Three Transactional Analysis Decision-Making Models

By Edward Chalk (edward@fleetingswallow.com)

Table of Contents

Introduction

Human decision-making is a complex psychological process that can be understood through various theoretical frameworks. Transactional Analysis (TA), developed by Eric Berne, offers a unique perspective on how we make choices by examining the interplay between our different ego states: Parent, Adult, and Child.

In this discussion, we'll examine three distinct TA-based models for understanding decision-making processes, each offering different insights into how our psyche navigates choices.

Model 1: The Democratic Ego State Council

The first model operates like an internal democracy where the Adult ego state serves as both facilitator and final decision-maker. In this process, the Adult presents the decision problem to both the Parent and Child ego states, allowing each to independently analyze the situation from their unique perspectives.

- The Parent ego state evaluates the decision through the lens of learned values, social expectations, and moral frameworks. It asks questions like: "What would be the right thing to do?" and "How does this align with our principles and social responsibilities?" The Parent draws upon internalized wisdom from authority figures and cultural norms.

- Meanwhile, the Child ego state approaches the decision from an emotional and instinctual perspective. It considers: "How will this make me feel?" and "What do I really want?" The Child is concerned with immediate satisfaction, creativity, spontaneity, and authentic emotional responses.

- The Adult ego state, serving as the rational processor, conducts its own analysis based on facts, logical reasoning, and objective assessment of consequences. It examines reality testing, probability assessments, and practical considerations.

Once all three ego states have reached their independent conclusions, they report back to the Adult, which then synthesizes these perspectives into a final decision. This model ensures that decisions incorporate moral guidance, emotional authenticity, and rational analysis.

Worked Example

Fork in the road: *Take the start-up product-manager role in a new city* **or** *stay in the current corporate job.*

---

1 · Independent reflections

First, each ego state thinks alone.

Ego state	What it notices first	Hopes if we move	Fears if we move	Provisional lean
Parent	Duty, safety, reputation	● Be a bold example for the kids. ● Work on something socially useful.	● Less security. ● Partner's career disruption.	**Cautious yes** – "Only if risk controls are solid."
Adult	Facts, timelines, strategy	● Equity upside; modern skill set. ● 24-month funding runway.	● 40 % start-up failure rate. ● Relocation cost.	**Conditional yes** – "Viable with a cash buffer and written severance."
Child	Excitement, belonging	● New city adventure. ● Creative freedom; hip office vibe.	● Leaving friends. ● Fear of layoffs.	**Strong yes** – "Let's do it!"

2 · "Internal Council meeting" - weaving the views together

Shared theme	Agreement across voices	Tension point	Council's mitigation plan
Personal growth & purpose	All three see the role as energising and meaningful.	-	Make growth a headline reason in the family narrative.
Financial & job security	Parent and Adult need firm guarantees.	Child is impatient with "boring money talk."	• Build a 10-month cash buffer. • Negotiate a six-month severance clause. • Health-insurance parity in writing.
Family & friends	Parent worries about partner and kids; Child fears loneliness.	Adult notes the distance logistics.	• Quarterly trips home budgeted. • Friday kept meeting-free for family time. • Partner offered relocation coaching.
Adventure & creativity	Child is thrilled; Parent neutral; Adult sees résumé value.	Parent fears burnout.	Institute a "Friday no-meeting" rule and schedule a mentor to monitor workload.

After talking through each theme, **no voice issues a veto**:

Parent accepts if safeguards are real, *Adult* finds the plan strategically sound, and *Child* remains enthusiastic.

3 · Decision & ground rules

- **Outcome: Accept the start-up offer.**
- **Built-in conditions**
    1. Buffer and severance secured before signing.
    2. Written health-care match.
    3. Quarterly trips home on the calendar.
    4. Friday protected as decompression / family day.
- **Review trigger:** If company runway drops below nine months or work-life balance slips, the council reconvenes.

Why this qualitative council works

- **Separate first, integrate later** - Each ego state forms its own view, so the loudest impulse doesn't drown the others.
- **Themes > scores** - Converting hopes and fears into shared themes keeps the discussion concrete without pretending the psyche does arithmetic.
- **Actionable safeguards** - Every lingering worry is translated into a practical rule, letting enthusiasm blossom without abandoning prudence.

Model 2: Second-Order Ego State Negotiations

The second model operates at a more sophisticated psychological level, recognizing that within each primary ego state exist sub-states that mirror the tripartite structure. This creates nine possible internal voices: Parent-in-Parent, Adult-in-Parent, Child-in-Parent, Parent-in-Adult, Adult-in-Adult, Child-in-Adult, Parent-in-Child, Adult-in-Child, and Child-in-Child.

In this model, decision-making occurs through negotiations between corresponding sub-states across different primary ego states. For example, the Parent-in-Adult (representing structured thinking and learned problem-solving approaches) might engage in dialogue with the Parent-in-Parent (core values and moral imperatives) and the Parent-in-Child (internalized rules about play and creativity).

This creates a more nuanced decision-making process where similar psychological functions across different ego states can communicate directly. The Adult-in-Parent, Adult-in-Adult, and Adult-in-Child might collaborate on fact-gathering and analysis, while the Child components across all states might focus on emotional and creative considerations.

This model acknowledges that our internal psychological landscape is more complex than three simple categories, and that decision-making can involve sophisticated internal negotiations between these various sub-personalities.

Worked Example

Decision under review: *Accept start-up product-manager role in a new city vs. stay in current corporate job.*

Below is a **snapshot of the first negotiation round** among the nine sub-states.
(“Stance” uses a five-point scale: +2 = strongly for, +1 = leaning for, 0 = undecided, -1 = leaning against, -2 = strongly against.)

Sub-state	Core function	Top concern(s)	Initial stance	Non-negotiables / red-lines
Parent-in-Parent (P-P)	Moral authority, tradition	Duty to family stability	**-1**	Must protect dependents from avoidable risk
Adult-in-Parent (A-P)	Experienced rationality filtered through values	Assess economic trade-offs	**0**	Wants clear severance clause
Child-in-Parent (C-P)	“Play by the rules” conformity	Fear of appearing irresponsible	**-1**	Needs public perception of prudence
Parent-in-Adult (P-A)	Structured problem-solving	Build career capital ethically	**+1**	Role mustn’t exploit staff
Adult-in-Adult (A-A)	Data-driven analyst	Salary, runway, probabilities	**+1**	Needs factual risk-mitigation plan
Child-in-Adult (C-A)	Inventive curiosity inside the rational mind	Opportunity for innovation	**+2**	Must keep option to pivot out in 18 months
Parent-in-Child (P-C)	“Rules of play” internalised as fun limits	Fear of burnout	**-1**	Weekends must stay sacred
Adult-in-Child (A-C)	Little scientist – logical yet playful	Learning curve excitement	**+2**	Budget for new gadgets & courses

Sub-state	Core function	Top concern(s)	Initial stance	Non-negotiables / red-lines
Child-in-Child (C-C)	Pure spontaneity & emotion	Adventure!	**+2**	Wants urban loft & dog-friendly office

---

Phase 1 – Cluster dialogues

Phase 1 — Cluster Dialogues (spoken plainly)

Cluster & members	Main negotiation points	Agreed actions	Stance change
Adult Triad *Adult-in-Parent, Adult-in-Adult, Adult-in-Child*	• Can the family survive a temporary dip in income? • What severance safety-net is realistic?	• Require at least 10 months of living-expense runway. • Insist on a written six-month severance clause.	Adult-in-Parent shifts from 0 → **+1**
Parent Vertical *Parent-in-Parent, Parent-in-Adult, Parent-in-Child*	• Moral duty to protect dependents. • Ethical culture of the new firm.	• New employer must match current health-insurance quality. • Secure a formal senior-mentor arrangement for guidance.	• Parent-in-Parent moves from –1 → **0** • Parent-in-Child moves from –1 → **0**
Child Trio *Child-in-Parent, Child-in-Adult, Child-in-Child*	• Fear of friends' judgment. • Homesickness and belonging.	• Publish a "strategic career move" announcement on LinkedIn. • Budget for quarterly trips back home to visit friends and family.	Child-in-Parent rises from –1 → **0**

Post-caucus tally: *Two voices now sit at **+2**, three voices at **+1**, four voices at **0**, and none remain negative.*

Phase 2 – Cross-cluster negotiation ("horse-trading")

Pending concern	Blocking voice(s)	Proposal crafted by opposite sub-state	Result
Job-security anxiety	P-P (0)	A-A drafts clause: 6 mo. severance + 3 mo. health coverage if laid off.	P-P → **+1**
Burnout risk	P-C (0)	C-A suggests "Friday-no-meeting" rule & calendar-blocked downtime.	P-C → **+1**
Public perception	C-P (0)	C-C produces PR-style announcement emphasising vision & social impact.	C-P → **+1**

Now every voice is +1 or +2.

Phase 3 – Weighted vote & consensus rule

Each sub-state has an intrinsic weight reflecting its host ego-state's typical influence:

Sub-state	Weight
Parent-in-Parent, Adult-in-Parent, Child-in-Parent	**3** each
Parent-in-Adult, Adult-in-Adult, Child-in-Adult	**2** each
Parent-in-Child, Adult-in-Child, Child-in-Child	**1** each

Decision metric: ∑ (weight × stance)
Pass if ≥ +14 (two-thirds of theoretical max = (3×3 + 3×2 + 3×1) × 2⁄3 = 21).

Sub-state	Weight	Final stance	Contribution
P-P	3	+1	**+3**
A-P	3	+1	**+3**
C-P	3	+1	**+3**
P-A	2	+1	**+2**
A-A	2	+1	**+2**
C-A	2	+2	**+4**
P-C	1	+1	**+1**
A-C	1	+2	**+2**
C-C	1	+2	**+2**
Total	—	—	**22**

Result: 22 ≥ 14 → *proposal carries*.

Model 2 therefore **recommends accepting the start-up offer**, contingent on:

1. Executed severance & health-coverage clause (Adult bloc).
2. Protected personal time policy (Parent-in-Child).
3. Quarterly home-base visits + positive public narrative (Child bloc).

How Model 2 differs from Model 3 in practice

Aspect	Model 3 (Matrix)	Model 2 (Negotiations)
Unit of analysis	3 ego states × 5 need tiers	9 sub-states (no external hierarchy)
Process style	Sequential constraint-satisfaction	Iterative bargaining / coalition-building
Risk control	Needs < 3 trigger mitigations	Negative or zero-stance voices seek trade-offs
Decision metric	Utility score vs. benchmark	Weighted parliamentary vote

Despite the stylistic difference, **both models converged on the same outcome** - illustrating the robustness of the decision when examined through multiple TA lenses.

Model 3: The Maslow-TA Decision Matrix

The third model introduces a structured analytical framework by creating a decision matrix that cross-references ego state perspectives with an internal prioritisation system similar to Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. This approach systematically evaluates each potential decision against different levels of human motivation while incorporating the psychological insights of each ego state.

The matrix is constructed with Maslow's hierarchy levels (physiological, safety, love/belonging, esteem, self-actualization) on one axis and the conclusions from each ego state on the other. For each cell in the matrix, decision-makers evaluate how their choice impacts that particular need level from that specific ego state perspective.

For example, when considering a career change, the matrix might evaluate:

- How the Parent ego state views the impact on physiological needs (financial security, health insurance)
- How the Child ego state perceives effects on self-actualization needs (creative fulfillment, authenticity)
- How the Adult ego state assesses safety implications (job market realities, risk factors)

The decision-making process then works systematically up Maslow's hierarchy, ensuring that foundational needs are adequately addressed before considering higher-level concerns. This creates a structured approach that honors both psychological complexity and human motivational priorities.

Worked Example

Sample Problem

Decision question: *“Should I accept a new product-manager role at a start-up in another city, or remain in my current corporate job and location?”*

We will evaluate the **option *Accept the Start-up Offer*** with Model 3’s Maslow-TA matrix.
(You would create a second matrix for the alternative if you wanted a head-to-head comparison, but one option is enough to show how the algorithm works.)

Maslow-TA Decision Matrix (Option: *Accept the Start-up Offer*)

Maslow Need Level →Ego State ↓	**Physiological** ***Money, food, rest***	**Safety** ***Stability, health, risk***	**Love / Belonging** ***Family, friends, team***	**Esteem** ***Status, mastery***	**Self-Actual-ization** ***Purpose, growth***
Parent	**3 / 5** *Start-up salary slightly lower but still covers expenses; stock options uncertain*	**2 / 5** *Job security is fragile; health insurance less comprehensive*	**3 / 5** *Moving disrupts extended-family support network*	**4 / 5** *Title is "Head of Product", more responsibility*	**4 / 5** *Sets example of taking bold career moves for the kids*
Adult	**4 / 5** *Runway savings → 10 months; cost-of-living similar*	**3 / 5** *VC-backed Series B gives ~24-month runway, but 40 % failure rate*	**3 / 5** *New city has active professional community; relationship distance stress*	**4 / 5** *Broader skill set; faster promotion probability*	**5 / 5** *Chance to build 0→1 product aligns with long-term vision*
Child	**5 / 5** *Excited by trendy campus office, free lunches*	**2 / 5** *Scared of layoffs; new medical clinic unknown*	**2 / 5** *Leaving close friends feels lonely*	**5 / 5** *Feels proud imagining "founding-team" badge*	**5 / 5** *Thrilled by creative freedom & adventure*

How to read a cell:
"Parent–Physiological = 3 / 5" means the Parent ego state judges that, on basic-needs grounds, this option scores 3 out of 5; explanation follows below the score.

Step-by-Step Algorithmic Walk-through

1. **Work bottom-up through Maslow's hierarchy**
   The algorithm refuses to advance to a higher tier until the lower tier is "reliably satisfied" for *all three* ego states.
   We'll treat any score < 3 as a potential block that must be mitigated.

2. **Physiological tier check**
   Scores: P 3, A 4, C 5.

   - **Outcome:** Acceptable (all ≥ 3, so basic survival needs are covered).

3. **Safety tier check**
   Scores: P 2, A 3, C 2.
   - **Outcome: Flagged.** Parent and Child feel unsafe (< 3).
   - **Mitigation loop:** Adult searches for ways to raise safety perceptions: negotiate a 6-month severance clause + private health add-on.
   - **Re-score after mitigation:** P 3, C 3. *Now pass.*

4. **Love / Belonging tier check**
   Scores: P 3, A 3, C 2.
   - **Outcome: Flagged** by Child (< 3).
   - **Mitigation:** Plan bi-weekly video dinners, budget for monthly flights home, join local hobby club.
   - **Re-score:** C 3. *Pass.*

5. **Esteem tier check**
   Scores: P 4, A 4, C 5 → *no issues*.

6. **Self-Actualization tier check**
   Scores: P 4, A 5, C 5 → *strong driver*.

7. **Weighted synthesis (Adult lead)**

    - All tiers are now ≥ 3 for every ego state.
    - The Adult applies a simple weight scheme (Maslow tier weight x w x 1-5, equal across ego states):

$$\text{Utility} = \sum_{tier} w_{tier} \times \left(\frac{P+A+C}{3}\right)$$

      (Classic MAUT style.)

    - Because higher tiers have higher *w*, the exceptionally strong Self-Actualization and Esteem scores swing the combined utility above the “stay” alternative (not shown here).

Calculating the final utility score

Maslow tier	Weight *(w)*	Avg. score (P + A + C)/3	Contribution = *w* × avg.
Physiological	1	**4.0**	1 × 4.0 = 4.0
Safety	2	**3.0**	2 × 3.0 = 6.0
Love / Belonging	3	**3.0**	3 × 3.0 = 9.0
Esteem	4	**4.33**	4 × 4.33 ≈ 17.33
Self-Actualization	5	**4.67**	5 × 4.67 ≈ 23.33
Total Utility	—	—	**59.67**

Maximum possible utility (all cells = 5) = 1 × 5 + 2 × 5 + 3 × 5 + 4 × 5 + 5 × 5 = ***75***
Scaled score = 59.67 / 75 ≈ ***0.80*** *(≈ 80 % of theoretical maximum).*

What the number means

- **Pass threshold:** After mitigations every ego state scores ≥ 3 on every tier, so the option is “admissible.”
- **Comparative strength:** A utility of ~0.80 is typically well above the Adult’s acceptance threshold (often set around 0.60–0.65 in this scheme) and, in a head-to-head comparison, would need only to beat the “stay” alternative’s score to become the recommended choice.

- **Sensitivity:** The bulk of the utility comes from the top two tiers (≈ 41 / 59.7 ≈ 69 %), so if circumstances changed—e.g., the start-up lost funding—the score would drop sharply, triggering a re-evaluation.

With the numerical result now explicit, the algorithm's recommendation—**accept the start-up offer, provided the agreed safety and belonging mitigations remain in place**—is fully auditable and transparent.

8. **Final conclusion**
   Accept the start-up offer, *conditional on* the negotiated safety mitigations (severance + health package) and the belonging-tier action plan (routine connection with friends/family).
   The algorithm justifies the decision by showing:
   - **Foundational tiers** are secured via explicit safeguards.
   - **Higher-order tiers** deliver pronounced gains across all ego states, fulfilling the individual's growth narrative while respecting value and emotional authenticity.

Why the Matrix Works

- **Transparency:** Each ego state sees its concerns quantified; no voice is drowned out.
- **Prioritisation discipline:** Moving tier-by-tier prevents "dream-chasing" at the expense of survival or safety.
- **Negotiation hooks:** Low scores trigger targeted action plans rather than binary yes/no thinking.
- **Analytical rigor + psychology:** The Adult's weighted utility calculation gives a clear, auditable path from raw feelings and morals → integrated decision.

You can replicate this template for any decision by *filling in the cells*, re-scoring after mitigations, and allowing the algorithm to surface a logically-and-psychologically sound conclusion.

Implications for Personal and Professional Decision-Making

These TA-based models offer several practical advantages over purely rational decision-making approaches. They acknowledge the psychological complexity of choice, ensuring that emotional and value-based considerations receive appropriate attention alongside logical analysis. They also provide structured frameworks for accessing different types of wisdom and perspective that individuals naturally possess.

For organizations, these models suggest the importance of creating decision-making processes that allow for multiple perspectives and psychological approaches to be heard and integrated. They highlight why purely rational approaches sometimes fail and why successful decisions often require emotional and moral intelligence alongside analytical rigor.

Understanding these parallels between psychological and analytical decision-making models also reveals that effective choice requires both internal psychological integration and external analytical structure. The most robust decisions likely emerge when we honor both our complex internal psychological landscape and apply rigorous analytical frameworks to organize and evaluate our options.

By recognizing that decision-making is simultaneously a psychological and analytical process, we can develop more sophisticated and effective approaches to the choices that shape our lives and organizations.

Real-world case studies

TA decision model	Typical personality signature	Illustrative leader & decision	Why the fit is natural
Model 1 – Democratic Ego-State Council	• High empathy / social intelligence • Comfortable giving every voice airtime before synthesis	**Abraham Lincoln – the "Team of Rivals" cabinet (1861-65)** He invited outspoken opponents into the Cabinet and forced himself to hear their moral (Parent), emotional (Child) and pragmatic (Adult) arguments before signing the Emancipation Proclamation.	Lincoln's inclusive temperament mirrors Model 1's rule: each ego state reaches its own view first, then the "Adult" (Lincoln) distills a final position.
		Indra Nooyi – PepsiCo's long-range "Performance with Purpose" plan (2006) She ran repeated listening rounds with finance, R&D, field operators, and activists before locking strategy, a textbook council approach.	Nooyi's democratic, employee-involving style lets Parent (values), Child (brand passion) and Adult (numbers) speak separately, then converge.
Model 2 – Second-Order Ego-State Negotiations	• Systems thinkers who enjoy layer-by-layer consensus-crafting • Comfortable holding contradictory inputs until trade-offs emerge	**Angela Merkel – Eurozone bailout packages (2010-12)** She ran months of shuttle diplomacy, iteratively bargaining between "scientist-Adult", "fiscal-Parent" and "solidarity-Child" voices inside her coalition, extracting small concessions each round.	Merkel's incremental "keep all options alive" style looks like nine sub-states horse-trading until no faction vetoes - exactly Model 2.

TA decision model	Typical personality signature	Illustrative leader & decision	Why the fit is natural
		Barack Obama – 2009 Afghanistan troop-surge review He insisted every agency present worst-case memos, let principals debate, revisited objections, then counted who could "live with" the compromise plan.	Obama's deliberative, consensus-forcing process matches Model 2's multi-layer caucuses and weighted final vote.
Model 3 – Maslow-TA Decision Matrix	• First-principles analysts • High tolerance for quantified trade-offs • Motivated by long-term self-actualisation	**Elon Musk – founding SpaceX (2002)** Broke rocket economics down to raw-material cost, scored each design against survival, safety, prestige and purpose, then bet personal capital when top-tier "self-actualisation" score dominated.	The step-wise, weighted assessment of basic viability → existential upside is a live example of the Ego-state/Maslow-style-hierarchy matrix.
		Jeff Bezos – quitting Wall St. to start Amazon (1994) Used his *Regret-Minimisation* equation: project physiological & safety losses (salary, bonus) vs. self-actualisation gain (build the future of retail). The 80-year-old self's utility score won.	Bezos literally converts need-tier pay-offs into a single utility number - Model 3 in pure form.

Appendix: Connections to Classical Decision Theory

Each of these TA-based models has fascinating parallels to established decision-making frameworks in classical decision theory.

Model 1 closely resembles **Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA)**, where different criteria (represented by ego states) are independently evaluated and then aggregated into a final decision.

The Parent, Adult, and Child function like different decision criteria, each with their own evaluation methodology. The Adult's final synthesis mirrors the aggregation phase in MCDA where various criteria scores are combined using predetermined weights or rules.

Model 2 parallels **Multi-Level Decision Theory** and **Stakeholder Analysis** frameworks. The second-order ego states function like different stakeholder groups or decision-making levels within an organization.

Just as organizational decision theory recognizes that choices emerge from negotiations between various departments or hierarchy levels, Model 2 acknowledges that psychological decisions emerge from negotiations between various internal psychological functions.

Model 3 most closely resembles **Decision Trees** and **Utility Theory** frameworks.

The systematic evaluation against Maslow's hierarchy creates a structured decision tree where each branch represents different need levels and psychological perspectives. The hierarchical progression up Maslow's pyramid mirrors the sequential decision-making process in decision trees, where certain criteria must be satisfied before advancing to subsequent considerations.

Additionally, the matrix approach resembles **Multi-Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT)**, where decision alternatives are systematically evaluated across multiple attributes (need levels) with different utility functions (ego state perspectives).