

TA (Transactional Analysis) concerns itself with communication as authentic and inauthentic transactions and with nontransaction (i.e., situations in which one would expect transaction to occur and it does not). The following discussion is not drawn from TA but does use both the communication-as-process notion and the tripartite distribution (as a way of evaluating one's own and others' behavior in interpersonal relations).

The highest-potential initiative toward transaction: "The word became flesh...full of grace and truth."

Authentic Transactions

1. BC is authentic because Person Y initiates the transaction with his memo style and Person X responds with his conversation style. The exchange is comfortable for both, and neither has tried to impose his style on the other--nor even adapted (for any reason) to the other's style. Also, CB.

2. CB is authentic, in all respects, as in transaction #1. Person Y is willing to talk, but prefers to think over what Person X has said and then respond by memo, possibly leading to further conversation. Note: Person Y does not refuse conversation, and may sometimes prefer it, but usually prefers memo (perhaps because more video- than audio-oriented, perhaps because he thinks better in private, perhaps because he likes to order on paper the possibilities, perhaps because he likes transaction records, perhaps....).

	INITIATIVE OF	
	PERSON X	PERSON Y
MEMO (paper preference)	A	B
CONVERSATION (mouth-to-ear preference)**	C	D

* On the vertical one may place verbal/nonverbal or any other combination of communication media. "Memo/Conversation" are used here only as illustration, as frequently met with in offices.
 ** To distinguish face/phone, make E/F add. level.

Inauthentic Transactions

- 3. BA is inauthentic if Person Y has coerced Person X into responding in Person Y's style, i.e. by the memo medium. Of course BA is authentic, though still strained, if Person X memos out of free choice as a style concession Person Y has no right to demand.
- 4. CD is inauthentic, as the situational reverse from BA. Person X has coerced Person Y into conversation. (The "of course" in transaction #3 applies pari passu.)

Nontransactions (incomplete transactions)

- 5. Initiative B alone is a nontransaction, for Person X does not respond either by memo or by conversation (phone, drop-in, or arranged). For a single reason or a complex of reasons, Person X at least momentarily ends (destroys) the relationship, causes it to cease to "exist" (i.e., to be transactional). (E.g., a marriage's death-silence, which is prelude to separation-divorce.) This exposition is not pejorative: some relationships should cease to exist. But a community can stand only so many such breaches before it falls ill and dies. For those who intend community, therefore, nontransaction is a dangerous strategy and easily becomes sin against community.
- 6. C is pari passu the same behavior as B. In this case, Person Y's refusal to make either response to Person X.
- 7. Same-level type: BB and CC are harsh nontransactions. (Elliott/Perls began CC.)

Situations BA, CD, B, and C are basically dehumanizing in process and effects, tending to constrict freedom, destroy individuality (and therefore pluralism), and disrupt community. The parish without diagnostic skills in transaction pathology is a parish in perpetual unnecessary trouble.