me a fresh way of looking at the usefulness of the TA framework of constructs as well as the ethos of TA as a supportive, affirming, permission-giving developmental tool.

Christine Hyde shares some reflections on identity and community and Joanne Garner (an associate member of IDTA) highlights the current debate about the benefits of supervision as a means of honing and enlightening our working practice. Whatever walk of professional life we travel, whether teacher, consultant, counsellor, coach or trainer, we are the means through which we practice – we are our own professional instrument as it were, and supervision is a nurturing way of keeping ourselves tuned up, tuned in and as near pitch perfect as it is possible for a human being to be!

We also have the latest in our biography series, featuring Trudi Newton, TSTA (E) who tells us about her TA journey and her current focus on research.

Which is a nice link into Anthea's piece in the adjacent column

Copy deadline for the next newsletter is 4 May 2007.

Lynda Tongue, Editor

Research

I am pleased to report that the Sutton Group collected the data for their research at the beginning of February as planned and the early indications are that we are going to find some very interesting results.

The success of the day focused our thoughts on other TA research and the fact that there appears to be very little in the field of education. What we do know, however, is that there is a lot of good TA work going on in schools and communities and it would benefit us all to share this information.

In the last issue we heard from headteacher Nicky Rosewell about how she uses TA in her school. TA is now the basis of the school behaviour policy and emotional literacy programme. Kaz Stuart shared with us her vision of TA becoming a part of the National Curriculum or a standard part of teaching and learning styles. IDTA would really like to hear from you about how **you** are using TA.

This information could provide the opportunity for networking within IDTA and perhaps lead members to consider their own TA research in the future. I would like to encourage you to write about your TA work so please do so and 'get the ball rolling'! Email your articles to me at anthea34@btinternet.com.

This is such an exciting opportunity for us to share our work so I look forward to hearing from lots of you!

Anthea Harding, IDTA Chair of Research

Transactional Analysis and Outdoor Experiential Learning

Annie Murray

Back in 2003 I was invited by Atul Mathur to deliver a TA 101 based at an outdoor experiential learning centre in Panchgani in the beautiful Maharashtra region of India. The course was for senior managers from a range of corporate backgrounds including finance telecom-communications and manufacturing industries.



Most of the delegates were unused to training anywhere other than a hotel or office base. So actually just being there, so close to nature and so far removed from familiar home comforts was a challenge to their frame of reference. Many of them had travelled from Mumbai or other busy cities. The shortest journey time travelled to the venue was 5 hours. The longest was over 30 hours. As well as being challenged by the different environment, most people were feeling stunned and slightly overwhelmed by the scale of the landscape, the beauty and the tranquillity of the place. The only sounds were sounds of nature.

And for me as the trainer, working alongside Atul and his colleague Vinita, I was thrilled by the landscape and also challenged by the very different experience of facilitating learning. Although I had had some experience of working with trainers from outdoor centres in Cumbria and Wales, being in this setting and integrating TA theories first hand was new to me.

Since then I have been back to Panchgani and have delivered training in that intensely beautiful environment and have witnessed the profound, and for some people unexpected, depth of learning that takes place there. I have also worked with numerous trainers and facilitators from UK based centres as the interest in integrating TA and experiential learning grows amongst these professionals.

In taking stock of the experience four years ago and of subsequent work with outdoor trainers, I have some observations to share about the value of this combination of Transactional Analysis and outdoor learning. Those people who are familiar with Pamela Levin's Cycles of Development model will notice a particular structure to these observations.

What does it mean to be in a learning environment that is outdoors?

Well for a start the sky is very big, then there are striking features of landscape all around and there is a very immediate sense of relationship between self and environment. For some people this is exhilarating, for others scary, physically uncomfortable or disorientating. Almost inevitably people experience a realignment of priorities. What seems like a huge and overwhelming problem in an office base has a different scale of proportion when discussed in the outdoors.

For people who spend long periods of time indoors, either looking down at a desk or looking at a computer screen they may be unused to noticing their own physicality. Or they experience this as problematic as in the case of back problems or RSI. The

physicality of the natural environment (as well as providing an abundance of metaphors for learning) stimulates awareness of breathing, posture and intrapersonal process. People look upwards and around them and they notice their physical capabilities. The landscape provides a place to simply **be**, to notice the world, oneself and others.

The process of exploration

Certain conditions are important for safe exploration in the outdoors. Appropriate protection and safety measures are perhaps the most obvious physical components of the contract. Similarly protective boundaries regarding the nature of psychological and interpersonal exploration are also crucial in providing a safe learning environment. In TA terms, an understanding of the relationship between injunctions, counter-injunctions, permissions and affirmations is invaluable equipment for the outdoor learning facilitator.

The combination of TA input and experiential exercises provide participants with a multi-dimensional route-map with which to explore their internal responses, the way they are with others and their options for relating differently. People are enabled in a gentle and respectful way to understand the blocks to their effectiveness and to address their self-limiting beliefs.

Tools for thinking

When people reflect upon and think through the implications of their learning experience in the outdoors, the language of the reflective process needs to be congruent with the essence of the experience. If, for example, the language that is used to process a challenging ropes exercise describes behavioural observations about how the person reacted and about how they can transfer this behaviour (or not), that is one dimension of processing.

If participants are using language that describes inter-personal behaviours then that too can be transferable to the workplace and represents an additional dimension of learning. If however they are taught a language that describes the relationship between thoughts, feelings and behaviours then the learning potential is raised. Transactional Analysis (TA) models provide highly accessible frameworks for promoting insight at personal and interpersonal levels. TA also provides information that generates options for people.

Reviewing professional (and therefore personal) identity

A moving or challenging or thought provoking learning experience in the outdoors can be enhanced by using TA models to reflect upon and gain a detailed understanding of the significance of the experience. People can then relate their learning to their personal and professional identity through an essentially validating set of constructs. The philosophical basis of TA provides the reassurance that people are entitled to feel whatever feelings they have and that their response to whatever challenge they face is valid for them.

Achievements in outdoor learning are not simply about climbing a pole or abseiling down a rock face. Combining TA with other established learning principles involves people in self-contracting for achievement, noticing what is 'normal' or usual for them and deciding what will be a developmental stretch. Through taking charge of their own development and using TA models to expand their possibilities people have a sense of an enhanced identity. They will often express this at the end of the course as

having 'grown', having become more than they were when they arrived at the centre.

Becoming skilful

Outdoor experiential learning, when combined with TA, enables people to embed their skills at a much deeper level. The transferability of skill is strengthened and supported by a psychological rationale. People are much more likely to integrate their developed expertise if they understand how come they are skilful and how specifically they can apply them.

They also get to practice interpersonal skills in an environment that is removed from their usual experience. This provides a neutral space for self-observation and learning through feedback. When people experience themselves as skilful, and when they give and receive skilful feedback, they have a positive reinforcement for maintaining and continuing their development.

Integrated learning

In a sense it almost doesn't matter which TA concepts are taught in this kind of learning experience. People just need enough input, time to reflect, discuss and apply their learning to the experiential exercises that they take part in, and to the concrete experience of their professional lives.

The requirement of trainers and facilitators is that they provide a safe and permission rich learning culture, a structure that empowers and enables, and space for people to be themselves.

This means that they need to be alert and responsive, to know what constitutes appropriate boundaries (personal, group and environmental) and to work within these boundaries. They need to facilitate exploration and thinking in a way that allows people to work things out for themselves. They also need to be affirming and respectfully challenging in the way that they acknowledge the many different identities that are experienced in the group.

Through working in this way trainers and facilitators are like new developmental parents. They are role-modelling the skills of personal and interpersonal processing in a way that provides new and positive paradigms for independent practice in the workplace.

In Panchgani there were a lot of models available as the TA content was the whole 101 programme. It took place over 4 days. The days were long, and once delegates had made the shift from attendees to participants, there was a learning culture of eagerness and enthusiasm. My two co-trainers were technical experts in experiential learning, well grounded in a range of psychological theories, highly experienced in the corporate world, and passionate about the role of TA in outdoor learning.

Since then I have worked with numerous outdoor learning facilitators who are also using TA to add depth and value to their work. Most of these people came into the profession through a love of the outdoors. They did not come fully equipped with the skills of facilitating learning at a deep and significant level. Almost all have found TA to be invaluable as a methodology for understanding themselves, their professional role and the richness that is possible in developing others.

**©Annie Murray PTSTA (Organisaational)
March 2007**

Reference: Pamela Levin *Cycles of Development* Vol 12 No 2 April 1982

Biography - Trudi Newton

Just a few days ago I realised that it is exactly 20 years since I began my training as a Transactional Analyst. I had known about TA for a couple of years before that, and had been running an informal, TA-based personal development group where everyone read '*I'm OK, You're OK*' and '*Born to Win*' and talked about what we were learning. I wanted to know more, so I joined a training group with Lily Stuart, a psychotherapist and clinical psychologist in Blackheath. After two years of thrilling, challenging and mind-opening learning I decided that being an educator was much more important to me than becoming a psychotherapist. Lily encouraged me to contact Julie Hay, at that time the only non-psychotherapy trainer in the UK. In Julie's group I met a range of colleagues, mainly organisational, who used TA in a very different way to what I had previously seen, and at the same time I was still a bit unusual in my focus on education as a radical, liberating and political activity and in exploring how TA offered me a framework for implementing my ideas.

When I qualified as a CTA (E) in 1994 I began a very exciting journey. Although my experience was in adult education (though I had done lots of youth work and social work with young people), suddenly I was in demand for school and local authority based training – which of course was still adult education with the teachers, support staff etc. A significant event was running a training day for staff and pupils together in a Pupil Referral Unit – scary for me, thought-provoking for everyone involved (including me) and, most importantly, the start of connections with a group who have become valued colleagues in the education field and active in developmental TA, Giles Barrow and Emma Bradshaw in particular.

With these colleagues and others I continue to be part of a very unusual training group that meets in Sutton (and is widely referred to as 'The Sutton Group'). Everyone in the group contributes to the

learning and leading. We have written two books together, run a local conference for educators and are now initiating a research project on the effectiveness of TA as a basis for social and emotional development in school.

As co-director of a training institute in Cambridge I work with a TA psychotherapy colleague to run all-fields training groups – the 'cross-fertilisation' between the various TA disciplines is a key part of the process.

After the fall of the iron curtain in 1989 I developed many friendships and contacts in Eastern Europe, mainly through church connections. As a result I was enthusiastic to offer TA training there too. Once I became a PTSTA I visited several groups in Slovenia, Lithuania and Serbia, and then directed an education training programme in St Petersburg for four years – several trainees there are now preparing for examination, and as practitioners are taking TA into key areas of education in Russia.

A big part of TA for me at the moment is writing about it. In 2000, together with Rosemary Napper, I published '*Tactics*', a resource manual for educators. Now we are writing '*Tactics 2*' and at the same time I am enjoying writing articles on educational theory and TA, and being on the editorial board of the Transactional Analysis Journal (TAJ).

Another current, and future, focus is research – with Charlotte Sills I will soon start a piece of collaborative enquiry into methods of TSTA formation and development, on behalf of EATA.

And after 20 years I still delight in TA. For me it is a language and a framework that enables me to both describe and explain my own experience – and to offer others the opportunity to do that too.

© Trudi Newton TSTA (Educational)

Organisational TA

Touraine, France

12, 13, 14 July 2007

Changing Roles, Changing Worlds

In our everyday lives we take on a multiplicity of roles and there are different perceptions about the effects of this role accumulation. For example, what difficulties might there be for a part-time manager who manages the team three days a week and the other two days is a part of the same team? When we change roles through promotion, passing examinations, or moving jobs it is our perception about these roles that affects our ability to relate and communicate, be productive, and take responsibility. Each change brings with it a re-socialisation that needs to be accounted so that confidence can be developed.

This workshop will explore the process of different and changing roles and the impact on the different worlds we live in – work, family, and other social groupings.

The Facilitator: Anita Mountain MSc, CTA(O)(P), Teaching & Supervising Transactional Analyst (with Organisational & Psychotherapy specialties) is based in the UK and travels worldwide training, teaching and coaching. She works in a variety of different organisations. She is the founding partner of Mountain Associates Training & Development Consultancy and has appeared on radio and television. She has had a range of different articles and chapters published as well as two books. Her workshops are informative, friendly and fun.

Venue : Near the beautiful small town of Amboise, in a restored house at the edge of the forest. Time: from 9:30 to 16:30, with a picnic break in the garden at lunch time. (Beginning first day 10 o'clock)

Structure: Training days on 12 & 13 July and supervision on 14 July .

Participants: From beginner to CTA. (Beginners are advised to read at least one book on basic TA concepts). English is the official language of this seminar. We would be delighted to welcome participants from all over Europe.

Price: €380 (+ VAT) for 2 days (training only), €490 (+ VAT) for 3 days (training + supervision). Breaks and lunch picnics made of Touraine specialties are included.

Booking: must be confirmed before May 15, with a down payment of €150.

Possible visits and national day celebrations: Le Clos Lucé (workplace of Leonard De Vinci); La Bourdaisière and the National Conservatory of Tomato (100 different species!); Caves and wines of Montlouis & Vouvray. On July 14, at night, enjoy the annual fireworks from an exclusive access point of view at the Château d'Amboise, over the Loire.

Contact: Pascale.theobald@acteus.com +00 33 (0) 6 80 40 74 89

Or download the booking form from: Mountain Associates web site:
www.mountain-associates.co.uk

Who do we think we are? again Some reflections after the Conference in October 2006

Christine Hyde

The theme of professional identity has been forefront for me for some time, having decided two years ago to close my psychotherapy practice to focus on Developmental TA within the Suffolk Youth and Connexions Service. I am now a Contractual Trainee in the Education field of application. In seeking to define for myself the significance of making that transition, I have felt perplexed, at times, as I have pondered issues like:

- How do you know, exactly, whether you are doing education or therapy?
- Is the supervision process in the developmental field different from the supervision process in psychotherapy?
- Was the way I practised as a therapist in the past, actually Developmental TA all along?

I have found that the answers are far from straightforward and have felt drawn to debate the complexities over and over again in supervision. This is very rich territory.

Thus it was that I arrived at the welcome desk at the Conference, hoping that I would discover this place was "home". Immediately, I was challenged to make decisions about my identity, as I was invited to choose a coloured ribbon to show whether I was a newcomer or an established member. I'm afraid I dithered over this apparently impossible choice for what felt like far too long! While I was a first-timer at an IDTA Conference, I really did not like the idea of being a "conference virgin" and I have been around in the TA community for some time. Someone tried to help by explaining that as a newcomer, people would have to be nice to me; as an established member, I might feel responsible for welcoming others. I decided I'd probably rather have people being nice to me and pinned the appropriate ribbon on myself to display this. Not quite "home" yet, then. A newcomer. Not easy, this identity stuff. Thus the scene was set for what was to follow in the Keynote Speech, on the theme of "Who do we think we are?"

Throughout the conference, at times, I thought I noticed some slight restraint in our enthusiasm for the theme. The image of driving with the hand brake on came to mind. During the panel discussion, David Dobedoe used the phrase "stealth TA". We all knew what he meant. Declaring who we are is a big deal, because it provokes a response from others. While, of course, we want to avoid pushing people's buttons from a position of "We're OK and these other people are not OK", let us not imagine that we can be who we are without provoking a reaction in the culture around us. If, in our working contexts, we notice that we have made ripples and find ourselves managing the consequent conflict, we will make waves when we act collectively. A certain carefulness is therefore appropriate. People will ask who we think we are and we had better have some answers ready.

Individuals and groups define who they are by reference to other individuals and groups. At the Conference, I noted the consensus not to define ourselves as "not psychotherapists". A few times I found myself listening with my psychotherapist's hat on and felt uncomfortable. I recognised the possibility that I might bring past experiences of being excluded from groups into the present. As I chose not to, I was aware that we were making the same choice collectively. If there was a time when we decided, "I can't belong here because I'm not a psychotherapist," we wanted to leave it behind now. Of course, there had been something very autonomous, too, in

the decision to form the IDTA. I thought I witnessed a collective motivation to name that autonomous something. By making it explicit, we hoped we would clarify our vision, enhance our celebration and strengthen our sense of collective identity.

From all my ponderings about our deliberations at the conference, there are four reference points that I particularly want to keep, because I think they signpost us in the direction of autonomous development. We might tend to discount these reference points if we were working from a reactive frame of reference; so involving these aspects in our explorations should minimise that possibility. There are two potential reactive positions. On the one hand, we might think of ourselves as “not psychotherapists”; on the other, we might be a little too determined *not* to be “not psychotherapists”. In the latter case, we would still be steering ourselves primarily by the same reference point.

- 1) The process of developing a healthy identity involves making decisions about who we are *and* who we are not. If we think only about who we are, we might deprive ourselves of valuable reference points. Let’s not give up altogether on asking who we are not.
- 2) If we define ourselves primarily as educators and organisational practitioners, we might miss the opportunity to make explicit the aspects of our practice which transcend fields of application. I perceive that those aspects might be more central to our practice as Developmental Transactional Analysts than our field of application. In our search for definition, those were the aspects that we seemed most drawn to explore. It also seems to me that defining ourselves by field of application leaves counsellors in an awkward place, because they straddle both camps.
- 3) When we ask who we are in relation to non-TA practitioners in education and organisations, we begin to draw out the things that characterise our practice as Transactional Analysts, such as quality of intervention. For many of us, being a Transactional Analyst is more fundamental to our identity than our professional label or field of application. Is it important to us, in the IDTA, to keep our TA identity central, at a time when, within the ITA, with the move towards compulsory registration for psychotherapists within the UKCP, there is pressure to invest more significance in the professional role?
- 4) There is also value in asking who we are in relation to the ITA. This draws out the significance of *Developmental* Transactional Analysis. However, there is a need to avoid the pitfall of defining ourselves as “not the ITA”.

As I have accounted for these four signposts, seeking both to define my own professional identity and the developing identity of the IDTA, one new possibility has seemed particularly significant. Within the existing structures, it seems radical and provocative, but it is an idea that will not go away for me, so I have chosen to share it. One consequence of our autonomous choice not to be “not psychotherapists” might be that I, and we, have to consider the possibility that therapists can be Developmental Transactional Analysts; and that some Developmental Transactional Analysts might be therapists.

In one of our discussions in supervision, my supervisor coined the expression “developmental therapist”.

Thus, referring to the Developmental TA themes from Annie Murray’s keynote speech, it would be possible to practise as a therapist who:

- Seeks to encourage healthy growth and development, rather than analyses pathology, thus working for prevention and promotion, rather than remediation and reparation. Or, who, if working to bring remediation and reparation, keeps central the paradox that cure happens when you know there never was anything wrong with you in the first place. And who understands that the processes of remediation and reparation are themselves subsumed within the process of healthy growth and development, rather than existing on a separate paradigm from normal health and development
- Recognises the phenomenon of co-creativity between human beings; rather than practising from a position of, more unilaterally, using my creative influence on you
- Does not invite others to view them as set apart because of their use of these tools, but emphasises universality and that human beings own these truths and tools collectively
- Is working in a context where closed, one-to-one confidentiality is neither culturally expected, nor desirable, so practises multi-party contracting as a norm.
- Is aware of working, in one-to-one relationships and group relationships, within the structures of society, with the consequence that the practitioner is aware of inviting social and political change, instead of being focused on individual change

I am not, of course, claiming to have avoided all the pitfalls. Rather, these are my starting points and I want to invite us to reflect some more together in this direction. In exploring my own professional identity, I have found it helpful to frame my ideas as "I am/do rather more of this and rather less of that".

I want to suggest that you can be a therapist who practises like that, just as much as you can be an organisational consultant, or a teacher, or behaviour support assistant. Although, interestingly, when I ask myself if you could be *psychotherapist* who practises like that, I shake my head. Some psychotherapists might disagree. Partly, it is about semantics. Achieving shared understanding of what the words mean is an essential part of our task to get words around our intuitive sense of identity. For me, "therapy" is not synonymous with "psychotherapy".

Anyone who practises like that will be committed to quality of intervention because those are some of the things that make interventions effective. You can also be a builder, a bus driver, a lunch-time assistant, a bank manager, a car salesman, or a nurse, who practises like that; or a mother or father or grandparent, or sibling, or friend - with the same quality of intervention; because the things Eric Berne brought to us, I think, have more to do with our identity as human beings than with our professional identity.

Eric, the human being, showed us what goes on inside people and between people. I think it was Eric, the psychiatrist, and his colleagues, who created applications where it was about what *should* go on inside people and between people - and it isn't only in psychotherapy practice that that happens. It can happen, too, in education, in parenting, in organisations and in any working context. Eric showed us the human processes that are the foundations of the therapy process, and the education process, the development process and the community process. In bringing them into our awareness, he gave us an opportunity to grasp the truth that understanding those human processes is more fundamental to enhancing human well-being and performance than any of the things people, in their various professions, had concluded were vital.

As the first day of the conference progressed, I felt increasingly uncomfortable about wearing the newcomer ribbon, and, at some point during the day, I took it off and tied

it discreetly onto my folder. That act represented a decision not to try to squeeze myself into a mould that didn't quite fit. At an almost unconscious level, it represented a decision to stay with the uncertainty of not being sure about identity, instead of defining myself in this space too early in the development of the group imago. I did not ask to swap my ribbon for the other colour.

At one time, I found a strong sense of belonging within another organisation whose identity resonated strongly with my personal identity. La Leche League is a registered charity, which provides support for breastfeeding mothers, through one-to-one help and informal discussion in local groups. Development was a central theme underpinning our mission - development of the baby, of the mother and of the mother-baby relationship, and I experienced it as a place where babies, mothers and volunteers alike grew.

The mission statement of La Leche League is summarised in ten statements - our "Concepts". The Concepts evolved from a process of wide consultation over many years. I am not sure if anyone can pinpoint the precise time when our Concepts crystallised into their final shape. They were revised and amended over time until we experienced that the words resonated with our intuitive sense of identity. At that point, we felt satisfied with our definitions and spontaneously owned them as a complete statement of our identity in LLL, individually and collectively.

The decision to stay with the uncertainty is one that I have returned to many times on my professional identity journey. I want to encourage us, too, in the IDTA, to stay with the uncertainty, rather than rush towards the security of clear definitions about our identity. Let us leave room for our sense of identity to grow and develop, in order that we will, in due course, achieve the same sense of satisfaction and spontaneous collective ownership.

I have always had a stronger attachment to the TA community than to the UKCP. I think the UKCP can legitimately take charge of a group of ways of practising psychotherapy professionally. All power to their elbow with that. However, they cannot have a monopoly on therapy, because therapy is a fundamental human process, which existed before the UKCP began and will continue for as long as human beings live and breathe. No one organisation can contain that, because it belongs to all of us and transcends all of us. I think it could be a mistake not to recognise therapy as a developmental process; and I think it is a mistake to over-regulate it, because it transcends attempts to put it in a box. I'm reminded of a song that goes,

*"Catch the bird of heaven
Lock him in a cage of gold
Look again tomorrow
And he will be gone...*

*All the things that man has made cannot hold him any more
Still the bird is flying, as before" **

Whoever you are and whatever you do, you can be a person who flies with the bird, or you can be a person who puts him in cage. The identity of the IDTA, I think, is to fly with the bird.

© Christine Hyde (in ongoing TA training with an Educational specialism)

*Written and performed by Iona (1993). *Bird of Heaven*, recorded on *Beyond These Shores*. Adapted from a poem by Sydney Carter (1971). In *New Life* (p.85). Galliard.

Supervision for People Developers? (Part 1)

Joanne Garner

Introduction

The context for this article is the burgeoning growth of the coaching and mentoring industry, and the growing awareness of the importance of supervision for coaching practitioners.

The EMCC (1) and the CIPD (2) are two professional bodies that have published helpful papers about coaching and the supervision of coaches. Both offer guidelines on what to look for in a coaching supervisor.

I'm going to make an assumption here – that the concept of supervision for coaches and its benefits is familiar to IDTA readers, and not repeat what has been excellently written on the subject elsewhere.

But as far as I'm aware, there is little written about supervision for other kinds of "people developers" – trainers, facilitators, HR consultants, educators – and I know many members of IDTA are specialists in these fields.

So in this article, I propose to say something about the potential usefulness and relevance of the type of support known as consultancy supervision to these associated disciplines.

I'll outline my own experience during two HR projects in which I wore "hats" other than that of coach or counsellor. Supervision of these HR projects provided formative, normative and restorative support with an educative element (4), which contributed significantly to the success of the interventions.

I'll also include a brief survey of my early people-developing career and journey towards supervision of my corporate practice; and make reference to other models I use to inform and underpin my practice. (They are not strictly speaking "models of supervision" but I find them useful as aids to SuperVision. If they are used as a basis for training workshops or consulting interventions, it makes sense to me to transfer them into the supervision session when reflecting on that training.) Finally I'll summarise a very simple model of supervision which I find useful.

And as I sat with fingers hovering above the keyboard, Keri Phillips' latest booklet (5) came through the post. On reading the first few pages, I realised how well he had articulated my own views about the invaluable cross-fertilisation of ideas and techniques across the two distinct yet related professions of coaching and counselling. He comments that "... I described some of these approaches (creative techniques) more than twenty years ago but *then it was in the context of group facilitation.*" (my italics) If this transfer – appropriately adapted - across contexts is a sound approach, then surely it is equally true for the supervision of those professions?

In consultancy supervision, the cross-fertilisation of ideas has free rein, unconstrained by the requirements of management responsibility, qualification processes, or regulatory compliance which may be present in other types of supervision.

Another strand in my thinking on this topic comes from an article published in the (then) Institute of Training & Development Journal in 1992 which caught my eye at the time and to which I still refer clients as an excellent summary of TA's contribution to organisational life: Julie Hay wrote *"Most of the TA concepts that apply to individuals can also be used to analyse the structure and climate of an organisation, and the*

processes which maintain the corporate culture." (6). Developmental TA practitioners are skilled in using these applications in their work, and I believe they are equally useful when applied to supervising that work.

Definition

The definition of Consultancy Supervision I'm using is proposed by Shohet and Hawkins (7). It refers to the type of supervision in which experienced and qualified practitioners keep responsibility for the work they do with their own clients/organisations, but consult with the group leader (supervisor) – who is neither their trainer, manager nor sponsor – on those issues they wish to explore.

Consultancy Supervision differs from tutorial, training or managerial supervision, which have a different function, emphasis, roles and responsibilities.

In Consultancy Supervision, supervisees are offered an independent, supportive, and totally confidential forum to reflect, learn and develop their professional practice; to ponder ethical and operational dilemmas, to explore new models and techniques and their application to organisational life, and if appropriate to bring client case material for discussion and debate. The keyword here is "independent". A consultancy supervisor has only one focus: to support the professional development of their supervisees.

Concepts from TA and other humanistic or psychodynamic modalities may be used as the basis for reflection. At the end of this article, I mention some of those which I find particularly useful.

Consultancy supervision differs significantly and substantially in both aim and content from, say, managerial supervision, where the element of anonymity and confidentiality is either absent or greatly diminished, and where organisational norms have to be adhered to or any departure from them justified. In tutorial supervision, anonymity and confidentiality of data may be preserved, but the normative element will be as great as in a manager/subordinate relationship. Inevitably, there is a pressure to be compliant towards the tutor/supervisor, who has power to award marks and grant pass or fail. The impact of this on the TA qualifying process has been widely discussed in our community, with particular regard to the CTA exam.

Taking Coaching Supervision as another example, this is as true in that situation – increasingly common in organisations which employ teams of internal or external coaches - where the executive responsible for recruiting and managing the coaches also has responsibility for searching and identifying the coaching opportunities. If that same person also has responsibility for supervising the work of the coaches – as happens in some organisations - it takes a confident coach who will bring their less than successful interventions or seemingly intractable dilemmas to their sponsor, who may grant or withhold future work! It may also be unrealistic to maintain confidentiality, if the sponsor who has identified the opportunities is supervising the work. By definition, they will know who the coach is working with. Further, any discussion of the impact of the organisational culture or practices on the coachee will be influenced by the fact that the sponsor has their salary paid by that same organisation; criticism and objectivity is thereby challenged.

In my own coaching practice, I have experienced the following dilemma:

- my coachee wants to leave the organisation which has contracted with my sponsor to provide coaching;
- my coachee asks me not to disclose this to my sponsor who will then feel

- obliged to disclose it to the employer;
- I am held responsible by the sponsor when my coachee leaves, for not persuading them to stay;
- I learn that retention of key personnel was an element inferred in the business case for providing coaching and this was interpreted by the organisation as a guarantee.

Clearly this was an untenable situation all round. I was able to take it to supervision. I now attempt to clarify this psychological level of the contract at the outset, but it has to be said, not always satisfactorily. In my experience, even the most rigorous “contracting” cannot entirely preclude this or other dilemmas in practice – the stakeholders’ interests may be too diverse. What a sound contract can do, is agree how the parties will handle any differences as they arise. But that’s another subject!

In terms of confidentiality, consultancy supervision may most closely resemble clinical supervision of independent therapists, in that the client(s)’s identity will never be known by the supervisor.

Psychotherapy has long and rightly debated the boundaries between training, supervision and therapy; in managerial or tutorial supervision, those boundaries are intended to be non-existent (in the case of therapy) or inextricably and inevitably linked in other cases. In many Managerial Supervision relationships, there is an additional element of regulatory compliance and financial monitoring of the supervisee’s work.

In contrast, the purpose of consultancy supervision is to ensure that the best and respective interests of *all* the various parties are clarified, respected and protected, and to support the practitioner to maintain an objective perspective rather than getting caught up in organisational politics or their own version of ‘reality’ and its attendant judgements. Financial constraints, while they may be considered (eg “what am I actually getting paid to do?”), are unlikely to drive the decisions about interventions in the same way as they would have to in, say, medical practice or academia.

In summary, where the granting of salary/fee/qualification or work opportunities lies with the individual also providing supervision, there is likely to be a conflict of interests and attendant ethical dilemmas. With independent Consultancy Supervision, this potential conflict is removed. (If there is a pressure, it could rather be on the part of the supervisor to “please” the supervisee in order to continue to be paid!)

Let me emphasise, though, that the above remarks don’t imply or infer that any of the above forms of supervision are of less value or do not have a place. They can offer invaluable and proper support to students, staff, coaches and consultants.

Personal experience of consultancy supervision

The CIPD (2) paper on Coaching Supervision states “Even the most experienced HR Practitioner can benefit from re-examining their practice in the forum of supervision.” It provides a different experience to peer group discussions or attendance at conferences and workshops, essential as these are. I’ve always joined the relevant professional body for my work, and attended regular CPD events and supplementary training, but thinking back over my career, I realise how much I would have benefited from what I now know as Consultancy Supervision.

As a newly qualified teacher in 1982, how I would have loved the chance of a quiet and supportive space to think through what I was actually doing in the classroom! The managerial and tutorial supervision provided by my Head of Department during that

probationary year was naturally very focussed on the College's regulatory requirements, and on ensuring I delivered the curriculum. (Some professional bodies do provide a mentoring service for probationers, but this was not available then).

The same was true when six years later I joined a commercial organisation as a Personnel and Training Assistant – my boss was fantastic, but her focus was naturally on keeping her stakeholders happy (ie the Board shareholders), rather than on giving me time to think through the detailed format and content of my training modules, which in any case were areas she was not conversant with, which – as she frequently joked – "is why I employ you Jo!". I managed graduate recruitment and career development, counselled plateau'ed executives, and facilitated resolution of conflicts between departments, while continuing my people development training ... although the greatest challenges always came from the organisational politics. This is where independent supervision would have been without price!

Several promotions later, I became the Group Training Manager and sponsor and executive director of the company's ground-breaking industry/education initiative. I relied heavily for restorative and normative support on the external consultants I retained to run the management development programme I had designed. I realise now, with the benefit of hindsight and TA's contracting model, that helpful as this was, it was often inappropriate to do so. But I knew of nowhere else to turn.

The closest I came during those years to what I now understand is Consultancy Supervision of my work, was in 1987 from a highly experienced trainer at Roffey Park Institute, who kindly took me under her wing. (Incidentally, it was at Roffey that I was first introduced to TA as a model of human personality and behaviour, although it wasn't until 1994 that I started formal TA training.)

During psychometric training in 1989, and as a newly qualified MBTI® practitioner, I was fortunate in living near two of the pioneers of Jungian typology in the UK – they freely gave me unstinting advice and support, as did the MD of the firm of industrial psychologists who tutored me through the BPS statements of competence. To these kind and generous people, I am indebted. Through them, I built a network of seasoned practitioners, on whose experience I could later draw.

In 1994 I started my formal TA training. This was primarily in the psychotherapy field, in no small part due to constraints of geography and practicality. By 1994 I had an established career and outplacement counselling and HR consulting practice, and had worked in organisations all my life. I benefited greatly from the perspectives my clinical supervisor's experience of organisations brought, and attendance at additional stand-alone workshops introduced me formally to TA Organisational applications of the core concepts. Since 1996, I have taken advantage of supervision of my corporate work by Organisational (O) and Educational (E) TA practitioners and other suitably qualified individuals. I've taken everything to supervision – from the basics of how to think about the seating arrangements and which AV aids to use, to the psychodynamics of the group and my reactions to them, as well as the content and roles and responsibilities. (For a discussion of "suitably qualified", see the EMCC document referred to above and CIPD reading list.)

© **Joanne Garner CTA (Psychotherapy)**

The second part of this article will be published in the next newsletter

For references, please email the Editor

Participative Training Techniques

12, 13, 14 June 2007

Buckfast Abbey, Devon

A three-day interactive workshop created for Trainers, Managers, Supervisors and Training and Development Officers.

The main objective is to show participants how to successfully communicate with an audience and teach concepts and ideas in a way in which people will learn and feel able to apply new techniques and knowledge.

This is a highly participative programme, which aims to equip participants with the skills they need to train groups of people, both large and small, whatever the subject.

Course Objectives

- Build confidence in your training style
- Explore accelerated learning techniques
- Understand the learning and competence cycles
 - Identify preferred learning styles
 - Improve your questioning skills
- Understand the course design process
 - Deal with difficult participants
- Provide an opportunity for practice in a supportive environment

£595 plus vat
(non-residential)

For more information, telephone Mike Tongue on 08456 448308
Email : mike@trianglepartnership.com
www.trianglepartnership.com

About IDTA The IDTA aims to provide networking and professional development opportunities to practitioners using Developmental TA. The purpose of this newsletter is not only to update members but also to invite participation in the growth of the Institute. Views expressed in this newsletter are those of contributors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the IDTA.