

10 Tape Transcript Assessment Criteria & Marking Document

Trainee Name: John Dray

Year: 3

Marker Name: Vicky Risser

Date: 23 July 2025

	CRITERIA	MARK
1	Quality of recording: The tape must be audible with no breaks or interference in the recording. Dialogue is clear throughout and the transcription is accurate. The recording is very clear and the transcription is accurate.	10/10
2	Prologue: Must include a brief overview of your approach which fits with your theoretical orientation and is reflected in the work. Reasons for choosing this tape are made explicit with a clear rationale for this specific extract. You clearly explain your clinical background with regard to UKCP ethical guidelines and use of supervision and personal therapy. Your approach and orientation as an integrative trainee is not evidenced or referenced (see comment 2). Rationale for choosing this client and this specific transcript isn't clear.	5/10
3	Quality of Therapeutic Contact: Demonstration of a safe and ethical therapeutic relationship is clearly evidenced on the tape with awareness and availability of the therapist's own process illustrated in the commentary. This will include reference to transference and countertransference. You have a warm, non-judgemental, and welcoming approach to your client and the quality of your working alliance is evident. Awareness of your own process and transference/countertransference is stated but you don't address whether you explored this in supervision. What is the impact of your process on the therapeutic relationship? You are quite directive and leading at times (see comment 3) and an exploration of what is going on for you is needed.	9/15
4	Creativity: The tape must demonstrate the range, flexibility and creativity of the therapist's approach in line with their theoretical orientation. The	7/10

	commentary must provide a clear rationale for each intervention. Your rationale for interventions is clearly given although the range/scope for creativity is limited in this piece. Your flexibility and attunement to your client is demonstrated and your interventions guide him towards looking at where his lack of trust in certain relationships developed, which you had contracted to work on.	
5	Effectiveness: The tape demonstrates the effectiveness of the therapist's interventions in terms of clarity, precision and timing. The I:thou moment at the end of the recording is beautiful and I see how your interventions up to this point led to that moment. Your interventions of circling back to there-and-then relationships with the men and women in his family to join the dots with his here-and-now feelings about (some) men is clear, well-timed and effective and it deepens the work. You obviously know your client and see where he needed to go but some interventions were too directive or leading and I wonder whether this is due to the co-creation of pupil: teacher in the relationship. See note 5.	7/10
6	Integration of Theory into Practice: The tape clearly illustrates your theoretical orientation and the commentary demonstrates knowledge of significant aspects of your modality. A range of different theoretical modalities is evident in the tape, but your focus and explanation of the TA framework in the commentary, doesn't demonstrate knowledge of theory into practise as an integrative trainee.	4/10
7	Professionalism: The commentary will include awareness of ethical considerations, anti-oppressive practice, limits of own competence & use of supervision including a willingness to explore counter-transference. Generally good. Issues of power could be explored more in the transference/countertransference (See note 7). Use of supervision isn't mentioned.	6/10
8	Epilogue: Reflection on how the therapeutic relationship was affected by this session. Discussion of the future direction the therapy took / might take and or discussion of the ending process. Generally good—this is where you start to reflect the therapeutic relationship in more depth. Discussion of future directions is too focussed on TA theory and as an integrative trainee, you will need to demonstrate knowledge and use of the other theory you've learned to show the breadth of your relational practise.	7/10
9	Reflective practice: The work must include some critical evaluation of the practice demonstrated on the tape through exploration of what could have been done differently within the session and awareness of 'choice points' in the therapy. Generally good. You mention several times that you wish you had made a	7/10

	different intervention/asked a different question. These “choice points” could be a made clearer and reflection on what was going on for you in your transference/countertransference.	
10	References & Quality of Writing: Appropriate structure, referencing and written style throughout. Excellent.	5/5
	TOTAL MARK	67
	GRADE	

General Comments
The I:thou moment at the end of this piece is beautiful (and made me smile every time I listened to it) and it's clear how your interventions up to this point have led to this moment. You have warm, non-judgemental and welcoming approach and the quality of your working alliance is evident. If you decide to submit this piece of work, please consider these points. -A discussion of the power dynamic in the co-created relationship. -A more thorough exploration of HOW you create safety (mentioned in the epilogue) to build the working alliance with reference to theory (Erskine, Clarkson, relational needs, neuroscience, attachment, trauma and shame etc.). -A more thorough discussion of aspects of theory that underpin your integrative practise is necessary to show your range as an integrative trainee. By primarily focussing on TA/PAC in the commentary, I feel you've not captured you as a relational therapist (and do yourself a disservice). -A more in-depth exploration of intersubjectivity and how you/your history/ attachment strategies etc. impact the therapeutic relationship would be helpful and how you used supervision to look at this. -A reflection on how you used supervision in working with this client and your “growing edges”.

	Specific Comments
1	I found the use of “+” to indicate that the client and therapist were talking at the same time confusing. For ease of reading/marking, you might consider having a four-column transcript where the first column is the time, the second is the client, the third is the therapist, and the fourth is commentary. This would more clearly show when you are both talking at the same time as your words would be on the same line.
2	As an integrative trainee, the other theoretical modalities that underpin your training should be clearly evidenced (even if you have been focussing on TA and attachment with this client

	at this point in your work) as your commentary reads more like you're a TA trainee. Please include the number of sessions you have had with this client and this session number.
3	You are quite directive and leading at times. I felt you could have asked more open-ended questions and sat in a space of creative indifference, "one step behind your client's unfolding awareness". I'd have liked more exploration in the commentary of your transference/countertransference and your own process/reflective practise. You mention mentor/guide and pupil:teacher in the epilogue and I wanted to hear more about that in the commentary and whether you explored this in supervision so that you could sit in a space of "creative indifference". An exploration of the developmentally needed relationship would have been helpful. Does your client need to idealize you and are you comfortable with that? Is there a parallel process of your experience with men in your family of origin and his?
4	By sticking to a TA focus, your commentary appears quite clinical at times and misses the relational depth that is evident with this client. I'd have liked an exploration of intersubjectivity, what goes on in "the between".
5	It's clear that you have your client's interests at heart but your occasional directiveness might be a "growing edge" for you and a discussion of this in the commentary would have been helpful. What is the co-creation in this relationship?
6	I feel you've done yourself a disservice in the commentary by not exploring the other aspects of theory that show your relational approach as a therapist. If you decide to use this piece of work for your level 6 submission, you need to show a more in-depth understanding and application of theory. For example: relational/developmental needs, attachment, intersubjectivity, neuroscience (in the safety discussion in the epilogue, it feels like you don't want to own your containing presence), trauma informed practise, shame, and grief.
7	If you decide to use this piece of work, issues of power in the co-created relationship should be addressed and your use of supervision to address this.
8	
9	I'd have liked a more thorough discussion of reflective practise, choice points, use of supervision and your growing edges in relation to the co-created power dynamic in this relationship.
10	Excellent.

EXTERNAL EXAMINATION

The Grade has to be agreed by the two markers before this work goes to the External Examiner.

Combined Grade:

Comments from Both Markers after Discussion

**External Examiner - Do you agree with this Grade, please delete appropriately: Grade
Agreed / Not agreed**

External Examiner Comments

External Examiner Signature:

Date:

Prologue

I am currently completing my third year of training as an integrative psychotherapist at the Welsh Psychotherapy Institute (WPI). As a trainee member of the United Kingdom Council for Psychotherapy (UKCP), I adhere to the UKCP codes of ethics (*UKCP Code of Ethics and Professional Practice*, 2019). I use these ethical frameworks as a foundation for my private practice, from the content of written contracting and GDPR statements to safeguarding and keeping the therapeutic work in the best interest of my clients. I attend weekly therapy with a UKCP-registered integrative psychotherapist, which provides me with space to take personal process work that arises from any area of my life. Additionally, I undertake individual supervision at a ratio of one hour for every six clinical hours with a UKCP-accredited supervisor. I have been in practice since April 2024 and have accumulated over 200 hours of clinical experience. I work with long-term clients through my private practice and with short-term clients through my placement with New Pathways. In my placement I have additional supervision with a BACP registered supervisor, covering those clients.

In this transcript the names of all parties have been changed to protect confidentiality. The client is Derek and their intimate partner is Graham. During the first full session of therapy, we had contracted to look at 'overthinking and lack of trust'.

In transcribing text, I have used '+' to indicate times when client and therapist were talking at the same time in line with Isaac (2015)

My work is based on Transactional Analysis Berne (1961/2011). In my notes I will use P, A and C to refer to the primary ego states Parent, Adult and Child (also as P₂, A₂ and C₂ respectively). I will refer to the secondary ego states within the Child ego state as P₁, A₁ (little professor) and C₁ (somatic child). This follows the schema described in Stewart & Joines (1987, pp. 31, 34–35).

John Dray

Start of session

Client has been unwell for three weeks—missing two sessions that were cancelled at the last minute—but only taken a couple of days off work. Here are some brief notes referring to the earlier part of the transcribed session:

Client has been to London to a concert Client has not been sleeping. Client concludes that they have been over-stimulated. Client has also been to a big queer festival which raised issues about 'being judged and like not looking right'.

In the previous session we had looked at transactional analysis, including nurturing/controlling parent (+ve and -ve for both) and free vs adapted child.

We explore body image at queer events - 'just seems to be this like underarching like like uncomfortability with being seen but wanting to be seen as well.' We have also explored looking at what the client wants, as opposed to what they 'should' do. This feeling of 'ought to' has been a common theme in previous sessions. This transcript gives an opportunity to explore this further. This excerpt reflects a time where the client and I were able to look at the nature of attachment, which seems to underline the client's trust mechanisms. The excerpt culminates in a moment of 'I-thou' where the client is truly seen and the possibility of a secure attachment seems possible.

Transcription

In the following transcription table, the T column is Timecode, the S column is speaker, either: T (therapist) or C (client). The use of '+' indicates where the speakers are speaking at the same time. The transcript has been split into three sections—this is purely for manageability and is not significant to the clinical understanding.

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
40:50	T	Too much. Well, I'll tell you if you ever get to be too much. I can't see that happening.	The client has received injunctions that are telling the client "don't be you" Goulding & Goulding (1979/1997, pp. 8–11). That said, my intervention is well-intentioned but clumsy. It suggests that I am the arbiter of what is acceptable. It also risks the client feeling shame as they could think, 'but I know I am too much' and they could be fearful of being fully themselves with me.
40:56	C	I know. no that's interesting actually isn't it	
41:02	T	and it's not your brother and your dad still saying those things to you. It's what you've taken in it's	Here I was suggesting that the P ego state had taken verbal and non-verbal information from the client's father and brother
41:09	C	fully yeah 100% like I think	
41:12	T	+ mmm	
41:13	C	you + know it's interesting because like now me and my	The client seems to immediately go towards the relationship being better. That

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		brother have a much better relationship than we did when I was younger and actually that's one of those relationships that was really helped like has felt like it's kind of healed a little bit	may be true. I am wondering if the client is willing to explore the relational wounds that were laid down before the relationship improved. I am wondering if this was a failure at the level of security or valuing (Erschine, Moursund, & Trautmann, 1999, pp. 124, 127), forming a wound that still remains with the client. My intrigue is whether the wound caused by the difficult relationships with the father and brother has left a general deficit in the ability to form a secure attachment with heterosexual men or a more general deficit in the ability to form relationships at all.
41:26	T	Mmm	I don't want to interrupt, but want to encourage the client to explore their relationship with the male members of their immediate family.
41:26	C	of that trust with men is with my brother because	
41:26	T	Yeah (quietly)	Again, hoping that the client will explore.
41:26	C	we were such opposites like such opposites he was this alpha alpha athlete out with his friends all the time camping all	I am intrigued by the use of the double-adjective 'alpha'. It lands with me as the client suggesting that the brother represents a perfect manifestation of what

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		the time	it is to be male. This chimes with my parallel process with my father where I could never match his, often self-contradictory, standards of what it meant to be 'a man'. For the client, this could represent how their brother is represented in their psyche (e.g. Klein (1997)). I know that in my process I felt a lot of shame and I am inclined to wonder if the client does, too. I also wonder if the client has a sense of safety in the therapy room because I present as a non-alpha male. Could this be part of the transference and colour how the client relates to me? Possibly there is a transference whereby the client sees me as the 'alpha' or 'mentor' in this context. This suggests that keeping an eye on the horizontalism of the session is important or risks reinforcing the symbiotic style of relationship.
41:42	T	Mmm	I am encouraging the client to continue
41:42	C	like everything that ticked the stereotype box of like popular athletic clever still and I was just like uh and that was not me. at all. They had lots of	The client rewards my patience with a continuation of what they were told "being male" was about. I am wondering if there is a process whereby the client has been presented an image of what it is to be

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		friends in a different way, you know, and I, yeah.	male. They do not conform to that image, so have come to the conclusion that they, themselves, are not truly a man. If so, this would parallel a process that I have taken to therapy. This makes it even more for me to listen to what the client is saying and not project my process onto them. This is also in counterpoint to the discomfort, discussed earlier in the session, where the client stated that he feels his body is being judged by other gay men. I am noticing that he is
42:01	T	But when you're with him, do you have to keep all those parameters in check, so that can't be too open?	I am intrigued why I used the word 'parameters' to describe character traits. It is as if each trait can be turned up or down. The sense I have of the client is that they have to keep their own character traits turned down when communicating with their father or their brother. This feels like an injunction 'don't be you'. I have an inkling that this is taken by that A ₁ and turned into a script that can then be enforced by P ₁ . "When dealing with heterosexual men, as modelled by my father and brother, it is important to present in this specific way with the

T S Dialogue

Commentary

character traits turned down.” This ‘don’t be you’ injunction (Stewart & Joines, 1987, p. 135) would come with shame. So this script could bring shame with every initial meeting with heterosexual males.

42:10 C Not anymore,

This presents a difficulty. It feels as if the emotional wounds of the childhood relationship with the client’s brother have been replaced with the ‘grown-up’ version of the relationship. However, the wounds have not been dressed and healed. I have a hunch they have been papered over.

42:11 T + So you do feel...

I am wondering why the client is interrupting me at this moment. I have a hunch that the client has worked out what I want to ask, and deliberately sabotages the question.

42:12 C not anymore + , but it takes a long time.

Based on what happens later in the session, I am fairly sure that the client is ignoring or denying the relational wound that they have experienced. This reminds me of clients who have been attacked and rush towards forgiving their attacker without acknowledging the wounds that they, themselves, have experienced.

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
42:13	T	So there is that level of trust there with you.	Not entirely sure why I feel the need to interrupt the client at this point. Is this because I feel the client interrupted me at 42:12? Perhaps I am feeling that my 'masterful' point has to be heard. Possibly my narcissistic process is getting in the way of the therapy.
42:16	C	Yeah, nowadays,	In other words, while the situation may now be better, it really was not fulfilling the client's needs while the client was growing up and developing their internal model of how relationships work. It is interesting to see this in the intersubjective model of Stolorow, Atwood, & Orange (2002). My hunch is that part of the client's subjectivity includes a belief that maintaining relationship is more important, in order to ensure that needs are met, rather than noticing quality of that relationship. This reminds me of Bowlby's referencing of Harlow's monkey experiments in (Bowlby, 1969/1997) where the infant monkeys attached to figures that gave them no nourishment.
42:17	T	+and openness	Here it is almost as if the client and I are having two conversations at the same

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			time, with my phrases supporting the client in continuing. Am I even needed for this part of the therapy, or does my presence give the client a sense of safety so that they can continue?
42:17	C	sure. + Yeah, I also think like with him a little bit more now, I'm like, okay, you, I think after me and Graham's split up, especially, he was quite like there for me.	Here, the client's P ₁ has been shown evidence that the script does not need to apply at all times. I think it has probably used the excuse, 'but this is a special case' to keep the script in force more generally.
42:29	T	+ Yeah	The interweaving of my phrases with the client's continues.
42:29	C	Like he was + , like, you know, dropping a message here and there. I'm like, he's almost shown his vulnerability to me more as an adult and as a + father	Here the client finds vulnerability from his brother. In thinking about this, I wonder how horizontal the power dynamic in the relationship is. Not only is the brother the 'alpha alpha male', but he is also here as a father. This is literally putting the brother in the place of the parent vs the client's child's need for attachment and support. A relationship where the parent is emotionally or physically absent, when the child desires attachment could be characterised as an anxious-preoccupied

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			attachment style as described by Bowlby (1969/1997). I think I had a flash of frustration, as I am deeply wishing the client to see this. At the same time, I am compassionate enough to realise that the client will or won't do this in their own time.
42:37	T	Yeah +	Urging continuation.
42:37	C	as well too. Whereas I felt then, I was like, well, why am I not being that way with him? Because, like, he's, there's been many years since we were +teens in the house to be nice.	I am intrigued as to how the client feels the need to repair his relationship with his brother. Is it as an Adult to Adult relationship, or, as I suspect, a Child attaching to a Parent?
42:49	T	He's been nice to me, so I've got to be nice to him?	This is bringing up a sense unhealthy scripts that can be seen as reflecting a symbiotic relationship, where individuals may be overly dependent, enmeshed, or lacking autonomy and differentiation. In a mother/child relationship, this would have some similarities to the state in Winnicott (1976) and Winnicott (1961) where the child has not successfully separated from the mother/child dyad. So a person in a symbiotic relationship is dependent on the

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			P_2 and A_2 ego states of the other to look after their C_2. The client looks after the C_2 of the other in the hope that the other will look after them. Hargaden & Sills (2002/2014, p. 51) explores developmental issues and the idea of symbiosis in a relational context.
42:53	C	well no like it's more that I'm like he's proving to me now something a different not proving he's he's showing me a + different part of his identity	The use of the word 'proving' with its rapid correction to the word 'showing' suggests to me a parapraxis. I choose to challenge the client about this.
43:03	T	mmm + I don't think people use words accidentally so that proving word it does sound like you needed that proof	My 'mmm' is quizzical, as I am picking up on the parapraxis and wanting to explore it further. To me this hints at an unconscious process that the client has yet to acknowledge. Here, the unconscious is trying to make itself known.
43:09	C	yeah because I did not trust my brother though I did	The client states that they did need proof. I am relieved that I did not let this 'slip' pass, as it gives way to a deeper understanding between the client and their brother. They did not trust their brother.
43:13	T	No	
43:13	C	in no way shape or form in the	I am quite surprised by the emphasis that

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		house	the client puts in this phrase. It feels like something the client has wanted to say, but dare not say openly. It suggests that the inner child of the client is feeling safe enough to be honest, rather than confluent.
43:13	T	+ and you've been	
43:13	C	if I couldn't sit with him +	
43:18	T	quite hurt from your relationship with him	I rephrase what I think I have been hearing from the client, so that they can correct or agree with my phrase. This is a level of challenged that I hope I have graded adequately (Zinker, 1978, pp. 131–132). However, I am sure that the strength of the relationship with the client is good enough to withstand this (Erskine et al., 1999, pp. 121–155).
43:20	C	yeah	The client strongly agrees. The danger at this point is that I represent a new P figure that the client's C has to agree with as a new confluence.
43:21	T	sounds like he didn't find you acceptable.	At this point, I present another challenge to the client. I am concerned that I may have presented it too strongly. This is responded to with a resistance.

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
43:24	C	He wasn't awful to me or anything. I'm not going to try and paint it, but it wasn't, we weren't, we just + had nothing.	I notice this resistance and feel that the client is trying to defend their brother.
43:31	T	No + I mean, we're not painting him awful. We're saying, what was the effect he had on you? And you could have the nicest person in the world. If they're not giving you what you need, then it doesn't make for a good relationship. And that's okay.	At this point I am trying to distance the process from the Larkin (2001), 'they fuck you up', sense that some clients have that the therapeutic process is about finding ways to blame the parents/significant family members. To this end, I re-frame the process as looking at ways in which the client did not get what they developmentally needed. I am trying to get the client away from a position in which they feel it necessary to blame and, instead, look at what they needed but did not get. I do feel that the phrase 'good relationship' was clumsy. I think I would have preferred 'satisfying' or 'developmentally needed'. This would have given the idea of a deficit compared to what the client needed while allowing for what could still be a loving relationship. In using the word 'good' I think I introduced a polarity that necessarily suggested that the

T S Dialogue

Commentary

			client's relationship was 'bad'.
43:47	C	Yeah.	
43:48	T	Because we won't get on with everyone.	Here, I am trying to normalise the experience of not liking people. This is in line with the TA goals of Autonomy and Intimacy.
43:49	C	Exactly. But it felt like, I think maybe my formative year is the people I didn't get along with my household with were the men.	I am feeling that the resistance has been avoided before it can take full hold.

Transcription part 2

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
43:56	T	Yeah. All your aunties.	In earlier sessions that client has talked about how he had his sister and his many aunties. They are all much older than him. In the absence of his deceased mother they provide a warm, fun presence—part sister, part mother.
43:58	C	All my aunties. My sister and my mum, when she was still around, they were like my comfort zones for sure. And like men felt very much like the fear factor.	I notice the client's stress of the word 'men'. I am imagining it is used almost to blame or curse.
44:11	T	And it sounds like when you were with women, everything was okay. You could be	In this I am trying to locate where the client feels safe. I am also wondering which ego state he is in in this locus of safety, and what that says about his attachment style/how he relates to people.
44:16	C	+ Yeah	The client's 'yeah' sounds much more relaxed than in the immediate conversation when he was talking about men. It is almost like a sigh of relief. Zinker (1978) relates anxiety to the holding of the breath. This release of breath feels like a release of the anxiety and fear provoked by the

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			thought of men.
44:17	T	open. + You were the young one so that you were... + (laugh)	My laugh here is spontaneous. Part of it is about the relief at talking about a nice situation where my client feels safe. I am wondering if I am reflecting on my parallel process when the thought of my father coming home was an imminent danger. When my father came home no-one could protect me. Here the client feels safe when his mother, sister and aunties are there. So, I wonder if my laughter is witnessing the safety that I did not feel. I check that I do not feel envy towards the client. I am sure that I feel a shared joy. Perhaps my laughter is sharing in the relief expressed by my client at 44:16
44:21	C	treated nicely +	
44:23	T	treated nicely you could have lots of gossip and you could just have fun and let fall	My wording here confirms a feeling of joy. I am also contrasting the feeling of comfort that the client had in this situation with the acknowledged fear that he felt in the presence of his brother.
44:30	C	to yourself	
44:31	T	really	
44:32	C	yeah yeah fully yeah 100%	I notice the client is in a far happier state

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			than when he was talking about men.
44:35	T	(intake of breath) yeah	
44:37	C	yeah	
44:37	T	(started to speak)	I started to speak my thought, but chose not to continue as the client was processing.
44:38	C	with men it was not I felt like this instant like even if I was like at a family event and I was all of the + men	
44:47	T	yes +	Affirming the client in his processing and urging him to continue. This is almost a 'yes, and...'
44:47	C	from the family I'd be like it's horrible + I hated it.	And we enter back into the (client's) discomfort of being around men.
44:51	T	(Mmm) + And it's interesting because you're using that (umm) term feminine earlier and I'm wondering whether it's when men actually remind you of your aunties that sort of vulnerability and openness is what you find attractive.	Here, I am trying to explore with the client what it is that is scary about men? Is it the projection onto them that they are closed-off, unavailable and a representation of a type of masculinity that is not congruent with my client's maleness, or is it just that they are male?
45:07	C	Yeah I do. I really find it attractive in men because it	In this, I seem to have found that the client finds the 'feminine' traits of openness and

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		instantly tells me I can trust you.	emotional availability attractive in men. I am intrigued that earlier in the session the client expressed difficulty being with gay men. I wish that I had checked this out with them. Do gay men in the club represent the same level of closed-off unavailability as the straight men of his home? In this way is he not only cut off from maleness but also gayness? This would make sense in the context of an anxious-preoccupied attachment style, as comfort would come only from open, obtainable people. At the same time, I feel conflict because it could also be understood as attachment only being realised in a simulacrum of a mother-child dyad. This would hark back to the symbiosis mentioned earlier. The ethical point here is whether working to change the relationship style falls within the contract we have agreed, and whether it is in the best interest of the client. The former is a goal of TA and part of our contract together.
45:13	T	(yeah)	This is a thoughtful 'yeah'. I want the client to continue and I am interested in what he

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			has to say.
45:15	C	And if I don't get that I find it hard to be able to connect or feel safe to open up and be + me	
45:24	T	(Mmm) +	I am hoping to encourage the client in what I perceive as his honest appraisal of the situation
45:24	C	I think so I think I've probably going back to where I mentioned about like dating and like all that I think I probably just was like okay I'm just here to be a sexual object	In the phrase "I'm just here to be a sexual object" I wonder if the client thinks that when dating they only get connection through sex, or if sex as a "sexual object" is about the avoidance of connection and simply about the satisfaction of a hunger.
45:34	T	OK	In retrospect I would have preferred not to use 'OK', as this suggests that the client's experience is 'OK' and they are expressing that it is unsatisfactory.
45:35	C	I'm here you've got to tell me that I'm fancy me you've got to show that you fancy me	
45:40	T	(Mmm)	I am wanting the client to continue.
45:40	C	and I'm actually just like a little doll in a china case and I just want you to look at me I don't	I find the image of a "doll in a china case" particularly stark. In my head it represents an inanimate "objet d'arte" that is there to

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		want you to play with me apart from	be admired, but not touched or connected with in any real sense. I wish I had probed this further with the client. Reflecting on it now, I wonder whether he sees himself a doll with his 'aunties'. The object of their pleasure, but not part of an intimate relationship. In my mind it represents the ultimate infantilisation. The babe in swaddling clothes, unable to move. Only there for the pleasure of others.
45:46	T	+ (Mmm)	
45:46	C	you know +	
45:47	T	+ (Laugh)	
45:49	C	(Laugh) + actual thing but and then I just yeah like and even now even when it's like people like don't like you'll be in situations and I'm like why do I care if that person like	The knowing laughter between the two of us represents the client's hint at sex. I was concerned that the laughter could represent my embarrassment at the subject of sex. However, the tone of it suggests a shared language that does not require words. It is notable that sex is the only 'playing with' that is acceptable in this transaction. It does suggest that in such transactions the client feels like the 'it' in an 'I-it' relationship (Buber, 1923/2018).
46:08	T	(Mmmmmm)	This long 'mmmmm' is meant to encourage

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			the client to explore this theme deeper.
46:08	C	I feel like I probably built this ideology in my own brain that to be accepted by gay man is to be fancied by gay men.	This statement connects back to my hunch that rather than feeling OK as a gay man, in the sense of life positions (Stewart & Joines, 1987, ch. 12), he feels not OK. This process is a classic example of A₁ taking information and formulating a script, as described in (Stewart & Joines, 1987, pp. 33–34).
46:20	T	(Ohhh!) If we take it back not to gay men, but to men in the context of your dad and your brother,	I rush to take it back to an exploration of his relationship with male family members. I wonder if this is me projecting my childhood onto the client's situation. Consequently, we do not get a chance to explore the 'doll' imagery. That said, the symbiotic relationship style was formed in the family, so I am thinking that it is good to get back to the radix of the matter. It is also possible that the script around gay men might be built on the script built around his male family members. Such script building is discussed by English (1988, pp. 294–303)
46:27	C	(Mmm)	
46:28	T	it was important to be accepted	Here I boldly state that the main people in

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		by men because they were the people in the household.	the household were his brother and father. His mother had died and I am not including his sister in this statement. In the moment, I may have forgotten her existence. Perhaps this is because she is not figural in my thought process at the time. I am concerned that my mental picture has a big blind-spot at this point.
46:35	C	(Mmmm) Yeah.	
46:36	T	So there's	
46:37	C	I didn't feel accepted by them.	
46:40	T	No, so you had to put on a mask until you saw that trait of femininity, say from an aunty, or even or + something.	I introduce the idea of masks. I am wondering if the client will find this idea useful. I find it useful as a way of talking about adaptation, as in adapted child. This would be before getting into more detailed theory such as (Joines & Stewart, 2002) which may figure in later sessions.
46:47	C	Yeah. +	
46:49	T	Which would say, oh, this is a safe space.	In the session I was convinced that the client allowed his free child to play in the presence of safe-signals, such as femininity. In retrospect I am wondering if the client is entering into a different sort of non-intimate relationship that feels safe

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			because it is familiar.
46:54	C	Yeah, it's true.	
46:58	T	(Mmm) And you see that with Graham.	I am curious what it is about the client's partner, Graham, that allows the client to feel safe.
47:01	C	Yeah. Yeah.	
47:05	T	And so there's a little kid a bit of you that when you just see someone who's that sort of type of male	Here, I decide to explore the 'guardrails' that are up in the presence of males who the client does not discern to be 'safe'. I lay out this scenario over the next series of interactions. I make sure to emphasise how dangerous this feels, as a display of empathy towards my client. This continues over the next few interactions...
47:13	C	(Yeah)	
47:14	T	without those open traits that you know you can trust.	
47:19	C	(Mmm)	
47:20	T	I can imagine all of the guardrails are up because you need to feel very safe because as a small kid you knew that you were unacceptable if you let all those bits out. Well, you were told that you were	

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		unacceptable.	
47:32	C	told	
47:32	T	You were acceptable. Yeah. It's the important bit to know.	Here, I am desperately trying to reinforce the 'OKness' of the client. I am concerned that he is not hearing this message. On the other hand, it is being reinforced by the quality of the relationship. I suppose this represents a two-pronged fortification of the 'OKness'.
47:36	C	(Mmm)	
47:37	T	But you were getting all these signals or if I'm truly Derek with men unless I've seen all these safety signals	
47:46	C	(M-Mmm)	
47:46	T	it's really dangerous	
47:47	C	(Mmmm) yeah	
47:49	T	I'm feeling I'm feeling really sorry for that scared kid	Having laid out the scenario, I hand out a life-line of empathy.
47:56	C	Mmmm me too	The client's response shows that he has grabbed the other end of the life-line.
48:00	T	yeah	
48:01	C	yeah me too you know it's interesting to hear of that kind	Here, I am excited that the client's response suggests that they feel

John Dray

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
---	---	----------	------------

		of like spoken back at me as	understood.
--	--	------------------------------	-------------

		well + yeah	
--	--	-------------	--

48:12	T	(yeah) +	
-------	---	----------	--

48:13	C	it feels right though it doesn't feel because then I think about in the house like	
-------	---	--	--

Transcription part 3

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
48:18	T	(MmmMmm)	I am hoping the client will continue.
48:18	C	when it was just me or me and my brother and me and my dad I just used to shut down I used	Here the client reveals the full extent of their 'shutdown' in the presence of the male members of their household.
48:24	T	(Yeah)	the following quiet interactions are all trying to suggest to the client that they continue.
48:24	C	to not speak I used to like you know with my dad I could probably be a little bit more like well like	
48:30	T	(Mmmm)	
48:31	C	because I can just talk about stuff that we've got to talk about as a parent and a child	
48:35	T	(Yeah)	
48:35	C	but with my brother I literally was like I don't want to speak to you because I don't want to put myself in a place of	
48:40	T	So with your mom going,	Here, I am acknowledging the full awfulness of the situation the young client found himself in. Possibly to emphasise the 'alone-ness' of the client in that

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			situation.
48:40	C	Mmmm	
48:40	T	to be left just with that,	I am interested as to why I interrupted at this point.
48:46	C	Mmmm	
48:48	T	it feels like a very scary place. I mean, you've got all that bereavement.	
48:52	C	Yeah.	
48:53	T	But then on top of it, you're in that prison where you couldn't be yourself.	I am intrigued that I use the image of 'prison'. This was figural in my childhood, as my father was a prison officer. I have also introduced the image of 'guardrails'. The client's image was a 'china cabinet'. The client seems to be able to work with my images. I wonder what would have happened if I had worked with his.
48:59	C	Yeah. It's true.	
49:04	T	Ooh.	
49:06	C	Oh. Yeah.	
49:13	T	Yeah.	
49:13	C	(Client's belly noises)	This feels like a special moment when the client's belly erupts into the room.
49:16	T	That feels like a big thing and I	This felt like a real 'I-thou' moment.

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		think your belly's agreeing. + (Laughing)	
49:19	C	I know, tell me my belly's + my belly's, like I'm uncomfortable. I'm	This could be the somatic child (C ₁) making an appearance, as the vulnerable child (C ₂) makes it's presence known.
49:23	T	(yeah)	
49:23	C	uncomfortable with it. Yeah, no. I think, yeah. That's pretty true.	In the presence of this vulnerable child I feel that we have touched on grief that has not yet been processed. The vulnerable, little child that is revealed feels really sad and fragile. I wonder if this is the start or re-commencement of a grieving process. This process could be to do with his mother, or/and it could be to do with the wider loss of the possibility of secure attachment.
49:31	T	Hmm. So we've acknowledged that little kid.	I am feeling so much for the client and I am excited to reach this special moment.
49:35	C	Yeah.	
49:36	T	He's actually giving him a little seat so he can tell us some stuff.	Here, I am reinforcing that this vulnerable/unadapted child is welcome in the presence of adults. A situation in which the C seems to have been given the injunction 'Don't be important'. Here, we are reversing that injunction by welcoming

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			the child centre-stage.
49:40	C	Yeah. Yeah. That's nice. It's nice. So he gets the opportunity to speak.	I take this as the client agreeing that the child is welcome and that rather than following the injunction 'Don't exist', they are welcoming the C into our midst. At this moment I am feeling like a proud parent and I think that the client's positive nurturing parent (+NP) is present too. We have a taste of TA autonomy with the P and A looking after their own C. We also have a moment of TA intimacy as we both marvel at the presence of the C. This seems to be an occasion where the script about how to be with men has been challenged. Again P ₁ may be able to make the excuse that this was not in the presence of straight men. I expect that this will mean that challenging this script will require a lot of work based on events that happen outside of sessions.
49:47	T	Yeah. Very pleased to meet that little kid as well.	
49:52	C	Mm. Mm.	
49:52	T	Because it sounds like he needed to be heard.	Again, reinforcing the welcoming of the child. I hold an imagining that C ₁ , the

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
			somatic child, was present in the belly noises.
49:56	C	Yeah. I think that's why I feel probably that level of panic quite often, to be honest. It's just that. That feeling of, yeah, something's not being met.	
50:08	T	+ (Mmm)	Here, I am encouraging the client to continue their thought.
50:09	C	Something's + not being kind of felt.	
50:13	T	Everything's got to be exactly right. So that little kids feel safe, so he's allowed out to play.	Reinforcing the need for that child to feel safe before he can appear.
50:18	C	Mmm (pause) That's the hard parameters to live by.	Here the client picks up the word 'parameters' from earlier in the session suggesting that it had landed with him and that it was a useful concept.
50:26	T	Hard parameters to live by.	My echo of the client is there to show agreement and that I have heard what they are saying.
50:28	C	Mmmm	I interpret this as a moment of contentment, where the client is enjoying having their free child available.
50:29	T	What we can do is we can have	In saying this, I am wanting to let the C ₂

T	S	Dialogue	Commentary
		a look to see whether there are ways that we can make that kid feel safer.	know that he is not welcome for a unique event, but that we will endeavour to give him more 'play time'.
50:35	C	I think that's the nice idea. I do. Yeah.	This sounds like the client's A agreeing.
50:38	T	Because he's not doing anything wrong. They're trying to protect you. So we can have a bit more than explore and see.	I am feeling relieved that the client's child is able to feel safe and reveal himself despite the potential for shame that I introduced at 40:50.
50:48	C	That makes sense. Yeah, I'd like that.	This allows for the continuation of this process.
50:51	T	Okay. Right.	We have hit a time boundary. It is noticeable that the pace of the session is much slower at this stage. It feels as if we both need time to breathe in the joy of this moment.

Epilogue

In this session I was particularly touched by the moment when the client's belly seemed to interject in the therapy. I felt a real moment of 'I-thou' connection as if the client's vulnerable child (C_2 and C_1 within C_2) was present in the session. In view of our initial contract to look at 'lack of trust', it seemed that here was a point where the client was truly trusting and allowing his vulnerability to show. I am wondering what contributed to the client's feeling of safety at that moment. There is the nice, comforting set-up of the room, that the client has commented on a number of times. In reflecting on the session, I am wont to say that it was the building of the therapeutic relationship, through empathy, to the point that the client's child felt safe. Perhaps there is some transference where the client sees me as an older, gay man who is in some sort of mentorship role - a life guide. This could be helpful as a new 'role-model', but it could also be harmful if it encourages a new symbiotic relationship, perhaps I am more of a transitional object and process of projective identification/integration as described by Ogden (1979, pp. 357–373). On the other hand . I am encouraged in my thoughts on this, as when I draw TA diagrams the client enthusiastically asks for a copy to be emailed. What is my countertransference? I see him as a competent person who has high standards. I do see him as a client who is actively invested in the process of change. However, I also wonder whether in the counter-transference he is a pupil to my teacher. In previous sessions he has stated that he sets his goals higher than those of his boss, so that he never disappoints them —*be perfect*. At the same time, I feel that the client is cute, like a cuddly toy. This might be coming from his *Please me* counterinjunction. I am feeling the force of his need to be liked. I hypothesise that this is coming from a "don't be close" injunction that was coming both from his brother and his father, and that was explored earlier in this session (with a good dose of "Don't exist" and "Don't be important"). So, in the transference and countertransference there is a good deal of information about the client's aetiology.

John Dray

This bringing out of the vulnerable child (C) also brought out a caring adult (A) “Yeah. Yeah. That’s nice. It’s nice. So he gets the opportunity to speak.” (49:40) I think that a large part of the continuing therapy will be about gently challenging parental injunctions and bringing about a restructuring of the personality. This will involve freeing the Adult from contamination by the other ego states, as well as noticing and challenging script beliefs. The attachment may present itself as partly symbiotic, which can be healthy if it reflects the dyad of the mother-child transforming into the *imago* of the fully formed adult.

References

- Berne, E. ([1961] 2011). *Transactional analysis in psychotherapy*. Snowball.
- Bowlby, J. ([1969] 1997). *Attachment and loss. 1: Attachment* (Vol. 1). Pimlico.
- Buber, M. ([1923] 2018). *I and thou* (R. G. Smith, Trans.; Bloomsbury revelations edition).
Bloomsbury Academic, an imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- English, F. (1988). Whither Scripts? *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 18(4), 294–303.
<https://www.fanita-english.com/wp-content/uploads/pdf/Whiter%20scripts.pdf>
- Erskine, R. G., Moursund, J., & Trautmann, R. L. (1999). Relational Needs. In *Beyond empathy: a therapy of contact-in-relationship* (Classic edition, pp. 121–155).
Routledge.
- Goulding, M. M., & Goulding, R. L. ([1979] 1997). *Changing lives through rededication therapy*
(Rev. and updated ed). Grove Press ; Distributed by Publishers Group West.
- Hargaden, H., & Sills, C. ([2002] 2014). *Transactional Analysis* (0th ed.). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315820279>
- Isaac. (2015, March 10). Psychotherapy Verbatim Transcription Guide. *Academic Transcription Services*. <https://weloty.com/psychotherapy-verbatim-transcription-guide/>
- Joines, V., & Stewart, I. (2002). *Personality adaptations: a new guide to human understanding in psychotherapy and counselling*. Lifespace.
- Klein, M. (1997). *Envy And Gratitude And Other Works 1946-1963*. Vintage Classics.
- Larkin, P. (2001). This Be the Verse. In *Collected Poems*. Farrar Straus and Giroux.
<https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/66966-they-fuck-you-up-your-mum-and-dad-they-may>
- Ogden, T. H. (1979). On Projective Identification. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 60, 357–373.

John Dray

Stewart, I., & Joines, V. (1987). *TA today: a new introduction to transactional analysis*.

Lifespace Pub.

Stolorow, R. D., Atwood, G. E., & Orange, D. M. (2002). *Worlds of experience: interweaving philosophical and clinical dimensions in psychoanalysis*. Basic Books.

UKCP Code of Ethics and Professional Practice. (2019). UKCP.

<https://www.psychotherapy.org.uk/media/bkjdm33f/ukcp-code-of-ethics-and-professional-practice-2019.pdf>

Winnicott, D. W. (1961). [The theory of the parent-infant relationship]. *Revue Francaise De Psychanalyse*, 25, 7–26.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/med:psych/9780190271381.003.0022>

Winnicott, D. W. (1976). *The child, the family, and the outside world* (Repr). Penguin Books.

Zinker, J. C. (1978). *Creative process in Gestalt therapy* (1st Vintage Books ed). Vintage Books.