THE EMOTIONAL EFFECTS AFTER THE FRACTURE
OF A POWER-UNBALANCED RELATIONSHIP

BY
JANELLE BAKER
2000-08-1

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Faculty of Graduate Studies
The University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

0-612-53085-X

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
****
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE

The Emotional Effects after the Fracture of a Power-Unbalanced Relationship

BY

Janelle Baker

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University

of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree

of

Master of Arts

JANELLE BAKER © 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to study the emotional responses of men and women after the fracture of power-unbalanced relationships. Respondents' perceptions of the interaction dynamics in power-unbalanced relationships and the resulting changes to their identities after fracture were examined in relation to the consequent emotions of anxiety, anomie, depression and anger. This thesis focused specifically on male/female dyadic love relationships where, given the lingering vestiges of patriarchy, the men were more power dominant compared to the women.

It was hypothesized that the men would express anger and that the women would experience the emotions of anxiety, depression, and anomie. As well, drawing from Berzonsky's identity types it was postulated that the men would have personalities with foreclosure type identities, and would thus exhibit little introspection and a high degree of resistance to change. Conversely, it was suggested that the women would expect a high degree of external control and would have personalities with diffusion type identities. After fracture, given these identity types, it was anticipated that the women would experience greater changes to their identities. From the conclusions, it was apparent that the hypotheses regarding emotions and identities were verified.

This research provides men with a heightened awareness of the detrimental effects of the all-encompassing emotional response of anger and encourages them to change their behavior within power-unbalanced relationships. As well, women are provided with information about the negative emotional consequences of being in relationships in which they are subordinate and of the importance of individually developing a strong sense of identity.

THE EMOTIONAL EFFECTS AFTER THE FRACTURE

OF A POWER-UNBALANCED RELATIONSHIP

I. INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the emotional responses of individuals after the fracture

of a power-unbalanced dyadic relationship. Respondents' perceptions of the interaction

dynamics in power-unbalanced relationships and the resulting changes to their identity

after fracture are examined specifically in relation to the consequent emotions of anxiety,

anomie, anger and hostility.

The study of interaction is at the forefront of social psychology. **Interaction** is

the process of actions and reactions among people in contact and communication with

each other. Further, a **relationship** is a pattern of interaction that is enduring and in

which each actor is able to predict the reactions of the other to his/her own actions. This

thesis focuses specifically on male/female dyadic love relationships. In these enduring

patterns of interaction, individuals come to have specific **roles** (ie. expected behavior)

and **statuses** (recognized positions) in society. These recognized positions vary in

importance and the respect accorded them (prestige). Accordingly, individuals in

relationships come to view themselves in particular ways (self-concept), depending upon

the way they are regarded by others and the importance of the statuses they occupy

(placement). This self announcement and placement by others gives an individual what

is called an **identity** which is very important to her/his psychic existence and renders the

person vulnerable to attacks on this identity. For individuals in dyads, such as the ones in

our study, identification as a couple will be salient in their hierarchy of identities.

In all relationships, dyadic relationships in particular, the actors in the union provide each other with gratification of different types, such as financial support (by the breadwinner of the family), love and affection (by a devoted partner) etc. These gratifications can be referred to as **rewards** and as such, add to the prestige and status of the person receiving them. In all relationships there is an **exchange**, between individuals in the relationship, of rewards to each other.

In any relationship if an individual is able to induce or force another individual in the relationship to comply with his/her will whether or not the other wishes it I refer to this as **power** on the part of the first individual. In a dyadic relationship the ability of one to influence the other (power) varies both in degree and distribution. In regard to distribution, it is possible for both partners to have equal power. I refer to this as balanced power in the relationship. It is also possible, and also much more wide spread, for one partner to have more power than the other. I assign this as **unbalanced power**; I refer to the partner with an excess of power as **dominant** and the partner with less power (a deficit) as **subordinate**.

One significant aspect of unbalanced power traditionally practised and sanctioned by society is referred to as **patriarchy**. Patriarchy represents a form of social organization in which it is the accepted norm for men to dominate and have authority over women. Patriarchy is so called because it originated in families where the father had supreme authority over the mother and children. Accordingly, assuming our society to be patriarchal, (as will be justified below) whenever the dominant partner in the dyad is mentioned I will refer to that partner as the "male" or "he." Similarly, the subordinate

partner will be referred to as the "female" or "she." This I do even in the literature review where the author quoted does not make this explicit distinction by sex.

It is clear that in an unbalanced power relationship the dominant partner will receive from the other more rewards (of love and esteem) than the subordinate partner receives. Furthermore, he or she will endeavor to control the amount and source of rewards available to the other. In such relationships the dominant partner usually has other sources of rewards (outside of the relationship) which the subordinate partner seldom has. This **inequality of rewards** affects the identities of the partners and their expectations in the partnership. In the case of the dominant partner, the reduction or removal of rewards is likely to be regarded as theft, while for the subordinate partner the removal of rewards constitutes deprivation. In either case, this cessation of rewards, as in the rupture of the relationship is, in effect, an **assault** upon the individual's **identity**. Such an assault inevitably produces arousal. Schacter and Singer (1962) refer to the phenomenon of arousal, which when identified by the aroused one is labeled by him/her as **emotion** e.g. anomie, anxiety, anger, hostility.

The focus of this paper is precisely upon the specific emotions experienced by dominant men and subordinate women respectively, when the love dyads in which they were previously engaged become ruptured.

II. RELEVANT LITERATURE REVIEW

The context of this thesis depends upon the existing ethos of patriarchy. It is imperative to recognize that the effects of social structures are produced and reproduced through interaction (Giddens, 1984:25). As seen above, in order to understand interaction within power-unbalanced relationships, where the imbalance is in favor of the

male, it is necessary to recognize the impact of a patriarchal society (Denzin, 1984:487). Given the fact that even at the end of the 20th century, and in enlightened civilized Canada, there still exist lingering vestiges of patriarchy, I must recognize that this cultural pattern will influence social relationships. Consequently, patriarchal values, which governed people's beliefs about how one should behave and the goals that each actor should strive for, became internalized through socialization at a very early age (House, 1978:539).

As well, patriarchy, through its extensions into numerous societal institutions and structures, has negative consequences for society as a whole. According to French (1985:508), "patriarchy, since its inception, used both eradication (eg. burning witches) and domestication (eg. household and family centered) to teach people the rightness of its ways and the truth of its vision of God". This "patriarchal truth" has been internalized by the members of society as an ideology that has legitimized the male position of privilege and power (Smith, 1996:160, Dobash and Dobash, 1979, Ptacek, 1988).

However, much of the behavior that was allowed within a patriarchal society, such as the emotional abuse and objectification of women, is now no longer acceptable (Shannon, 1996:56). Shannon (1996:56) points out that the power and status of men has been much influenced by a growing protest in current society against traditional male behavior. Unfortunately, this shift in the ethics of power has been met with resistance from men who feel threatened by the idea of women gaining power (Thompson, 1989:849). As a result, men entertain patriarchal expectations in spite of current changes, which make such expectations politically incorrect. In addition, "women in general are still subordinate to men, and women are still all too frequently the victims of male

violence" (Smith, 1990:161). These conditions are strong enough to warrant our assumption, in this study, that our society is still much influenced by patriarchy and this must be recognized in any study of male/female power-unbalance.

Within many relationships today, men (whether they recognize it or not) often still have greater power. The costs of patriarchy are all too real to those who are subject to its subordination. As Denzin (1984:486) indicates, "cultural, social, legal, economic and etiquette practices place the male in the dominant authority position ... transforming him into the guest who is served, his spouse into a servant – mistress, and the house into a residential hotel". Although generally not acknowledged, there are also damaging results to those who dominate. "Cruel or callous actions cannot be performed without cost to the actor, who becomes numbed by his own acts" (French, 1985:508). Therefore, power-unbalanced relationships, in which the imbalance is in favor of men, will have certain consequences for both actors.

A. The Development of a Coupled Identity

The influence of patriarchy will be revealed by the examination of male/female dyadic love relationships. In discussing relationships, Stryker (1977:151) and Vaughan (1977:323) call attention to the inevitable development of hierarchical orders in which love relationships tend to be at the top. Through close self-centered interaction between the couple, the relationship becomes their main source of self-realization (Vaughan, 1977:323). When initially autonomous individuals couple, they begin to build a shared definition of reality, thereby creating a mutual identity as a unit (Vaughan, 1977:323). The more committed an actor is to the dyadic relationship, the greater the likelihood that the individual will announce it and so be placed by society (ie. as a couple) in the

relationship. As a result, identification as a couple becomes salient in that person's hierarchy of identities (Stryker, 1977:151).

The importance of this identity becomes paramount to each actor involved in the relationship. Identification as a couple grants each actor the potential authority to define the situation and each other's identity. In discussing identity, Blumstein (1997:277) suggests that each actor is motivated to shape his/her own identity in the relationship in such a way that the other actor will comply with his/her own goals. The importance of identity is revealed in the "simple principle that actors' purposes (desires, goals) can best be served by the identities they choose to enact and the identities into which they are able to cast their interaction partners" (Blumstein, 1991:276). Accordingly, I may infer that if two individuals are committed to a relationship and identification as a couple is salient in their hierarchy of identities then the fracture of these highly significant relationships will be devastating to both participants.

B. Reward Exchange Relationships in Power-Unbalanced Situations

Interaction within male/female, traditional, love relationships can be viewed as an exchange in which individuals receive benefits and pay costs (Secord, 1982:38). The rewards that accrue to the dominant male partner in a love relationship are typically the high status of the family head, which comes from the compliance of a loving and devoted partner, as well as the fulfilling of his physical needs including: the preparation of meals, laundering of clothes, cleanliness of the house and sexual gratification. As a result of such rewards the dominant partner's self-concept is bolstered and he is given a feeling of importance very dear to him.

The rewards that accrue to the subordinate female partner in such a relationship are: the love and devotion of her partner, frequently expressed by various tokens of affection such as hugging, kissing, flowers and candy, and other tokens of ego enhancement that come from the partner as well as financial support and physical protection. It is important to note here that, in the case of the male dominant partner, these kinds of rewards are often obtainable outside of the relationship and are frequently so obtained (Musolf, 1993:259), (Kemper, 1978:379). In the case of the subordinate female partner, the ethos of patriarchy makes such availability of alternative sources of rewards and gratification much more difficult (Cook et al., 1997:39). This form of exchange creates a unilateral monopoly in which the female relies solely on the male for rewards, while the male has alternative sources to the female which offer rewards (Turner, 1991:565).

The costs to the dominant male in providing rewards to his female partner are financial but also to a great extent psychological, involving the necessity for understanding, tact and patience. In paying these last mentioned costs, the contemporary male is liable to be regarded by his buddies as being "whipped," a further serious cost not to be discounted. Although such men fully realize how dependent they have become upon the rewards they receive from their partners (Blumstein 1991:278), it is necessary to hide this dependence from the buddies and even from their partners.

Costs to the subordinate female partner in the love relationship are first, her subordinate status which considerably limits the degree to which she is able to determine her actions and achieve any goals other then those dictated by the dominant male. In addition, the housework mentioned above, as a reward accruing to the dominant male,

can be onerous and a cost to the female. Where there are children in the union, the generally accepted cost of child bearing is further amplified by the greater burden of child rearing assumed by the female because the male is occupied with his "serious business" of earning the family income. Considerable as these costs are to the female, they are augmented by the lack of appreciation and the degradation of them by the male (Bernard, 1972:17). It should be clear from the statements above that the balance of rewards and costs to the respective partners is unequal in a patriarchal society, and thus an integral component of the power unbalance with which I am concerned.

C. Dynamics of Unbalanced Power

This power unbalance is not static but feeds upon itself as a result of the habits and routine of life between the dominant and subordinate partners who initiated it. The expectations of the partners lead them to imagine alternatives to the current arrangement of their union (Secord, 1982:39). Depending upon which partner succeeds more in achieving alternative arrangements in the distribution of rewards and costs; the balance of power could go either way. The gender-related features of social structures presently provide men with resources that are overwhelmingly greater than those provided women. This potential power deficit to women is further accentuated by what Waller calls the "principle of least interest," i.e. the partner who has greater emotional investment in the marriage tends to exert less power. Women, Scanzoni and Scanzoni (1988:323) indicate, are trained "to think of marriage as their absorbing life interest whereas men are socialized to think of themselves first in terms of the world of work and only secondly in terms of their marital relationships." Given such constraints, interactions between the couple, particularly ones that are conflicting, will be such that the male will more likely

come out of the confrontation realizing his goals (Waller, 1938, Secord, 1982:43).

Secord (1982) does not provide specific examples of the outcome of such negotiations. It is hoped that the findings of this paper will be a modest contribution to this deficit.

In addition to the views of Waller (1938) and Secord (1982), Athay and Darley (1982:63) emphasize which way the power unbalance is likely to go. The concept they introduce is the "epistemic commodity," which means the power to maintain or increase the status quo (in this case patriarchy). Clearly, in the relationships with which I am concerned, this commodity is possessed and monopolized by the dominant male and will most likely be used to augment the patriarchal norm of male dominance and so swing the pendulum of power imbalance "malewards." The male is allowed to take on the culturally accepted role without reasonable doubt or question and thus assumes that his partner will probably comply with it (Athay and Darley, 1982:63).

However, it is necessary that other actors validate the dominant individual's identity. According to McCall and Simmons (1978:148) "men seek to live and act in the manner in which they like to imagine themselves living and acting or, failing that, in some degree at least, to be able to continue thinking of themselves in that same manner." If men, within a patriarchal society, place themselves in a position of superiority they will want to continue to perceive themselves as such, and have others support that position. By others implying that the man is who he imagines himself to be, he will be gratified (McCall and Simmons, 1978:149).

Among these others, and perhaps the most important, is his female partner. If his evaluation of her is low he will not derive satisfaction from any evaluation of himself by her, and will accordingly, demand from her other kinds of rewards. McCall and

Simmons (1978:156) emphasize the consequences of this situation by stating that "alter (the subordinate female) may be led (or forced) to accord him extravagant rewards of other types...". As the dominant male's self concept rises the subordinate actor's evaluation of herself, as a result of his devaluation of her, decreases. In so doing, the identity of the subordinate female also becomes dynamic as the dominant male pushes it into further subordination.

Consequently, with a poor self-concept, the subordinate partner (with a power deficit) will be dependent on the dominant partner for rewards, direction and support (Shannon, 1996:143). This dependence allows the dominant individual to make decisions, direct lives and, in general, take charge (Shannon, 1996:229). With this decrease in the female's self image, her perception of alternative rewards, and thus power, already limited, will decline further. This renders her more and more resentful.

As the female becomes more resentful and the male realizes that she may withdraw all rewards, he employs the strategy of talking her out of any such untoward intention by reasserting his superior status and knowledge, suggesting that the consequences for her if she were to break the relation would be dire. He also invokes such norms as the rectitude demanded of dutiful partners and the wrongfulness of returning his love by such ingratitude (Walker, 1979:66). In many ways he tries to blame her (Lempert, 1995). He further attempts to limit her possible alternatives by discrediting people to whom she might turn for help while at the same time subtly steering her to people he knows will support him. He also might attempt to control her further by monitoring not only her dress and behavior, but also her communications. There are

numerous other strategies employed by the dominant male to control her behavior and steer it into channels that keep her in the relationship and also subordinate.

This reward exchange and distortion of identity on the part of the female might go so far as to cause her to feel that the costs are too high and break up the relationship, another important focus of this thesis. What this thesis does contribute are the specific circumstances and alternative audiences that come into play, which in effect force the female to take the drastic step of rupture which she probably would not otherwise had done.

D. Kemper's Treatment of the Concepts of Power and Status

The concepts of power and status have been defined in the introduction of this thesis. At this point it will be noted how one significant author brings these concepts together in a matter that parallels the hypothesis of the thesis: namely that power - unbalanced relationships involve unequal statuses in which the actors protect their self concepts and identities and where these are assaulted (as in the rupture of a love dyad) violent emotions arise – due specifically to assaults on the identity of the actors.

In order to understand the effects of the exchange dynamics within interaction, it is important to explore the relationship between power and status. Action towards other individuals may be coerced or voluntary. The exchange dynamics within an unbalanced relationship gives the dominant actor the power to coerce the other to do what he wants to obtain his objectives. This power is manifested through a process in which the individual with a deficit will experience noxious stimuli (kicking, slapping, and restraining) or reward deprivation either as threat or as punishment (Kemper, 1978:372). The dominant individual's use of power reduces the other actor's status. This reduction of status

involves not only the withdrawal of concrete objects or opportunities for activities, but also aspects of an individual's identity (through shaming, insults or snubbing) (Kemper, 1978:372).

As a result of the male's actions the female's self esteem is further reduced, thus increasing her dependence on him and rendering it even more necessary for her to keep the channels of communication open and to be attentive to his wishes and direction (Davis 1982:93). This renders her status and self-image even lower.

The dominant individual will expect his wants or needs to be met whether or not he specifically asks for them. If the subordinate individual fulfills the dominant actor's desires and complies with his wishes, without his use of coercion, his consciousness of status is enhanced and it is possible that the amity of the relationship that existed at its inception will be revived. On the other hand, if the subordinate partner does not comply with the dominant partner's wishes voluntarily, but only as a result of coercion or out of fear, then the male's esteem is lessened, and thus his status. Kemper (1978:379) refers to this as status deficit. Mackinnon (1994:31,58) confirms this idea, namely the relationship between voluntary and involuntary compliance, and status.

Where the subordinate partner, knowingly or unkowningly, voluntarily or involuntarily fails to comply with the demands of the dominant partner she definitely reduces his status and self-image and thus, in effect, exercises power. According to Kemper (1978:285), "in the case of withdrawal of customary rewards, that is, the reduction of status, the object of such loss ordinarily feels the hurt even if the withdrawal was not part of a purposive power play." Therefore, subordinate individuals are able to

affect the outcome of power-unbalanced relationships. It is this power-status dynamic

which affects the emotional outcomes of the relationship after fracture.

E. The Emotional Consequences of Power-Status Mixes

By describing the consequences of her compliance and non-compliance, and their

resulting effects upon his status and self-image, it is possible to go onto an examination

of the different emotional responses in each of the following different cases (Kemper,

1990:221). Kemper's (1978:33) sociological theory of "distressful emotions" suggests

that within relationships, in which power imbalances exist, actors feel either a power

excess or power deficit. Each actor will have a sense of the agent who is responsible for

the excess or deficit of either power or status. Within relationships, various power-status

mixes will produce certain emotions. According to Kemper (1990:212) "indeed,

emotions are among the primary effects produced by power and status behaviors, both

within ourselves and in others." It must be noted that Kemper does not distinguish

between the sexes in this discussion of power and status excess and deficit. The use of

s/he in the account is this author's own.

Emotional Consequences of Power-Loss

According to Kemper's social relational matrix of distressful emotions, where an

actor has an excessive power position, and recognizes it as inordinate in its exercise over

another, s/he tends to feel guilt and reacts to his/her feelings of self guilt by projecting it

upon alter as its cause (Kemper, 1978:33). The continuance of this blaming of the other

enhances the actor's self-image, perhaps to the extent of megalomania (Kemper,

1978:33). If the individual's position of power is threatened, and s/he blames

herself/himself, having nobody else to blame, the consequent emotion experienced by the

actor will be anxiety. If on the other hand s/he can find someone to blame, the emotion experienced will be anger.

In Kemper's work there seems to be a gap between two circumstances in which loss of power occurs. The first case implies that the loss of power is occasioned by some act by a subordinate. Kemper does not treat this case. His discussion of power loss is when it is occasioned by a superior, in which case the reaction of the actor who loses power can more accurately be called rebellion. I discovered later that both circumstances applied in this study.

Emotional Consequences of Status Loss

The emotions recorded above as emanating from loss of power, recognized as inordinate or not, are then anxiety and anger. A loss of status also generates strong emotions in the person who losses it. Loss of status most likely will result from one actor ceasing to render the rewards that the other member has come to expect and has contributed to the lofty status to which s/he has become accustomed. If the actor senses his/her cessation of rewards and the consequent loss of his/her status as being his/her own fault, s/he will become depressed. If however, s/he is able to blame the other for this loss of status, the consequent emotion is anger. In effect, Kemper is implying that the reactions that actors have to status loss are depression and anger. According to Kemper (1978:322) "to recover his/her previous level of gratification, the actor is also wont to use power acts, especially noxious power in which a direct injury is inflicted."

In the same way that an actor can come to feel that the power s/he exercises is undeserved, s/he may also come to realize that the status s/he occupies is unwarranted. S/he may further recognize that this undeserved merit is his/her own contrivance. The

result is that s/he feels shame for this bogus status claim. Kemper (1978:31) suggests that this shame will be internalized and reacted to either by retreat into solitude and avoidance of interaction, particularly with those s/he conned into providing him/her with a false status. Instead of seclusion s/he may come forth as a benefactor and shower his/her "supporters" with rewards. Alternatively, such a person, as a result of his/her shame, will project his/her dishonesty upon another partner and attempt to establish a situation in which s/he can feel unashamed and even superior to a more dishonest other.

Sullivan (1986:183) reinforces Kemper's notion that status loss produces significant emotions. He adds that the emotion of anger in such situations functions to mask such damage to the self-esteem as depression or shame. Furthermore, Hochschild (1975:295-296) suggests that anger is seldom addressed or directed against a power equal, but rather, most often, against a weaker subordinate. Important to our thesis, which will be developed later, Hochschild (1975:295) says that "powerful and powerless people live in different emotional worlds." In effect this means that dominant men and subordinate women will both experience different emotions in response to power and status reduction. I hope to make this apparent in the presentation of the data. Kemper makes no distinction on the basis of sex between the dominant and the subordinate partners in regard to their emergent emotions.

In addition to power and status changes strong emotions are also generated when an individual is uncertain of his/her identity or when an individual is dissatisfied and questions it. A false identity is when one's definition of one's self and announcement of it is different from the identity attached to one by others, i.e. placement (Stone, 1964). Such dissonance between announcement and placement can come about in a dyad as a

result of one partner over-praising or over-criticizing and denigrating the other. Usually, such impacts upon the identity are carried on by the dominant partner. Weigart (1992:8) suggests that such a false self-concept as would be produced by either over-praising or denigrating lead, in the subject, to the emotion of anxiety, presumably because of the effect upon the identity. A person in that state, Foote (1986:335) suggests, becomes in effect an automaton, dependent on some other for a rudder in life. Foote (1986:335) uses Durkheim's term for such a condition, namely anomie. Through the linkage of emotions and identity it may be possible to understand how actors' identities are transformed during and after disruption.

F. Identity Types and the Effect of Power Imbalance on Them

In a power-unbalanced love dyad, the dominant partner will have considerable effect in shaping and re-shaping the subordinate partner. As well, the dominant partner's own self concept will in turn be affected by the female actor. Berzonsky (1988:250) describes some individuals who have developed so strong an egotism that they become so confident of their superiority that no responses of either praise or denigration can change their self-images. Berzonsky (1988:250) refers to this identity type as having a foreclosure personality. Foreclosure types are rigidly committed to a set of beliefs and values that have not been personally examined and evaluated" (Berzonsky, 1988:250). This lack of self-assessment helps the dominant individual to remain committed to patriarchal ideals even in the face of change. These actors will search for information that confirms their beliefs, thus encouraging biased assimilation of the received information. Berzonsky (1988:250) found that even when presented with evidence, which disconfirmed their beliefs, foreclosure types' confidence and certainty were not

threatened, but instead, their beliefs were strengthened. Berzonsky (1988:252) stresses

this point by stating that "foreclosures hold inflexible self-belief systems that are resistant

to change and intolerant of ambiguous information."

Foreclosure types' resistance to change is illustrated throughout the relationship

by their emotional response to situations that threaten their identity. In addition, the

dominant individual may either deny the fact that he occupies a threatening position, or,

he may recognize his position but deny the need to change. Breakwell (1986:81)

illustrates this deflection strategy by stating that "first the facts are denied, then their

relevance, then their urgency, then the need to act, then the emotions aroused and, finally,

the importance of these emotions."

Another identity type described by Berzonsky (2988:251) is the diffusion type.

Individuals with this identity tend to avoid confronting personal problems and expect a

high degree of external control. Berzonsky (1988:251) stresses that diffusion types lack a

personal belief structure and instead, are very much inclined to compliance. As a result

of the dominant actor's control, the subordinate individuals lack "inner-directedness"

(Berzonsky (1988:251). Some authors (Browne, 11:1987 and Gillespie 1989) have

suggested that this passivity and compliance, which Walker (1979) calls learned

helplessness, is not an unconscious development of the subordinate person's personality

but rather a consciously adopted conflict-avoidance strategy. If she fulfills the

subordinate stereotype expected, she does not disrupt the domestic regime and thus

avoids anxiety (Kemper, 249:1978).

A third identity type described by Berzonsky (1988:248) is the moratorium type,

in which the person experiments with personalities to find the one that fits most

comfortably into her/his situation. This identity describes individuals who are currently

attempting to resolve a crisis. According to Berzonsky, (1988:249), moratorium types

tend to resolve this crisis by seeking out, elaborating and evaluating self-relevant

information in an objective fashion.

Breakwell (1986:95) again expands upon Berzonsky's idea of identity

experimentation by suggesting that what happens in such cases is compartmentalization,

in which quite often mutually exclusive identities compete with each other. This

detachment from any particular identity may be only temporary before a permanent new

identity eventually emerges.

G. Reactions to a Threatened Identity

It should be clear from what has been said above about the rewards of power-

unbalance, reward giving and withholding, that not only is the power balance dynamic

and changeable but also the identities of individuals are involved in such changes. These

identity changes can reach crisis proportions. These crises in individuals' self-concepts

are differently reacted to by the different personality types just described. The reactions

are as follows: personalities with foreclosure type identities outright reject any

belittlement of themselves. Those personalities with diffusion type identities behave like

moratorium types and experiment with different selves until they find a comfortable fit

between their announcements of themselves and the placement of them by others.

H. Summary

In the review of the literature above, Waller (1938), Secord (1982) and Turner

(1991), in their treatment of reward exchange emphasize the proposition that I started

with, that our society is patriarchal and that in dyads, such as I studied, men probably will

be dominant. Athay and Darly (1978) and McCall and Simmons (1982) elaborate on Secords notion of male dominance by suggesting that the male will further gain control over the female by defining her identity. Shannon (1996) and Davis (1982) emphasize how the male's actions reduce the female's self-concept and have specific consequences for her. Accordingly, the assumption of patriarchy introduced earlier seems justified in the literature.

Kemper (1978) treats the process of power/status loss as well as the consequent emotions resulting from a felt excess or deficit of either power and/or status. He does not however make clear the importance of identity to the individuals' psyche and thus its relevance to the emotional life. Furthermore, as stated above, Kemper (1978) makes no distinction between power-status change and the consequent emotion by sex. It is clear that a mediating concept is called for to explain Kemper's (1978) hypothesis that status/power loss will engender specific emotions. Stryker and Vaughan (1977) postulate the concept of identity and stress its salience in the individual's psyche thus making it a source of emotions. A typology of identity is supplied by Berzonsky (1988), which facilitates the analysis of particular dyads. Weigart (1992) suggests a linkage between a specific type of identity namely what he calls a false identity and a specific emotion, anxiety. In regard to the other omission of Kemper's (1978), namely the sex difference in emotion experience, Hochschild (1975:295) says that the "two sexes live in different emotional worlds" and suggests typical female as opposed to male emotions when identity is assaulted.

The insights of these authors will be used as guides in the investigation of our sample and will fill gaps where possible.

III. HYPOTHESES

<u>Hypothesis 1</u>

For men, after the rupture of a power unbalanced love dyad and the consequent

assault on identities occasioned by the rupture, the emotion likely to arise is anger, and in

some cases shame and/or guilt.

<u>Justification of Hypothesis 1</u>

Assuming patriarchy and male dominance, and assuming also that in a ruptured

relationship the partners will be separated and the male will be deprived of the rewards

customarily supplied by his partner, which deprivation will of course include a reduction

of his power in that there is at least one less person over which to exercise it. Also his

status is reduced in that his feeling of importance is deflated by the loss of her deference.

Kemper (1978) would lead us to conclude that because of the power loss he will

experience anger, and because of the status loss he will also experience anger. Still

following Kemper, I would expect that if he blames her for the rupture, which he

probably would, his anger would be increased. If, which is unlikely, he were to blame

himself he would suffer momentary guilt (because of his excessive exercise of power)

and shame (because of his excessive demand for status), which he would immediately

project upon her, thus increasing his anger. Clearly, in both cases his identity is assaulted

and the position I take in this thesis is that the specific trigger of the given emotions

described is assault on the identity.

Hypothesis 2

For women, after the rupture of a power unbalanced love dyad and the consequent

assault on their identity occasioned by the rupture, the emotions likely to arise are

anxiety, anomie, depression and anger.

Justification of Hypothesis 2

In the case of the woman, after the rupture of a love dyad and the consequent loss

of both status and power, little as they might have been before the rupture, she is liable to

be even more deprived than the male of determinants of her identity and feel, perhaps

rightly, that this deprivation is due to the male. However, unlike him, instead of

projecting it upon him she introjects (Kemper's (1978) term) the blame and suffers

anxiety and depression. Furthermore, among the rewards of which she is now deprived,

are the necessities of life. This further increases her anxiety and, to the extent that he

determined her identity, she now lacks a rudder and sense of direction which Durkheim

calls anomie. She does of course also experience anger, which she cannot or finds it

difficult to take out on her dominant partner as the target, and so internalizes it and

increases the inner turmoil, anomie. In effect, hypothesis 1 and 2, if established, will

justify Hochschild's (1979) statement that men and women live in different emotional

worlds.

Hypothesis 3

Men and women will have different identities. Men predominantly will have

personalities with foreclosure type identities and women predominantly will have

personalities with diffusion type identities.

Justification of Hypothesis 3

Before fracture, from Berzonsky (1988), dominant men will most likely possess personalities with characteristics of little if any introspection and refrain stoutly from such. In effect, they foreclose acceptance of alternative images of themselves other than that of the omnipotent male. As shown above women, particularly compliant ones, will obediently take on the identities prescribed for them by their male partners – most likely a deflated one.

Hypothesis 4

After the rupture of the relationship, women's identities will tend to change more than men's identities.

Justification of Hypothesis 4

Given the justification of hypothesis 3, where the male tends to have a personality with a foreclosure type identity, it is assumed that the male will be inflexible. Breakwell (1986) adds that the foreclosure types denial of emotions, such as guilt and shame, facilitates the men's resistance to change. On the other hand, after rupture women with diffusion type identities will enter an experimental stage (Berzonsky's (1988) moratorium type identity) where they will evaluate themselves and even compartmentalize unfavorable aspects of their present identity until a permanent, true identity is developed.

IV. METHODOLOGY

This is a qualitative study in that it aims to describe the behavior and its emotional outcomes – not to measure them. Strauss and Corbin (1998:10) stress that "by the term qualitative research I mean any type of research that produces findings not arrived at by

statistical procedures or other means of quantification." The descriptions of the 22 cases

in the sample are guided by the theories reviewed and presented uniformly for all

respondents according to a modal format suggested by the theory.

A. Data Collection

Individuals who had been in unbalanced power relationships were interviewed in

order to determine the effect on their identities and the emotional responses after fracture.

Intensive interviewing, in the form of guided conversations, was used to obtain detailed

materials that were qualitatively analyzed. This discussion was facilitated by questions

such as,

1. Can you tell me a little about yourself (work participation, status, education, race
   religion)?

2. How did you meet?

3. How long did you pursue each other before your first date, living together, sex?

4. Was the relationship an important part of who you were?

5. Do you remember whether, at the beginning of the relationship, either one of you
   seemed to be the dominant party or the more subservient?

6. Was there a specific point in the relationship at which you noticed this power
   imbalance (uneven distribution of power), if yes, at what point?

7. Were there any incidents where he/she exerted his/her will over you? Describe.
   Were there any incidents where you exerted your will over him/her? Describe.

8. Can you describe the circumstances that finally led to the break up with your
   partner?

9. Do you feel that these situations were ones in which he/she was exerting

his/her will over you to an extreme? or Do you feel that the exertion of your will over

your partner led to the break up?

10. Do you feel that this exertion of his/her will over you tended to change

your conception of yourself, and if yes, how so? or Did your exertion of your will

over your partner give you a certain self conception?

11. Did you have anyone to turn to outside of the relationship who would boost your

   morale and ego?

12. When the relationship was at the lowest level of tolerance, did you feel that if

you broke it off that there would be support from friends and relatives?

13. How dependent on him/her did you feel you had become?

14. How confident or uncertain were you in your own ability to manage?

15. What were you dependent on your partner for?

16. After the separation can you describe what your mood and feelings were?

17. What would you say were the most prevailing emotions?

18. How did you feel about the organization of your life after the point of fracture?

19 Do you feel that your personality has been markedly changed as a result of the

relationship? If so, how?

20. Did you or do you feel confused?

It was important to remember that, given the nature of these questions, there was a

possibility that the respondents may lie about or forget certain information. However,

self-serving error and bias reports, along with internal and external consistency reports

helped to evaluate the accuracy of the respondent's perceptions (Lofland, 1995:75). In

addition, according to Lofland (1995:75) "...despite considerable professional and

philosophical concern about error and bias in naturalistic studies, these topics rarely arise in connection with accomplished works".

It was a purposive sample rather than a random sample in that the focus was not so much on prediction and verification as on the empirical demonstration of existing hypotheses in the literature. Clearly, in these cases, violence and anger had occurred before the interview. The thinking behind employing such a sample was not so much to verify the occurrence of violence and rage but to trace and document the dynamics of these outcomes (anger, rage) as related by the respondents. Therefore, this examination focused on the dynamics of interaction and the reasons that anger and violence are related to power imbalance. In addition, these emotions were analyzed in relation to identity crisis and the changes that are provoked by the fracture. Qualifying questions distinguished whether or not the participant perceived himself/herself to have been committed to the relationship and to have occupied a subordinate or dominant position within the coupled unit. It is important to note that men and women from the same couple were not interviewed, but rather, respondents consisted of men and women who were from different love dyads but who had experienced a common situation.

Participant Selection

Eleven women from various counseling centers (Nova House, Mamawichita, and Klinic in Winnipeg) who had experienced fractured relationships, in which there was power-unbalance, were interviewed. These women had experienced the anger and, in some cases, hostility of their partners. The sample consisted of women ranging in age from their thirties to their late forties, with the majority, eight, in their mid to late forties.

The majority of women were white and did not practise any religion. As well, nine of the eleven had at least a grade twelve education and were employed.

Eleven men (from Probation Services) were also interviewed. This sample consisted of men ranging in age from twenty-four to fifty. The majority of the respondents were white. However, the sample did include men with Aboriginal, Spanish and Portuguese ethnicities. In regard to their employment, half of the respondents were on welfare or worked as laborers, while the other half were trades people or professionals. They ranged in education from grade nine to post-secondary courses with the majority, seven, having a grade twelve plus education. Most of the men in the sample were either nominal Catholics or Protestants. However the majority, eight, did not practise any religion.

B. Data Analysis

In order to understand fully the emotional effects after the fracture of a power unbalanced unit, it is necessary to place the data within the context of the lingering existence of the external constraints of patriarchy. The interviews were transcribed and coded in order to label, separate and organize the data into meaningful categories (e.g. Dominance, Shaping the Other, Confidence in Control, Anger and Hostility). This conceptualization was achieved by using Strauss and Corbin's (1990:61,116) technique of "open coding" (examining, comparing, conceptualizing the data). The use of various colors, each representing a conceptual category, became extremely useful. These techniques were used for the data collected on both the male and female interviews. However, each group of interviews was separated by gender and analyzed in its own right.

Qualitative research demands the simultaneous combination of data gathering and analysis. Therefore, as meaningful categories were being created, memos describing the relationship between categories and the absence of needed information were recorded (Lofland, 1995:193). The implications of the data were assessed according to the individual's own interpretations and experiences. On the basis of the coded categories of relationships, (significance to respondent, power relationship), identity type before and after rupture and emotions before and after fracture, "storylines" were developed using the categories in that order as a model framework for each "storyline." The data from these storylines were summarized in two tables – one for men and one for women. In order to present a more complete analysis, intra- and inter- comparisons were made in the tables. These comparisons allowed anomalies to be recognized and similarities to be stressed. By uncovering patterns in the data, it was then possible to examine identity changes after the fracture of a power-unbalanced relationship and the consequent emotional responses of each participant.

In effect, by collecting these data in the fashion I have described I am attempting to achieve Merton's (1957) recommendation that first, concepts used should be made clear (which was done in the introduction). After clarification the next essential in empirical research is ample elaboration and illustration of the concepts cited. This elaboration is done here in the long storylines prepared as described above. These storylines, though indeed long and might seem disproportionate in size to the rest of the thesis, do not by any means constitute the totality of the information given by the respondents. Rather, in each storyline careful analysis was brought to bear on the information given in order to bring out the salient and relevant aspects of it as well as to

allow the reader to experience the impact of them and to follow more closely the analysis presented.

V. THE DATA

The following information was derived from questions concerning each respondent's background characteristics: formation of the dyad; process of interaction in the dyad that point to the nature of the power imbalance; any changes that took place and the direction of those changes in the power imbalance within the dyad; the effects upon identity as a result of the changes during and after the relationship; who attaches blame to whom as a result of the assaults on identity; and the feelings and emotions produced by such assaults.

A. The Males in the Sample

Their characteristics and eventual emotional conditions are as follows:

1. SONNY

Sonny, a twenty-seven-year-old white male is a laborer with a grade twelve education who claims to attend church once a year to please his grandmother. He met his partner at a bar and after one month they became lovers and she became pregnant immediately. They then moved in to the same household. Sonny identified with the relationship by saying, "I would say I was happy, she was really good looking but her personality sucked, but that was my old lady, man." He boasted that: "I could get any girl. To the guys I was awesome." This last quote is one indication of his personality – super egotistic.

He also goes on to say explicitly "all I wanted her to be was a house mom," suggesting if he achieved that wish he would definitely be the dominant partner and she

the subordinate. Sonny made it very clear that he was powerful within the relationship. "I am very stern and don't give in. If somebody tries to intimidate me I will jump down their throat." He speaks also of her being a "bitch" and of him "wanting to be with her and she not doing what he wanted," indicating his striving to be dominant and a feeling of assault upon his egotistical person.

For this failure on her part to provide the rewards of status he felt due to himself, he blamed her and justifies this blame by stating that she not only drives him crazy, but "she drove a pervious boyfriend to suicide." He also implies, and it is assumed that he made explicit to her, that her consorting with prostitutes suggests her identity as being one of them. Furthermore, he says this dissolute status of hers takes time from her proper domestic duties and further deprives him of his due rewards. "The house was never clean. I would come home and have to do the dishes and make my own supper." He blames her so severely but does not see in himself the need for any blame whatsoever, "I know it is not me." This not only establishes his dominant self-concept but also indicates his rigidity in resisting any change to it – his is clearly a foreclosure type personality. Her status, as defined by him, has been considerably reduced, while his own, though not supported by her, is extravagantly bolstered by his work mates who tell him he is "strong" and that he should "get rid of her."

These changes in status, power and identity of the partners come to a climax when Sonny finds her in the bar with a group of her friends, male and female, without him and his sanction. As a consequence, he experiences fierce anger and goes to her and punches her in the face. There is blood, commotion and the arrival of the police – which he says, was absurd. Previously, he had been arrested, tried and put on probation for two different

assault charges against her. This final incident led to his incarceration. This heavy assault upon his identity by superior external forces, Kemper (1978) would lead us to expect, would produce rebellion in Sonny, which he does indeed express by calling the affair "stupid." However, after the court trial, which in a sense provided him with a "looking glass self," he appears to have experienced genuine guilt. He expresses this feeling by stating "I felt bad for what I did to her." He also seems, at least for a time, to have experienced some degree of anomie. "I was lost, I didn't know who I was."

In effect, in Sonny's case as described above, I find that clearly the relationship was one of unbalanced power; that the unbalance increased in Sonny's favor; that this change in the balance contributed to a megalomania on his part; that after fracture his identity suffered from both the domestic situation and the municipal one; and finally that the emotions he displayed were anger (to the extent of committing violence), guilt and anomie.

2. PHIL

Phil, is a Portuguese-Canadian Catholic, in his late forties who has a grade ten education. Previously employed in dry wall, he is at present unemployed. Phil met his partner, while in his late twenties, through a neighbor who had introduced the couple. After dating for a year, she got pregnant and he suggested that they get married because "I didn't want her to suffer because I knew how the Portuguese people were" (presumably she is also Portuguese). Phil identifies with the relationship by saying that "at the time she was O.K. I liked being in the relationship."

Phil was raised in a family where women did not "show their power" because they were supposed to "trust the men" (patriarchy). He describes his relationship with his

partner as one in which he was "more in control" and did "not need more power because I had all the power I needed" (i.e. dominant). During the union this originally unbalanced power relationship became even more unbalanced in Phil's direction, as shown by the fact that he established rules for who could smoke and who shouldn't in his house. "Just because I smoke you are going to be smoking too? I said there is enough people smoking in here, you don't need to smoke in here." He also states that he regarded her proper duties as being to cook the food and keep the house clean (expected rewards to himself). "Sometimes she does not bother me. She has my food ready and then there is no argument." However, according to him she just lies around instead of "picking up the clothes and cleaning the house" (in spite of her injured back).

This change in the power imbalance also indicates the availability to him of alternative sources of rewards that he quite unabashedly proclaims. "She makes me leave the house, of course then I meet somebody. I say that it is your fault because you made me go out." The last assertion of his also indicates the attachment of blame to her by him, a further reflection on his personality as being of the foreclosure type.

This megalomania on his part and blaming of her leads to a situation in which she begins to resist and disobey his orders, leading him to smash the walls of the house and other violence, to the extent that the police enter the situation and put him into jail. This puts an end to the relationship.

After the fracture of the relationship as I have shown in the literature review above, blame is usually attached by the person either to him/herself, the other partner, or to some superior other for any consequent loss to him/her of rewards (status giving) and power. In this case Phil has lost both. As would be expected, he sees no wrong done on

his own part but blames her for his particular predicament. The loss however,
irrespective of whom is to be blamed affects his identity and, whether or not he admits it,
detracts from his ego and inevitably generates anger ("smashing walls") and rebellion
against the police. "I do not lose my control, all of a sudden there are police cars at my
house for no reason, I was not going to go with them."

There is no guilt or shame whatsoever. Instead, Phil immediately fills this gap by
resorting to other woman and a circle of affirming friends. "If you are with a person and
this person bothers you, what do you do, you go with someone else, so that is what I had
to do." "I am very popular with the people. Everybody likes me. Everyone else is
against her. They are not against me. Everybody loves me."

In effect, in the case of Phil I see an originally power unbalanced relationship
progressing in the direction of more power for him and denigration of his wife to the
point where the relationship is fractured and an assault is made upon his identity, to
which he reacts with anger (smashing walls) and rebellion (against the police). As
previously mentioned, there is no trace in him of guilt or shame, he did however, loftily
express some sympathy for her. "I feel sorry for her, even today I feel really sorry for
her." It is clear also that his self-concept was in no way changed and he may be truly said
to be a foreclosure type.

3. JOE

An Aboriginal person in his late twenties with a grade ten education, Joe is a non
– church going Anglican. He works sporadically and is on welfare and in counseling. He
met his partner, who is also Aboriginal, in a bar and they began to live together in a
common law relationship after two months. They had two children. She is a good-

looking woman and he cites this specifically as a reason for selecting her. "Yes, I think it was important to me, you know, having a good-looking woman."

From the beginning this union was very power-unbalanced. Joe tells us that he controlled the money, their comings and goings, and what and how many groceries to buy. "I had control of the money. If I suggest that we get groceries and pay the bills and then go out and do something, I would be controlling." He admits that from the outset of the relationship he was jealous of her and even if she visited her sister he would insist on her coming home that same night or, at least, phoning him. "I would ask her to at least come home at night and then she wouldn't, and I would say at least phone me and let me know if you are not coming home and that didn't happen and I was jealous." Nevertheless, it would seem that authoritarian as he tried to be, she was not completely subservient. "A lot of times her sister would get money and her and her sister would leave (over night)." Joe, in addition to striving to exercise power over her, also demanded from her the rewards of good cooking, tidiness and nursing care. Again he indicates that these status needs of his were not adequately met, "With cooking she could have tried harder. She wasn't a very good cook. She never took care of me when I got sick and I was more of a house keeper than she was." Joe reacted to this deficit in both his power and his status occasioned by his partner's less than full compliance by violence, even from an early stage in the relationship. The first incident of violence occurred when Joe and his partner were engaged in an argument over money. He wanted to prove that he was in control of the situation "I grabbed her wrists and I kind of pulled her and rolled her. 'I said', 'See what I can do I am so much bigger.' " Joe also illustrates his use of violence when his status needs were not being addressed. "She said she wasn't

happy. She was bashing all my hopes that we were going to be together in this relationship, so I grabbed her by the ankle and dragged her to the front door and said get out. I felt I was being treated unfairly, I became violent." In effect the description above of Joe is that of a person with a foreclosure identity. In spite of these power and status losses (failure on her part to phone him, negligent housekeeping, and poor nursing care) he refuses adamantly to see any of these things as indicating a weakness in himself. Rather he boasts of the fact that after he kicked her out a number of times "she kept coming back," implying his own attractiveness. Furthermore, in spite of being arrested by the police, sent to jail by judges and forced into counseling by his probation officer, he has an excuse or justification for these assaults upon him by the legal and social authorities. "At the court, I got probation, but it was minor because I didn't beat her up. Again I was charged but again I had not done anything." It does seem that he shuts out any threat to his own ego, which justifies our classification of him as a foreclosure type.

Resisting recognition of it as much as he does, Joe nevertheless does lose power and status, while on the other hand, his partner seems to gain in that she is able, by a mere telephone call, to bring the long arm of the law down upon him. "She had control over me through recognizance orders, and the zero tolerance policy. She could just pick up the phone and they would be there, she had a lot of power that way." This, to him, outrageous situation enforced by a greater authority than himself (the police and law courts), drives him to anger and rebellion. "I have a lot of resentment." His hate and anger is even further increased when, just preceding their break up she rebukes him in front of the children – an unmistakable reduction of his status, and an assault upon his identity which even Joe is unable to deny. "She went into the bedroom and started

calling me down to the children. That's when I lost it. I choked her in front of my children. I had the feeling that I really wanted to hurt her bad." This finally ended the relationship. After the fracture of the relationship Joe seems to have recovered his wounded identity as an important strong man. He says, "Not having the stresses of her around or having someone push your buttons, I feel confident in myself."

It can be seen that this relationship was one that began with unbalanced power, weighted toward the male, subsequently shifting in a degree toward the female (an unusual occurrence), with an initial denial of the deficit to him by the male (a foreclosure behavior), which did not at first challenge his identity until she brought the police and courts into the situation, leading to rebellion and anger on his part. Her further action to diminish his status and consequently his self-image produced even more intense anger and violence.

4   DOUG

Doug is a man approximately in his mid thirties, who describes himself as being of Spanish background. He is a lapsed Catholic with a grade twelve plus education, who is a construction worker. He met his partner in a bar and they dated for a year and were married. They have two children. He felt that the relationship was important to him, particularly his children. "I wanted her (his wife) to understand that he (their son) was first."

From the outset of the relationship, even before marriage, Doug assumed superiority and expected compliance and subordination. He says, "I didn't phone her the weekend that she told me to, but then in two weeks I phoned her," indicating that he was not about to be directed by her and that he would make all decisions. In this vein, he also

says, "Don't tell me what to wear or tell me how to look." In all such matters, as he says, "I wanted to be heard and I wanted to do what I thought was right for me."

After their marriage he assumed further power prerogatives such as, "I had to take control of the credit cards, she was taking money out of the account without my permission." In addition to his own power boosting, he tended often to denigrate her. "I said, 'Why don't you put some make-up on? Look at yourself, look at you. Before you used to dress all nice.' " This might be because it seems as if she was not the bashful type, having for example, as stated above, begun early in the relationship to give him directions as to when to phone her.

In addition to rearing their two children and caring for the household she was taking university courses. His response to her student status was to declare that she would have been better occupied securing a job and getting an income which she could contribute to the family budget. "I said you got to help me out and get a job. When she had to do the housework, go to school, (and raise the kids) I guess it became too much for her. I don't know." Doug later contradicts himself when he states "financially I was fine," suggesting that he encouraged his partner to get a job for reasons other than the family income. He does admit grudgingly, though not explicitly, that she should certainly get a job and cease her university frivolity in which case, if she complied, he would be doing the directing and thus exercising power.

The relationship that began with a power unbalance toward Doug increased in that direction. As well, he also demanded a high degree of status. "If I come home and things are not done then I had to do them. If things were done then I would at least know that she is doing something." Through his exercise of power Doug was able to ensure his

partner's dependence and thus maintain a secure level of status. "I am very confident. She was dependent on me for everything, financially and emotionally." This self-assurance bolstered Doug's egotistical personality and allowed him to stick to his convictions. "When I am right about something, I don't back down." Clearly he is a foreclosure type personality.

The relationship came to an end when Doug's power position was threatened by the exercise of his partner's own power. "She started playing with the television and smirking at me like she had the power to do whatever she wanted and then I took the remote from her." Doug attempted to regain his power over her through violence. " I got up and I pushed her." When the police intervened, Doug reacted to this outside authority with rebellion and anger. "I was angry because I didn't cause this and I didn't deserve this treatment (being arrested)." Doug also expressed anger towards his partner and accused her of lying to the police. "I was angry and I asked her, 'Why did you lie and tell them that I hit you? You had no marks.' "

After the fracture of the relationship, Doug continued to experience anger. "The first few months you are angry." However, without the presence of his partner over whom he was able to exercise power and receive the rewards of status, Doug also experienced anomie. He explained his feelings by saying, "Lost, try to answer and you can't, you feel that your whole world goes down the drain." As well, he does indicate feeling some guilt and shame. "Sometimes when I walk away, I feel guilt and feel like I had failed." These last two emotions are quickly denied and the blame is projected onto his partner. "You feel less, but I knew that I was better. "It took me a long time to realize that I was not guilty. She will learn that it is her fault. I didn't do nothing." He

also overcomes his feelings of anomie by quickly finding a new partner who provides him with the rewards of status. "Even the woman that I am with right now, she says I can't believe she (his ex-partner) did all this, and that we ever broke up because of the way I am," indicating that he was able to manipulate his new partner into thinking that his ex-partner "had the perfect guy." Doug's resistance to change and repeated pattern of behavior with his new partner strengthens the assumption that he has a foreclosure type personality.

In effect, in the case of Doug I saw that the relationship was power unbalanced and increasingly progressed in the direction of more power for him, while he simultaneously denigrated his wife, thus reducing her status. His partner's attempted exercise of power threatened Doug's identity, and he reacted to this assault with anger towards his partner and rebellion against the police. Although there were traces in him of guilt and shame, Doug quickly denies these emotions by projecting blame onto his partner. As well, his feelings of anomie subside when he quickly finds a new partner over whom to exercise power and demand status, thus allowing him to resist any changes to his self-concept, a foreclosure type personality.

5. TERRY

Terry, a white man in his late forties, is a lapsed Catholic with a grade eleven education. He has upgraded his education with a few accounting courses. He manages a Canadian legion clubhouse. A mutual friend introduced him to his partner of twenty-five years who has a Mennonite background. They lived in a common law relationship and did not have any children together. From the very beginning of the relationship Terry says, "I definitely had more control." Furthermore, this control seems to have included

when she should be at his service, and when he preferred, he would bond with his buddies. He says, "It has its ups and downs. Certain things become more important at certain times in our relationship. I did a lot of male bonding at certain times in our relationship."

This power unbalance continued to increase in his favor to the point where he controlled all the decisions that were made in the relationship. "I was more predominant over the choices in everything. When it came down to it everything in our relationship was my decision." He exercised this power to control the finances and even the lovemaking. "I controlled the money and the sexual relationship to the point where I became more dominant." He says, "I view myself in the masculine role. I make the decisions and we live by that."

Terry expected compliance and the rewards of status from his partner. He expected her to respect his values and beliefs more than her own. "Certain stuff that she liked and I didn't we wouldn't have. My diet had more strength than her diet. Her cultural foods that I didn't like, we wouldn't eat those." He explains that many of their arguments occurred when he felt that she was not giving him his deserved deference. "If I felt that her values were being forced on me that would cause problems. I made the decisions and she agreed. Things that I thought I knew or was right about, [those things are what] I have a problem with her making those decisions." Terry explains that any problems within the relationship could have been avoided if she would comply with his desires. "She knows what I like and she knows I hate something different. If she would just stay away from the things I hate she would be O.K., but sometimes she tries something new and I will get mad."

He seems to realize that this autocratic behavior of his is not politically correct these days, but he nevertheless blames her for it because she never resists him. This is a clear inconsistency with his previous statement that any resistance on her part angers him. "Her giving in to me all the time, if one person is dominant and the other person lets them and if it continues that way it does not change." Given Terry's belief system and resistance to change, he is definitely a foreclosure type personality.

Terry explains that he feels "threatened by change" and, as a result, if his partner was non-compliant or did not give him his deserved status he became angry and hostile in an attempt to re-align her behavior with his beliefs. "There was pushing and shoving, yelling and a change in my demeanor." The final incident, which led to their separation, involved her not meeting his status needs. "I came home and I was hungry and she wouldn't make me anything to eat." He reacted to her defiance by uttering threats, which brought in police involvement and forced him to go for counseling sessions. He reacted to this outside authority with anger and rebellion. "I was angry with the law more than anything else."

After the fracture of the relationship, Terry's power and status were threatened and he experienced anomie. "I was not sure about myself." In addition, going to counseling forced him to look at himself and evaluate his behavior and beliefs. "I am not used to it [i.e. self-examination and having to admit another reality]. I find that I have to think twice and that bothers me." However, even given his feeling of anomie and counseling sessions, which forced him to self-evaluate, he was able to maintain his foreclosure type identity. "I still have my values. I am strong minded."

In effect, in Terry's case the relationship was very power unbalanced and had been for a long period of time. After fracture his identity was assaulted and the emotions he experienced were anger with his partner and rebellion against the police. He did experience feelings of anomie. However, he was able to maintain his strong belief system, which was consistent with his foreclosure identity.

6. JOSH

Josh is a white, twenty-four year old, Catholic who has more than a grade twelve education and owns a hotel. He met his partner at the hotel, where she worked for him. The sexual relationship began three weeks after they met. Josh identifies with the relationship by saying, "It was something new, something at that point in my life that was new. It didn't really matter – at no time was I ever totally committed."

The relationship began with him ceding some of his power in order to pursue her, however, the balance quickly shifted his way. "I pursued her, but for the next few months she was all over me. I was definitely more dominant." He continued to seek greater power by controlling her behavior. He says, "If she wanted to go out and I couldn't go she could not just go by herself, she had to wait for me until I said O.K. I am ready to go. It would be, it's my time, so let's go. She would never be able to say to me O.K. we are going now." Not only did he control her behavior but also the lovemaking. "I had more power in the sexual relationship." As well, Josh increasingly used his access to material resources to increase his partner's dependency on him, thus augmenting his control and adding to his egotistical personality. "When you feel that somebody is dependent on you, you automatically have that sense of distance" (for him, vertically elevated).

As the relationship progressed and Josh became more confident in his power, it was no longer necessary to reciprocate the rewards which she continued to offer. "She would do the dishes, my laundry and clean my truck." He felt that, "If she likes you more than you like her, when that happens you automatically have some sort of superiority over that other person." He demanded from her the rewards of status while at the same time he denigrated her. He says, "Sexually, it would have been a long two years without any companionship, but I did not have much respect for her." In the same vein, he continued to reduce her self-esteem by insulting her choice of dress and level of education. "I would say sarcastically, 'oh that's a nice outfit' or that, 'you are not intelligent enough to argue with me.' "

Josh held very strong beliefs that were non-negotiable. "What I did is what I did. I did what I wanted, when I wanted and how I wanted to do it." He was so confident in his control over her that any threat from her to end the relationship did not produce any challenge to his identity. "She would say that it was over sometimes but I would just say whatever." Blaming her for his excessive use of power and demands of status facilitated his rigidity in resisting change. "When somebody gives you an inch, chances are you will take a mile. Is it your fault? What are you supposed to do? Is it your fault that you maybe take advantage?" Given his beliefs and resistance to change, he is clearly a foreclosure type personality.

Josh admits to using his partner in order to achieve the rewards of status. "I would have had no choice. I would have been lonely. I needed somebody to talk to and tell somebody how my day was." However, when she no longer continued to provide the rewards (both of power and status because of, understandably, her increasing

unwillingness to do so) he felt his identity assaulted. "I was worked up. When I needed her the most there was emptiness. I want a relationship to be more rewarding." Josh's desire to find another relationship is indicative of his lack of change and self-examination even after fracture – foreclosure type behavior. "I don't think she affected who I am."

In effect, in Josh's case the power unbalance progressed in his favor, while he simultaneously reduced her power and status. When she no longer provided him with the rewards he sought, he experienced the emotion of anger and ended the relationship. With his belief system intact and little assault upon his identity (foreclosure type), he searched for a more rewarding relationship.

7. FRED

Fred is a white forty-year-old man with two years of college, who works in the advertising business. When he met his partner he became a Born Again Christian, and they dated for a year before they were married for ten years. She was previously married and had two children from her prior relationship. Fred and she also had twin boys. He identifies with the relationship by saying, "I was definitely committed. I was focused on her. When I got saved it was a very serious thing and that was the focus of the relationship was the fact that wow, my lifestyle was pretty rough before, going from one extreme to another. I was very committed."

At the outset of the relationship, power was fairly balanced. However, Fred felt that she had more control because she made the decisions about her children. He says, "She was more dominant because I walked in and did not know how to take care of children." He quickly began to feel threatened by her focus on the children and his

status deficit. He protests, "A lot of things focused on the kids. Decisions were made because of the kids."

In addition to her devotion to the children, he also resented her singing career. "She spent hours practising her singing." He attributes her less than adequate giving of rewards (status) to him to his not taking a more powerful position in the relationship. "It was basically not taking more of a charge. I gave in to a lot of things, just letting her do that hurt us."

Throughout the relationship attempts were made, on his part, to increase his control, seemingly in order to get for himself some signs on her part of esteem. By controlling the money he was able to increase her dependence on him and thus gain some power. "I would say, 'Let me pay the bills.' I did the creative juggling when times were tough. I never depended on her." He attempted to extend his financial control into other areas where he could possibly dictate her behavior by challenging her habits. He says, "She still smoked and she wanted to go have a cigarette and I said, 'No, you don't need a cigarette.' " He made some gains. However, the balance of power swayed back and forth as the friction continued regarding the children, her work, and her habits (smoking). In all areas of the relationship, he continued to feel undervalued and to strive particularly for that lacking value, status which was his main concern. This felt status deficit led him to make a more active effort to negotiate and argue that God required that she give him the respect he sought. He says, "There has been a lot of violations of scripture here. I remember the pastor saying, 'It is not right, go home and work it out'. She did not see it that way and figured that God had told her that divorce was fine."

Unable to adequately secure the desired rewards of status, Fred attempted to reduce her status below his own in order to achieve some feeling of importance. He would call her a "bitch" and accuse her of being "ignorant." His inability to convince her of her subordinate position and his superiority led to serious confrontations between them, during one of which she attempted to turn her back on him and leave the room. He tried to prevent her physically by standing in the doorway in order to force her to listen to him. "When I would want to talk to her I would stand in front of the door." This was the final incident, in that it marked the rupture of their relationship.

The interaction between them, as described, clearly was not one that led to much increase in his power, if any, and it certainly led to diminution of his status – the outcome most painful to him as it was a serious assault upon his identity. "I became spineless." Thus, the most suitable identity type for Fred would seem to be the moratorium type. Seeing the end of the cherished self he imagined was his, he however was able to pick up the pieces (his own) and look forward to a relationship with a new partner in which he would be able to enjoy the self esteem which he always sought in the last relationship but never achieved. "At this point I would definitely take a more active role in making decisions. I won't make the mistake of giving in to make someone happy."

After the fracture his partner obtained a non-molestation order to stop him from continuing his name-calling. With his status already reduced, what power he had was threatened by outside authority. He became angrier with her and rebelled against the police as well. "I was angry because I can't believe she would do something like this, the non-molestation order was a loose order, it was stupid." Given his dismal situation,

Fred experienced feelings of anomie. "I don't have direction, I have to struggle to get

my life back." As well, he did show some sign of feeling shame but dismissed it as

being forced upon him by his ex-partner. "I feel like I failed as a father and a husband

because I have been told that from her."

In summary, in the case of Fred, the initial power balance was fairly equal, though

he struggled for it to increase in his favor in order to get from her greater rewards of

status. Fred's experimentation with becoming more powerful in order to receive greater

status was unsuccessful in this relationship causing an assault upon his identity.

Specifically due to the status deficit, the emotions he experienced were anger and

anomie. Although he showed signs of feeling some shame, Fred denies this emotion by

saying that it was not genuine because his ex partner forced it upon him. As established

above, Fred's identity is of the moratorium type in that after the fracture it changed from

a self-concept of spinelessness to one of masterfulness (at least in hope).

8. JAKE

Jake, a white man in his early forties, is a non-practising Catholic with a grade

eleven education and a mechanic's ticket. He works as an industrial mechanic. Both he

and his partner had previously been married. They dated for a year before living

together. He identifies with the relationship by saying, "Yes, I was committed. We had

both previously been married so we had a lot in common, and we never argued or

fought. It was enjoyable, I was very committed."

The beginning of the relationship was fairly power balanced. He says, "It was

mutual." However, this dynamic began to shift in favor of Jake shortly after the start of

the relationship as he gained control over the finances and lovemaking. He says, "I

would take care of all the bills and would watch the money. She did not know how to pay the bills so I would control that. I also instigated and controlled the sexual relationship." Jake enjoyed the rewards of status that he received from his partner. However, he tended to expect and take them for granted. "I got used to the fact that she was a good cook and she made my lunches."

Nevertheless, this seeming cornucopia of rewards and balm to his status ceased to satisfy him fully and led him to demand more. He believed that "She was not much of a house worker and that she was lazy at times." Jake felt he deserved her attention and expected her to long to be with him whenever possible. He protests, "I would say, 'Let's go to bed,' and she would say that she would be right there, and then she would pass out on the couch and I would be upset. If she is going to fall asleep she should be in bed with me."

Jake considered her lack of attention to him to be his greatest deficit and caused his suspicions of rivals. These feelings of insecurity were augmented by his subculture of friends. He says, "the guys were raz'n me." He felt insulted if she wore a nice outfit when she was going out without him at her side. He distrustfully says that "She dressed up extra nice to go out and I said wow, I have never seen that outfit before." To alleviate his feelings of jealousy, he attempted to become more powerful in order to achieve, from her, more esteem. He confronted and questioned her in an attempt to gain control over her behavior and reduce her status below his own. He says, "There were some instances of jealousy. I asked her about her past and how many guys she had been with. I got all upset and started accusing her."

His attempts, however, were unsuccessful and Jake's identity was assaulted when "she started to drift away." He became more and more suspicious that he had a rival. Whether or not this was true, he believed it and became paranoid. He says, "I would call her sister's house, and if she was not there I would stop by her sister's place." He turned to anger as a means of ensuring his deserved status. "I followed her, I walked up to the side of her car and I kicked it." In a desperate attempt to re-gain power and status he says, "I threatened her and I threatened to kill her." There was no physical violence against his partner. However, at this point the police became involved and the relationship ended.

Initially after the fracture of the relationship, Jake was very sad and depressed. "I am very sad. It hurts. I am depressed and lonely. I had an emotional breakdown." However, he soon became angry with her for her engagement with the legal system and rebelled against outside authority. He says, "The zero tolerance policy, she is abusing it, the justice system made an error on the side of caution. I am not a criminal."

Discovering that his ex partner had entered into a new relationship soon after their break up added further insult to his already reduced level of status. He says, "She went from me to him without even skipping a beat." He did not try to examine himself but instead became even more obsessed with reducing her level of status below his own. He explains, "I had got her boyfriend's phone number and I told him about her past. I told him to watch her. I phoned her boyfriend again and left a message that she will mess around on you. I told her niece that she should not use her aunt as a role model because she is a liar and a cheat." These strategies on his part did not persist as he continued to be arrested for harassment.

These assaults upon his identity seemed to have forced him to lower his expectations. He says, "I don't have many expectations." However, before entering into a new relationship he plans to make sure that he is not as committed and has more control over the other person. "I won't fall in love as fast and I will want to find out exactly what goes on with that person." Therefore, although his expectations were reduced, Jake's desire to find a new relationship where he would receive greater rewards indicates that his identity is of a moratorium type, implying of course change and experimentation in getting there.

In effect, in Jake's case, shortly after the start of the relationship the power balance was in his direction. However, although he did receive some rewards of status he felt dissatisfied and attempted to become more powerful in order to achieve greater status from his partner. He was unsuccessful and this assault upon his identity caused him to become paranoid and obsessed. Given his felt status deficit, he experienced the emotions of rebellion, anomie and anger.

9. BILL

Bill is a white man in his early thirties who has a degree in economics and is a Protestant. At present he is unemployed and receives disability payments. He was previously married for six years and has a son from that relationship. He met his partner, who is eight years his senior, at a restaurant where she worked. They started going to bars together and he moved in with her a month later. They have a daughter together. He identifies with the relationship by saying, "Yes, I was committed. It was a good feeling but it did not feel like a permanent thing. It was more like a drinking partner. I was just getting my feet wet again."

At the start of the relationship she was more dominant because he moved into her apartment. "I was living in her house so she would say we will do this or that and pay these bills. I was still recovering" [from a car accident that almost left him paralyzed]. Bill seems to have been for a long time, if not always, dependent upon women for the satisfaction of his needs which, I assume, endowed him with a certain amount of status. He says, "I went directly from being with my ex wife, and then the accident and having my mother around all the time, and then I moved in with her."

As he recovered and gained his strength, his self-esteem increased and he felt even more worthy of his present partner's care of him, a contribution to his status. In spite of the goodness on her part, he yearned for more status and attempted to achieve this by striving to exercise more power and influence in the relationship. According to Bill, many of the confrontations between them occurred because of something she said or did that he felt might reduce his status. "It [the cause for fighting] was usually something she said." On one occasion she was going to call a friend to disconfirm something he had said and he "picked up the phone and slammed it down and broke a glass table." In another incident Bill says, "She was being flippant about our daughter and about one thing or another." He uses power to establish her place (as he saw it) by "grabbing her and pushing her on the couch."

Her reaction to his behavior led him to try to establish even more emphatically and dramatically his right to superior status in the relationship. He blatantly consorted with other women and on one occasion carried out a public confrontation with his partner when she, justifiably, resented his vulgar behavior. He says, "This guy introduced me to a female friend and she walked up to me and we kissed." His partner's

angry reaction to this incident posed a threat to his felt deserved status. However, he is able to deny any feelings of shame for occupying such a lofty position by blaming her. He says, "you need to smarten up and settle down." As well, he also "grabbed her and pushed her down." For all these acts of violence and excessive use of power, which had been a continual occurrence between them and which he felt were necessary to ensure his deserved status, he blames her in order to avoid any feelings of guilt. "She should have warned me or said that if you do this, this is going to happen [arrest]. There was never a mark on her."

In addition, he also blames her for what he considers to be a loss of status. She (a woman) rebuked him (a man) in public. He retaliates by accusing her of extreme vulgarity. "I started asking her about her ex-husband and how many boyfriends she had." He also accuses her of being a difficult person to live with so much so that her ex-boyfriends left her and one even committed suicide in desperation and frustration. He says, "One of her boyfriends had to leave the Province, and the other boyfriend committed suicide."

During their relationship, his excessive use of power, employed to secure the rewards of status, resulted in him being charged several times for domestic assault. He became very angry with her as well as with the police and court systems. "I was very angry, bitter and disappointed. She was using the court order and playing games. I was sitting in the remand center thinking my case was the most important, but I just had to wait."

Each of the times that he was arrested he was able to convince his partner to have the charges against him dropped. "I said, 'You have to go to women's advocacy and

sign a form.' " Bill used her compliance as a way to belittle her. "Look at this girl. She makes charges and recants her statement, not once has she testified against me." Although he was able to maintain control and some status within the relationship he began to feel embarrassment because of his numerous arrests and became more concerned with the status he would receive from his peers. That eventually ended the relationship.

In regard to Bill's identity type, it is necessary to remember that at the outset of the relationship he was a weak convalescent as a result of a recent accident and per force dependent on three women for props to his status. Nevertheless, on his recovery from illness, and as the relationship progressed, he became more and more aggressively dominant and refused to admit dependency any longer. Rather, on the contrary he tried to assert supremacy both at home and in the bar. Therefore, in spite of the fact that, because of his physical mishap, he began the relationship with low self-esteem, he eventually came around to demonstrating an exaggerated, unshakable one. I must therefore classify him as a foreclosure personality type. It must be noted however, that he experienced change, suggesting elements of a moratorium type. "I had things going very well. This was like a step down and you don't want to tell them [friends] about it." He moved in with a female friend and focused on his job and new friends. "I am just working and looking for opportunities. I have new friends through work. I feel more confident than ever."

In effect, in the case of Bill, the initial relationship began with her having greater power. As he recovered from his accident and gained self-esteem he adopted a more powerful position where he could gain greater status – indicating a change from

moratorium to foreclosure type identity. His repeated arrests posed an assault upon his identity and he experienced feelings of anger, and rebellion against outside authorities. He ended the relationship to avoid further damage to his ego and, as a result, felt more confident than ever.

10. GERALD

Gerald, a white man in his mid forties who has a grade twelve plus education, is a maintenance supervisor. He does not practise any religion. He met his partner in Jr. High School and their sexual relationship began when they were in grade ten. They were married shortly after high school and were together for a total of twenty years. They have three children together. He identifies with the relationship by saying, "Yes, from my values it was important because marriage and family were key things in your lives and lead to happiness. It was very important, I was committed."

When the relationship began the balance of power was fairly equal. "I would say we would have been equally involved in what each other did and how we dealt with things in our lives." However, family was very important to him and he demanded that she focus her attention in that sphere. He says that after marriage "You spend more time with your children and your spouse, although the neighbors could be friends, you don't see them. That was a problem for my wife, but I was satisfied being at home with the kids."

His demands for his partner's attention became excessive. If she did not comply with his wishes he was jealous and obsessive. "When you start looking for things, you probably end up screwing it up because you think that things happen that maybe are not there." In an attempt to reduce her status and self-esteem to ensure she would remain in

the relationship he started to blame her for various things. "I started accusing her of everything, sit down in a chair wrong and I would make a comment and we would argue."

His partner rebelled against his demands for attention and started going out with friends. She eventually did start seeing another man (his self-fulfilled prophecy). Given Gerald's already felt status deficit, the possibility that his partner may be dating another man threatened his identity. "I am a father. I have a job. Family is important to me, but I don't see the picture I painted." He reacted by trying to gain control in the relationship and further exercise his power as the "man of the household." "I tried to control the situation. We argued in relation to where she was going. I told her she could not go out. I would phone her work to see if she was there."

His efforts were unsuccessful and a posed further assault on his identity. He became angry and threatened his partner. "I was yelling. I threatened her. I said I would kill her and the guy." The relationship ended when the police became involved and he was charged with uttering threats. His personality identity type can be classified as moratorium, in that he experimented with the exercise of power over her in different ways and degrees, by trying to control her comings and goings, sometimes gently, sometimes threateningly, and thus viewing himself as tyrant at one time and gentle husband at others, finally settling on (after the fracture of the relationship) the gentle husband.

After the fracture of the relationship, initially he felt mad. "You feel mad." However, soon after he began to experience feelings of sadness and guilt. "I was sad. It scared the hell out of me that a person could get so angry." Without the security of his

valued family unit to provide him with direction, Gerald also experienced anomie. "I lost how I did things. If you fall off your bike, you are shaky but you get back on. Where you are going, you are not sure." His acceptance of responsibility for his behavior after the relationship ended led to feelings of shame. "It woke me up from where I was and made me realize that something had to change." He recognized that the anger he expressed did not reflect his personality and he continues to experiment to find his true identity – a true moratorium type. "I didn't like it [the anger]. It wasn't me. Everything is new. It is like craving a new beginning, but it is better than what I felt during [anger] the relationship."

In effect, in the case of Gerald the initial power balance was fairly equal. When he felt his position within the family was threatened he attempted to alleviate his deficit by becoming more powerful – moratorium type identity. However, he was unsuccessful and his identity was further assaulted causing him to experience the emotion of anger. After fracture he was still angry for a short time. However, this anger turned to sadness, guilt and anomie. By accepting responsibility for his behavior and not projecting the blame outwards, he also experienced shame and recognized the ineffectiveness of his actions, which were motivated by anger.

11. RODNEY

Rodney is a twenty five year old Aboriginal male with a grade nine education who is at present unemployed. He does not practise any religion. He met his partner in a bar and they started living together within a couple of months. They have three children together. He identifies with the relationship by saying "I had a picture of how a family should be. I had the perfect kind of image that I would be happy all the time."

Initially the power balance was fairly equal. He says, "Yes, we were equal." However, as the relationship grew, the balance shifted towards him. "I became more dominant." He started to control whom she would talk to and where she would go. He explains, "It started with the phone, asking who was on the phone, stuff like that." His dominance progressed and he began to demand "who her friends were and how long she would be gone."

Given Rodney's patriarchal ideology of the nuclear family, he also demanded a high degree of status. In all aspects he expected his needs to be met. "I expected her to be there, the house to be clean and her not to yell." He also tried to reduce her status by accusing her of dressing inappropriately. He says, "I made comments about what she wore, like isn't that too small?" During the relationship, he controlled her behavior while holding on to his beliefs and disregarded her suggestions for changes. He says, "She would be mad if I went out partying for awhile, but I knew that it would only be for awhile so I kept doing it."

However, her resistance to his demands added to his felt status deficit and posed a threat to his identity. In order to correct her less than satisfactory behavior and receive greater rewards, he turned to anger and violence. He explains that if she did not give him his deserved status he became angry. "I felt angry if the house was dirty or the dishes weren't done. It was a build up of those things. There was lots of slapping, punching and yelling."

His personality type would seem to be moratorium, in that, at the outset of the relationship, he regarded himself as being happily egalitarian. However, for various

reasons he clearly became autocratic and authoritarian which change he felt was necessary to safeguard his self-respect.

During one of these incidents of violence the police were called and the relationship came to an end. Rodney started attending a group for abusive men and, after fracture, took responsibility for his behavior. He says, "I knew there was a problem. I knew that I was losing control." He does not blame her for his excessive use of power, and as a result, experienced feelings of guilt. "I blamed myself. I felt guilty." He adds, "When I was in the relationship I controlled them [his partner and children] so I didn't have to control myself. I wouldn't have to look at myself." As well, he recognizes that his demands for status may have also been excessive and he feels shame. "I feel ashamed. Now I put myself down." He became very depressed and began to question his identity. "When she was gone it hurt and it was hard. I was depressed. I was not sure who I was or where I was going." He now searches for a new identity – indicating moratorium type behavior. "I don't like myself because of what I had done. Now I read a lot [self help books] and keep myself busy by going for walks."

In summary, the initial power balance in the relationship was equal. However, as the relationship progressed Rodney gained greater power and started demanding more rewards. Her resistance to his demands threatened his identity and he became angry. After the fracture of the relationship, he experienced the emotions of depression and anomie. Having accepted responsibility for his behavior and not projecting the blame on to his partner he also felt guilt and shame. He continues to experiment in order to find a suitable identity.

B. Females in the Sample

1. DEBBIE

Debbie is a white female in her early thirties who has a grade eleven education and is a Protestant with strong beliefs, but does not attend church. She met her partner when she was seventeen, at a fishing lodge where she was a supervisor. The sexual relationship began after two months at which point they also moved in together and lived in a common law relationship for two years. They were then married for five years and had a son together. She identifies with the relationship by saying, "I believed that this was the guy. I thought I was in love."

From the start of the relationship the balance of power leaned towards her partner. However, for the first two months his power was superficially cloaked in shows of equality and he displayed to her an outward courtesy. She says, "At first I thought he was arrogant but when I met him he was very sweet. He acted like a gentleman and I thought well. this guy is really good. I thought finally there is a guy out there that respects women." Unfortunately for her, his mask of nobility was replaced by overt cruelty after two months. She explains, "He definitely became more dominant after the sexual relationship started."

He began to assert his power in the relationship. She explains that he became jealous, "He had a problem with me talking with men or going for a walk and being approached by a man, even having an innocent conversation with a man made him angry." He insisted that all aspects of all situations should be as he defined them and that she recognize this and respond accordingly. She illustrates by saying that "If I did not call his work and let him know that I had gone shopping, and when he came home and

dinner was not on the table pronto, that was another problem." If she displayed any threat to his position of authority she had to face the consequences of his anger and hostility. She says, "It only started with a slap across the face or a shove in the door, but at one point, he pounded his fists repeatedly on my scalp."

To avoid these confrontations with her partner she complied with his demands for high status. "I would teach myself to ask first before I would make a meal to be sure he would like it, always ask before going for coffee with a friend, and before wearing an outfit, find out if he liked it and if he thought it was suitable." Her apparent power deficit and his massive reduction of her status assaulted her identity. She says, "He was definitely shaping me. I began to question myself. I was losing ground on what was normal anymore." The identity type that best described Debbie is the diffusion type, in that she accepted a high degree of external control and lacked inner directedness.

It would appear that he, dense as he was, nevertheless sensed that his behavior might cause her to consider a happier life elsewhere and with someone else. To thwart this she describes the preventive measures he employed. She says, "He let me know that my family would never believe me anyhow [i.e. the possible need to desert him], and that I was never leaving him" [i.e. also that I could never live without him either]. On one occasion he physically prevented her from leaving the house for days. She explains, "He sealed all the windows and doors, shut them and unplugged the phone for the next few days."

Furthermore, he attributed this outrageous use of his influence over her to her own misbehavior, in that his great love for her was unappreciated and unrequited, making his exercise of authority necessary. She says that her partner would often tell her that "He

loved me so much, and if I wouldn't make him so angry he wouldn't have to do this" [abuse her]. Her partner was successfully able to reduce her self-esteem and she eventually internalized his accusations and blamed herself. Given her self blame for her power deficit, she continued to comply with his wishes, albeit out of fear, and as a result experienced a high degree of anxiety during the relationship. She says, "I felt stressed, anxious, nervous and insecure." In addition, during the relationship she experienced depression and guilt for her felt status deficit. "I was really down on myself because I was not cooking the right meals, wearing the right clothes etc. I was down on myself hard. Shopping spree's no longer existed for me. I would feel way too much guilt. I felt not worthy of such a privilege."

Debbie was able finally to end the relationship with the help and encouragement of a woman who had been involved in a similar situation. One evening she waited until her partner was drunk and passed out and she took her son and moved to another province. After the fracture of the relationship, Debbie continued to experience anxiety as a result of her fear of her partner's retaliation. She explains, "I drastically lost weight and clumps of hair." In addition to her feelings of anxiety, with her partner no longer there to direct and control her behavior, she also experienced feelings of anomie. "I thought where am I going to go? What am I going to do? I felt lost."

After a period of time, she was able to reflect on the situation and she began to experience feelings of guilt. She says, "I was shocked. I was shocked that I used to live like this. I could not believe I allowed myself to be in that situation and live like that." Given this realization, she began to experiment with activities and new thought patterns that would enable her to re-establish a new identity. "I tired to calm myself and

remember things about my school days and tried to bring back my old memories." She

illustrates this change in her personality by saying, "I have my own interests. I have my

own hobbies. I feel like I have my spirit back. I did not have a spirit for so long. I have

my soul. I am able to feel my own feelings, able to do my own things, go shopping and

there is nothing wrong with it and I buy things for myself." Therefore, given her re-

awakening and change in identity it is necessary to describe Debbie as moving from a

personality with a diffusion type identity to one with a moratorium type identity.

In effect, in the case of Debbie, the initial balance of power did not lean toward

her. Instead, her power and status positions were continually reduced throughout the

relationship. Consequently, in order to avoid confrontation she became compliant -

diffusion type identity. With her self-esteem reduced she blamed herself for her deficits

and, given her lack of power, experienced anxiety and lack of status, depression. After

the fracture of the relationship she continued to experience anxiety, and without her

partner's direction, anomie. However, after some self-examination she began to feel guilt

for allowing him to exercise his excessive power over her. To recompense herself, she

began to re-establish a true identity – moratorium type behavior.

2. JEN

Jen is white, Anglican, but not a church goer, with a grade 12 education, who

worked as an accountant. She met her partner at a mall when she was seventeen and the

sexual relationship began within a week. They met in March and by October of the same

year were married, particularly because she was pregnant. She says, "I was pregnant and

felt it was the right thing to do." Concerning the marriage, she expresses satisfaction in

that, it made an "honest woman of her." She says, "It was important to me because I thought I was a better person" [in the relationship].

Although for the first few months of their relationship it appeared as though the balance of power was fairly equal, it quickly swung "malewards." Jen says, "He did not want me to go out with my friends. It was a big change because I used to go out whenever I wanted to." Her partner demanded control and used various tactics to maintain his dominance. She explains that he began "choosing my friends." As well, she had to stay at home because, she says, "He used to call me on his breaks so I had to be at home." If she did not submit to his authority she would be punished. "If I did not do what he wanted he would not talk to me for weeks on end."

Not only was she in a lesser position of power, but was also expected to give him excessive rewards of status. "He wanted me to look good because I was with him." Given his demands, her status was deemed less important, and thus, reduced and undervalued. She says, "He controlled me to do everything for him and the kids." In addition, her status position was further diminished by the restrictions he placed on her access to alternative sources of rewards. "He would get mad even if I went to my parents. He would say, 'Why are you going there? Stay home.' "

If she did not comply with his demands he became angry. The first incident occurred when Jen resisted his sexual demands. "He threw me down the hall, it had to do with sex." On other occasions when he felt that she challenged his authority she was "pinned up against a wall." He frequently became physically violent to "the walls, doors and the car."

Given her experience of physical attacks she became fearful of her partner. "I had

nightmares of him hitting me." This fear and her felt dependence encouraged her to stay

in the relationship (presumably her fear that if she left him he would retaliate with

violence, and also that she would be destitute). "I was financially dependent." As the

relationship progressed, her self-esteem was reduced. "I had low self-esteem." Because

he had so cut her off from alternative others who would have helped her to preserve a

more positive self-image, she blamed herself for her power deficit and experienced a high

degree of anxiety. "I had anxiety attacks." In addition, she also blamed herself for her

reduced level of status, thus experiencing the emotion of sadness and depression. "I had

depression."

This lack of control and reduction of her status position assaulted her identity.

She says, "He had so much control over me that I did not know who I was. I went

through the motions not knowing my personality or what I wanted." Given Jen's

compliance and lack of inner directedness, she is definitely a personality with a diffusion

type identity.

In spite of all the deterrents from accessibility to alternative sources, on one

occasion their young son intervened in her partner's physical abuse towards her, and she

"took the bull by the horns" and while he was away at work, fled to her family in another

province both to escape his persecution and for the children's sake, thus ending the

relationship. Eventually with the support of friends and family, who lived in another

province, she was able to gain the courage to leave the relationship. She explains, "I had

friends out here and my family, but if I had not left the province I would not have been

able to do it" [end the relationship]. However, after fracture, she continued to internalize

her partner's perception of her reduced status level and her feelings of low self-esteem persisted. "I don't think of myself" [i.e. she had become so other directed that she lost all self-efficacy]. She says, "I still struggle with making myself happy." In spite of her moving away from him he continued to pursue her with persecution. She says, "He said that everyone thinks you are a major bitch." In addition, Jen continued to feel responsible for her power deficit and feels anxiety. She says, "I go through anxiety around life and doing things for myself." Upon further self-examination, she also blames herself for allowing him to exercise power over her. She says, "I feel a lot of guilt for what I had done to myself and my family."

Without the direction of her partner and his incessant demands she experienced feelings of anomie. "You feel a little bit lost because you don't have the control crutch to lean on." She explains, "I still wanted that control. You are so used to somebody telling or forcing or directing you so you feel you still need it. For example, like grocery shopping, I didn't know if I could go by myself, buying my clothes, putting gas in the car or anything like that; things you have to do by yourself which you can do but you are still looking for somebody else to say go ahead and do it." Eventually this felt inability to exercise control began to fade and Jen started to assert herself more independently. "It was an experimental stage that I went through after I left, I started to make my own rules." She explains that her journey to a new identity continues. "I have partly found who I am and what I want to do." Given her change from an originally compliant individual with little external control to one who experiments with more assertive behaviors she can be described as moving from a personality with a diffusion type identity to one with a moratorium type identity.

In effect, in the case of Jen, the initial power balance in the relationship was skewed towards her partner. Both her power and status positions were reduced and thus she accepted a high degree of external control – diffusion type identity. During the relationship she experienced anxiety and low self-esteem. However, eventually she was able to end the relationship. Even after fracture, she internalized her partner's blame and felt anxiety for her power deficit and depression for her lack of status. Without her partner present to direct her behavior she felt anomie. In addition, she also felt guilt for allowing her partner to exercise control over her and her children. Nevertheless, she was able to begin to experiment with taking more control in her life and became a personality with a moratorium type identity.

3. DONNA

Donna is an Aboriginal woman with a grade ten education who did not practise any particular religion during the relationship, but became a Christian after the fracture of the relationship. She was a single parent with a three-year-old son when she met her partner, a Scandinavian, through a Native paper where they wrote to each other as pen pals for four years. He then moved to the city where she lived and they became engaged. She says, "right away I got engaged. It was too fast." She identifies with the relationship by saying, "Yes, it was important to me. The relationship took over."

From the start of the relationship the balance of power leaned towards her partner. He controlled her behavior in the private and public spheres. She says, "He was dominating in the sexual relationship." As well, he demanded that she submit to his authority and enforced his power through various tactics. She explains, "He would say 'where are you going' and he would actually wait outside of meetings for me. He would

call ten times a day and I had to be there to answer the phone, and even if I was talking on the phone he had to know who it was."

In addition to his desire to control the relationship, he also demanded from her the rewards of status. She describes him telling her, "wear these negligees, wear these teddies, act slutty [i.e. in the bedroom] and be like this. This is the way I want you to be." In everything his needs and wishes always came first and he demanded compliance. If she failed to comply he over-ruled her wishes by force if necessary. She explains, "He did this over and over in the marriage. I often said no to sex but he would not listen. If I was sick or tired and lying in bed he would just do it and forget about my feelings. He was very possessive and jealous."

Not only did he ignore her feelings, but he also derided her by mocking her dress. She says, "If I wore a T-shirt with something on the front of it he would ask me if I had been there sarcastically and then laugh at the shirt I was wearing." In addition, she was also insulted by the way he treated her like a child. She explains, "I got an allowance of $35.00 every week, I was treated like a kid."

If she gave any of her attention to anyone else he became very angry. On one occasion he felt neglected and threatened to "push my daughter, who was in a stroller towards a train." He also accused her of getting pregnant without his permission and he "tried to get the baby out." She says, "The worst incident of physical abuse I can think of was a miscarriage, I was thrown and sat on and held down, his whole body weight holding me down and pushing on me."

Abusive as he was to her, he nevertheless blamed her for his actions. She says "He would say, 'why did you do this to me', or he would go into denial and say that he

never hit me or abused me." In addition, he also appealed to a higher authority to make her realize that this was her place. She says "He would say that God wanted us to be together and he had the whole church on his side."

Given the circumstances, she experienced fear and low-self esteem during the relationship. She says, "He really pulled my self-esteem down. I didn't have any confidence." Given Donna's compliance and acceptance of external control she can best be described as a personality with a diffusion type identity.

One particular incident of violence went so far that she was driven to call the police and was herself taken off to a shelter for abused woman. She had been so disoriented that she was unable either to take the children with her or to arrange for their care while she was in the shelter. They were left with him and he straight away began to abuse them, including sexually. During this time a social worker (albeit too late) looked in on the children, found out what was happening to them and took them into foster care. Donna blamed herself for this situation and felt a tremendous amount of guilt. She says, "I am hard on myself about the kids." Supported by counselors in the shelter she summed up the courage to leave him permanently and so ended the relationship. "I had planned to leave and then I had some people who were going to back me up, some professionals."

After the fracture of the relationship and her leaving the shelter she blamed herself for her loss of both power and status, in that she never did have power in the relationship and even the status of married woman (dismal as hers was) was also lost. Because of these power and status deficits, as Kemper would lead up us to expect, she experiences anxiety (because of the power deficit) and depression as a result of the status

deficit. She says, "I would start to feel overwhelmed and anxious". She expresses, "I was sad, there are still days when I don't feel my self-esteem is around at all." In addition, she describes herself as being very disoriented (anomie). "My spirit was taken away. I felt very cut apart, set somewhere into the unknown, not knowing what was going to happen to me."

Eventually however, she began to recover from this trance of disorientation and to view herself and the situation more realistically. The erstwhile self-blame became severe blame of him for abusing her and the children, and the social worker agency for depriving her of her children.

Having thrown off the guilt of self-blame and attached it to where it justly belonged she began a process of self-rehabilitation. "I started to do my own financial stuff. I do things I would have never done before. I have taken cooking classes. I am going to job readiness. I feel more independent and self-sufficient." She eventually came to a comfortable satisfaction with her life and a realization of her real self. "I feel more like my own person."

In summary, Donna initially entered a subordinate relationship of unequal power, which became over time even more so unbalanced. In this subordinate position she was degraded and denigrated to such an extent that she lost not only her self-esteem but also her children. This loss and the related power and status deficits rendered her identity so flaccid as to justify a classification of diffusion type (which later became rehabilitated and justifies noting an identity type change from diffusion to moratorium). The emotions suffered by Donna throughout and after this unfortunate relationship are guilt, anxiety, depression, anomie, and finally with the transference of blame from herself to him, anger.

4. STACEY

Stacey is a white, non-practising Catholic who has a master's degree in education and speaks four languages. She was a teacher in her early twenties when she met her partner in a singles bar and they dated for six months before they were married. She says. "We started dating in February and were married in June. It was just a whirlwind." She identifies with the relationship by saying, "It became a part of who I was quite quickly. I was a fixer. I devoted myself to him. I helped him get to be successful because at that time he was poor and uneducated."

Initially, given her partner's financial and educational situation, Stacey had more control in the relationship. However, this balance of power and status quickly shifted towards her partner. She says, "I lost that control. As his situation improved mine deteriorated. It was a direct correlation between me losing control, self respect, everything, as his improved." She describes this exchange in power and status positions as a "transfusion." She explains, "It was taken from me and put into him."

She worked as a teacher and supported him, and he eventually used her money to set up a shop. Soon after he started to become successful she was no longer able to access any of "his" money. If she wanted to go grocery shopping or buy a new outfit she had to check with him first. She explains, "If I went grocery shopping I would have to go get a check from him at the shop made out to the store and then bring it back and tell him how much the groceries were." As well, "If I wanted to buy clothes I would pick out a dress and he would go and pay for it later. He would not give me the money, he would say if he liked it and if he didn't he wouldn't buy it." Given his new control in the public sphere, her partner then expanded his authority into the private sphere. She says,

"I was submissive in that area" [the sexual relationship].

If she did not submit to his authority she suffered the consequences of his anger. "I mean he would smack me around or throw me down the stairs." He blamed her. She, however, accepted the blame for his excessive use of power and says that after an assault, "I would beg him to forgive me."

Not only did he exercise his newly found power over her excessively, he also demanded from her the rewards of status. He began to have parties in his own honor. She says, "He controlled me at the parties. The parties were for his success. He convinced me that he was this great person." At these parties she was reduced to his dutiful wife who supported him and abided by his wishes. She says, "Whenever he had has his staff over he would make sure that I was the Cinderella of the party, 'do this do that, the baby is crying, go feed the baby'. There was this whole sick atmosphere."

An extreme example of his demand for status and denigration of her occurred when he insisted that she entertain a woman with whom he was having an affair. She says, "He had forced me to be friends with this girl, we would have them [her and her husband] over for supper and he [her partner] would say she likes this, make this for her, and I would cook that." This infidelity of his continued throughout the relationship. She says, "The infidelity, that was the killer." In an attempt to stop his vulgar behavior, she informed his mistress's husband of their behavior. Her attempts to remove from him the rewards of his infidelity he regarded as a threat to his status because it detracted from his business. She says, "He blamed me because the women he had an affair with had so many customers [at his shop], and now her husband knew and he would not let her come back to work." Her partner then forced Stacey to go apologize to this woman and try to

convince her to come back to work. In effect, he blamed her for damaging his business rather than himself for infidelity.

Upon the arrival of their first child, Stacey quit work to stay at home and raise their children, a total of four. She recognizes this removed access to alternative rewards as part of the reason she remained in the relationship. "I didn't have the professional support. If I would have been teaching through all of this it would have been different." Consequently, having given all her money to him for his career and without an income of her own she felt dependent. She says, "I had given him all my money to help him start a business and to help get him on the road. I did not receive any money. I am telling you I did not have a nickel. I did feel like a child."

In addition, having internalized his perception of her reduced status position she remained in the relationship. She says, "I could not live a minute without him. I was his wife and nothing else, their mother [the children's] and that was the only person [I was]. I had no identity than what I was to him. I didn't want to be anyone else." Given her compliance and acceptance of his external control, she can definitely be described as a personality with a diffusion type identity.

Her power deficit and his massive reduction of her status assaulted her identity. Stacey's self-esteem had been reduced to the point where she describes herself as being "a walking wound." She was extremely depressed, and even eventually had to be hospitalized. She says, "I was hospitalized for ten days in a psychiatric institute, I lost forty pounds." When asked if she was ever fearful of his aggressive behavior she responded by saying that "you can not fear something you feel you deserve." Given her self-blame, she was "panicky all the time" during the relationship.

Eventually, he left her and their four children to be with other women and the relationship came to an end. Stacey continued to blame herself for her power deficit and says, "I was anxious, extremely fretful and panicky." In addition, her feelings of depression, as a result of her felt status deficit, increased because she bore the burden for herself and her children. She explains, "I was hurting for five people. I internalized all the pain." Without him to direct her behavior she also experienced anomie. She says, "I kept the lights on for 2 ½ years because I thought he was coming home. I could not live a minute without him. I felt like I lost all myself."

Given her desolate situation of having to raise four children on her own, she was forced to get a teaching job. In reflection, Stacy recognizes this step as the beginning of the change within her personality. She says, "I would take a teaching job and now I realize that was a huge part of my recovery." Upon self-examination she experienced feelings of guilt for allowing him to exercise power over her. She says, "I think to myself, I allowed this to happen to me and did this to myself. I mean what kind of person would allow this to happen to them?" Stacey began doing things for herself and recognizes her survival of this unfavorable situation as an inspiration for her to find her true self. She says, "The survival is part of my self confidence now. I found myself again without much help from friends or family." Given her change in personality from one of compliant wife to assertive and confident mother and woman, she can best be described as moving from a personality with a diffusion type identity to one with a moratorium type identity.

In effect, in the case of Stacey, the initial power balance leaned in her direction. However, as he became more successful (with her help) she was forced to adopt a

subordinate position within the relationship. Her power and status levels were reduced and she was continually denigrated. She complied with his demands and began to lack inner directedness – diffusion type identity. She blamed herself for her deficit of both status and power and her identity was assaulted. She experienced anxiety and depression. Without her partner present to direct her behavior and define her identity she also experienced feelings of anomie. After she reflected upon the situation she felt guilt for allowing him to exercise power over her and she began to develop a true identity – moratorium type identity.

5. PAM

Pam, a white female, who does not go to church, has a grade twelve plus education and is a manager of a liquor store. She was a single mom, with a child from a previous marriage, when she met her partner, a customer, at work. The sexual relationship began very quickly and they were married after six months. She identifies with the relationship by saying, "I latched onto him and thought I was all of the sudden very important. I was in awe."

From the start of the relationship, the balance of power was skewed towards her partner. Nonetheless, initially, given his demands for her attention, Pam felt that she was needed. She says, "He was very demanding and over-powering and I felt very honored and put on a pedestal that someone that had a good job and who was well off was actually interested in me." However, his domination soon became excessive and he started aggressively to control her behavior. She explains, "He would phone me in the morning to see what I was doing, he would phone me at work. I can see now that he wanted to know where I was going or who I was with." His use of power was so extensive that he

eventually defined all aspects of reality within the relationship. She says, "You get into this circle where the abuser is your life and he takes over your whole way of thinking, my world became his world." If she did not abide by his rules she was punished. "He would slap me across the face or grab me and throw me against a door."

As his authority increased, he also began to demand from her deference. He became obsessive about sex and demanded that she satisfy him everyday. She explains, "Before he left for work every morning I had to perform some sort of sexual act for him." He demanded her time and became jealous if she paid attention to other individuals. If she would focus on her daughter she says "He would say 'put her to bed, get rid of her [my daughter] so we could be alone'. He demanded my attention." To ensure that she focused her attention on him, he demanded that she dress a certain way and would denigrate her and accuse her of being a slut if he did not approve of her apparel. She says, "If my skirt was a little too short or too tight, if I wore earrings I looked like an old whore. If my buttons were open too far he would ask who I was making myself open too."

To prevent her from leaving the relationship he restricted her access to alternative sources of rewards. He became her only reference available to confirm the normalcy of the relationship and her status position. She says, "I always had to look for his approval, he always used very sly and subtle ways to rip me apart from my family." Consequently, because he blamed her and she internalized this and felt anxious. "I was walking on eggshells." Given his massive reduction of her status during the relationship she also experienced low self-esteem. "I was feeling very, very low at that point in my life." Pam

can best be described as a personality with a diffusion type identity, in that she accepts a high degree of external control and is compliant.

However, her father's death provided the first glimmer of a re-awakening for Pam, as she realized that life was too short for her to remain in such an unsatisfactory situation. After her partner went to work one morning, she took her children and went to a women's shelter, thus ending the relationship. Although she was able to leave, having internalized his blaming of her, she experienced a great deal of guilt. She explains, "I drove out of town with the thought that the whole world was looking at my van. It was awful." As well, after fracture, she continued to feel anxiety for her power deficit and depression for her status deficit. "I was nervous and always in anguish." Without her partner present to direct her behavior, she also experienced anomie. She says, "I did not know what I wanted or where I wanted to be. I was lost, always questioning myself." Given these overwhelming emotions, she attributes her strength in being able to leave the relationship to the counselors at the women's shelter. "The shelter, they are the ones that kept me stable and kept me from going back."

After having left the shelter, she continued to obtain support from her sister. The encouragement she received from the latter finally made her re-examine her situation. She says, "My sister finally said 'will the real Pam please stand up.' " Upon this reflection she re-focused her blame away from herself and on to him and experienced anger. She explains, "You hate him for everything: for the way he treated you and for the way he treated your children." She then went through a process of re-establishing her true identity. She says, "it is not big things but little things, like doing the laundry at midnight if I want, starting to work on crafts, sitting and having a cup of tea on my deck,

it is the little changes that gave me freedom and helped me gain my life back. I moved from victim to survivor" [diffusion type identity to moratorium type identity].

In summary, the initial power balance leaned towards her partner and increased in his favor. As a result, she not only experienced a power, but also a status deficit. She was degraded and her self-esteem was reduced. She became compliant and a personality with a diffusion type identity. Because she had internalized his blame of her, she experienced anxiety and depression for both her power and status deficits, during and after the fracture of the relationship. She also experienced the emotions of guilt and anomie. Through her self-examination after fracture, she placed the blame appropriately on him and felt anger. This anger motivated her to re-establish a true identity – moratorium type identity.

6. JILL

Jill is a white female who does not attend church and has a grade twelve education. She met her partner when she was fifteen years old at a restaurant where she worked. They started dating and were married when she was eighteen. She identifies with the relationship by saying, "I think the relationship was an important part of who I was because when he left one summer to go to work [before they were married] I remember I felt such an emptiness. It was like a part of me was missing."

From the start of the relationship, Jill was subordinate within the union. Her partner's view of reality was predominant and included his strong beliefs about a woman's role and position within a marriage. She says, "I wanted to get a nursing degree, but my husband had a thing about hospitals, that I would always be bringing home some disease, and the old story that my husband didn't want his wife to work."

Throughout the marriage he used his patriarchal views of the woman's role to control her behavior. She adds, "I said we are going to stay at a friends for supper and he said, 'no we are not going to stay for supper'. He said, 'we will have supper at home', so we went home and he told me to 'get busy and peel the potatoes and get that supper ready because women are supposed to stay at home.' "

If she did not submit to his control he would either "not talk to her, or become very angry and emotionally abusive." She says, "The emotional abuse was the worst." However, he did also physically abuse her. When she did not submit to his authority and defied him in front of another couple by saying that they would stay for supper when she had not gotten his permission, he assaulted her when they returned home. She says, "I was five months pregnant and with a closed fist he punched me in the stomach." He blamed her for this excessive use of use of power. She expressed that "He makes me feel like I wrecked his life."

Given her partner's patriarchal ideologies, he also demanded deference from her. He expected her to cook, clean the house and give her undivided attention to him. If she did pay attention to another man he would become "very angry and jealous." Although she was compliant ["I have always done what he approved of"], he blamed her for not satisfying his needs. If she went out he would make her feel guilty because she had left him. As well, he reduced her status by constantly complaining about her cooking. She says, "I had made him supper, but we always fought about that because it was always too cold or burnt or tasteless or it was always something with the food." When she went grocery shopping he accused her of buying something that he did not like. She explains,

"If I bought a different brand he would say I should have looked harder, and if I bought nothing he would say why didn't you at least buy something else."

To prevent her from leaving the relationship, her partner denied her access to alternative sources of rewards. She says, "He did not like it if friends came over and he would drop hints and tell my family that they should really not be coming over at this time". In addition, although she was the breadwinner [She says, "I am the breadwinner"], he convinced her that she was dependent on him. "I thought I was dependent on him because he paid the bills and took care of all the financial things [with her money]. He looked after the car. Any repairs or anything that was broken, he made all the decisions, even grocery shopping."

Given her power and status deficit and his blame of her, she experienced feelings of depression and anxiety during the relationship. "He made me emotionally unstable. I was sad and I could never sleep because I was nervous." She also feared his retaliation and did not feel that she could express herself honestly. "I couldn't be myself because I knew he would be angry." Jill can best be described as a personality with a diffusion type identity, in that she accepts a high degree of external control and lacks inner directedness.

During an incident of his domineering, she was able to contact the police. Upon the arrival of outside authorities, he was arrested and she was brought to a woman's shelter, thus ending the relationship. After the fracture of the relationship, she continued to blame herself for her power deficit and experienced anxiety. "I would feel myself getting really uptight. I am very insecure." His success in ensuring that she internalized the blame for both her status and power deficits caused her to continue to feel guilt after

fracture. She says, "I worry about him all the time and I sometimes wonder if I did the right thing." As well with him no longer there to direct her behavior, she also experienced anomie. "When someone asks what I want in my life, I can not tell you because I have never really thought about it. I was his wife and that's how it went. I lost part of myself. Still I feel like I have a big hole."

Eventually through self-examination Jill began to fill the void in her life and to establish a true identity. She explains, "I go out. I go to my families a lot. I can visit them now. I have friends over and I go out for coffee or for supper and I spend a lot of time at the library. He never liked me reading before." As she regained her confidence, she moved from a personality with a diffusion type identity, to one with a moratorium type identity.

In effect, in the case of Jill, the initial power balance began with and further progressed towards her partner. Both in influence and importance in the dyad she continued to be the lesser partner. She blamed herself for this and experienced depression and anxiety. Given her compliance and acceptance of external control she can be described as a diffusion type identity. After the fracture of the relationship, she continued to feel anxious, depressed, guilty and experienced anomie. After she reflected upon the relationship she began doing things for herself. She continues to work on developing a true identity – moratorium type identity.

7. JOANNE

Joanne, is a white female who does not follow any religion, has a grade twelve education and works as a secretary. She met her partner at her place of work and their sexual relationship began immediately. When they met she was already involved in a

relationship with another man, which she describes as being "unhealthy." However, she remained in that relationship and dated both men for some time. She says, "I was living with the other person. That lasted for six months to a year, dating both of them." She identifies with the relationship with her latest partner by saying, "It became more serious when I moved out [of her first partner's place]." She and her second partner were eventually married and had two children.

Although it would appear that the balance of power was skewed in her direction when they began dating (given the fact that she was dating two men), she describes this power dynamic as shifting in her partner's direction very quickly. She explains. "I always had to watch who I was talking to. I was always under his eye." As well, "He would question my phone calls, question who I was calling and who I was with." He expected her to respect his authority and follow his rules, which did not, however, apply to himself. She says, "He would be with other people. I could never get a hold of him, but he would get possessive, controlling and jealous of me." Although she was working, her partner also controlled the finances. She says, "He played head games. He would move bank accounts and sign my name without me knowing it." If she did not comply he "could be more aggressive."

Not only did he control her behavior, but he also demanded deference from her while simultaneously belittling her. She says, "I was just there to look after the kids, just a possession. He thinks of me as a trophy for him and I should keep my mouth shut." Joanne did have a certain amount of status, given the fact that she was attending university. However, her partner constantly attempted to sabotage her university career. She explains that he would often begin a confrontation when she needed to be studying.

She says, "Each incident happens during an exam or when I have a big paper due. He tries to sabotage school." In addition, he continually disparages people who are educated and makes her feel guilty for not having a job. She explains, "He makes jabs about educated people and says that because I don't have a job, I don't contribute to the family."

Near the end of their relationship, Joanne discovered that she was part Aboriginal and became interested in studying her heritage. However, she says that her partner felt threatened by her new focus and used it against her as well. She explains, "He is controlling me as a person because he feels threatened by my new interest. There is a lot of racism and discrimination. He uses it against me." His belittlement of her assaulted her identity. "I am not as out going and I am not as confident in meeting new people, so I spend a lot of time by myself."

She blamed herself for both her lack of influence and reduced status and thus experienced low self-esteem and anxiety. "It was like an emotional roller coaster. I was sad and nervous." Though she resists him in the matter of her going to University and searching for her Aboriginal routes (thus not being completely compliant), all things considered, she can best be described as a personality with a diffusion type identity in that, during the relationship, she most often was compliant and accepted his external control.

However, during one of his domineering performances, she became scared and called the police. At this point, Joanne ended the relationship. After the fracture of the relationship she continued to feel anxiety and depression. She explains, "It is hard. I am anxious. I am almost forty and I am just now working on a professional future. I am

working on getting things back on track and starting everything over." As well, without

her partner present to direct her behavior, she expressed feelings of anomie. "What is

going to happen? I am tired of not knowing what is going to happen."

Nevertheless, with the help of her "counselor at school and some friends," she

began to reflect upon her relationship. She states, "I am Aboriginal and I want to learn

more about that. I am finding my cultural identity. I have more direction and feel more

determined." In finding her new identity, Joanne has compartmentalized an important

part of her life as her focus; her children. "I use my children to stay focused." She

continues to be transformed, from having a diffusion type identity, to having a

personality with a moratorium type identity.

In summary, in the case of Joanne, although the initial balance of power began in

her favor, it changed and progressed in her partner's direction. She lacked influence and

was belittled, thus assaulting her identity. She blamed herself for her loss and

experienced anxiety and depression. As well, she became compliant and a personality

with a diffusion type identity. After the fracture of the relationship, she continued to

experience depression, anxiety, as well as anomie. However, with the influence of

"alternative audiences" she was able to re-examine herself and become a personality with

a moratorium type identity.

8. SUE

Sue, a white Protestant, met her partner in high school when she was seventeen

years old. Their sexual relationship began on the first date. After she graduated from

high school she became an executive director of a grain company and at that time,

married her partner and they had two children together. She identified with the

relationship by saying, "I am a very trusting person and when I make a commitment I stick to it."

From the beginning of the relationship the power balance leaned towards her partner. He controlled her behavior, the finances and the sexual relationship. She explains, "He always knew what I was up to. He always knew who I was with or where I was." In regard to the finances, she says, "He always wanted to know how much money I had in the account and would try and keep track of my money. He would just buy things on his credit and then make me responsible for it. He told me what to do with the money. Sexually he was controlling too." If she resisted him he became angry. For example, she describes, "There was no love making. He would come home and screw me. He would do this in a controlling and powerful way and I had no choice in the matter. I would say don't touch me or come near me and he would never listen."

Not only did he expect her to respect his authority but he also demanded her attention and expected her to show him deference. She says, "Somebody would ask me to dance and then he would beat him up. He was very jealous and controlling in that way." His jealousy extended to her friends as well. She explains, "He wanted me there with him, not with my friends." If she did not comply with his demands she would once again experience the consequences of his retaliation. She says, "He came home and started to slap me around and I had bruises on my face, legs and arms and he was calling me a whore and a slut." Throughout the relationship Sue was continually denigrated. She adds, "He never once complimented me on what I wore, what I looked like when I got my hair done, never once not even on our wedding day. He always wanted praise for himself."

In spite of his obsessive attempts at controlling her, she nevertheless registered for University courses, which she said "put him over the edge." Feeling threatened by her interests outside of the relationship, her partner attempted to belittle her further and sabotage her university career. He would accuse her of being "self centered." She says he often told me that "I was going to university only for my benefit and I was having nothing to do with him or the family." As well, she says, "He would always try and screw it up for me. Even the night before I was writing exams he would start to rip down walls in the house. He would make it noisy so that I could not sleep at night. He would work until four or five in the morning."

As a result, during the relationship Sue was pressured to put her partner's needs ahead of her own. She says, "As soon as he would walk in the door everything stopped now and we had to make sure that we would not get him upset. If he was working late we would never eat before him, our lives were based around him." Without the strength to resist her partner's demands anymore she became compliant – a personality with a diffusion type identity. "I had to make sure everything centered around him."

As a result of her lack of influence and feeling of unimportance, her identity was assaulted. "I never felt free to ever be myself." Consequently, she experienced low self-esteem and became "anorexic." As well she felt responsible for her deficiency and also expressed feelings of anxiety. "I was nervous."

The incident, which led to the fracture of the relationship, was when Sue broke her leg during an accident. Her partner did not support her and instead she explains "He thought it was funny when I broke my leg." His perpetual lack of caring and compassion made her realize that "this [the relationship] was not going to work." Given this

conclusion, she began a process of rebuilding. She says, "I started to build myself up so I could do this" [leave the relationship]. She began to focus on her job and her children. "I do a good job and that is where I get my personal strength from." As well, she describes her kids as being "number one" and expresses "That is how I had to see myself, as their provider." This new self-image (moratorium type identity) started to provide her with a new strength and she was able to end the relationship. She describes her true identity as something that "was always there but was put on hold because I had this guy in the household and he was trying to change my personality."

After the fracture of the relationship she continued to experience anxiety. "I was anxious about the organization of my life." She also expressed feeling anomie and was confused as to "how to go about doing things." However, she no longer felt depressed and instead says, "When I left it was a huge relief. I put aside thinking about him and his needs and thought about the kids and myself."

In summary, in the case of Sue, the initial power balance began with and progressed towards her partner. Her lack of influence and feelings of unimportance became assaults upon her identity and thus reduced her self-esteem. Unable to resist her partner's demands she became compliant and a personality with a diffusion type identity. As well, she felt responsible for her deficits and expressed feelings of sadness and anxiety. However, by gaining strength by focusing on work and her children she was able to end the relationship and establish a new identity. Although she did continue to experience anxiety and some feelings of anomie after fracture, she did not feel depressed, but instead relieved that the relationship was over.

9. KARA

Kara is a white female who is in her late twenties and has a degree in both English and Law. She is an Anglican but participates in sweat lodges and smudging. A mutual friend introduced her to her partner and their sexual relationship began three months later. At that time they began living together but were never married. She identifies with the relationship by saying, "Yes, I was defined by the relationship but I did have an affair, actually two."

Initially the balance of power was skewed in her direction. She explains, "I was more out going. He was quiet and only socialized with a few people and he usually did what I wanted to do. I was more dominant." Kara admits that she did have two affairs as she felt something was missing in this relationship. However, she did not end the relationship because she was "too wrapped up in it" and "wanted to make it work." Justifiably so, her partner began to feel unimportant. He attempted to increase his importance and by reacting towards her in ways that would bring him more effectiveness. She describes him as becoming "jealous and envious." He began monopolizing conversation, dominating the sexual relationship and showing anger and violence when she did not comply, so she began to be compliant. She says, "I would back off and not talk." In regard to their sexual relationship she explains, "I didn't want to have sex but ... he would roll me over and I would just wait till he was done. A couple of times he got physical and was throwing things around."

In regard to this last behavior on his part she felt that he was explicitly attempting to bolster his own ego by putting hers down to the extent that on some occasions she was driven to tears at which he would benignly comfort her as if she was a child. She says,

"He would knock me down until I cried and then he would come and comfort me like he had accomplished what he wanted to." This belittling of her inevitably had an effect upon her self-image. "I had no self-esteem. He made me feel worthless."

This low self-esteem on her part was further diminished by the fact that he introduced in her a feeling of guilt. She explains, "He would say that I wasted his life and he had given so much." In addition, because of the control in their relationship which she obviously lost as a result of the developments in his reactions to being an underdog – become – tyrant, she became anxious and depressed. She says, "It drained my energy [the verbal and physical abuse] and I was a nervous wreck. I was depressed." Unable to resist him any longer, she became compliant and a personality with a diffusion type identity. "I feel like there has been a huge drain on me. I am not the same person I was."

Given her low self-esteem, some of her friends suggested that she see a counselor. The relationship ended when the counselor indicated to both her and her partner that they should temporarily separate. This hiatus in their relationship became a permanent break up. She never went back. After the fracture of the relationship, Kara continued to experience low self-esteem. She explains, "All I could concentrate on was sleeping and trying to eat healthy." As well, having become accustomed to the dictates of her partner she experienced anomie when he was no longer present to direct her behavior and shape her identity. She says, "I no longer had a sense of self. I didn't know what my goals were or what I liked." However, given her new found freedom, away from her partner, she slowly began to establish a new identity – moratorium type identity. "I am now

working on finding myself. I am able to work on that now. I finally have the freedom to do that now."

In effect, in the case of Kara, the initial balance of power was in her favor. However as her partner began to experience a status deficit he attempted to exercise power over her in order to achieve from her, greater rewards. The reduction of both her power and status assaulted her identity and she experienced low self-esteem. Unable to regain her confidence she became compliant and a personality with a diffusion type identity. She felt responsible for having lost her power and status and experienced anxiety and depression. After the fracture of the relationship she continued to experience anxiety, depression, guilt and anomie. Nevertheless, she was able to become, from a personality with a diffusion type identity, to one of a moratorium type and continues to search for her real self.

10. REBECCA

Rebecca is a white female, who considers herself to be half Catholic and half Lutheran. At the start of the relationship, she was sixteen years old and in high school. She was introduced to her partner through a mutual friend and they dated for three years and were then engaged, after she had completed high school. However, they were never married. Their sexual relationship began two years into the union and she identified with the relationship by saying, "It got more serious right around the two year mark when the intimacy started. Then it became a bigger part of who I was."

The initial power balance in the relationship leaned towards her partner. However, his dominance increased due to his jealousy of her and his insecurity regarding her affections. Although his feelings of insecurity were unfounded, she says, "My loyalty to

him, it was pretty much a jealousy issue." She explains, "If I would walk into a restaurant, if the guys at another table would smile at me he would say that I was checking them out and that I was embarrassing him." In effect, he attempted to instill in her feelings of guilt for her indifferent behavior (as he saw it).

To counter his lack of confidence he further attempted to become more influential. He controlled what she wore, who she saw and even reduced her to a child when they went out. "If anything was too skimpy, low cut or high cut or too tight he would tell me what not to wear." As well, she says, "He tried to control who my friends were. If he did not like a friend, I was not to see her, and if I did he would be very mad." He reinforced his demands by, as she says, "checking up on me." In regard to his belittlement of her, she says, "Whenever we would go out he would order for me even if I did not want to eat that." As well, she says that he often insulted her by calling her a "bitch" or a "slut."

Initially, she resisted his demands and ignored his insults. She explains, "I was somewhat rebellious, so my self-esteem was still somewhat intact. He belittled me, but I did not take it to heart. I never thought of myself as being what he thought I was and I would sometimes still wear what I wanted to. I was trying to get a little bit of control back." However, her defiance was met with his physical retaliation. She says, "The first time it was a slap, and the second time he gave me a bloody nose."

Unfortunately, his persistent derogation of her and influence over her assaulted her identity. She says, "Before we met I was lively, fun, outgoing, and after we had been dating for quite awhile I became very quiet and self-conscious." Given these circumstances she began to show some signs of compliance – diffusion type identity. She says, "I lost the energy to fight in the relationship and I got tired and gave in."

However, when her partner began to work out of town she was able to seek out "alternative audiences" and gain a new view of a "normal relationship." She says, "When he started working construction out of the province I had a little more freedom and I would start hanging out with my friends and saw how their relationships were going and I started to ask questions." While her partner was out of town she had sent one of her friends (who also lived out of town) an engagement picture. Rebecca explains, "She [her friend] called me back and said that the guy in the photo was dating her friend." Having learnt of his unfaithfulness and given her newly found confidence she was able to end the relationship. Unfortunately, when she took this final stand her partner made one last attempt to influence her and she says, "pushed me down the stairs." She suffered a sprained ankle and bruises. This final incident ended the relationship.

After the fracture of the relationship, she internalized his blame of her and felt responsible for her lack of influence and reduced level of status. She experienced anxiety and depression and says, "I felt a little anxious and sadness." As well, although she recognized that she was better off without him she did experience some feelings of anomie. She explains, "I figured it was better than what my future would have been with him but I had my doubts. I did feel lost, not aware of my surroundings, in a daze." Upon reflection she reassigned the blame onto her partner and experienced "anger." As well, she started to get in touch with her real self – moratorium type identity. She explains, "I think I still knew deep down inside who I was, but now I am my old self. After he was gone I got control of my life again. I learned to think for myself and do for myself and that built my confidence a lot."

In effect, although Rebecca was resistant, the initial balance of power was biased and progressed towards her partner. Eventually, given her lack of influence and diminished importance within the relationship she experienced defeat and became compliant – diffusion type identity. However, her taste of freedom, while her partner was out of town, provided the incentive to end the relationship, (unfortunately not without consequences) when she discovered he had been unfaithful. After fracture, she felt responsible for her own power and status losses and experienced anxiety and depression. However, upon reflection she blamed him and became angry and motivated to re-establish her true identity – moratorium type identity.

11. JUDY

Judy is a white female who does not follow any particular religion and has a grade twelve education. She was previously married and met her most recent partner through a group of friends, after her divorce. Their sexual relationship began three months after their first date, at which time they moved in together. While they were living together she became pregnant and they were then married one year after their son was born. She identifies with the relationship by saying, "It was number one."

From the start of the relationship the power balance was fairly equal. However, this power balance began to shift in her partner's direction when she decided to go back to college for one year to become a dietary supervisor. Her partner started to feel unimportant and began vocalizing his concerns. She says, "I was no longer able to do everything. I wasn't washing out the fridge or doing the landscaping and he was very vocal about that."

To compensate for his feelings of neglect he began to act in ways in which he would have greater influence over her. She explains, "He would always ask 'where were you, what were you doing?' There was always some kind of fight." As well, he controlled the finances even though she was working. She says, "He was very controlling with the money." To reinforce his dominance she describes him as telling her "you belong to me." If she did not comply with his demands there would be "some kind of verbal confrontation." In some situations, she says, "He would push me around."

In addition, to his increasing control over her, her partner also began to belittle her. She says, "he would call me a whore, bitch or lazy." As well, he attempted to instill in her feelings of guilt. She explains, "He said that my job stressed him out." In order to avoid any confrontation Judy became compliant – a diffusion type personality. She says, "I realized the control was trying not to fight and I realized that I acted the way I did a lot so I would not get into a fight with him."

Her lack of influence and his degradation of her assaulted her identity. She says, "It is like a piece of armor, and as things become more and more controlling a piece of armor falls off and you are left vulnerable, small pieces fall off one by one until there is no armor left." Because of his blame of her, she felt responsible for her loss of influence and importance and experienced depression and anxiety. She explains, "There was a lot of depression and I was nervous."

Given his domination and demands, and the resulting consequences for her identity she says, "I almost quit school." However she was able to persevere and as a result secured a new job, which she felt "empowered" her. During one incident of his domineering, she explains, "He threw me and my belongings out the front door in

winter." This incident was the final circumstance that ended the relationship. She says "I was aware of this kind of behavior [abusive] from the courses [on family violence] I had taken at work and I knew something was wrong, I gained confidence from my job."

After the fracture of the relationship, she continued to blame herself and experienced feelings of guilt. She says, "I felt too guilty to press charges." Given the fact that she continued to feel responsible for her lack of influence and reduced status she felt depressed and anxious. "I was nervous and in a state of depression." As well, without her partner present to direct her behavior she expressed feelings of anomie. "I lost part of myself. I felt empty, like a shell of a person. I was just going through the motions." However, with the support she gained from her job and she says, "Later my family," she was able to re-establish a new moratorium type identity. She says, "I have to tell myself to watch when people try and control me and then change that, it is like re-training myself. I do more self care and personal things that I have not done in a long time."

In summary, in the case of Judy, the initial power balance was equal. However, when she began to focus on herself by going back to school her partner began to feel neglected and attempted to gain greater influence over her. Consequently, she experienced both a power and status deficit and her identity was assaulted. Given her feelings of low self-esteem she attempted to avoid confrontation with her partner through her compliance – diffusion type identity. Both during and after the fracture of the relationship she felt responsible for her deficits and experienced guilt, anxiety and depression. Without her partner present to direct her behavior she also experienced

anomie after fracture. Nevertheless with the support of her co-workers and family she

was able to re-establish a true identity – moratorium type identity.

VI. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The storylines above are analyzed and tabulated for the data relevant to the focus

of the study including specifically, initial commitment to the dyad, nature of the power

balance at the outset of the relationship, changes and direction of the power balance, the

effect of these changes on the respective identities of the respondents, and finally the

emotions experienced by them after fracture. These details are tabulated in table 1 and 2.

In addition to findings from the data reported in tables 1 and 2, the findings below will

also include additional emergent relationships gleaned from observations and personal

perceptions of the author during the interviews.

A. Table 1

Commitment, Power and Personality

In Table 1 that there is an inverse relationship between initial commitment

and the initial power balance. Namely, when commitment is high I expect the male to

refrain from inordinate shows of power. Conversely, if his personal commitment was

low I would expect him to exert high power. As I look down the table and compare the

first two columns, I find this assumption to be true with the exception of Bill. He is a

unique case because he has a low personal commitment and low initial power. This is

due, however, to his circumstances of having been injured when he first met his partner.

As his health improved, so too did his level of power within the relationship.

In column 3 it is noted that in 7 of the cases the balance of power increased in the

direction of the male partners. In the other 4 cases there were fluctuations, which were

Name	1 Initial Commitment	2 Initial Power Balance	3 Change in Power Balance	4 Identity type	5 Change in Identity	6 Emotions During Union	7 Emotions After Fracture
Sonny	Medium	Positive	Increase	Foreclosure	None	Anger	Anger/Guilt
							Rebellion
							Anomie
Phil	Low	Positive	Increase	Foreclosure	None	Anger	Anger
							Rebellion
Joe	Low	Positive	Fluctuation	Foreclosure	None	Anger	Increase
							Anger
							Rebellion
Doug	Low	Positive	Increase	Foreclosure	None	Anger	Anger
							Rebellion
							Anomie/small
Terry	Medium	Positive	Increase	Foreclosure	None	Anger	Anger
							Rebellion
							Anomie/small
Josh	Low	Positive	Increase	Foreclosure	None	Anger	Indifferent
Fred	High	Neutral	Fluctuation	Moratorium	None *	Anger	Anger
							Anomie
							Rebellion
Jake	High	Neutral	Fluctuation	Moratorium	None *	Anger	Rebellion
							Anomie
							Anger
Bill	Low	Negative	Increase	Moratorium	Foreclosure	Anger	Anger
							Rebellion
Gerald	High	Neutral	Fluctuation	Moratorium	None	Anger	Depression
							Guilt
							Anomie
							Shame
Rodney	High	Neutral	Increased	Moratorium	None	Anger	Depression
							Guilt
							Anomie
							Shame
Total	5 Low	8 Positive	7 Increase	6 Foreclosure	1 Change	11 Anger	8 Anger
	2 Medium	4 Neutral	4 Fluctuate	5 Moratorium			8 Rebellion
	4 High	1 Negative					7 Anomie
							3 Guilt
							2 Shame
							2 Depression

* From their stated resolutions about the future the classification here should be "wanna be" foreclosure types.

nevertheless, biased towards the men. This might be due to the patriarchal ethos being acted out in the relationships. French (1985:506) suggests, as a reason for this predominant power increase on the part of men, is that they find themselves upon a "linear progress" to ever more power – a goal that can never be satisfied. Furthermore, Janoff-Bulman and Frieze (1987) suggest that a drive for power is endemic in the male so much so that failing to achieve more and more is a cause for shame. These observations constitute an analysis of the data beyond an investigation of the hypotheses but are clearly relevant in that they concern power and the drive increasingly to unbalance it.

In column 4, 6 of the 11 men had personalities with foreclosure type identities. The remaining 5 had personalities with moratorium type identities. The last 5 occupied either a negative or neutral initial power position and, given the patriarchal society, experimented with gaining more power during the relationship. It is important to note that, in column 5, Bill was able to transform himself from a personality with a moratorium type to one with a foreclosure type. Also, both Fred and Jake, started with personalities with moratorium type identities, and resolved through their use of coercion to become more powerful identities, foreclosure types. Even after fracture, they vowed to occupy a more dominant, inflexible position in their next relationships.

Anger

The emotion of anger is a universal characteristic in all male partners even from pre fracture. After the fracture of the relationship 8 of the 11 men continued to express anger. In each of the cases, these men experienced the loss of power and blamed another for their deficit, and thus, as Kemper (1978) would lead us to expect, experienced anger. Further to Kemper's (1978) structural explanation of anger resulting from a power deficit

and finding someone to blame for it, Breakwell (1986) adds a more psychological explanation. He suggests that the person feels that his identity is challenged and challenges arouse negativism which may, as in this case, be expressed as anger. Yet another author (Kenney, 2000) reinforces the propensity of men to anger in the face of challenge when he discusses fathers' reaction to the murder of a child. He interprets this as the male's attempt to reinforce his identity as being one in control.

Though not found in the data shown in the columns of the table but clearly evident to the author in the degree of vehemence expressed by the respondents, there was clearly a variation in the intensity of anger. It was evident also that the highest intensity was expressed by those with foreclosure type identities. In effect, anger intensity is a function of identity type. Also observed by the author is that degree of self-confidence was also related to identity type in that, again, foreclosure types expressed the greatest amount of self-confidence (for example, when asked how confident they were in their ability to manage without their partners). Both foreclosure and moratorium types are optimistic. However, when opposition to their goals is encountered the more self-confidant the individual (in this case foreclosure types) the more frustrated they will be. Accordingly, foreclosure types should be expected to evince the higher anger intensity as I found, and Kemper (1978) suggested would be the case.

As can be seen in column 7, the 8 men who experienced anger also expressed feelings of rebellion against outside authority. Although the remaining 3 also lost power, they did not feel anger or rebellion. In the case of Josh, he did not consider the fracture of the relationship to pose any great threat to his domineering person and therefore he was indifferent. On the other hand, Gerald and Rodney were devastated by the break up

of their relationships, but did not experience anger, as they did not place the blame on their partners. As Kemper (1978) would lead us to expect, if they blamed themselves they would experience anxiety. Neither Gerald nor Rodney expressed feeling this emotion. An explanation for this may be that, unlike the situation of some of the women after fracture who were still threatened by violence from their ex-partners this was not the case for either Gerald or Rodney and thus, no reason for anxiety on that basis.

Anomie and Commitment

Questions (see questionnaire p.23 and 24) were asked which addressed both the intensity of commitment at the outset of the relationship (question #4) as well as the degree of anomie i.e. disorientation (questions #18 and #20). As can be seen in columns 1 and 7, 6 of the men expressed moderate to high commitment to the relationship. Of those 6, all expressed a high degree of anomie after fracture. This emergent positive relationship between commitment and anomie is explained by Durkheim (1964) thus: the more a couple is committed the more are the bonds that bind them which, when broken, leaves the individual unbound, without direction and disoriented. Of the 5 who expressed little or no initial commitment to the relationship only one admitted to a modicum of anomie. The other 4 men expressed not experiencing any anomie at all. Though not noted in the summary data in the Tables, these 4 respondents made clear in the interview that they were indifferent to things past. Although they were angry and fixed blame, none were particularly reflective or haunted by their own behavior in the relationship. In effect, if one does not feel anomic, one tends not to reflect. Perhaps it is what one should expect in that if an individual is anomic (lost, disoriented) one will certainly try to

diagnose these feelings in oneself via reflection. These 4 men neither reflected nor felt any guilt.

Guilt

Of the 7 who reflected on their behavior (Sonny, Doug, Terry, Fred, Jake, Gerald and Rodney), 2 of them (Doug and Terry) admit to brief periodic pricks of conscience but hardly enough to be called guilt. In fact they deny any such feeling. It must be noted, from the storylines, that all of these men in fact during the relationship exercised excessive power (punching, slapping, throwing) which Kemper (1978) would lead us to expect that they would experience guilt. So I have here as far as this small sample would suggest a deviation from Kemper's theory.

Three of the 7 who reflected on their behavior admit to experiencing guilt. An explanation for the difference in feelings of guilt among the seven who reflected on their behavior is that: between the 4 who did not experience guilt and the three who did is seen from the story lines. Sonny, after the fracture of his relationship, went to live with his sister, a single parent, in the role of family head and protector of her and her family and there, because his fondness of her and the strength of their family ties brought about a conversion in him so that he realized the enormity of his violence to his ex partner, and so experienced guilt. In the case of Gerald and Rodney both expressed themselves as men who highly valued family life and respected the role of motherhood and the importance of harmony in a family. To have breached these values which they claimed to hold so strongly to the extent they did, caused them guilt.

Anger and Depression

As mentioned previously 8 of the 11 men continued to experience anger even after fracture. Not only were they angry as a result of their loss of power, but they also blamed their partners for their status deficit, thus adding to their anger. The 3 who did not express anger after fracture (Rodney, Gerald and Josh) can be explained for the following reason: Josh did not experience anger because the fracture of the relationship did not greatly affect his power or status. Of the 7 who reflected on their behavior, 2 (Rodney and Gerald) admitted that they blamed themselves for their loss of status and, as Kemper (1978) would predict, expressed feelings of depression. Also in this group of those who reflected, one of them, Jake, seems to have been depressed, in that he admits explicitly feelings of depression. Nevertheless, in this last case, these feelings were quickly denied and replaced by anger.

Gerald and Rodney, in addition to expressing guilt and depression, also expressed shame in that their statuses, on reflection, were seen and admitted to being excessive – undeserved. It is also to be seen from the storylines that where Gerald and Rodney state, "I knew there was a problem. I was ashamed" (Rodney) and "I didn't like it (the anger), it wasn't me" (Gerald), that they are expressing an admission of failure to achieve their original good intentions and their true selves. As Kemper (1978) hypothesizes, in such cases, shame is the consequent emotion. In two other cases, that of Doug and Fred, they seem to have had occasional blushes of shame. However, they promptly hid and denied these feelings.

Clearly, this group of 11 men is abnormally violent, unfeeling and unloving. Moreover, even after fracture of their relationships, they remained unchanged. The only

two exceptions are Rodney and Gerald. It is interesting to note that these two men are the

only ones (besides Josh, who is indifferent) who did not express anger after the fracture

of the relationship and also blamed themselves. These two facts are in accordance with

Sullivan's (1977) insight that the emotion of anger is so consuming that it blocks out all

thoughts of self-accusation. It does seem as if there is some hope for these last two in

that they propose to have more democratic and egalitarian relationships in the future.

This is a useful observation for workers in counseling and rehabilitation who, if they

stress this linkage between anger and honest self blame (cognitive-behavioral approach)

to their clients, might be able to produce in them more humane types. This

transformation could be even more effective if counselors used it in conjunction with the

approach used predominantly by feminists, which stresses accountability. The final

outcome would be a worthy contribution to a better society.

B. Table 2

In regard to the women, with the exception of 2 (Joanne and Kara) all 9 entered

into the relationship with a high commitment to it. In the cases of Joanne and Kara the

commitment was less in that they both had another lover at least for a time. In regard to

the initial power balance, again as in the case of the men it is observed that there is an

inverse correlation between initial commitment and initial power balance. This is

supported by Waller's (1938) principle of Least Interest, in that where one's emotional

stake in a relationship is high, i.e. initial commitment, one's exercise of power is likely to

be low and conversely (as I saw in the case of the men). The one exception to this

postulation is Stacey, who was highly committed but also had a high degree of initial

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name	Initial Commitment	Initial Power Balance	Change in Power Balance	Identity type	Change in Identity	Emotions During	Emotions After Fracture
Debbie	High	Negative	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
						Fear	Guilt
							Anomie
Jen	High	Negative	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
						Fear	Guilt
							Anomie
Donna	High	Negative	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Guilt
						Fear	Depression
							Anomie
							Anger
Stacey	High	Positive	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
							Anomie
							Guilt
Pam	High	Negative	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
						Fear	Guilt
							Anomie
							Anger
Jill	High	Negative	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
						Fear	Guilt
							Anomie
Joanne	Medium-High	Positive	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
							Anomie
Sue	High	Negative	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Relief
							Anomie
Kara	Low-High	Positive	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
							Guilt
							Anomie
Rebecca	High	Negative	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
							Anger
Judy	High	Neutral	Decrease	Diffusion	Moratorium	Anxiety	Anxiety
						Depression	Depression
							Guilt
							Anomie
Total	11 High	7 Negative	11 Decrease	11 Diffusion	11 Moratorium	11 Anxiety	11 Anxiety
		3 Positive				11 Depression	10 Depression
		1 Neutral				5 Fear	8 Guilt
							11 Anomie
							1 Relief
							3 Anger

power. Both her high education (M.E.) and secure financial position in relation to her partner's initially dismal situation sheds light on this anomaly. Given her devotion to her partner, however, she eventually sacrificed everything for him and thus her power was quickly reduced.

In column 3 it is noted that in all 11 cases, even where the initial balance of power was positive, power decreased for the women. This uniformity emphasizes, once again, the patriarchal ethos being acted out in the relationships.

Given their lack of control within the relationship, column 4 illustrates that all of the women had personalities with diffusion type identities. However, in column 5, it is noted that after the fracture of the relationship and away from their domineering partners, all eleven of the women transformed themselves from being personalities with diffusion type identities to ones with moratorium type identities.

Columns 6 and 7 address the focus of the thesis, the emotional responses during and after the fracture of the relationship. These responses and their relationship to other conditions in the situations discussed now follow.

Anxiety, Fear, Depression and Anger

In column 6, anxiety and depression are universal characteristics in all 11 women even pre fracture. The fact that their power decreased (column three) and that they blamed themselves for their deficit caused them feelings of anxiety, which provides support for Kemper's (1978) theory. In 6 cases (Debbie, Jen, Donna, Stacey, Pam and Jill) the women experienced an extreme power deficit, and five of them expressed feeling fear of retaliation from their partners for their "shortcomings." The exception, Stacey, experienced the same violence that the other women did, however, her lack of fear is

explainable by her perception that she "could not fear something she felt she deserved."

All of the women expressed feelings of depression as a result of having blamed

themselves for their loss of status during the relationship.

After the fracture of the relationship, the women, unable immediately to regain

power and status (which were further reduced given the loss of their position as wife),

continued to express feelings of anxiety and depression. Even in the three cases (Donna,

Pam and Rebecca) where the women were able to place some of the blame on their

partners and express anger towards them, they continued to feel anxious and depressed.

Again Kenny, (2000) suggests supporting data for our findings. He found that for women

experiencing the murder of a child, the predominant metaphors used by them to describe

their emotions are anxiety, fear and depression. However, according to the table there is

one exception, Sue. Although she did continue to experience anxiety, she did not feel

depressed after the relationship ended. In this case, however, Sue had begun to rebuild

her identity during the relationship and as a result, upon fracture, she did not suffer a

severe status loss but instead felt relieved that her partner could no longer continue to

degrade her.

All 11 women expressed themselves as feeling anomic after the break up. Eight of

them described their feelings of anomie as ones of disorientation and of being lost (lost

people). The other 3 described their feelings of anomie as feelings of disorganization and

inability to establish a routine (situationally disorganized).

The 8 "lost people" also expressed guilt. Four of the 8 (Debbie, Jen, Donna,

Stacey) felt guilt for not leaving a clearly impossible situation earlier. The other 4 (Pam,

Jill, Kara, Judy) expressed this emotion for ending the relationship and thus leaving in the

lurch a cruel but helpless partner. The 3 "situationally disorganized" (Joanne, Sue, Rebecca) did not express guilt after the fracture of the relationship at all. This is most probably due to the fact that they had alternative audiences who supported their egos. For the latter three, it was much easier, upon fracture, for them to find their true selves. The observations above regarding anomalies as well as consistencies that were not hypothesized will now be followed by a formal reporting of the specific hypotheses.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

A. Hypothesis 1

The findings, as tabulated in Table 1 and discussed, are that after fracture all the men except two experienced anger. This supports hypothesis 1. As well, the expectation that in some cases the men would also experience guilt and shame is supported in that three experienced guilt and two experienced shame. However, there is a widespread absence of guilt and shame, which might be explainable by the fact that their anger was so fierce as to damper their other emotions, consistent with Sullivan.

B. Hypothesis 2

All eleven women experienced anxiety and anomie as hypothesized. Ten of the eleven women experienced depression as hypothesized. The only hypothesized emotion not experienced by the women, except for three, is anger. Accordingly Hypothesis 2 is supported by three out of the four concerned findings. Clearly, too, Hochschild's (1979) aphorism that men and women live in different emotional worlds is certainly supported.

C. Hypothesis 3

An inspection of Tables 1 and 2 show clearly that men and women have different identity types and that there is no exception to this or over lapping of any kind. Also, our

expectation that the characteristic identity expected of women is the diffusion type is

supported by all participants. The expectation that men would have foreclosure types is

much less convincing in that six of the eleven show this type and five moratorium.

D. Hypothesis 4

Again for women, the expected result is supported in that all eleven had originally

diffusion type personalities, and every one of them later showed moratorium type. Also

in the case of men, the hypothesis is supported in ten out of the eleven cases.

Accordingly, our hypothesized expectations for the most part have been borne out with

very minor exceptions.

At this final phase in the study it is useful to cast a theoretical eye back on all that

has been said, focusing particularly upon the specific concepts enunciated in the first

section and the dramatic and tragic happenings related in the storylines. These concepts

will be brought within the compass of one specific paradigm. Such a procedure would

seem best achieved using C.W. Mill's (1959) linked concepts of "public issue" and

"personal trouble." The public issue here is patriarchy which it was agreed at the outset

to regard as still pervading Canadian society. The hallmark of patriarchy is power, its

distribution among actors and the consequent troubles to which unequally distributed

(which I have called unbalanced) power leads. The private troubles which are the

concern of this thesis are the distressful emotions (Kemper, 1978) experienced by the

respondents in the study resulting from the nature of their interaction during the

relationship and particularly after its fracture. This interaction involves the use of power,

the status it confers, the loss of both status and power and the reaction to these by men

and women respectively depending upon their identity types.

It has been shown that in the love dyads studied, the men occupied the higher power position at the outset. I have seen also, in regard to commitment, that women were the more committed to the relationship. I have demonstrated that commitment to the relationship was related not only to power but also to gender difference. The predominant lack of commitment on the part of men can possibly be a function of the fact that their world, the world of the breadwinner and protector – both canons of patriarchy – is the public issue. In turn, the higher commitment quality of women has been shown in many cases to lead to a self-victimization – a private trouble. If women recognize that their plight is widely shared in the world of patriarchy they may no longer blame themselves and, as I have seen, suffer the emotions of depression and anxiety. Also, where they are able to point the finger of blame at abusive partners they can resist them and end it.

VIII. PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

The practical applications of the results should be of use to counselors in the field. Hypothesis 1 indicates that when men experience a power or status deficit they often turn to anger. Hochschild's (1979) precepts concerning emotion work in anger management have been verified as being salutary. Not merely is the dampening down of anger necessary but also the helping of the subject to recognize it and even to cultivate other emotions such as genuine guilt and shame. If this happens it may produce an identity transformation and more responsible social behavior. As seen in hypothesis 3 not all the men had personalities with foreclosure type identities. However, even those with moratorium type identities experimented with becoming more dominant and sought more power. As a result, not only is it necessary to encourage anger management, but also to

present young men with social skills and goals which place value on things other than the all-encompassing struggle for more power.

Hypothesis 2 indicates for women that there are prevailing themes in society, such as romanticism and romantic love which, though attractive and even healthy in moderation, have dangerous complications and consequences if abused by insensitive partners. I have seen that the emotional consequences of this abuse are anxiety, depression and anomie, all of which are unhealthy. If women in general and particularly women in counseling can be made aware, by counselors in schools as well as in therapy sessions later in life, of the "red flags" such as the quality of inordinate jealousy in their partners – circumstances that lead inevitably to dependency and an over reliance on the partner, the trauma and pain described in so many of the story lines above could be avoided. As seen in hypothesis 4, after the fracture of the relationship, all the women began to re-build their identities and re-establish their true selves. This transformation can offer hope to women in similar situations. The fact that the hypotheses have demonstrated facts and relationships known for some time, and used by therapists in counseling, should reassure counselors that they are on the right track and even give them further useful insights.

<u>REFERENCES</u>

Athay and Darley (1982). Social Roles as Interaction Competencies. In Kidd 1982 <u>Personality, Roles and Social Behavior</u> (pp.57-77) New York: Springer-Verlag

Berzonsky, M. (1988). Self-Theorists, Identity Status, and Social Cognition. In Lapsley, Clark, 1988 <u>Self, Ego, and Identity: Integrative Approaches.</u> (pp. 243-262) NewYork: Springer-Verlag

Blumstein, P. (1997) The Production of Selves in Personal Relationships. In Kollock and O'Brien <u>The Production of Reality</u>. California: Pine Forge Press

Breakwell, G. (1986) <u>Coping with Threatened Identities</u>. New York: Methuen

Bernard, J. (1972) <u>The Future of Marriage</u>. New York: Bantom

Browne, A. (1987) <u>When Battered Women Kill</u>. New York: Free Press

Bulman-Frieze (1987) Gender Schemas and Individual's Self-Concepts. In Kenney, <u>Metaphors of Loss: Murder, Bereavement and Gendered Revelations About the Self</u>. (p.14) Dalhousie University

Cook et. Al. (1997) Power and Dependence in Exchange Networks: A Comment of Structural Measures of Power. In Szmatka et. al. <u>Status, Networks and Structure</u>. California: Stanford University Press

Davis, D. (1982) Determinants of Responsiveness in Dyadic Interaction. In Kidd <u>Personalities, Roles and Social Behavior</u>. (pp.85-124) New York: Springer-Verlag

Denzin, N. (19840 <u>Toward a Phenomenology of Domestic Family Violence</u>. University of Chicago

Dobash and Dobash (1979). <u>Violence Against Wives: A Case against Patriarchy</u>. New York: Free Press

Durkheim, E. (1964) <u>Suicide</u>. (Trans. John A. Sparkling and George Simpson.). New York:Free Press

Foote, N.N. (1986). "Identification as the basis for a theory of motivation." Stone et al. pp. 333-341. Reprinted from <u>American Sociological Review</u>. 1951, XVI, pp. 14-21

French, Marilyn (1985). <u>Beyond Power: On Women, Men and Morals</u>. New York: Summit Books.

Giddens, Anthony (1984). The Constitution of Society. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gillespie, C. (1989) Justifiable Homicide. Columbus: Ohio State University

Hochschild (1975) "Sociology of Feeling and Emotion: Selected Possibilities. In Reynolds 1993 Interactionism Exposition and Critique (pp. 280-307) (3rd ed.). New York: General Hall Inc.

Hochschild, A. (1979) "Emotion work, feeling rules, social structure". American Journal of Sociology 35, 551-573.

House, James, (1978) Social Structure and Personality. In Rosenberg, M. and Turner, R.H. Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives. New York: Basic Books

Kemper, T. (1978) Toward a Sociology of Emotion. American Sociologist. 13, 30-41. St. John's University

Kemper, T. (1978) A Social Interactional theory of Emotions. New York: John Wiley and Sons

Kemper, T. (1990) Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions. New York: State University of New York Press

Kenney, J.S. (2000) Metaphors of Loss: Murder, Bereavement and Gendered Revelations About the Self. Dalhousie University

Lempert, Lora (1995) The Line in the Sand: Definitional Dialogues in Abusive Relationships. In Studies in Symbolic Interaction. 18, 171-195. JAI Press Inc.

Lofland J. and Lofland L. (1995) Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis. (3rd). Toronto: Wadsworth Publishing Company

MacKinnon, N. (1994) Symbolic Interactionism as Affect Control. New York: State University of New York Press.

McCall and Simmons (1978) Identities and Interactions. New York: The Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Merton (1957) Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, IL: Free Press

Mills (1959) The Sociological Imagination. NY: Oxford University Press

Musolf, G. (1991) Some Recent Directions in Symbolic Interactionism. In Reynolds
1993 Interactionism Exposition and Critique (231-182) (3rd ed.). New York
General Hall Inc.

Ptacek, James. (1988). Why Do Men Batter Their Wives? In Kersti Yllo
and Michele Bograd (eds.), Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse. (pp.127-143)
NewBury Park, CA: Sage.

Scanzoni and Scanzoni. (1988) Men, Women, and Change: A Sociology of Marriage and
Family. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company

Schacter and Singer (1962) Cognitive, Social and Physiological Determinants of
Emotional State. Psychological Review, 69, 379-399.

Secord, P. (1982) The Origin and Maintenance of Social Roles. In Kidd 1982
Personality, Roles and Social Behavior. (pp.33-51) New York: Springer-Verlag

Shannon, W. (1996) The Power Struggle. New York: Plenum Press

Smith, Michael (1990) Patriarchal Ideology and Wife Beating. In Brym 1996 Society in
Question (pp.51-61) Toronto: Harcourt Brace Canada

Stone, G (1964) Embarrassment and the Analysis of Role Requirements. The
American Journal of Sociology. Copyright by the University of Chicago Press.
(pp. 1-15)

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) Basics of Qualitative Research. (2nd ed.).
London: Sage Publications

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory
Procdures And Techniques. London: Sage Publications

Stryker, S. (1977) Developments in two Social Psychologies: Toward an appreciation of
Mutual relevance. Sociometry. 40, 145-160.

Sullivan, H.S. (1977) Self as concept and illusion. In Stone et. al. Reprinted
from The Fusion of Psychiatry and Social Science. (pp. 179-185). New York:
W.W. Norton and Company, Inc. 1964, (pp. 211-228)

Thompson L. (1989) Gender in Families: Women and Men in Marriage, Work and
Parenthood. In the Journal of Marriage and the Family. (pp. 845-871) Madison:
University of Wisconsin.

Turner, H. (1991) The Structure of Sociological Theory. (5th ed.). California:
Wadsworth Publishing Company

Vaughan, D. (1977) <u>Uncoupling: The Social Construction of Divorce</u>. American Sociological Association

Walker, L (1979) <u>The Battered Woman</u>. New York: Harper and Row Publishers

Waller (1938) <u>The Family</u>. Reprint edition, revised by Reuben Hill. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.

Weigert A.J. (1992) Identity: Its emergence within sociological psychology. Farberman et al. pp. 1-26. Reprinted from <u>Symbolic Interaction</u>. 1983, <u>6 (2)</u> 183-206.