Transactional analysis of early adolescents

■ Arti Parmar, Pragaya Dashora*, Himakshi Baruah and Milan Punadiya

Department of Human Development and Family Studies, ASPEE College of Home Science and Nutrition, Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, PALANPUR (GUJARAT) INDIA
(Email: pragayadashora@rediffmail.com, himakshibaruah23@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

Transactional analysis is a unique technique of behaviour modification through which undesirable behaviour can be turned into affirmative and constructive behaviour. The present study was aimed to analyse transactions among early adolescents. The study sample comprised of 240 early adolescents (120 girls and 120 boys) from Government schools of Deesa City. Transactional pattern of girls was found to be better as compared to boys but statistically they were of same order. Reactive style was most preferred where as task managing was least preferred by total respondents. Task managing, adaptive and creative style was preferred by girls whereas boys favoured nurturing, regulating and reactive styles. Boys and girls differ significantly for reactive and creative style. Education, type of school and annual income were significant determinants of TA.

INTRODUCTION

TA is an unspoken psychological flow of communication that runs in parallel (Wikipedia, 2015). It is a tool to examine self and other's behaviour and feelings (Kulkarni, 1988). It aims to learn the language and concepts underlying, analyze transactions, examine relationships with one another and to develop an ability of straight and effective communication. TA is a useful technique by which individual can improve his or her behaviour, way of dealing with others, identify mistakes, remove psychological barriers, avoid disturbances and incorporate harmony in relationships (Berne, 1964). It is an effective measure for psychodynamic treatment and interpersonal psychotherapy (Kegan, 1982). Basically, TA is a system of analyzing and understanding human relationships and a method of systematizing the information which helps to identify interaction or communication pattern or 'transactions', between a person and others (Wikipedia, 2014).

Adolescents are future dividend of society on which the prosperity of nation lies. Variety of changes in body, mind and spirit occurs during adolescence. The thinking, reasoning and interacting pattern of adolescents also takes twist (Collins and Steinberg, 2006). In such circumstances TA is of big help to prepare adolescents for better tomorrow through modification in behaviour and interaction pattern.

As the transaction pattern of adolescents is of significant value for the entire society including the individual. In time of inclination towards relations, the value of TA increases. Looking to this an attempt has been made to intercept Transactional analysis among adolescents.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in Deesa city of Gujarat state. A total of 240 respondents from class VI to VIII comprising of 120 boys and 120 girls were selected from four Government schools through proportionate random sampling method. Transactional analysis of the respondents was assessed by using Transactional Style Inventory–General (T.S.I.-G) developed by Pareek (1999). Data were analysed with the help of frequency, percentage, mean, SD, t-value and co-efficient of correlation.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The present study in its broad sense is an attempt to find out the transactional analysis among adolescents. The study findings have been presented from Table 1 to 3.

Overall transactional style scores and in different dimensions of transactional style in respect of boys and girls are presented in Table 1. When viewed for overall transactional style, girl's score (306.52) was better than boys score (305.69). Girls scored higher for task managing (43.54), adaptive (53.92) and creative (53.21) components of TA whereas boys scored higher for nurturing (49.46), regulating (49.98) and reactive (59.79) dimensions. Further, it was noticed that reactive style (58.32) was most preferred style and task managing (43.44) was least preferred style for total respondents.

Similar trends were noticed for girls and boys separately. Engels (2016) also indicated that teacher- student relationship is very important for behavioural engagement of students. Timothy (2006) concluded that the significant relationships were found between and among the five psychosocial ego strengths.

Persual of Table 2 indicates that for nurturing mean value for boys and girls was 49.46 and 49.45, respectively with 't' value 0.008 which shows no significant difference. For the regulating mean value of boys was 49.98 while of girls was 49.54 with 't' value 0.492 which indicates no significant difference. Although the mean value for task managing was higher for girls (43.54) as compared to boys (43.34) with 't' value - 0.222 but the differences were insignificant. The mean value between boys and girls in case of adaptive dimension were 53.35 and 53.93, respectively with 't' value -0.552 that showed no significant differences. With regard to reactive style, it was noticed that boys and girls achieved mean value 59.79 and 56.85, respectively with 't' value 2.864 which was found to be significant. For creative dimension the mean value for boys was (49.77) whereas for girls it was (53.21) with 't' value -3.476 which shows significant differences. With regard to overall transactional styles negative no significant difference was found and 't' value -0.361 was perceived among boys (305.69) and girls (306.52).

Further it is clear from Table 2 that overall transaction pattern of boys and girls were of same order

Table 1: Average transactional styles scores of respondents							(n=240)
Sr. No.	Parent ego state		Adult ego state		Child ego state		Overall T.A.
	Nurturing	Regulating	Task managing	Adaptive	Reactive	Creative	
Boys	49.46	49.98	43.34	53.35	53.92	49.77	305.69
Girls	49.45	49.54	43.54	53.92	56.85	53.21	306.52
Total	49.45	49.76	43.44	53.64	58.32	51.49	306.10

Table 2: Comparison of transactional analysis among boys and girls				
Sr. No.	Dimensions of transactional styles	Boys (n = 120) Mean ± S.D.	Girls (n = 120) Mean ± S.D.	't' value
1.	Nurturing	49.46 ±8.19	49.45 ± 7.24	0.008
2.	Regulating	49.98 ± 6.97	49.54 ± 6.93	0.492
3.	Task managing	43.34 ± 7.31	43.54 ± 6.64	-0.222
4.	Adaptive	53.35 ± 7.04	53.93 ± 8.97	-0.552
5.	Reactive	59.79 ± 7.72	56.85 ± 8.19	2.864*
6.	Creative	49.77 ± 7.94	53.21 ± 7.39	-3.476**
	Total	305.69 ± 17.76	306.52±17.61	-0.361

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively
NS=Non-significant

Table 3 : Correlation between personal and socio- economic variables with transactional style of total respondents   **(n=240)**

Personal and socio-economic variables	Transactional style dimensions						
	Nurturing	Regulating	Task managing	Adaptive	Reactive	Creative	Overall TA
Age	0.006	-0.028	0.003	0.050	0.104	0.071	0.095
Education	0.032	-0.025	-0.041	0.061	0.128*	0.026	0.086
School	0.069	-0.012	-0.075	-0.156*	0.011	-0.204**	-0.161*
Ordinal position	0.003	0.025	0.066	0.003	-0.033	-0.041	0.006
Area of residence	0.029	-0.042	-0.067	-0.026	0.044	0.057	0.004
Family type	-0.018	0.027	-0.011	-0.011	0.035	-0.013	0.003
Family size	-0.003	-0.029	0.158*	-0.065	0.031	0.073	0.067
No. of sibling	-0.116	0.108	0.075	-0.017	-0.037	-0.014	-0.009
Religion	-0.041	0.031	0.066	0.022	-0.030	0.020	0.025
Caste	-0.040	0.089	0.001	-0.005	-0.008	0.030	0.025
Fathers occupation	0.014	-0.013	-0.098	-0.090	-0.014	0.009	-0.081
Annual income	0.034	0.054	0.069	0.057	0.096	-0.008	0.130*
Mass media	0.121	0.011	-0.123	-0.051	-0.073	-0.070	-0.079

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively

as the differences were negative and not significant. In reactive dimension positive significant differences and in creative dimension negative but highly significant differences persist among boys and girls. Whereas, boys and girls were at par in case of nurturing, regulating, task managing and adaptive dimensions. It can be concluded that boys and girls significantly differ on reactive and creative dimension of TA.

Table 3 indicates that in case of total respondents, education ('r'= 0.128) was significantly associated with reactive style of TA. Type of school showed negative significant relationship with adaptive ('r'= -0.156) and creative ('r'= -0.204) styles as well as with total transactional analysis ('r' = -0.161). Family size ('r' = 0.158) was found to be significantly associated with the task managing style. Annual income ('r'= 0.130) was found to be significantly associated with total TA. Nurturing and regulating dimension of TA showed no significant association with any of the personal and socio-economic variables.

In general it can be said that education is a means which is beneficial for developing reactive style. School play crucial role for the development of adaptive and creative styles as well as Erskine and Jerry (2008) mentioned that TA is an essential educational approach for providing benefits to students. Linda and Charles (1989) also reported that ego development is associated with individual's perception about family structure and their adaptability.

Conclusion :

The result of the present study indicated transaction pattern among boys and girls which were of same order. Reactive style was most preferred whereas task managing was least preferred style among respondents. Significant positive differences were found among boys and girls for reactive dimension of TA. In creative dimension highly significant but negative differences persist. Various personal-socio-economic variables (education, school, family size and annual income) were significantly correlated with TA and its various dimension. Education was significantly positively related with reactive style; school was negatively significantly associated with adaptive, creative and total TA; family size showed positive significant correlation with task managing style and income was significantly positively linked with overall TA. Since transactional styles are an important technique of behaviour modification and development of personality so adapting suitable style on the basis of situation will be helpful.

References

Berne, E. (1964). Games people play. The psychology of human relationships. New York: Grove Press. pp 71-74.

Collins, W.A. and Steinberg, E.L. (2006). Contemporary research on parenting: The case for nature and nurture. *J. American Psychologist.*, **55** : 29-45.

Engels, C.M. (2016). Behavioral engagement, peer status, and teacher–student relationships in adolescence: a

longitudinal study on reciprocal influences. *J. Youth & Adolescence*, **45** : 1192-1207.

Erskine, R.G. and Jerry, M. (2008). The effects of a TA class on socially maladjusted high school students. *Transactional Analysis J.*, **5**(3): 252-254.

Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self: problem and process in human development. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. pp 65.

Kulkarni, S. (1988). Theoretical approaches to parent education programmes. Parent education perspectives and approaches. rawat publications. Jaipur. pp 86.

Linda, B. and Charles, R. (1989). Adolescent ego development: relationship to family cohesion and adaptability. *J. Adolescence*, **12** : 83–94.

Pareek,U. (1999). Transactional Styles Inventory –General (TSI-G). Tool published by HRD research foundation. Jaipur. pp. 26-38

Timothy, A.M. (2006). Ego development and adolescent academic achievement. *J. Res. Adolescence*, **16**(1): 1-18.

Wikipedia. (2014).The free encyclopedia.

Wikipedia. (2015).The free encyclopedia.

8th Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★