Abstract
This article is the final exposition of Bernd Schmid’s keynote speech presented at the 2007 International Transactional Analysis Conference in San Francisco. Schmid is the winner of the 2007 Eric Berne Memorial Award for his adaptation of the transactional analysis concept of ego states. His role model integrates transactional analysis approaches with systemic ideas and can be used as both a personality model and a communication model. It expands the ego state model, describing the individual as the portfolio of his or her roles played on the stages of his or her world. Background information about these ideas are provided along with perspectives that are integrated in this role model. Familiar concepts—including intuition, encounter, empathy, humanity, and spirituality—are described from the point of view of an integrated approach.

In 2007 I was honored with the Eric Berne Memorial Award (EBMA) for the role concept of transactional analysis. I developed this concept in the early 1990s. Drifting more and more into the organizational field, I had become dissatisfied with many classical transactional analysis concepts. Perspectives from clinical transactional analysis were not focused on organizations as systems but on people in organizations and their psychological and developmental background. For organizational work, I needed to focus on more dimensions of reality, such as organizational roles, structures, market dynamics, technical and economic criteria in shaping prices, and so on.

To deal with my professional developmental needs, I tried, on the one hand, to contribute to discussions about the development of TA as an approach in various professional fields and about necessary changes in transactional analysis identity and associations (e.g., Schmid, 1988, 1989, 1990a). On the other hand, I also developed concepts and approaches that I needed from a systemic perspective, integrating transactional analysis ideas as well as elements of the professional culture of TA. These were then labeled systemic concepts, for example, the role concept of personality. I acknowledged the transactional analysis background of my concepts, but I did not refer to them as transactional analysis concepts. But as time has gone by, I have come to refer to them as systemic transactional analysis concepts.

In this article I will:
1. Briefly mention some of the transactional analysis principles I use in my work and additional perspectives that can guide conceptual developments and professional identities
2. Outline the role concept of transactional analysis and give personality and relationship examples of using it
3. Give a short overview of some of the other concepts for personality, encounter, and cocreativity developed at my institute over the years
4. Discuss some expansions on Berne’s concept of intuition, including intuition of the possible
5. Make some remarks on empathy, humanity, and spirituality

Transactional Analysis: Principles Kept and Additional Perspectives
Developmental theories and models of pathological adaptations as well as strategies for dealing with them were of great value to me when I was a psychotherapist. Circles, arrows, and triangles were great illustration tools for
communicating transactional analysis approaches to others. To a certain extent, they also contributed to my identity as a clinical member of the transactional analysis community. However, the more I needed to define my transactional analysis identity beyond the profession of psychotherapist, the more other transactional analysis qualities became essential.

I held many principles of transactional analysis to be important, even when I did not introduce myself as a transactional analyst. Among them were:

- Focusing on real people in real life situations
- Focusing on how reality is created by transactions
- Acknowledging and understanding multiple background levels (e.g., psychological level, organizational function, etc.)
- Accepting the necessary function of intuition in creating reality
- Acting from a position of OK-OK and caring love
- Being dedicated to how people find meaning in life
- Encountering others on an equal level, respecting the other’s reality
- Taking each other’s autonomy and wisdom seriously (e.g., by use of the contractual method)
- Taking responsibility in relationships and toward society
- Using concepts and procedures that can be understood and related to by everyone involved
- Keeping concepts as simple as possible yet profound on a deeper level
- Achieving professionalism through transactional competence
- Building nonabusive and nonexploitative relationships
- Confronting each other about differences in perception and culture
- Building pluralistic and nonimperialistic associations

To have something that no one else has is an immature wish to define one’s identity. Since we all are part of our human community and our time, we cannot expect to be unique by having something no one else has. Identity should be defined more by the specific way in which we follow these values and the specific culture of our associations (Schmid, 2007).

Beyond the models and theories I had from classical transactional analysis, I needed to expand my ways of responding to the needs of the organizational fields and to keep up with developments in other professional associations, especially in the systemic field. Some of these included:

- Including organizational contexts in models of personality and relationships
- Focusing on organizational structures and processes as well as on individuals and their relationships
- Orienting toward cocreativity, solutions, and meaning
- Including consequences for people and processes that are not present in the situation
- Including the content and purpose of communication, structures, and processes
- Including other background levels (e.g., financial benefit or marketing strategy) in addition to psychological background
- Shaping approaches to fit interplay and integration with other professions and perspectives in organizations
- Developing approaches that integrate different scientific disciplines (not only as an additional speciality or an appendix to psychological considerations)
- Taking seriously the autonomous identity of different professions and priorities according to their fields
- Being open to using a variety of approaches, concepts, and methods according to the developmental needs of various professional fields, just as I do with transactional analysis
- Developing a declared transactional analysis identity that takes a metastance to classical concepts and to developing professionalism in various fields and meeting emerging new challenges

I am sure that much of what I wanted to add has also been realized by many colleagues and handled in an individual way to expand their practice and identity. But isn’t the official identity of transactional analysis still very traditional?
and bound to earlier developmental stages of TA associations? Why do so many institutes and professionals use additional labels or shift to approaches other than transactional analysis or even leave it altogether?

The success in spreading the classical basic concepts of transactional analysis—such as ego states, games, rackets, scripts, the psychological level of transactions, and so on—has a downside. Nowadays, professionals in many fields are confronted with problematic reactions when they identify themselves as transactional analysts. Sometimes people are interested but have misleading expectations; sometimes they lose interest because they do not want to have what they think transactional analysis is. For the individual professional, it is a strain to explain all the time. An official process of developing and spreading new identity statements for transactional analysis could bring relief and make it more attractive to clearly label oneself as a transactional analyst.

The Role Model

The role model is an expansion of the ego state model, and thus, on the one hand, it is used as a personality model and, on the other hand, as a communication model. This is why the role model can be used in combination with many familiar transactional analysis concepts and procedures. Here I can only give a short explanation and a few examples. For further explanation, see my article on the role concept (Schmid, 1994).

In the role model of personality, a person is described as the portfolio of his or her roles played on the stages of his or her world.

In this model, people's uniqueness and humanness are expressed in the way they structure their roles. They are also expressed as content and in the way roles are experienced and lived. The model implies for pragmatic purposes that people in their humanness only exist and are experienced through their roles. Going beyond ego states, roles connect people with plays and stages of their worlds. Thus, personality is also a matter of context and content. This facilitates professional positioning and intelligent and meaningful complexity control in organizations.

In previous articles I have developed a “three-world model” (see Schmid, 1990b) in order to pose the question of personality in light of dealing with three worlds: the private, the organizational, and the professional worlds. According to other differentiations, the worlds could be different in number or definition. For example, Mohr (2006) designed a four-world model in which the community world is its own category.

My three worlds are the private world, the organizational world, and the professional world (see Figure 1).

![Three-world Personality Model and Role-ladder Model](image)
The distinction between the organizational world and the professional world is particularly helpful for a better understanding and more autonomous definition of oneself in organizations. Many questions confront the same person in different ways depending on whether those questions are put from an organizational role (e.g., as a representative for women’s rights), from a professional role (e.g., as a social worker), or from a private role (e.g., as a mother-to-be).

Definition of Role. A role is a coherent system of attitudes, feelings, behaviors, perspectives on reality, and accompanying relationships. This takes into account that every role is linked with and refers to a certain sphere of reality and related frames of reference. The description of roles always touches the description of relationships corresponding to these roles and the play the role is played out in. From the view of the person, every role entails ideas about the kind of relationships that can be shaped from and are suggested by this role.

Illustration. The diversity and meaning of roles is immediately understandable when we imagine a road accident in which we encounter the people involved, their neighbors, the president of the local community action group, the head of operations of the technological relief organization, the doctor on emergency call, the police responsible for securing the scene of the accident and future evidence, and a colleague who happens to be passing by. We can imagine many other roles that—depending on the event—activate their own attitudes, feelings, and behaviors and their own perspectives on reality. Each person is dealing mainly with certain aspects of reality and, on the basis of his or her role, has clear ideas about how he or she should structure his or her relationships with the other people present at the scene of the accident. If the fire department’s head of operations happens to be a personal friend of one of the badly injured victims and also godfather to this person’s son, who is also present but uninjured, we can imagine that several roles are activated simultaneously and that their coexistence within this one person must be controlled in such a situation.

Discussing Personality. Under the headings of “role integration” and “resource policy,” questions about autonomy and mature adult functioning are discussed here.

Today professionals are challenged with ever-increasing diverse roles and must also—in organizations, for example—combine various affiliations with different systems of reference. This renders it barely possible to identify oneself with one role or with a small, manageable bundle of roles. Rather, one must acquire an autonomous, professional attitude in the selection and shaping of roles as well as in the decision and control of affiliations. Getting used to the net of roles and references in one’s own way is a huge task in itself. However, we are additionally confronted by potential conflicts between diverse affiliations and roles. It thus becomes essential to be economical with available resources (including our own resources of energy and time). In modern business, managers of corporations are generally eaten up by the great role demands made on them, unless they control complexity by means of their own autonomous identity and concentrate congruent role configurations into viable structures.

An integrated personality is the concept of a mature personality, meaning a person who can integrate diverse roles in different worlds in a functional and essential way. People express their essence—their distinctive characteristics—in the form of integration as well as in the style of their roles. The circle in Figure 1 is a symbol for the necessity of integrating roles and worlds.

A variety of other questions around personality discussed in classical transactional analysis gain different perspectives and additional dimensions using the role concept. For example:

- Under the rubric “congruity of roles,” questions about the notion of ego-syntonic/ego-dystonic are discussed.
- Under the rubric “activating roles/leading roles,” energy concepts and executive power are discussed. Professionalism has a good deal to do with the ability to activate and deactivate certain roles at will and also with structuring situations to provide the appropriate triggers for activating complementary role relationships in others involved.
• “Role competence” is an additional notion that acknowledges that competence is more than becoming free from neurotic restrictions. Role competence means having control over the coherent system of attitudes, feelings, behavior, perspectives on reality, and the accompanying relationships that are bundled with the role. It also includes understanding and matching with the intended play. (See formula of competence later in this article.) Many personality problems have to do with the fact that the necessity of acquiring role competence is not recognized or not taken seriously, or inadequate steps are taken on the way to acquiring it.

• “Restriction of the personality” is considered in terms of role restrictions, role fixation, role exclusion, role contamination, role confusion, role habits, and conventions (rackets). Many considerations from discussing ego states can be applied and expanded easily.

As an illustration, I view role contamination as analogous to Berne’s (1961/1966) ideas about contamination; role contamination is the chronic inclusion of elements from other roles in a role without the person being aware of it. In such circumstances, the individual considers the inclusion of elements alien to the role as appropriate to it. For example, in wage negotiations, someone in a bargaining agent role might experience feelings of indignation seeping in, feelings that arise from his consternation at the expected wage reduction for himself as an individual. These feelings can be easily mistaken for feelings appropriate to the role of negotiator in order to balance out the diverse problems and interests and, if necessary, to set them in contrast to the conflicting interests of the other negotiating party. In another example, someone may activate behaviors in a private argument that would be more appropriate to the psychotherapeutic treatment of patients without identifying such feelings as alien to the private role relationship.

**Discussing Communication:** The Role Model and Reality in Relationships. From the systemic perspective, communication is the cocreative process of inventing reality. Communication is not only an exchange of messages but also a definition of the roles from which we communicate, the contexts we refer to or create, and the relevant relationships and ongoing play.

Much of this happens so automatically and with a mutually safeguarded preconception that this process often escapes our attention. Careful attention to the beginning of communication as an embryonic situation and guiding force for communication outcomes has a good tradition in transactional analysis and should thus be extended to the confirmation or nonconfirmation of preconceptions and/or new definitions when communication begins.

Analogously, staging a communication situation and the communicating partner’s statements can be understood as contributions to the invention of realities. In a barely predefined space, it is particularly easy to observe how dialogues and multilogues between the individuals involved serve cocreation. The ensuing relationships and the realities in which they are described are the object of observation from the perspective of relationships. Here we can distinguish whether the participants in the communicative process either stage reality habitually or generate it anew. By employing the role model, we preclude the assumption that individuals, as such, are in charge. When observing people in their roles, social and system powers come into view. They have a far greater determining influence on the roles than the protagonists of the role are aware of. Difficulties can also arise when background role relationships, unnoticed by the communicators, determine the course of the official, foreground role relationships.

Using role model transactions, games and dysfunctional symbiotic relationships can be described as well. The diagram of the functional ladder model helps to illustrate interaction (Figure 2).

**Illustration.** Imagine a strategy discussion between the head of a human resource department and his team, with the agenda being to decide on priorities. At first, discussion is on the level of organizational roles, during which (according to the company’s culture) people can offer suggestions, although they must leave the final decision to the head (transaction 1./2. in Figure 2). After some time, unnoticed by the participants, there is a switch to professional
argument (transaction 3./4. in Figure 2), in which everyone feels dominated and as if they do not have equal rights. In the background, there might be male rivalry directed toward a woman also present. The psychological approach might suggest directing attention to this kind of background. The organizational consulting approach might direct attention to the switch in roles and role relationships. However, reestablishing stable communication between organizational roles might solve the problem.

Backgrounds connected with private life, its history, and actual dynamics is only one kind of background. Here is an example for an organizational background level: Two employees of a department might believe that they have a problem working together as professionals, let us say the communication trainer and training administrator. They deal with the problem from the opinions and habits of their respective professions and from the relationship between these professions. However, they might overlook the fact that the difficulties in the relationship are defined much more by the organizational structure and by incompatible, doubly defined areas of responsibility than by the different professions. There would be further evidence to back up this perspective if the software trainers in the neighboring departments had similar relationship problems with training administration.

In organizational roles there can be relationship problems that control professional arguments from the background. The awareness (real self) of those concerned may be located in the professional roles in the foreground. For the clarification of such situations, it is important to bring the background relationship of the organizational role into the foreground and make it the focus of attention. Such arguments can influence the private relationships of those concerned and bring more private reactions to the foreground. This can relax the situation without really solving the organizational problem or even increase tension because the problem is dealt with on a level on which no solution can be found. Escalations may lead to various neurotic reactions. To deal with them may necessitate a good deal of psychotherapeutic work. If solved on an organizational level, people may return to competent behavior and good relationships on their own, because the organization became more functional and thus healthier.

These explanations and examples hopefully show how transactional analysis can be enriched using the role model. It is not the content that is new, as many competent transactional analysts do competent work in nonclinical fields. What is new is the way of conceptualizing these things using other models of personality and communication, thus serving the needs and identity of many professional fields using many valuable transactional analysis approaches and without depending on clinical TA explanations.

**More Concepts Available for Transactional Analysis**

The presented role concept is one of many new concepts I developed to deal with cocreative relationships, including a variety of possible background levels and questions related to professional and organizational culture. They are already published in German. Many of them are published in English as articles.
and other translations can be downloaded free from my Web site (e.g., Schmid, 2006). If a publisher can be found, much of this work could soon be published in English as a book.

To give a first impression, some of these models are mentioned here briefly.

*Communication as Cultural Encounter.* This model (Figure 3) describes communication as encounter of cultures (personal, professional, regional, etc.).

![Figure 3 Communication as Cultural Encounter](image)

This concept does not assume that mutual understanding is normal. It expects that each communicator involved is predominantly oriented to his or her own reality. To communicate effectively, it is necessary to study the realities of the sender and the recipient. The model assumes that creating shared reality is a necessary extra effort. If mutual understanding and influencing fails, the implications and interests of the communicators must be studied further. What sense do the messages make in the other’s reality?

*Encounter Levels of Communication for Establishing Shared Frames of Reference.* This model (based on Schiff et al., 1975) (see Figure 4), shows different levels of shared frames of reference that build up into shared realities. Problems usually appear on level 4 but are due to mismatching on level 1-3. Along with this concept, there were changes suggested in Schiff’s terminology so as to describe a relationship between equals (e.g., accounting and discounting or definition, codefinition, and redefinition).

![Figure 4 Communication Levels for Establishing Shared Reality](image)

*The Theater Metaphor of Personality and Cocreative Relationships.* This is a model for understanding personality as a portfolio of one’s roles, stages, themes, stories, and styles of plays (see Figure 5).

It is also a model for understanding relationships as encounter in which individuals and organizations meet for inventing shared plays and tying together roles, stages, stories, and so on (see Figure 6).

![Figure 5 Personality in Terms of the Theater Metaphor](image)
Formula of Competence and Matching between Individuals and Organizations. This model indicates that, from a systemic perspective, competence is not only a general property of a person but is to be differentiated into role competence and context competence (see Figure 7). Using the theater metaphor, this differentiates competence to play roles and competence to understand the play in which roles are played. If necessary, both must be invented in a cocreative process. Competence in a specific organization or field is dependent on how well the individuals and the organizations match. Thus, competence is defined as the product of these three components.

\[ \text{Competence in organizations} = \text{role competence} \times \text{competence in the professional field} \times \text{matching} \]

Beyond that, matching includes many other dimensions designed to answer the question: How does an organization make sense for an individual and how does an individual make sense for an organization (market/association, etc.) (see Figure 8)?
Dialogue on Responsibility in Organizations.
This concept of a culture of responsibility in organizations (Schmid, 2005) is based on the transactional analysis concept of symbiotic relationships and passive behaviors (Schiff et al., 1975). It is further developed for dealing with responsibilities in organizations. Starting from the idea that the word “responsibility” contains the word “response,” it distinguishes between four dimensions of response-ability.

With reference to their positions at work, people:
• Want to respond (are dedicated): This is a question of values.
• Are able to respond: This is a question of being qualified to respond.
• Have the resources to respond: This is a question of being sufficiently equipped.
• Must respond: This is a question of obligation.

Responsibilities are conceptualized as complementary, related parts of a whole system of responsibility (see Figure 9).

Dimensions of Whom or What Meets in the Dialogue.
Different approaches have different perspectives on what is essential in communication and what has priority to be observed and trained. Four levels are differentiated so as to invite considerations for further improvement. That is, are there (1) individual behaviors, (2) attitudes, (3) personal myths (e.g., script stories), and (4) organizational, professional, and cultural myths involved (see Figure 10)?

The Dialogue Model of Communication.
This model, which refers to the intuition concepts of Berne, Jung, and Erickson, shows how methodical and intuitive levels of communication together contribute to cocreative realities. Professional competence and organizational culture depend on focused dialogues between these spheres (see Figure 11).

What do all these models offer?
• The possibility of being adopted as transactional analysis models of personality and encounter
• Inclusion of complex backgrounds, contexts, and contents
• Examples from a variety of application fields together with the imbedded ideas
• Encouragement for constructing new models as needed in different professional approaches
• A language focused on positively creating reality
• Cocreative alliances within and between people and organizations
• Opening up intuition and supporting intuitive and scientific communication cultures
• Inviting an attitude in which orientation to responsibility in society, task fulfillment, and caring for intuitive backgrounds and meaningful life courses are balanced

It is not that these aspects are not somehow covered when transactional analysts work, but can they become TA? Models like this are probably tolerated, if used by transactional analysts, but can they claim to be a further development of transactional analysis? If asked what transactional analysis is, don’t most TA people talk about ego states, games, and scripts as has been traditional for the last 50 years?

In the organizational field, we need to adapt the program of transactional analysis for professionals, who have a mix of many roles and contexts, who must deal with overwhelming complexity, and who are responsible for creating realities together that fit the goals and needs of our society. This means not only the needs of those present, but also those who are touched by the implications and consequences. For this we must expand the horizons of quality criteria beyond the OK-OK relationship between humans present. This must include more than the psychological perspective. And certainly we are dedicated to meaningful individual life courses and a shared culture of realizing the individual life plans of people involved and touched, while being dedicated to common goals and ethics.

Some Remarks on Intuition

Transactional analysis started with Berne’s studies on intuition. TA concepts came about as crystallizations of Berne’s (and others) intuition as it was focused on psychotherapy. Berne defined intuition, based on Aristotle, as the way we know something without knowing how we know and often without knowing in words what we know, although we act as if we know (Berne, 1949/1977). Intuition is a way to know about and create reality through action (Schmid, 1991).

Intuition can be qualified or unqualified, and it can lead us or mislead us. Professional intui-
tion must be trained and become focused according to what sphere is relevant and for what professional purposes it is needed.

Different professionals should have different masteries of intuition because they have different spheres of reality to deal with and different responsibilities.

**Intuition of the Possible.** Berne focused on intuitive perceptions of realities that have already occurred somewhere sometime. In addition, I point to a whole sphere of intuitions that are not covered by Berne’s concept of intuition, that is, the perception of the possible. Jung (1921/1972), and especially his follower Marie-Luise von Franz (von Franz & Hillmann, 1980), pointed to this dimension of intuition. It refers to the whole sphere of phenomena that could be real instead of what is real already. It is the perception of the potential. And somebody must realize it, which means perceiving the possibility and making it real.

Berne’s intuitions meant perceptions of represented archaic realities. Jung’s intuition meant also the anticipation of possible realities; his intuition is needed for finding new trails rather than detecting old pathways.

**Limitations to Intuition.** Berne taught us that intuition is limited or contaminated by two sources:

1. Taboos: This means that we are not allowed to deal with certain aspects of reality.
2. Desires and fears: This means we are seduced or blocked or driven by hidden motivations that we do not dare face or admit.

If we include content, context, and intuition of the possible, we need to add some further limitations, and I guess we could find even more. Each of the following points could be formulated as chance or resource, but I view them as restrictions following Berne’s use:

3. Fixations in habits, including cultural, professional, and organizational habits: We just do it because we learned to do it and always have done it.
4. Lack of competence and knowledge: Intuition is also learned as part of professional knowledge and experience. If we do not have relevant experience or knowledge, this is also lacking in the variety of our intuitions. If we do not know which kind of intuitions to activate in which professional role or organizational context, our intuitions may be vague, mischosen, or misplaced.

5. Blocking experimental flow: In complex, constantly changing situations, it is often necessary to work on first ideas and find out more on the way. Working in an experimental mode means not knowing which models and approaches to use when we start. It challenges us not to reduce things to familiar concepts but to become creative and to learn quickly. Evidence and importance and acceptability may change in every moment. In addition, intuition must be flexible and not stick to ideas once adopted. This also means leaving open what we do not understand and pointing to what we are not qualified for. If we stick to approaches and explanations that are plausible at first and can easily be justified, we are in danger of choosing “safe” intuitions and do not dare to leave things open and wait (or ask) for other more relevant intuitions.

6. Lack of tuning into each other’s spirit: Empathetic dialogue in our habitual areas of private or professional empathy may not be enough. Beyond this, empathy needs to include tuning into each other’s possible essence and possibilities that are in shadow. This may also include images about tendencies of the soul, such as acting more like an official or sleeping talents like working with metaphors. It also includes imagery about possibly satisfying steps in someone’s life course at a specific moment, such as starting one’s own business. If intuition involves habitually oriented viewpoints—such as how the professional can be important for the client or how he could confront using transactional analysis concepts or which feelings may be blocked—then the intuitive wisdom coming from understanding the spirit of the other is lacking.

7. Lack of inspiring ideas and creative designs for future realities.
Besides intuitions concerning the human beings involved, inspiring ideas for creative designs on stages in the outer world are as important for many professions. For example, if you are working with an organizational team, it may be an endless enterprise or not really relevant work that contributes to the success of the effort if you focus on working through personal issues or confronting group dynamics. If the team’s unsatisfying situation is due to the lack of ideas about how the team could be successful (e.g., which moves could work to set up a new project, etc.), then intuition should be focused on creating these ideas. If there is no competence in that area of intuition, it does not make sense just to do things with which the consultant is familiar.

Finally, the integration of all of these intuitions and their combination into images of pathways to the future that are realistic for the people engaged is important. Much of intuitive ability is based on knowledge and experience and the result of professional training on intuition in these areas. For this kind of training, an elaborated methodology and language is essential. Transactional analysis has optimal resources for that and could put this into the main focus of its identity.

Building an organizational and professional culture in which professional intuition is a main focus and in which a power field for the development of such competence is created could be a core field for transactional analysis.

**Remarks on Empathy, Humanity, and Spirituality**

I often encounter sympathetic but romantic worldviews around the terms “empathy,” “humanity,” and “spirituality,” and I want to offer some more prosaic remarks on these topics. I do so not to put these ethical dimensions down, but to ground them deeper in terms of facing the complex problems of today’s society.

**Empathy.** Empathy in psychotherapy is mainly focused on other people’s feelings or on past experiences and former relationships in the background. Empathy is often connected with having corresponding feelings. This has not changed much during the last four decades, even though recent discussions in the field have been enriched by the neuroscientific concept of mirror neurons.

It is certainly important for each individual to learn to tune into others’ actual ways of experiencing and acting. This contributes to mutual bonding and building a circle of relevant others. However, I question whether the backward orientation in personal life history and focusing on feelings is the most important part of empathy.

I suppose that many psychotherapists are successful not so much because of their sharing past experiences and corresponding feelings, but because of their intuition of possible options and ideas about how those options can be created as reality through communication. This may sometimes be the main reason why clients are willing to cooperate and cocreate with therapists a metaphor for the past and the present, hoping that will offer a link to a metaphor about the future.

In addition to emotional empathy there is intellectual empathy. Together with emotional empathy, the latter fosters an understanding of how other people interpret their situation and what they are heading for, are about to do or develop, and how we might cooperate or at least relate to that. This part of the story may not have much to do with feelings but may relate to other ways of understanding the other person’s life situation and attempts to handle it. Empathy means “reading” what is going to happen and be done and be created by others and relating to that through action. The roots of this may go back to an early tribal fight for survival, when our ancestors could only survive through cooperation and creating mutual benefit. Without empathy for the emerging future and promising actions, cooperation is not easy and cocreation is almost impossible.

If someone does not have enough positive experience with bonding to engage in cooperative relationships, he or she might need to resolve this through psychotherapy to a certain extent. On the other hand, the person might need training in understanding and corresponding to other’s actions in the current play and to understand tendencies. If cocreation and cooperation goes well and is beneficial, this may also create bonding and relatedness. Kohlrieser
(2006), for example, goes in a promising direction in his work.

*Humanity.* Global humanity does not come from empathy, emotional bonding, and cocreativity alone. This might be sufficient for what can be called “tribal humanity.” You may treat your people in a human manner and at the same time demonstrate inhuman attitudes and behaviors toward others. Close attachment and cooperation within the group—what we call “we”—always goes together with imperialism and exploitation of those who are called “others.” I assume that empathy is the way evolution enabled us to cooperate and to have solidarity within the tribe in order to survive. What must be added so that we can survive as a global community?

Taking a closer look, we become aware that there are no “others”! We are all “the others.” Global humanity challenges us to treat every human being as one of us, even when we do not feel like that. We need insight into this interdependency in order to influence our feelings. To augment this kind of humanity, we must deal with specific questions in education. What helps us to cooperate creatively with people who are strange to us and to whom we do not feel close and attached? How can we remain peaceful and tolerant when we do not have personal contact and empathetic reactions? How can we contribute to peace when we feel scared, blackmailed, and oppressed, when we suffer from cruelty and injustice? How must we act politically, and how do we have an impact on our governments? Intellectual insight and autonomy against spontaneous reactions and needs play an important role in that process. Global humanity has more and different challenges than “tribal humanity” and requires more than what transactional analysis can offer today.

*Cocreativity and Spirituality.* We have many good, down-to-earth reasons for cocreativity so far. Let me add a personal up-to-heaven reason. Cocreativity is spiritual.

1. For me there is no image of a personal God. If there is a God, it is beyond my anthropomorphic projections and probably more principle or sphere. To paraphrase Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a famous German Protestant theologian murdered by the Nazis, *Mutatis mutandis:* The God existing in our imaginations doesn’t exist (Bonhoeffer, 1998). But there is spiritual experience. The universe and evolution are miracles to me. To be in tune with aspects of those is a spiritual experience.

2. God is, for me, the creative principle of evolution, and the outcome of evolution is not determined.

3. God is not almighty. We are challenged to help bring up meaningful creations of cultural evolution.

4. Nobody can be creative alone. We need each other in many respects. If we come into a creative flow together, that is a spiritual experience for many people.

5. If we can elicit meaningful cocreativity, that is realizing caring love.

6. To take that responsibility is part of our dignity as individuals and as organizations. Cocreativity is not always pleasant and should not be equated with fun. It is sometimes hard work and frustration. It is sometimes a gift for or from people we do not know and never meet.

To conclude, my hopes for transactional analysis are that it will be a transactional approach to cocreativity in professions, in organizations, and in our private lives as well.
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