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Abstract

Three Types of Internal Adaptation to Parental Divorce in Latency-age Boys

A Case Study

A thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of Doctor of Philosophy for convocation in the year 2001,

by Klaus Wiedermann

Department of Human Development and Applied Psychology

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the

University of Toronto

Divorce is known to have adverse effects on children. This study was designed to investigate how parental divorce impacts on the subjective internal reality of boys. In keeping with the goal of developing new theory, the study uses a qualitative methodology. Open-ended interviews were conducted with seven latency-age boys. These interviews were then analysed with a modified grounded theory approach. Object relation theory, in particular the concept of internal reality inhabited by internal images, formed the conceptual underpinnings of the data analysis.

Three distinct types of internal adaptation to parental divorce were found. Each type is distinguished by the identity of the internal victim image. The adaptation to divorce thus depends on how the boys internalise the parental conflict, and more specifically, who they see as victimised before and after the separation.
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INTRODUCING THE PROBLEM

Purpose of the Study

Divorce is a common remedy for unhappy marriages. Therefore, its sequelae, such as increasing numbers of single-parent households and step-families are here to stay. The number of divorces in Canada has fallen sharply in recent years (Statistics Canada, 1997). The study by Statistics Canada titled “Divorces 1995” was published in 1997 and contains the latest census data for Canada in the area of marital dissolution, child custody and related subjects. The number of divorces seems to have plateaued at 1980 levels of about 1,200 divorces per 100,000 married couples. However, not included in this figure are the numbers for dissolutions of common-law couples. The number of common law couples has increased and is estimated at one million, but these unions are thought to be less stable than marriages. Unfortunately, their formation and dissolution cannot be traced with any degree of accuracy, so it is difficult to ascertain the numbers of children exposed to separation in those couples.

The recent decline in divorce rates reverses a trend that started in the early 1970s, but the number of children involved in divorce is still rising. All told, between 40% and 45% of the children who were born in the 1970s will have seen their parents separate by the time they turn 18 (Statistics Canada 1997). Divorce seems to have proven, over-all harmful effects on children, while providing the parents with the solution they seek.

The literature on effects of parental divorce on children reports short-term and long-term negative outcomes for both genders on various measures relating to achievement and emotional well-being (Wallerstein, Kelly 1976, 1980; Amato & Keith 1991a,b; Amato 1993; Cherlin, Furstenberg, Chase-Landsdale, Kiernan, Robins, Morrison and Teitler 1991). The quantitative literature has focused on identifying key variables that affect the outcome for these children. External factors such as family functioning after separation, age of the child(ren) at separation, shift
in socio-economic status (SES) of the family after separation etc., correlate with outcome measures such as academic achievement, success in intimate relationships, and prevalence of depression in adulthood. These studies have provided a wealth of data linking external factors with outcome measures, yet the field lacks theoretical cohesion (Allen 1993; Amato 1993; Demo 1993, Kurdek 1993) because no theory has been advanced that explains the process of how and why parental separation or some factor associated with it produces changes in achievement and emotional well-being.

Wallerstein and her collaborators designed a longitudinal study using both qualitative and quantitative measures (Wallerstein, Kelly 1976; Wallerstein, Kelly 1980; Wallerstein 1984; Wallerstein 1987; Wallerstein, Corbin 1989; Wallerstein, Blakeslee 1989) to provide a normative understanding of divorce on families. This project has given us a description of the long-term normative changes in the development of children following parental separation. Their study will be discussed in more depth in the following chapter.

Normative descriptions of the effects of divorce are the necessary precursors to the question: "How and/or why does parental divorce lead to the reported negative outcomes for children?" Amato had hoped to develop and test a unified theory in his meta-analysis (Amato 1993), yet by his own admission, fell short.

Divorce is not a gender neutral issue (Allen 1993). Different outcomes have been reported for boys and girls after divorce (Hetherington, Cox, and Cox 1985; Camara, Resnick 1988; Peterson, Zill, 1986). While both male and female children showed roughly the same amount of maladjustment, the nature of their difficulties showed gender specific patterns (Kalter, Rembar 1981). These differences seem to persist into adulthood because similar differences have been reported for adult males and females whose parents separated or divorced (Silvestri 1992; Palosaari, Aro 1994). Fathers gain sole custody of their children in about 11% of divorce cases (Statistics Canada 1997). The absent or partially absent father is therefore a
widespread social and psychological phenomenon. Because developmental pathways are gender specific (Blos 1985), father loss affects boys differently than girls (Lamb 1976; Biller 1976).

Blos introduced into the psychoanalytic literature the notion that male development strongly relies on a dyadic father-son relationship of identification that precedes the competitive triadic oedipal relationship to the father (Blos 1985). Therefore, father loss should have distinct, observable effects related to the specific aspects of the father-son relationship that are missing. In addition, the quality of the mother-son relationship, the timing of the separation, as well as the quality of mother-father-son triangle before and after separation, should be important factors in the developmental trajectory of the son.

**Personal Interest**

Aspects of male identity formation have long held special interest to me, as witnessed in my masters thesis on becoming a father for the first time. Since my first marriage broke up more than ten years ago, the welfare of my own son from that first marriage has been a focus of my personal life. This long-held personal interest, as well as personal observations of the struggles of many of my son’s friends whose parents are also separated, have led me to ask the broader, more theoretical questions of this study. My personal experience has sparked the theoretical interest and become the impetus for this study, a tradition shared with other researchers who undertook research in areas of personal vulnerability (Zola 1982; Weaver 1991).
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REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

A wealth of articles and books has been published on divorce and related issues. For the purpose of conceptual clarity, the review will be divided into three sections. First, I will discuss the question of whether or not divorce has harmful effects on children. Second, I will consider the four most common variables associated with divorce that have been put forward to explain negative outcomes for children and adult children of divorce. Third, I will present two psychoanalytically oriented case study reports pertaining to the psychological effect of father absence due to divorce on young boys.

The Negative Effects of Divorce on Children’s Well-being

A rise in the number of studies on the impact of divorce on children has not necessarily fostered more agreement among the researchers. Some of the confusion around the impact of divorce has been prompted by research designs that cannot be compared. Four different designs stand out:

1. The within group longitudinal design:

Wallerstein’s study is the foremost example of this type of study. It permits comparison of divorced families to each other and over time. However, it does not allow us to attribute changes and effects to divorce per se because it lacks a control group. It also treats divorced families as a heterogeneous group. This approach may do more justice to the reality of divorced families than the assumption that divorce families form a homogeneous group.

2. The comparative divorce group design:

Here, two or more different variables distinguishing two groups of divorces are compared. Ambert’s (1982) comparison of mother-led and father-led households fall into this category. Many studies probing the effects of post-divorce arrangements
also fall into this category (Glover, Steele 1993; Luepnitz 1982). This design permits statements about differences relating to the specific types or outcomes of divorce, yet it does not allow statements about the effects of divorce by itself.

3. Multiple comparison group design:
This design compares one group that has experienced divorce with at least two groups from intact families, i.e. happy, intact vs. unhappy, intact (Greenberg, Nay 1982). This design does permit attribution to divorce per se. Caution is necessary, however, because the use of ‘children from intact families’ begs the question of whether these families will stay intact or are heading for a breakup. This question is especially pertinent when a group of children from unhappy, intact homes is used. This design also assumes (possibly wrongly) that the ‘divorce group’ is homogeneous.

4. Control group design:
This design compares one group of divorces with another group of currently intact families. Many studies based on surveys have taken this approach (i.e. Cherlin et al. 1991). Based on this design, the effect of divorce or a variable associated with it can be distinguished from the effect of not having experienced divorce. This design, however, cannot distinguish between divorce and other factors associated with it, i.e. high parental conflict. As with the multiple comparison group design, there is no guarantee that the ‘intact’ family will not be a ‘divorced’ family at some later point in time. Nor can we be certain that all divorced families are similar and therefore form a homogeneous group (i.e. the time since the divorce may be more important for some outcome measures than whether or not a divorce has occurred).

All four designs have been used extensively in the literature. No design is without weakness and each has comparative strengths. For a methodological critique of studies showing negative outcomes for children raised in one-parent families, see Blechmann (1982). Contradictory results based on these different designs present a challenge for further theoretical integration of higher order. Some studies with
contradictory results will be presented in the following paragraphs.

Greenberg and Nay (1982) and Robson (1983) concluded that adolescents and young adults from divorced parents did not differ from their peers from intact families in their attitude towards dating and marriage. The only notable difference was that adults from divorced families saw divorce in a more positive light. However, Greenberg and Nay's (1982) stated conclusion was somewhat misleading because they differentiated among three groups in their original study. Their results in fact showed that there were no differences between college students from unhappy, intact homes and from divorced homes, but that these two groups differed from students who described themselves as growing up in a happy, intact family. In short, children from happy families differed from children of unhappy families, regardless of whether the parents were separated or not. The quality of the parental relationship, not parental separation determined the children's attitude toward future relationships.

Other studies from that same period suggest that parental divorce does have negative effects on children and adult children of divorce (Pope, Mueller 1976; Mueller, Pope 1977; Wallerstein, Kelly 1976, 1980; Kelly 1981; Guidubaldi, Cleminshaw, Perry, McLoughlin 1983). Pope and Mueller (1976) examined five national data sets in the U.S. and noted increased marital dissolution rates among children of divorced parents. Mueller and Pope (1977) found that children from divorced families tended to be less educated and from lower SES homes and tended to marry earlier. High risk mate selection due to premature first marriages with partners of lower SES seemed the link for the “intergenerational transmission of marital instability (Mueller, Pope 1977).”

Wallerstein and collaborators designed the most comprehensive longitudinal study to date. Initially, the study was designed for a year because in accordance with crisis theory, the authors assumed that the children would adjust to the new family structure and continue on their developmental trajectory after an initial period of
upheaval of about six months to a year (Wallerstein, Kelly 1980). Their early results (1976, 1980) suggested that children do not recover completely and this convinced them to continue their study. They have now reported on their initial sample at the fifteen year mark (Wallerstein and Blakeslee 1989).

Wallerstein and Kelly designed their study for normative purposes. They excluded children who showed signs of psychopathology before the separation so as to understand fully the impact of separation itself. Their research supports the hypothesis that separation itself is a traumatic event that overextends the children's adaptive capacities. But their design lacks a control group and therefore does not allow for statements about divorce per se as compared to intact families.

Wallerstein's study may in fact underestimate the effect of parental divorce on children because she excluded families whose children had come to the attention of mental health agencies before the break-up. Since we know that parental conflict affects children adversely (Fincham, Grych, & Osborne 1994) and may also lead to divorce, the researchers may have inadvertently cut off the most disturbed slice of their target population.

In a comprehensive study based on a national sample, Guidubaldi et al. (1983) found that children of divorce scored significantly lower than their peers from intact families on 27 out of 34 outcome measures. Controlling for SES reduced the number of significant results to 13, buttressing the claim that divorce in itself is detrimental. The decline in SES for the post-divorce single-parent household influences the severity of the impact, especially in the cognitive area.

Cherlin et al. (1991) used national data sets for both the U.S. and Great Britain. They found lower test scores on academic tasks and more behaviour problems in children from divorced families. However, most of these difficulties were observable prior to separation and controlling for pre-divorce differences reduced some of the post-divorce differences to insignificant levels. These results suggest
some harm had been done prior to divorce in a family that was structurally still intact.

In 1991, Amato and Keith published two meta-analyses to inject some theoretical clarity into the burgeoning field. Their first meta-analysis (1991a) included 33 studies on the long-term effects of divorce on adults whose parents divorced when they were children. Amato and Keith found negative outcomes for adult children of divorced parents in the areas of psychological adjustment, socioeconomic achievement, and marital stability (Amato & Keith, 1991a).

Amato and Keith’s (1991b) second meta-analysis included 92 studies comparing children from divorced homes with children from intact families. The authors found that parental divorce was associated with negative outcomes for their children in the areas of academic achievement, conduct, psychological adjustment, self-esteem, and social relations. Most effect sizes were in the range of small to moderate. Amato (1993), in his third meta-analysis, summed up the cumulative results of the field as follows:

The cumulative picture that emerges from the evidence suggests that parental divorce (or some factor connected with it) is associated with lowered well-being among both children and adult children of divorce (Amato 1993, p. 23).

Amato’s (1993) somewhat ambiguous statement reflects his control group design. The four most often cited factors affecting the well-being of children of divorce will be discussed in the following chapter.

Some factors, such as decline of SES in single-parent families, are logically separate from divorce itself (even though they are associated empirically in our society) while other factors, such as the partial absence of one parent are, by definition, an aspect of divorce itself. Factors such as loyalty strains are, by definition, associated with divorce, yet the degree of such strains depends on the dynamic family interactions before and after divorce.
Factors Accounting for the Negative Outcomes in Children of Divorce

The literature has examined various factors associated with divorce to account for the pattern of results. The variables that have been most widely put forward are:

- socioeconomic status (SES) in the post-divorce, single-parent family
- parental conflict and divided loyalties before and after separation
- the effects of various post-divorce parenting arrangements
- interaction of age/developmental stage and gender at the time of divorce

Each of these factors has been discussed in the literature, yet the extent of interaction between variables is unclear and leaves the picture muddied and full of contradictions.

Socioeconomic Status

One of the most noted consequences of divorce is the lowered standard of living particularly for custodial mothers and their children. Desimone-Luis, O'Mahoney and Hunt (1979) found that a decline in the level of family income was associated with adjustment problems for the children. Guidubaldi et al. (1983) found that children's academic performance was adversely affected by lower SES after divorce. On the other hand, controlling for SES had no bearing on measures of psychological adjustment.

In her qualitative study, Ambert (1982) compared father-led single households with mother-led households. Differences in emotional well-being and adjustment of their children were influenced by SES as well as by factors associated with the gender of the custodial parent. Ambert found father-led households to run more efficiently and with more emotional warmth than mother-led households. When SES was controlled for, the gap between fathers' and mothers' effectiveness narrowed, but did not disappear. Three lower SES women led their families successfully, bucking the trend of the association between poverty and poor family functioning. While SES
accounted for part of the differences between father-led and mother-led households, social and familial support, and public perception of the quality of parenting were important variables in favour of the fathers. They were seen (and possibly saw themselves) as doing something unusual and commendable, while middle-income single mothers were seen (and possibly saw themselves) as doing the expected.

Overall lowered standard of living has been shown to be a factor in children's adjustment to divorce, although few studies addressed the problem directly (with the notable exception of Desimone-Luis et al. 1979). There seems to be a connection between lower SES and lower academic achievement in the aftermath of divorce. Psychological measures, on the other hand do not seem sensitive to the impact of SES (Mueller, Pope 1977; Guidubaldi et al. 1983; Cherlin et al. 1991).

**Parental Conflict**

Parental conflict has been associated with behaviour problems, depression and increased illness in children (Fincham, Grych, Osborne 1994). Peterson and Zill (1986) found that as the level of parental conflict in structurally intact families rises, children report less close relationships with both parents. Closeness to at least one parent was linked to emotional well-being of children (Stewart, Copeland, Chester, Malley, Barenbaum 1997). Children from intact homes with high levels of parental conflict report the same low level of closeness to both parents as children from divorced homes. Emery (1982) even suggested that the psychological problems of children after divorce are due to parental conflict and that divorce itself has little or no negative effect. Jennings, Salts and Smith (1991) found that conflictual parental relationships had a negative effect on attitudes towards marriage for a college population, regardless of the timing of the conflict and regardless of family structure. Greenberg and Nay (1982) found that attitudes towards dating for college students from divorced homes were similar to the ones from intact but unhappy homes. Booth
and Edwards (1989) compared adults from divorced families with adults from unhappy, intact homes. They found that the adult children of parents who in spite of their conflicts stayed together, entered into lower quality marriages than offspring from divorced parents.

Brennan and Shaver (1993) found that divorce itself does not affect adult attachment status. The quality of the parental marriage and the parents' remarriage status did, however, have effects on their adult children's patterns in romantic relationships. Children whose parents later divorced, suffered the effects on their attachment status prior to their parents divorce (Cherlin et al., 1991). Exposure to parental conflict before the actual separation clearly affects children's well-being; so it is quite plausible that exposure to parental conflict changes aspects of the children's selves in permanent and pervasive ways.

Some parents continue on with their conflictual relationship after the separation. Custody battles, indicating high parental conflict after divorce, have been shown to have negative effects, especially on young children (Stewart et al. 1997). When parents were involved in intense custody battles, young boys were reported to have more behaviour problems in school and at home, while young girls tended to be ill more frequently. For teenagers, parental conflict did not have the serious effect it had on young children. Teenagers seemed to handle their parent's verbal disagreements quite well. However, exposure to emotionally charged or physically violent parental conflict resulted in an increase in behaviour problems for teenage boys, while teenage girls seemed to react with illness and depression, not only to overt forms of fighting, but also to underground interpersonal tensions between the parents (Stewart et al. 1997). Overall, a high level of conflict between parents after separation has a negative effect. Young children seem to retreat from their parents prematurely when the parental relationship is highly conflictual. However, it is not clear whether the harmful effect of parental conflict indeed decreases for teenagers, since their
developmental tasks include a loosening of the close ties to their parents, or whether their reactions consolidate into more permanent intrapsychic and relational structures. Loyalty conflicts can be seen as relational (internalised) structures associated with parental conflict.

Loyalty conflicts are a source of difficulty for children within families (Boszormenyi-Nagy, Sparks 1973). When parents fight, children often get 'caught' in the parental battle. Wallerstein (1980) found that parents frequently resorted to the tactic of involving their child(ren) in battles against the other parent. Wallerstein and Kelly (1976) observed that latency-age children of both sexes became embroiled in the parental struggle and one quarter entered into an alignment with one parent (usually the mother) against the other parent (usually the father). Four years later, these same youngsters were embarrassed when reminded about their fervour in taking sides during and shortly after the initial break-up.

Especially high conflict couples openly use their children as weapons against each other (Stewart et al. 1997). More covert forms of pressure for loyalty, such as the fleeting look of hurt or disappointment on the face of one parent after a good visit with the other parent, were noticed and reported by the children.

Perhaps the most striking finding is that loyalty strains were associated with poor child adjustment, according to mother and child reports within and over time. In addition, lack of father-child closeness was associated with mother's reports of children's illness... (Stewart et al. 1997, pp. 222)

Loyalty strains have been shown to offset the benefit of having a relationship with the non-custodial parent. Hetherington et al. (1982) and Healy, Malley, Stewart (1990) found that the frequency of father's visitation was positively correlated with children's adjustment only when parental conflict after separation was low, but negatively correlated when conflict between the parents remained high.

The literature supports the statement that unhappy marriages (covert conflict) and marriages with a high level of overt conflict have a harmful effect on
children, regardless of whether these marriages end in divorce.

There is also strong empirical support for the notion that the loyalty strain associated with a parental divorce adds to the emotional difficulties of the children. The amount of loyalty strain is mediated by the parent’s capacity to resolve conflicts with his or her ex-spouse.

**Various Custody and Visitation Arrangements After Divorce**

In 1995 in Canada, 67.6% of children were awarded to the mother as custodial parent, 21.4% were awarded to the joint custody of both parents, and 10.9% were awarded to the father as custodial parent (Statistics Canada 1997, p. 20). Therefore, most one-parent households are still mother-led. Accordingly, stepfathers are much more prevalent in reconstituted families than stepmothers.

Children seem to be affected by three aspects of the post-divorce arrangements: a) the quality of the relationship between the now-divorced parents b) the psychological ties and changes in the household of the custodial parent c) the ties with the non-custodial parent and the events in that household.

Studies using survey data present us with the status quo. Since most single-parent households are mother-led, it is not surprising that many researchers find that the children’s well-being is almost entirely linked to the mother’s adjustment to her divorce (Furstenberg, Cherlin et al. 1991). Hetherington et al. (1982) found that mothers in the first year after separation were more anxious, depressed, angry, and self-doubting than married mothers, a result of the traumatic life transition. Furstenberg (1988) found hardly any effects related to paternal involvement in their children’s lives and suggested that this may be due to the fact that only a small percentage of non-residential fathers see their children enough to have any kind of influence. Furthermore, positive effects of paternal involvement are negated when the relationship between the parents remains conflictual (Hetherington et al. 1982;
The role of non-custodial fathers in the lives of their children seems very unclear (Seltzer 1991). Using 1987 survey data, Seltzer also found that fathers who pay child support tend to have more contact with their children. Stephen, Freedman and Hess (1993) used survey data to show that joint custody agreements were associated with the children spending more time at their father's house.

Joint custody has been touted as one possible solution to the children's adjustment problems following separation. Research indeed suggests that joint custody at its best is as good or better than single custody at its best (Luepnitz 1982). Luepnitz compared the effects of maternal single custody, paternal single custody and joint custody on the self-concept and other adjustment measures, and found the children in joint custody to be comparatively as well or better adjusted.

Another study looked at the adjustment of boys in joint custody, single custody (presumably maternal), happy intact families and unhappy intact families (Pojman 1981 quoted in Glover and Steele 1989). Boys from joint custody and happy intact families were better adjusted than boys from single custody and boys from unhappy intact families. Glover and Steele (1989) came to similar conclusions, namely that joint custody is preferable to single custody for children's outcomes. They also found the relationship to the fathers significantly weakened for children in single custody, while joint custody children's relationship with their father remained as close as in intact families. This weakening of the bond to the fathers over time when mothers are custodial parent has been noted in numerous studies (Furstenberg 1988; Wallerstein, Corbin 1989; Wallerstein, Blakeslee 1989; Seltzer 1991; Spigelman, Spigelman & Englesson 1994; Stewart et al. 1997). However, by no means is joint custody a panacea because in many jurisdictions this arrangement was not imposed by the courts, but sought by both parents. Thus the results of studies favouring joint custody may reflect a self-selection bias. As a group, parents who seek joint custody
and who share parental responsibilities after separation are possibly more mature than parents who seek sole custody, because they are willing to deal with their own ambivalence towards the former spouse in the best interest of their children.

Spigelman, Spigelman and Englesson (1994) administered portions of the Rorschach projective technique to children of divorce and a group of children from intact families. They then undertook a cluster analysis for the group of children from divorced parents. Children in the cluster with the most positive psychological profile all had frequent access to and a positive relationship with both parents. What distinguished them from the children in the other two groups was their access and positive relationship to their non-custodial fathers, who all lived within an hours driving distance.

Studies comparing mother-led and father-led single parent families have come to the conclusion that both parents can be effective. Schnayer and Orr (1989) found no differences between children raised in father- and mother-led households on measures on self-perception and behaviour. Ambert (1982) found that children in father-led households were more appreciative, helpful and emotionally better adjusted than children in mother-led households. Both studies examined families with children between the ages of six and sixteen. However, no research has addressed the impact of single father custody on very young children.

Step-parent families are increasingly common. The weight of evidence seems to support the notion that children's well-being decreases with the addition of a step-parent (Brand, Clingempeel, Bowen-Woodward 1988, Clingempeel and Segal 1986). Amato (1993) found 19 studies supporting, and 11 studies contradicting this statement. Interactions between gender of step-parent and gender of step-child may account for the contradictory results. Hetherington, Cox and Cox (1985) found that the presence of a step-father improved the well-being of little boys, but had either no effect or a negative effect on aspects of outcomes for little girls. This result suggests
a gender effect of the addition of a stepfather. Visher and Visher (1983) point out that the addition of a step-parent is stressful for adults and children alike. A second marriage also conjures up the possibility of another separation. In fact, half of the children whose parents divorce will experience a second parental divorce (Bumpass 1984). Peterson and Zill (1986) found that children who suffered such multiple divorces were no worse off in terms of depression and behaviour problems than children who experienced a single divorce. However, Booth and Amato (1991) report results contradicting Peterson and Zill's conclusion. They studied adults with a history of multiple divorces in childhood and found them to be more likely to be depressed and to have problematic relationships than adults who were only party to one marital break-up. The fact that boys seem to react more positively to the addition of a step-father and seem to react more strongly to the separation has led Hetherington, Clingempeel, Anderson, Deal, Hagan, Hollier, and Lindner (1992) to suggest gender specific sensitivities towards changes in family structure. Since the overall negative results of the addition of a step-parent seem to reflect the effect for girls more so than for boys, Hetherington et al. (1992) proposed that young boys suffer more due to the separation because boys lose their same sex parent, while girls react adversely to remarriage because they now have to share their same sex parent with a step-parent. However, more studies testing this hypothesis are needed because

... we know little of how gender of parent/stepparent, gender of child, or the interaction between gender of parent/stepparent and gender of child moderates the socialisation process (Kurdek 1993, p. 41).

**The Interaction between Age at Time of Divorce and Gender of the Child**

The timing of divorce in relation to the child's gender and developmental stage is another important issue. Wallerstein and Kelly (1976, 1980) and Kelly (1981) describe stages of adjustment to the impact of the divorce. For younger children, the
impact was more globalized, affecting all areas of functioning, and initial symptoms tended to be more severe. However, these early symptoms did not necessarily last. Around 18 months after the parental separation, more permanent patterns of psychological adjustment were discernible for all age groups. These patterns would calcify over time and change the developmental course of the youngsters. Wallerstein and Kelly (1980) noted that after 18 months, boys still showed more signs of distress than girls, leading them to speculate that girls were adjusting more fully to separation than boys. Stewart et al. (1997) found the same pattern in their longitudinal study. Their design called for two assessments of the children, one immediately after the break-up and the second 18 months later. Boys six years and older showed more difficulties in their overall adjustment than girls. The boys tended to have increased behaviour problems, while the girls’ symptoms were characterised by mood swings, depression and withdrawal. Hetherington et al. (1982) in a longitudinal design found boys and girls improved two years after separation, yet boys from separated families did exhibit more conduct problems than boys from intact families.

Wallerstein (1986), in her ten year follow-up, reported increased yearnings for their fathers for adolescents of both sexes, but in particular for the girls, regardless of whether the father had actually attempted to maintain contact throughout the years. These adolescents seemed less troubled than their older siblings because they were too young to remember the family conflict leading up to the divorce (Wallerstein 1984). To their surprise, Wallerstein and Corbin (1989) found that these same teenage girls who yearned for their fathers, but seemed overall well adjusted just five years earlier, now showed general signs of depression as well as signs of anxiety and withdrawal around men. Since adolescence requires the consolidation of all previous developmental achievements into a coherent personality (Blos 1985), previously undetected difficulties seem to re-emerge during that time.

Kalter and Rembar (1981) tested three hypotheses related to the interaction
between developmental stage/age and gender of the child at the time of parental divorce. The recency hypothesis states that divorce is a traumatic event that children recover from over time. Therefore, children whose parents’ divorce was the most recent should show the strongest signs of psychopathology. The cumulative-effect hypothesis assumes that the earlier the parental divorce occurs in the child’s life the more profound its effects will be. The critical-stage hypothesis assumes that divorce at critical developmental stages, i.e., during the oedipal years, would produce distinct psychological profiles.

In their child guidance clinic, Kalter and Rembar (1981) did not find more severe symptoms for children whose parents had divorced during any sensitive period. Nor did they find more symptoms in children of more recent marital dissolution. They did, however, find an interaction between timing of divorce, gender of the child, and the nature (not the degree) of particular vulnerabilities. Marital dissolution very early in a child’s life (two-and-a-half years and younger) was related to separation-related difficulties during latency age for both boys and girls. Divorce during the oedipal period (ages three to five-and-a-half years) precipitated increased vulnerability in adolescence for both sexes. Adolescent boys whose parents had separated during that time showed a marked inhibition of aggression, while the researchers observed an increase of direct, problematic aggression in adolescent girls of that group. Kalter and Rembar define ‘non-aggressive disturbance with parents’, the category that dominated the clinical picture for adolescent boys, as “reflecting an overly entangled, dependent, or libidinized relationship with a parent (Kalter, Rembar 1981, p. 94)”.

This description does not seem to match the pattern of behaviour problems usually associated with boys (Wallerstein 1976; Stewart et al. 1997). It is, however, consistent with Wallerstein and Blakeslee’s (1989) observations fifteen years after the break-up. These researchers noted that many bright young male adults lacked the aggression necessary to achieve, commensurate with their talent. Many were
floundering in their careers as well as in their emotional lives. Particularly alarming to the researchers were the cases of children who had witnessed violence prior to the parental divorce. The young males of that group struggled with their own tendency to lash out violently by inhibiting all aggression. By contrast, some young women from that group entered consciously into abusive relationships with men because for them violence and sexual excitement were linked (Wallerstein and Blakeslee 1989).

It is therefore plausible that after a period of acting out, boys develop an overly entangled relationship with one parent (Kalter, Rembar 1981) over time and that this libidinized relationship with one parent requires repression of aggressive impulses. This aggression is then unavailable for separation from the parents during adolescence and for struggles in their careers and other aspects of their lives.

Palosaari and Aro (1994) found that young adult males whose parents had divorced during their latency years were prone to depression and alcohol abuse. Young adult women whose parents divorced during their latency years were more prone to depression than women from intact families, but they were significantly less depressed than their male counterparts.

The literature is inconclusive on whether boys are more at risk than girls after their parents divorce. However, there seems to be consensus in the literature that there is an interaction between age at the time of divorce, recency of divorce, gender of the child and the nature of the outcome for that child.

**Case Studies with Psychoanalytic Framework**

Case studies with psychoanalytic underpinnings have been interested in two main areas: first, the fate of the tie to the lost non-residential parent (the tie to the lost object), and second, the effect of divorce on the identificatory process. These two processes are connected because identification is a particular means of maintaining a close relationship to an absent external object, and it can be the “sole condition under
which the id can give up objects” (Freud quoted in Chethik, Dolin, Davies, Lohr, Darrow 1987, p. 122).

While working on a major research project on children and divorce, Chethik et al. (1987) repeatedly encountered children who had been referred to their clinic because they displayed the negative characteristics of the missing parent after separation. These characteristics caused considerable upheaval in the single-parent household. Chethik et al. called the phenomenon a ‘negative identification’, because the identification with the negative or ‘bad’ aspects of the lost parent had taken over in these children’s day to day lives.

The causes for the negative identification have to be assessed very carefully, because its primary source could be a) primarily an attempt by the youngster to maintain the tie with the lost parent b) primarily a misperception by the custodial parent fulfilling an internal need c) a combination of an identificatory process within the child and the projection of a parental need into the child. In this instance one would find a shift in identification in the child due to a combination of external pressure by the parent (projection) and an internal need of the child (introjection). In this case the ‘negative identification’ serves the needs of both participants. Obviously the diagnostic task is one of assessing which of the three scenarios is closest to the truth.

Chethik et al. illustrate the power of the negative identification with a case of a three year old boy. The boy’s violent outbursts were crucial for the emotional equilibrium of both, him and his mother. For the mother the boy’s outbursts confirmed her self-image as good but victimised by male violence (now embodied by the three year old son after the violent father had left). For the boy who had been threatened by the father’s violence himself the outbursts provided a sense of power that helped him master pervasive feelings of loss and panic.

In another case, an eleven year old boy, whose father had left without
forewarning, soon spent long hours in his father's library and started to stutter in ways similar to his father. A period of mourning for his father ushered in a return to more normal pursuits and a return to his old speech pattern. Here the negative identification primarily served an internal need of the boy.

Sack (1985) reported three clinical cases of gender identity conflict in young boys between four and seven years of age in the aftermath of divorce. He noted that these young boys became preoccupied with wanting to be a girl, dressing like girls and playing stereotypical girls' games seemingly in response to stormy, prolonged, strife-ridden custody battles. Sacks called the boys' wish to be female 'reactive and defensive', an attempt to avoid the negative identification with the aggressive father. The gender identity conflict may be understood as a defensive attempt to avoid the negative identification with maleness. Two of the three boys were presented for clinical consultation by their mothers, while the third one was presented by his father who had just won custody of the boy. Sacks noted for all three cases that once the inhibition of aggression was loosened in therapy, a shift in gender identification towards a more 'male' personality occurred.

While 'gender identity conflict' and severe 'negative identification' with the missing parent are not the norm, these 'extreme cases' highlight developmental pitfalls for young boys in their process of adjusting to parental separation, pitfalls that a normative approach may have missed.

Both the fate of the tie to the missing parent and the shift in identification precipitated by the divorce are important aspects of the developmental trajectory for both genders. Wallerstein and Corbin (1989) have addressed the effect of father loss on girls in their report on daughters of divorce. They dispelled earlier conclusions (including their own) that girls were less affected by parental separation and adjusted faster than boys. How the divorce and its aftermath affects the identity formation in boys will be the subject of my research.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

No study can begin in a theoretical vacuum. Some form of prior knowledge is necessary for an enquiry to begin.

Theories act as interpretive structures which the observer/enquirer refers back to in order to understand new information, i.e. there is a search for common ground between what is already known and understood and new information that is new because it is not understood (Kinowski 1984, p. 45).

The existing literature has not arrived at a unified theory of the short term and long term effects of parental divorce on children. In the following chapter, conclusions will be drawn from the existing literature. Obviously there is more than one direction one can take faced with a multitude of questions still unanswered in the literature. The chapter will present the reasoning for my particular choice of approach.

In the second chapter, an object relations theory of psychodynamic structure is introduced. This chapter introduces the concept of internal reality and its components.

In the third chapter, two general aspects of psychoanalytic theory of human consciousness are discussed. Especially the two modes of experiencing time are crucial for understanding the data analysis later on.

Drawing on the existing literature and concepts from object relation theory, the research question is then formulated.

Conclusions from the Literature

We are now in position to construct a rudimentary conceptual framework to accommodate the various results in the literature. The literature does attribute negative outcomes to children and adults from divorced homes in the area of psychological adjustment and academic performance. The literature also concludes
that the *impact of divorce on children is gender specific.* The issue of gender will be addressed first. According to the literature, parental divorce affects both boys and girls equally severely. However, the nature of the overt changes in behaviour due to divorce (or some associated factor) shows gender specific patterns. Somehow boys are affected differently by parental divorce than girls.

It is stating the obvious, that aspects of external reality change for children because of parental divorce. The specific constellation of external factors is unique in the case of each child. Even siblings do not experience an identical set of external factors bearing on their experience. The quantitative literature has identified a number of common *external factors* thought to contribute to the negative outcomes in the cognitive and the psychological sphere.

Negative outcomes in the areas of cognitive, psychological and relational functioning many years after the parental break-up suggest either long lasting and *detrimental changes in the external environment* after the break-up or *internal changes in the children* in response to divorce (and/or the external factors associated with it). Amato's attempts to identify the negative external factors causing the longstanding effects of parental divorce fell short.

Since the efforts to identify the external factors leading to negative outcomes have only been rewarded with modest success, I propose to take up and investigate the other possible explanation, that is, that there are internal changes in the children in the build-up to, during, and after parental separation that lead to negative outcomes long after the actual divorce. It is understood that the parental separation itself is the culmination of one family process and the beginning of another. Parental separation is only one action among a series of significant family interactions that affect each family member.

Since adults from divorced homes still show the psychological effects of the parental break-up many years later, I propose that parental break-up might leave
intrapsychic ‘scars’, that is, disturbance to aspects of the children’s inner world change in response to the parental break-up. I propose that the quantifiable changes in cognitive and psychological functioning can be conceptualised as correlates of changes to the inner world. In this view, the internal, intrapsychic world of the children becomes the conduit connecting external factors impinging on the child (the divorce and its sequelae) and the changes in their behaviour. Once we conceive of an inner world as a separate entity, we have to define the term and its constituent components. Object relations theory is one such theory that has defined the term ‘internal reality’ and its constituent components. Key concepts of that theory will form the theoretical underpinnings of this study.

The Inner World, Internal Objects, Internal Images

Implicit in my earlier comments is an idea that was first formulated by Klein in the 1930s. Klein came to believe that every human being lives in two worlds simultaneously, the external world of real things and real human interaction and the subjective internal world inhabited by the ego and internal objects.

“Klein .... made a discovery that created a revolutionary addition to the model of the mind, namely that we do not live in one world but in two - that we live in an internal world which is as a real a place to live as the outside world (Meltzer, 1981, p.178)”. 

This internal reality is bound up with the subject’s experience of the body as well as the mind. The internal world is made up of the ego and internal objects.

“Internal objects are experienced as concretely real and inside the ego, which means an experience of inside the body. They are different from images and representations which, when we experience them, retain an ephemeral quality in themselves (Hinshelwood, 1991, p. 330) “.

The ego’s activities are for the most part outside subjective awareness. One example of the ego’s unconscious adaptive activity might be the phenomenon of subjective distortions in perception, i.e. selective hearing of a mother favouring noises
made by her infant over loud background noise. The ego also shapes the representations of external events and is involved in all aspects of dealing with external reality. The activities of the ego are so manifold, yet hidden to the eye of the observer that the activity of the ego is not deemed observable for the purposes of this study.

The ego contains the internal objects. The internal objects are unconscious experiences or phantasies of concrete objects located inside the ego/body. In their concreteness internal objects are different from internal images and representations.

"The distinction (between internal introjected objects and representations) is, at bottom not a conceptual one but a distinction in quality of experiencing oneself and one's own mental activity (Hinshelwood, 1991, p. 330)".

In conversation most people tend to reveal an internal world inhabited by internal images. In other words, most people easily reveal the representational aspect of their inner world. Many of these internal images may have at their core an unconscious phantasy of an internal object. This concrete core of the internal objects is subsequently associated with representations of external events. These mental representations of external events and people lack the concrete basis of internal objects and are called internal images. While internal objects are 'introjected', - this term denotes an unconscious phantasy of physically swallowing the object - the internal images are 'internalised'. The term internalisation denotes a process of mental assimilation of symbolised, not concrete, contents.

An internal image is said to be a mental representation of a person or thing that has been internalised by the subject's ego.

Psychoanalytic theory assumes that the world of the internal objects is greatly influenced by external events and vice versa, so that the inner world becomes a mirror, albeit with some distortions, of the external world. "The experience of the internal object is deeply dependent on the experiencing of the external object - and external objects are, as it were, mirrors of reality (Hinshelwood, 1991, p. 69)".
As we have seen, initially Klein saw internal objects related to unconscious phantasy. Fairbairn took up Klein's idea of two realities and added the idea of an internal world inhabited by a multiplicity of internal objects and object representations.

"...time is now ripe to replace the concept of 'phantasy' by a concept of 'inner reality' peopled by the Ego and its internal objects. These internal objects should be regarded as having an organised structure, an identity of their own, an endopsycic existence and activity as real within the inner world as those of any object in the outer world.... Inner reality thus becomes the scene of situations involving relationships between the Ego and its internal objects (Fairbairn 1944)". (italics mine K.W.)

Fairbairn's concept of inner reality is reminiscent of the idea of the internal world structured along the lines of a theatre with a cast comprising the ego and its internal objects playing out internal scenarios.

The interview data collected for this thesis do not permit conclusions about concretely felt internal objects. Instead, the data show the representational world of the subjects. Therefore this thesis only makes statements about the internal images in relation to each other, not internal objects. In short, the term 'internal object' includes both the representational aspects, i.e. the internal images, and their basis in concrete sensual experience. The reader is reminded that the method of collecting data (in-depth interviews) only permits access to the representational aspects of the internal objects, the 'internal images', not to concretely felt internal states. Therefore the term 'internal images' is used in lieu of the more comprehensive term 'internal object' throughout the thesis. Since internal images are defined as the representational aspects of the internal objects, their essential relational characteristics are the same as the relational characteristics of internal objects.

In keeping with Fairbairn, relationships among internal images represent the internalised interactions among people in the external world. Since the process of perception and subsequent internalisation is open to distortions, the internal images represent the environment as perceived by the Ego.
The Self representation constitutes a special case of this phenomenon. In this case the subject mentally represents its perception of itself. The Self representation is a mental representation of the ‘objective’ aspects of the subject (this logical conundrum will be addressed in the next chapter). The Self image is merely one specific internal representation. However, the Self image deserves special attention because the subject identifies with that part of the inner world.

According to Fairbairn, internal objects and internal images have four qualities: an organised structure, an identity of their own, an endopsychic existence and activity as real within the inner world as those of any object in the outer world. In short, the internal images interact with one another in an organised and stable manner.

From a developmental perspective, the first internal images are the ones representing the earliest caregiver (usually the mother) and the Self. Over time, other people, such as siblings, teachers, grandparents, etc. are also represented as internal images in the child’s psyche and these images at times play crucial roles in the internal world.

As the child mentally represents its surroundings, the child not only relates to the internal images of mother and father separately, but also relates to the representations of mother and father as a internal image of a ‘combined couple’ (Klein 1946). This image of the ‘internal couple’ constitutes a separate internal image, distinct from, but related to the internal images of father and mother.

Scharff & Scharff (1994) suggest that we carry a variety of internal images of couples and families, but that the early internal image of the parental couple is the most powerful. The internal couple is an internalised dynamic picture of the relationship between the parents, based on the mother and father image, as it impinges on the ego. The internal couple is always part of an internal triadic relational structure that includes the two parental images and the self representation. This
internal structure will be referred to as ‘internal Triangle’ later on.

Internal relationships are subject to change from birth on because of maturational processes within the child and because the child represents continuously its own dynamic interactions with significant others as well as their respective interactions among themselves. The *internal relationships are dynamic* in the sense that various internal images, the self image, the father image, the mother image, the internal couple, etc. are in constant interaction with each other in the inner world. The ego shapes internal images as layered representations of multiple interactions with significant others over time. Through this process of layering the *internal images gain a measure of stability*.

The concept of reparation is a cornerstone of Kleinian thought. Klein was preoccupied with the question how infants manage the aggressive impulses that were seen to be part of early childhood development. Through observation Klein discovered that children in play therapy tended to try and mend broken objects including the therapist-as-object. This observation gave rise to her formulation of reparation as a means to deal with aggressive instincts in a creative manner. “Reparation .... consists of the phantasy of putting right the effects of the aggressive components” (Hinshelwood, 1991, p. 414). According to Klein and her followers, the aggressive components are part of an instinctual heritage. Various images give expression to this aggressive instinct and in the process harm other images. Reparation is an attempt to undo the harm done by aggressive internal images. In object relation theory reparation has a prominent place because this impulse to repair ‘broken’ internal images is seen to be ubiquitous.

“The past is not dead, it is not even past.” Faulkner

**Human Consciousness and the Experience of Time**

In the previous section, I have defined the internal images as structural
aspects of the inner world or internal reality. Internal images are layered representations of external objects and events over time. As such they contain a subjective relational history. How this dialectic of current and historical aspects of internal images can be understood, is the subject matter of this chapter. In essence, this chapter describes the dialectic nature of the experience of time in internal reality. This experience of time is at once diachronic and/or synchronic. How these terms are defined and how they are embedded in psychoanalytic thought is presented in the following chapter.

Diachronic vs. Synchronous Experience of Time

As subjects are telling their story about past events, present goings-on and future hopes and fears, they at once present us with a remembered history about how things came to be, and they tell us about how things have come to be how they are now, that is, they present us with their current internal state.

A narrative of remembered events following one another emphasises the experience of time as a linear progression of sequential events. The experience of time as linear progression is called diachronic.

When we conceive of the past as preserved in internalised form in the present as object relations (Scharff & Scharff 1991), or relational patterns among internal images, time is experienced as synchronic because the subject paints a picture of his/her current internal life in the present as shaped by the past. In synchronic experience of time the emphasis is on how past experiences (i.e. unconscious modes of perception, etc.) are co-shaping the experience of the present. Ogden (1994) calls this experience the ‘living past’ because the distinction between past and present has collapsed in the synchronic mode of experience of time.

These two conceptions of time as diachronic and synchronic are complementary. Developmental concerns associated with diachronic experience of
time shed light on the question of how a particular state of affairs came to be, while concerns associated with synchronic time illuminate the present emotional impact of the past. The previous discussion can be summarised as follows:

*Every explicit statement about a lived present or an imagined future implies a memory of a developmental past.*

Conversely, *every explicit description of a developmental process in the past implies its present and future emotional impact.*

One or the other mode of experience of time is in the foreground of the subjective experience of internal reality at any given time, while the other, complementary mode has for that moment receded into the background. The subject may focus on internal interactions as sequential events following their internal logic, thus emphasising the diachronic aspect of time. The subject may not focus on the fact that the sum of all the memories of past interactions make up the current state of the internal world. Subjectively the focus is not on the synchronic aspect of time, namely that these past events are represented in the present as dynamic interactions of internal images and thus impinge on the present.

**Purpose of the Study**

So far the literature on the effects of divorce has been plagued by a lack of conceptual clarity. The search for explanatory models has not been entirely successful. The research is unequivocal in its conclusion, that parental divorce or a factor associated with it has a detrimental impact on children and adult children of divorce and that outcomes for children show gender specific patterns.

Rather than pursuing the well travelled avenue of investigating a combination of relevant external factors, this study is designed to investigate internal changes due to parental divorce or factors associated with it.

To that end I have introduced the idea that humans live in two realities
simultaneously. The terms internal reality, inner world, internal objects and internal images have then been defined. These concepts will form the theoretical underpinnings of the data analysis. This study investigates, how an external event, in this case parental divorce, affects the inner world and its constituent components and how this event is in turn reflected in this internal reality.

Since gender specific patterns have been found in outcome measures, one wonders, whether matching gender specific patterns are to be found in the internal world. Since this is the first study of its kind, designed to understand the internal world, I have limited myself to exploring the internal world of male children of divorce. While a comparative study of the internal worlds of both boys and girls is desirable, this undertaking would simply overwhelm the scope of this study.

Given the choices made in regards to the theoretical underpinnings and in regards to gender, the research question for this study can now be formulated.

The Question
How is parental divorce and its aftermath reflected in the patterning of the inner world of latency age boys?
METHODOLOGY

Introductory Remarks

This chapter presents the methodological underpinnings of the research design. How a problem for scientific research is posed has direct implications for its methodology. The research question defines and limits the information sought.

Given the question asked, this study uses a qualitative methodology because qualitative methodology allows us to consider questions of meaning. The three main components of the process of data analysis in qualitative research is presented.

Special attention is given to questions of validity of inductively reached qualitative hypotheses.

Since I propose to use a case study format for this study, issues relating to qualitative case studies are discussed.

Qualitative Data Analysis

Introduction

“The low status and marginality of qualitative research have fostered defensive posturing which emphasises (and perhaps exaggerates) the subleties and complexities involved in qualitative analysis (Dey 1998, p. 5)”. There is no more need to justify the choice of a qualitative research strategy (Merriam, 1988). Unfortunately, the editorial boards of most scientific journals not only have a bias for quantitative studies, they also lack the ability to judge qualitative studies (Ambert, Adler, Adler, Detzner 1995). This state of affairs makes for a false dichotomy in research and it may have skewed our views on divorce because only in qualitative studies (i.e. Wallerstein et al.) have children and adolescents been asked directly about their experiences.

Qualitative research is an umbrella term for a variety of approaches to data
collection and analysis in the social sciences. These interpretative techniques seek to come to terms with the meaning and structure of social and psychological phenomena rather than record their frequency. "To operate in a qualitative mode is to trade in linguistic symbols (Van Maanen 1979)."

"The practical problems of conceptualising meaning are common to a range of different perspectives (Dey 1993, p. 5)". My approach to qualitative research is pragmatic, in the sense, that I do not espouse the virtues of one particular epistemology. Instead I shall give the reader a detailed account of the procedures of data analysis and their rationale throughout the 'methods and results' section. In keeping with the pragmatic approach to qualitative research, I discuss some general principles of this type of research and address the questions of reliability and validity.

**Three Components of Qualitative Data Analysis**

As we have seen qualitative studies are inductive in nature. Miles and Huberman (1984) have described three components of qualitative data analysis. Qualitative data analysis consists of three concurrent activities: a) data reduction, b) data display and c) verification/conclusion-drawing. These three processes happen simultaneously throughout the different stages of the study, although at different stages one or the other of the three may be in the foreground. In quantitative studies these three processes are usually distinct and sequential.

*Data reduction* is the process of transforming the raw data appearing in the field notes or interview transcripts. During this process the researcher selects, simplifies and abstracts the collected data. Qualitative studies are analytic from the start because the bounding of the field, the selection of the sample, the conceptual framework, and the research design "all involve anticipatory data reduction - which, as we have noted, is an essential aspect of data analysis (Hubermann, Miles 1994, p. 430)". Later in the study data reduction involves writing of summaries, coding,
construction of clusters, writing of memos etc. This process starts even before the researcher goes out into the field, because in selecting a topic and deciding on a conceptual framework, data reduction has already taken place. Data reduction as one stream of activity continues throughout the study. During data reduction the researcher steps back from the subjects and reappraises the information gathered in the field. This stance of appraisal involves doubt and mistrust in the information received. This mistrust or doubt is not a doubt of the goodwill of the informant, it is a doubt based on the knowledge of the conscious and unconscious limitations of the subjects and the interviewer. One can assume that, what is conscious, known and revealed and therefore recorded in the transcripts, is only part of the available information. Other aspects, such as conflictual or affectively loaded material may be left out or may be metabolised into an unconscious system that may show itself only on closer scrutiny.

*Data display* concerns itself with the presentation of the data. Most qualitative studies display data as text. Miles and Huberman (1984) advocate graphic displays such as charts, graphs, matrices, etc. They argue that graphic data display forces more rigorous analyses to reduce the wealth of field notes. If properly used graphic data displays also guards against the pitfalls of self-serving data selection and poorly justified conclusions, because these displays should represent *all* the data. One of the most frequent reasoning flaws in psychological research involves building causal chains with a limited selection of data (Tversky & Kahneman 1971), so that a small slice of data becomes the basis for a general theory. In hindsight, this effort to display data in charts and matrices was extremely fruitful. It forced a much more rigorous analysis and in the end resulted in a more nuanced theory.

*Conclusion-drawing and verification* is the third stream of analysis. This activity constitutes the *iterative inductive cycle* that makes up the 'constant comparative method' (Glaser, Strauss 1967). Initially the researcher notes
relationships, patterns, covariations, irregularities, etc. He then pieces these bits of insight together into more overarching gestalts. These fragments of emerging theory in turn yield hypotheses that can then be tested (verified) in further field research or confirmed through more thorough study of the existing data. Should the theoretical conclusions stand up to scrutiny, they become building blocks of the theory. Should the process of verification lead to mixed results, the emerging theoretical concepts require either modification or even complete overhaul. Verification can take many shapes, from a simple re-evaluation of the original field notes following a flash of insight or a pang of doubt all the way to attempts to replicate the findings in another setting or with a different population. Through the cycles of conclusion-drawing and verification the theory emerges. This research strategy seeks to minimise the prejudicial effect of pre-established conceptions of the researcher in the field, so that the emerging theory is **grounded in the data**, hence the name 'grounded theory'.

**Criteria for Validity of Qualitative Research**

While validity of logico-deductive research hinges on the quality of the operationalisations used to test the original theory, the validity of inductively derived hypotheses has to be determined in a different fashion. Giorgi (1975) proposes to link the validity of qualitative research with its acceptance in a *dialogue* with the community of scientists. If other scientists consider the results and agree with them, a theory is supposed to be valid. This seems to be a very weak criterion of validity. The history of science is full of situations where a theory was declared to be false by the scientific establishment of the day, only to be vindicated years later.

Hubermann and Miles (1985) have added some criteria for validity reached inductively through qualitative research. While they caution that "inductively derived hypotheses are valid in the relaxed sense that they are probable, reasonable, or likely to be true (Huberman & Miles 1985, p. 357)", they also name four criteria for
assessing validity:
- conceptual consonance: the emerging theory fits with already existing theories
- fittingness: the theory explains the data
- functional efficiency: the theory works when applied next time
- independent corroboration: the theory concurs with the explanations given by the informants in the field

Unlike Giorgi's criterion, these four criteria can be assessed without resorting to agreement among experts. However, it is important to keep in mind that qualitative research based on an inductive approach can only claim to be valid in a relaxed sense.

**Qualitative Case Studies**

While there are single case studies conducted in the empirical tradition (see Kazdin (1982) for a discussion of their merit), most single case designs are qualitative in nature. This study uses more than one single case, yet does not attempt to represent a sample or slice of a given population and therefore does not vie for 'statistical generalisability'. Yin (1989) considers it a fatal flaw to conceive of a single case in a qualitative case study design as a 'sampling unit'. He contrasts two types of generalisations, *analytic generalisation* and *statistical generalisation*.

Statistical research treats each subject as one instance of a larger population. Verbal responses or observations are coded based on pre-established categories, quantified and then analysed by means of probabilistic methods. These mathematical procedures allow the researcher to generalise from the subjects in the given experiment, quasi-experiment or survey to a larger population. Yin calls this level of inference from data to theory *statistical generalisation* (Yin 1989). "In statistical generalisation an inference is made about a population (or universe) on the basis of empirical data collected about a sample (Yin 1989, p. 38)."
In qualitative case studies, the object is *analytic generalisation*, "in which a previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study (Yin 1989, p. 38)". In selecting subjects for case studies, the researcher is looking for individuals that can help shed light on the research questions. In qualitative studies of organisations one often finds references to one key informant that elucidated the information gleaned from everyone else. Qualitative case studies function in similar ways. Each case is understood as potentially having all the information necessary to develop a theory. Multiple cases in case study research function as quasi-multiple studies, that confirm or disconfirm results found in previous cases (Yin 1989).
RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

The particulars of the research design flow from the research question and the methodology. The research design includes the selection of the subjects, the setting and the selection of a research instrument. In the process of selecting the subjects, the setting, and the research instrument, the researcher bounds the data collection.

The Subjects

Selection criteria

First of, an age range was established for the research subjects. Since puberty brings with it many changes related to all aspects of life, it was decided to include only boys who have not yet reached that stage in their development. During latency, the upheavals of puberty that might potentially confound the data are not thought to be as relevant. An age range between 8 years and 12 years old was therefore established for the subjects. In the end, the boys' age ranged from 9 years to 12 years old.

Furthermore, only boys were selected whose parents had lived together and subsequently been separated for at least 18 months. This period of time in terms of recency of the separation has been chosen, because at about 18 months more permanent personality adjustment are starting to solidify (Wallerstein & Blakeslee 1989).

The question of diversity vs. homogeneity of the sample of subjects was addressed next. Bertaux (1981) proposes the concept of ‘diversity’ for selecting respondents in his qualitative approach to sociology. Subjects should represent a range of differing circumstances. For this study, I have included boys who represent a range of differing psychological outcomes, some boys who function well or above average in the social and academic aspects of their lives, as well as boys whose well-being has declined since the separation, as perceived by the referral sources.
Since it is known that social circumstances affects psychological adjustment, a fairly homogeneous group in terms of socioeconomic status was selected, so that the boys' psychological adjustment does not primarily reflect cultural and socioeconomic differences.

At the outset, the study was designed with 10 subjects in mind. However, the difficulty of recruiting boys and the overwhelming amount of data from each case convinced the researcher to limit the study to 7 cases. I concur with Bertaux' (1981) and Yin’s (1989) (see previous chapter) argument that concepts of saturation are more relevant than those of sampling in deciding the number of subjects in qualitative research. Successive interviews quickly approached the point of theoretical saturation.

One boy was chosen for a pilot study. As a psychodynamic psychotherapist working with children and adolescents I have ample experience talking to children about personal matters. I used a pilot interview to familiarise myself with a more structured approach to interviewing and with the recording equipment. The pilot interview was conducted with a twelve year old boy who did not fit the inclusion criteria, but who could relate to the questions because he had grown up without the presence of his father.

Despite the fine tuning of the interview process during the pilot interview, the first interview (Bob I) was somewhat more disjointed than later interviews. However, a careful reading of the transcript does suggest that valuable information was collected. The second interview filled the few remaining gaps left open during Bob's first interview.

**Referral Source**

As referral source, I approached a Soccer Association in the west end of Toronto (name withheld to protect the privacy of the boys who agreed to participate
in the study). This Soccer Association offers a soccer program for boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 15 years old. I have been a coach in this organisation for four years and noticed that 4 out of 13 players on my most recent team lived in single-parent, mother led households. I was told by the president of the association that he was initially shocked to find that roughly one quarter of the registered children live in single-parent households. He has since realised that the program offers a valuable service to these children. Some fellow coaches agreed to present this study to mothers whose boys fit the inclusion criteria of this study.

The Soccer Association in question services a predominantly white, middle-class neighbourhood in the West End of Toronto and most children participating in the soccer program reside in the area. The boys living in this neighbourhood therefore form a homogeneous group in terms of cultural background and socioeconomic status.

**How Parents and Children were Approached for the Study**

The data were gathered through two in-depth interviews with each boy, with an interval of about two weeks between the two consecutive interviews. This allowed the researcher to review the first interview before embarking on the second one, without sacrificing continuity for the subjects.

The mothers who agreed to consider allowing their sons to participate in the study were encouraged to call the researcher. The mothers were informed that the interviews are a part of my doctoral research conducted under the auspices of OISE/UT. They were told that not enough is known about the impact of divorce and its aftermath on their sons and that my research will hopefully contribute to providing improved support. If the mothers were still supportive of the research (and some were not), they were encouraged to bring the topic up with their sons, with the proviso, that the boy’s participation should be strictly voluntary. The mothers then informed me on their conversation with their sons. In one case, the mother agreed to
the study, but the son declined participation. I then contacted the boy and set up an appointment time for the first interview.

**Informed Consent**

It is mandatory for research with human subjects to obtain informed consent. In this case, both the custodial parent and the participating child were asked to give this consent. Parents and children were informed that the interviews would be recorded on audiotape and then transcribed. Both were assured that the interviews will be kept confidential and that each had the right to withdraw from the interview process at any point, should the children or their parent wish to do so. The parents and children signed a consent form stating the above (see Appendix B and Appendix C).

Both, parents and children were informed about the research topic and title of my study and the general topics that were to be raised in the interviews. Both parties received a letter describing the study (see Appendix A). In the beginning of the first interview, each boy was invited to choose a pseudonym and to state his understanding of the purpose and intended topic of the interviews. In the end, the boys were asked whether they thought we have indeed talked about that topic. This process of checking for the boys' understanding of the research topic before and after the interviews was put in place to ascertain *face validity*. All boys concurred that they had indeed given information pertinent to the research question.

**The Setting**

Since the research was to explore the boys' private thoughts and their psychological adjustment to significant events in their lives, the setting had to meet two conditions:

- there had to be an assurance of privacy for the time of the interviews
- the setting should be familiar and comfortable to the boys, so that the interviews are not hampered by anxiety due to a strange environment. All interviews were conducted in the boys' homes behind closed doors, out of earshot of other family members. All interviews were recorded and then transcribed in their entirety.

**The Research Instrument - The Open-ended Interview**

**Introduction**

"Perhaps, then, the best way in investigating the nature of man is to ask him (Schultz 1969, p. 217)".

With the exception of Wallerstein's work, children and adolescents have rarely been able to tell about their experience after divorce without the imposition of a structure: their own voices have not been recorded. This may very well lead to a misrepresentation of children's experience in adult terms, as Allen (1993) suggested in her critique of Amato's meta-analysis of the quantitative literature. This study has attempted to allow the children to respond to a loosely assembled set of question presented in the chapter on the Interview Guide.

The open-ended interview allows for the boys to tell their story in dialogue with the researcher. "The central value of the interview as research procedure is that it allows both parties to explore the meaning of the questions and answers involved (Brenner, Brown, Canter 1985, p. 3)". How this process was handled, is described in the chapter on Questions and Interventions During the Interview.

Finally, issues relating to the skills and the attitude of the interviewer are discussed in the chapter The Researcher as Participant in the Interview.

**The Interview Guide**

Issues and problem areas were formulated beforehand based on the knowledge
of the research literature and my own clinical knowledge gained in the capacity of psychotherapist for children and adolescents who had experienced parental divorce. These questions were listed in an interview guide (see Appendix D). The interview guide was used as a guideline for the interviewer, as the interview unfolded. Care was taken that all major areas addressed by the interview guide were covered in the two interviews. All interviews began with an invitation to associate to the topic of parental divorce. The interviewer then followed the lead of the boy’s association so as to follow and deepen the themes brought up by the subject. During the interview, the researcher introduced new topics when necessary. Care was taken to follow more difficult, conflict-laden material with 'lighter' topics, to ensure that the boys were not overwhelmed by emotional material.

The open-ended nature of the interview allowed the participant to use as much time as was necessary to tell his story. All interviews lasted between 1 and 1 1/2 hours. The interviews were brought to an end, when the boys showed signs of fatique or boredom, unless the interviewer had strong indications that these signs were relevant reactions to the research topic and insights could be gained without harming the relationship or the subject by pursuing the matter further.

**Questions and Interventions during the Interview**

Asking questions is an art. How questions are worded is of extreme importance because the questions serve as stimuli for the subjects to respond to. Asking truly open-ended questions becomes an essential skill of the interviewer (Patton 1980). Only then will the respondents have the freedom to answer the questions in their own language. How difficult a task it is, to ask truly open-ended questions, became apparent during the transcription of the interviews. A definite learning curve was evident related to that skill during the fourteen interviews conducted for this study.

Probes and interventions are a necessary tool for the interviewer (Guba &
Lincoln 1981, Patton 1980). The researcher may ask the subjects to clarify statements, to expand on a topic that was only mentioned in passing, or the researcher may introduce a topic known to be relevant to the research, but not mentioned by the subject so far. However, the decision to intervene has to be weighed carefully because the omission of certain areas of the topic in the spontaneous telling may in itself be a significant finding. The interviewer will have to make this decision on the spot, guided by his prior knowledge, by his clinical skill, as well as by hunches generated during the course of the interview (see the iterative process of the constant comparative method in grounded theory).

Open-ended questions should yield some unexpected results. These in turn, will guide the researcher in developing new questions for subsequent interviews. That way the boys become co-researchers because their input shapes the process of investigation.

In general, the interviewer’s role is to create a relationship that allows the subjects to elaborate on their experience so that its meaning can be revealed.

The Researcher as Participant in the Interview

Methods that have been borrowed from the realm of clinical tools such as unstructured or semi-structured interviews demand specific qualities from the researcher precisely because quasi-clinical data are gathered. I use the term as defined by Berg and Smith (1985, p. 14). “Especially in psychology, the clinical setting is an arena of professional practice or research in which understanding is sought in systematic examination of the researcher and the research relationship as well as in an analysis of the human phenomenon being studied.” This definition of clinical research locates the researcher inside the research as participant in a dialogue, not only as a possible source of unwanted effects or confounds, that should be minimised or at least controlled for. The researcher relies on the ability and willingness of the
Other to report his experiences verbally or make them observable in some other medium such as visual arts. Involving the Other in an in-depth dialogue is an essential skill of the clinical researcher.

Clinical research relies on this relationship between two subjects, the researcher and the research subject. Emotional dynamics between those two play an important role in the research process and presumably in its results. However, instead of solving the problem of emotional dynamics in an interviewer-subject dyad by eliminating emotional responses, that is, by standardising the responses of the researcher in an attempt to minimise his differential influence on the subjects, qualitative research seeks to draw out the differences in subjective experience by encouraging the interviewer to respond in a differentiated manner to each subject and thus engage each subject in an in-depth dialogue about his idiosyncratic inner world. This task of responding in a differentiated manner to a subject's idiosyncratic internal world can only be accomplished if the interviewer has access and is responsive to his own internal world. The interviewer thus bring to the interview his own idiosyncratic experiences. Since open-ended interviews rely on the clinical skills of the researcher they also raise the questions commonly associated with clinically based research.

One of the most vexing issues in clinical theory is the issue of researcher/clinician bias. By bias I mean a prejudice or assumption held by the interviewer/researcher that guides his/her handling of the interview process and skews in a systematic manner the responses given by the research subjects. This prejudice or assumption held by the researcher may also interfere with the data analysis because the researcher may selectively highlight evidence confirming his/her initial bias while discarding evidence that runs counter to his/her assumptions. The issue of bias as a threat to validity will be discussed thoroughly in the final chapter of the dissertation.

Suffice it to say for the moment, that both the conceptual framework and the
grounded approach to the data analysis are designed in such a manner as to safeguard against the danger of bias during the interviews and during the process of drawing conclusion from the raw data.
DATA ANALYSIS - METHOD SECTION

Introductory Remarks

In this chapter, the methods of the data analysis, that is, the process of abstracting more generalised statements from the raw data of the interviews, will be presented. This description concerns the procedures used in the service of the qualitative methodology. As pointed out earlier, in this type of data analysis the procedures chosen reflect the nature of the data and each step or analytic procedure reflects the conclusions the researcher has arrived at so far. Therefore, results of an earlier step of data analysis feed into the choice of procedure at a later date. Earlier findings therefore shape the nature of later results. Later findings also corroborate or call into question early attempts at conceptualising the data. Since the procedures were not chosen in a conceptual vacuum, the emerging theoretical conclusions are discussed alongside the methods. Conceptual dead ends and failures are also discussed along the way.

Transcription Procedures

Each taped interview was transcribed by an experienced secretary. The secretaries were instructed on how to safeguard the confidentiality of the interview process. The two secretaries chosen work for a Family Service Agency and are familiar with clinical material. Because of their background both secretaries also understand how to handle confidential information. The transcripts were stored on computer disk and one hard copy of each interview was printed.

To ascertain the accuracy of the transcripts, the interviewer compared the hard copy of the transcripts for each interview with the original taped interview. A few errors were corrected and some ambiguities resolved. The transcription of Adam’s interview posed unusual problems because Adam was crying during most of the two interviews and his voice was muffled throughout the recording. Some of his
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issues, meaning units often contained several actors and perspectives. Thus more than one category needed to be assigned. However, as a rule, no more than two categories were assigned to any meaning unit. If a third category was needed, the relevant data bit was split instead, so that in the end no more than two categories were assigned to each meaning unit.

Categories were developed based on the communalities present in the annotations. The descriptions of the annotations centred around actions and states. Angry attacks for instances occurred in many stories. The category assigned to this state or action was anger. This choice was made so that this category would include both the state of anger and the action of attacking. Since all reported attacks were fuelled by anger but not every experience of anger led to an attack, yet anger seemed to connote a potential for attack, anger was the more inclusive category. The categories were each defined to have very specific inclusion criteria and these inclusion criteria were refined continuously. For example, the category 'Injury' was first defined as describing a state of physical harm to one of the participants of any given interaction. Later, with the linking of categories under way, this definition was changed to also include emotional harm due to an emotional attack.

An initial set of 16 categories was later expanded to 24 categories during the task of coding the interviews. During the process of coding, the initial definitions of the categories were constantly reevaluated. These categories form the raw material for the sequential chains and the tables of relational patterns (the list of categories and their definitions can be found in Appendix E).

In an initial attempt to conceptualise the data, the categories were subdivided into four groups centring around one core category identified as 'conflict'. However, this endeavour failed (see the section on 'failure to find a core category').

The Failure to Find a Core Category
When the process of assigning categories to the data bits was finished, I tried to develop one overarching general structure for all cases. I was looking for one category or a group of categories that could be seen as central in each and every case. Given, that every case would need to be organised around a central construct, finding one single case that could not would then undermine its empirical validity.

Only categories represented in every single case were therefore considered in the search for a single central construct. A list of all categories assigned in every case showed that the categories Conflict, Loss, Longing, Fixing, Peacemaking and Recovery were the only ones represented in every case. However, for each of these categories I found at least one case in which it could not easily be applied as an organising construct.

For example, the most promising category, Conflict, had only three assigned data bits in one case (Pepsi). Further checking of these three meaning units showed that the described level of conflict was very low. In two instances there was even doubt during coding whether to assign this category to the meaning unit. Conflict was therefore not deemed a useful central construct for organising the data in Pepsi's case, and was thus eliminated as a general organising construct.

In hindsight, the problem at this stage was that the categories were treated as static states and not as dynamic forces in interactional sequences.

Associated with that problem was another issue: Since the same category was assigned to meaning units with different actors involved, a means of codifying this relationship between assigned category and person(s) involved in the data hit had to be found. A process had to be developed to distinguish, for example the anger expressed by a father from the anger expressed by one of the boys.

Early in the data analysis, an attempt was made to organise the data according to the protagonists involved in any given interaction. Based on theoretical assumptions rooted in object relation theory, the categories were cross-referenced
according to four internal images. The internal images of father, mother, combined couple and the self were assumed to be the most relevant for the internal psychic organisation of the boys. However, two problems arose simultaneously:

- First, most categories were assigned to data bits with at least two, and sometimes three or more actors.

This meant that most data bits was associated with more than one internal image. Without the concept of interaction between various internal images there seemed to be no explanation as to why so many data bits were assigned to several internal images.

- Secondly, internal 'characters' other than mother, father, and child were involved in some episodes of the interviews.

Because the data analysis initially presupposed a set of four internal images, the data pertaining to all other characters would have been lost for further study. If, for example a mother was interacting with her parents, this data bit was assigned to the maternal image only, disregarding the internal image of mother's parents.

Therefore, the attempt to cross-reference a limited number of static internal images and categories led to two problems. For one, relevant data were excluded from the analysis because they could not be assigned to one of the internal images, that had been chosen a priori. Secondly, each data bit was assigned to up to two categories and was then cross-referenced with up to three internal images, creating confusion rather than conceptual clarity.

**Linking the Data - Creating Relational Matrices**

Since no central organising construct emerged from the data at this point, further analytic strategies were necessary to arrive empirically at more generalised statements about the data. Dey (1993) describes a process of considering meaning units in context by linking these units to create chains or sequences of categorised
data. This procedure was done for every single case.

Every data bit was now considered in context. If any given meaning unit was part of a story or chain of events, the chain of events was now expressed by sequentially linking the meaning units that had already been categorised previously. This procedure of linking data bits resulted in sequences of categories.

Interviewer: What do you see in your mind's eye, right now?
John Doe: Umm ... My Dad sitting at a table with someone and I spilled food or something and he gets mad and starts yelling at me (John Doe I, p.6).

If for example John Doe spilled his food at the table, his father then got angry and the boy was punished, the sequence of linked categories would be: Mistake (boy) leads to Anger (father). This short example is part of a more involved story that links many more categories into a sequential chain.

As each data bit was linked with the surrounding data, complex sequences began to emerge. Often one specific sequence of categories was found numerous times within the same case. Categories also carried a tag referring to the participants involved in the interaction. The sequences of linked categories for each interactional pair or triad were built up until they were saturated. This was said to have occurred when further data bits did not contribute any new links to a given sequence. The resulting sequences were then mapped for each case and called 'relational matrices'. Each 'relational matrix' was then displayed as interactional sequence between two or more participants in space and time. The visual display of the relational matrices allowed the researcher to:

- follow a given relational sequence in time
- follow complex interactional patterns among numerous participants

Several relational matrices were constructed for each case. Each matrix represents a chain of events between various interactional partners as remembered or wished for by the boy.

The concept of an inner world peopled by internal images (Fairbairn, 1946) was
then brought to bear on the relational matrices (see the chapter ‘Conceptual Framework) and the combination of these two concepts redirected the course of the data analysis. Once the actors and characters in the boys’ narratives were understood as internal representations of real or imagined people in the external world, the relational matrices were cast in a new, theoretically fruitful light.

A relational matrix displays a sequence of internal events as a dialogue or interaction between various internal actors/images. The actors in the narrative are defined as internal images relating to each other in an internal drama. By utilising the relational matrices as abstract descriptions of the inner world the researcher can now accommodate an infinite number of internal images and the relevant internal images do not have to be defined a priori. This solved the dilemma of a finite set of defined internal images that had stymied the data analysis in previous attempts.

Every case yielded twelve or more relational matrices. Each matrix was thought to represent one aspect of the boys’ internal reality. These matrices were the tools used in the early parts of the data analysis.

To put it succinctly, the construction and analysis of the relational matrices provides a rigorous, empirically based method of condensing internal relational structures from a given narrative.

The relational matrices describe dynamic sequences of actions and states among various internal images.

The relational matrices were later supplanted as tools for the data analysis by ‘relational patterns’ based on a given set of internal roles. This step from relational matrices to relational patterns is described following the chapter on epistemological considerations regarding the linking process.

**Epistemological Considerations regarding Linking Meaning Units**

So far, we have simply set up relational matrices by linking categories into
sequential chains without thoroughly questioning the nature of the link. Any transitive verb denotes a potential link between two states or actions. Among the many possible ways of linking categories two were singled out, 'leads to' and 'avoids'. The two links are the inverse of one another. If an action A leads to a state B then avoiding the action A also avoids state B. This type of logic was found in the data, i.e. when Zachary stated that he does not want to get married to avoid a separation as destructive as his parents' break-up.

How to make use of and assess the strength of the links will now be scrutinised. The following discussion applies to both types of links A 'leads to' B, and not-A avoids B. Both links are based on the assumptions by the subject/narrator that action A is associated with an effect B.

The word 'leads to' is ambiguous enough to denote three types of links, a causal link, an explanatory link, or a temporal link. Since the subject of the study is the internal reality of the boys, the most important criterion for the nature of the links is the state of mind of the subjects. If they see causal or explanatory links among internal events they assume an inner logic, if they see events as following one another as mere coincidence, conclusions about the inner logic of their internal reality have to be made much more cautiously.

The strongest link between two data bits is a causal link. If one event is indeed thought to be the cause for another, we can always expect that the second event follows, whenever the first is present. Causal links cannot be found in data because the data show subjective reality. They only contain causal associations between events as seen by the boys. In other words, the boys may well see a causal connection between action A and effect B, but this association is their subjective explanation of events. It does not follow that action A is without fail followed by event B.

Explanatory links are weaker than causal links, and temporal links are
weaker still. Both explanatory and temporal links are abundant in the data.

Explanatory links, just like causal links, are based on the conjunction 'because' as in: 'I ate all the cookies because I was hungry'. The person making this statement explains his action of 'eating all the cookies' with the internal subjective state 'I was hungry'. We cannot claim to know that the hunger was the objective cause for his action (this would be a causal link), because there may have been other causal factors not in the subjective awareness of the individual making this claim. We can claim however, that the individual explains his action of eating the cookies with his feeling of hunger. This explanatory link is part of how this individual makes sense of the internal and external world. Most of the boys' statements fall into this category.

Temporal links are based on the conjunction 'and then'. Suppose the individual tells us that he ate the cookies because he was hungry and was then yelled at. The individual made a temporal link between the action of eating the cookies and getting yelled at. Temporal links are considered weak because they do not imply any inherent order based on some form of causality. They simply put events into a sequence. A temporal link does not allow any assumptions about future sequences. Pure temporal links do not appear to serve the goals of this study because they do not allow us to generalise (they do not imply inherent order). Let me therefore consider the temporal links found abundantly in the interviews more carefully.

Narratives, of course, depend on the fact that the listener converts temporal chains into explanatory or even causal chains. In our example, under certain circumstances, the listener would convert 'he ate all the cookies and then got yelled at' into 'he got yelled at because he ate all the cookies'. The listener assumes that the storyteller would let us know in context, if he thought he got yelled at for reasons other than eating all the cookies, i.e. he might tell us 'this person always disliked me, so they yelled at me'. If we assume that the temporal sequence of 'being yelled at' after 'eating all the cookies' denotes that the individual sees 'the eating of all the
cookies’ as the cause for ‘being yelled at’ we are interpreting a temporal link as an explanatory link. Let us now consider the advantages and disadvantages of such an interpretive leap.

When making an interpretive leap from a temporal to an explanatory link, we assume that the author is trying to explain a chain of events to us, that is, through his narrative he is making sense of the events. In making this leap we assume a lawful universe and we further assume that humans have a propensity to impose order through mental activity, i.e. telling stories. Sherman and Titus (1982) showed that making causal inferences actually plays a role in encoding information in memory. In other words to remember is to link events via inferences.

We can interpret temporal links to imply explanations as long as we carefully consider the context. Studying the context will help us determine whether the author has offered other competing explanations for the temporal sequence under scrutiny.

If, on the other hand, we decide to err on the side of caution and forgo the interpretive leap from temporal to explanatory links in principle, we risk losing a wealth of data usually implied in sequential narrative. In this case we misread the data in the opposite direction. Rather than treating the data as part of a logical chain we treat them as mere chronology, with the implication that the sequence of events is coincidental and does not follow an internal logic. We then assume that the narrator is not attempting to explain how he thinks the events are linked logically.

In the end, the reader will have to decide in each case whether the data presented bear the weight of the inferences made about the nature of the link between two internal events.

**From Relational Matrices to Relational Patterns**

So far the workings of the internal world have been conceptualised as chains of actions or states among various internal images. During the cross case analysis, the
researcher arrived at even more abstract statements about the data. It became clear that all relational matrices (and the initial categories for that matter) centred around two core themes, conflict and provision of resources. Eventually this 'discovery' of core themes led to new analytic tools called relational patterns that supplanted the relational matrices. In the end, relational patterns are used as analytic tools in the case studies and in the cross case analysis. While the contents of the relational patterns is discussed in the result section, the nature of the relational patterns belongs to the method section. Relational patterns describe internal events in ways compatible with Fairbairn's (1946) concept of 'the organised structure of the inner world'.

Initially the case studies were written up using the relational matrices as an analytic tool. During the analysis and presentation of the case studies, the first building blocks of the relational patterns emerged. In the process of constructing relational matrices, it became evident that specific internal images were 'cast' repeatedly in specific 'roles' in the internal drama. Some of these roles had inadvertently been identified and named in the Case Studies (i.e. the internal Aggressor, the internal Victim, the internal Caregiver, later called the Provider, etc.). However, during the within case analyses no attempt was made to incorporate these internal functions into a conceptual framework or to investigate the roles/functions systematically.

The attempt to contrast and compare cases in the cross case analysis required a set of comparable properties for each case. Trying to compare cases on the basis of relational matrices proved impossible because the relational matrices were often found to be similar in some ways and quite dissimilar in others. Initially relational matrices had proven useful in the case studies because the emphasis was on describing the flux of internal relations. However, relational matrices cannot be compared across cases. Other, more stable properties had to be identified for each
case so that a cross case comparison was feasible.

During the cross case analysis, it became clear that the boys' narratives centred around the aforementioned two core themes, conflict and provision of resources. Associated with each theme was a set of roles or functions. The resulting configurations of internal images were tabulated and called relational patterns. Relational patterns describe the function of each internal image participating in a specific chain of internal events. The conceptual step from relational matrices (interactional) to relational patterns (functional) made the cross case analysis feasible.

During the cross case analysis, the rudimentary system of roles and their definition was developed further. Most roles seemed to occur in complementary dyads or in triads. For every internal Aggressor, the relational structures also contained an internal Victim, and often also an internal Pacifist. During the cross case analysis, all functions/roles of internal images were catalogued and then compared. Functions/roles that seemed similar were clustered together. Their common essential characteristic were extracted and the role was then named so that the name conveys the essential characteristics of that role. Five roles clustered around issues of conflict and six roles clustered around issues relating to the provision of resources.

The core themes and their respective roles are understood as organising principles for the boys' internal worlds in the wake of parental separation. The defining aspect of each role is its function within the context of the internal world. Each role designates a specific function in the internal world.

The internal image occupying a given role can now be identified as having a specific function in the internal world. Throughout the case studies and the cross case analysis this process of assigning a specific function to an internal image is referred to as 'casting', because an internal agency, that cannot itself be observed
(presumably the ego), casts certain internal images in certain roles and thus assigns a function to each internal image. The internal world is seen as akin to a dramatic production with certain roles (internal functions) occupied by certain actors (internal images). While not all roles (functions) are filled in every production (each episode in each case), the main themes of conflict and provision of resources are dealt with in every production.

The notion that the internal reality of the boys revolves around two main themes with a limited set of functional roles depicts the internal world as more stable than the notion of relational matrices as abstractions of ever changing relational events.

Not only does this notion of relational patterns allow for comparison across cases. It also allows for meaningful comparisons during the within case analysis. The cases are no longer analysed as a succession of relational events. Instead each relational pattern is compared to other patterns and analysed as part of a meaningful whole. The constant comparative method is thus applied to the within case analysis. In the results section, the reader is presented with a distilled internal structure for each case based on considerations of each relational pattern in context.

**Definition of Internal Roles Relating to Conflict**

Conflict, the aftermath of conflict, and conflict resolution were themes discussed in every case. Not surprisingly, the theme of conflict dominated the memories before and leading up to parental separation for most boys. The first two complementary roles that emerged from the data were connected with this theme. They are the (internal) Aggressor and the (internal) Victim. Later three more roles belonging to this theme emerged in the data. These are the Pacifist/Healer, the Authority, and the Bad or Disobedient Rulebreaker.

All roles are defined as a range of functions within the internal world. Each role
is associated with a set of categories and its corresponding meaning units. The following definitions for each role contain its essential characteristics, its range of functions in the inner world, and the corresponding categories.

the **Aggressor** - angrily attacks, causes conflict and injury to the Victim, the role ranges from representations of expressions of critical disapproval to representations of violent physical attack, corresponding categories: anger, conflict

the **Victim** - is innocent, but injured by the Aggressor during conflict, the role ranges from representations of mild to moderate emotional discomfort to representations of physical injury, corresponding categories: damage or injury and relief

the **Pacifist** - attempts to stop conflict and takes care of the Victim, the role ranges from representations of wishful thinking without action to representations of powerful action to stop Aggressors, corresponding category: peacemaking often paired with fixing.

the **Rulebreaker** - intentionally or through neglect causes injury or damage to a Victim, breaks rules imposed by social convention or by the Authority, the role ranges from representations of inadvertent 'honest' mistakes to representations of breaking social conventions, natural laws, and agreed upon contracts, corresponding category: mistake

the **Authority** - sets rules and limits for conduct and enforces these against Rulebreakers, the role ranges from representations of the setting and enforcement of fair and equitable rules for conduct to representations of setting of unfair and arbitrary rules enforced in a harsh and punitive
To give the reader a taste of how the roles relate to the data, a brief segment of Michael's first interview along with the coding and the casting of internal images into roles is presented. In the following segment, three roles relating to conflict are illustrated, the Aggressor, the Victim, and the Pacifist.

Interviewer: O.K. So if you could have done something about it (the fighting), what would you have done? Have you thought about what you could have done?  
Michael: Maybe told them that...not to fight any more.  
Interviewer: Did you do that?  
Michael: Not really.  
Interviewer: No? Why not?  
Michael: Well, once, when I was small my Mom was crying, so I was going to tell them...um tell him not to be mean to her.  
Interviewer: Yeah... Did you? ... And what did your Dad say?  
Michael: Well, I sort of forgot about it because he wasn't there.  
Interviewer: Right.  
Michael: And so I sort of forgot about that. (Michael I, p. 3)

Here, Michael describes the aftermath of a conflict. The internal father's mean attack (anger) on the internal mother leads to emotional injury to the internal mother. The Self image forgets (was absent-minded) to stop the internal father from hurting mother image. Both mother and father image participate in the conflict, but their roles are different. While the internal father starts the conflict, the internal mother gets victimised. The father image is cast as Aggressor, and the mother image as Victim. Michael casts the powerless Self image in the role of Pacifist, the one image that wants to but fails to stop the internal father from injuring the internal mother. The relational pattern for this episode was tabulated as follows (table # 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Before Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 1: Michael's relational patterns regarding conflict before separation

Michael did not cast any internal image in the role of Rulebreaker or in the role of Authority in this episode. Relational patterns for each internal episode were tabulated and these patterns formed the underpinnings for the case studies and the cross case
Some aspects of this theme. Themes of deprivation and absence dominate the boys' memories of the time after parental separation. Internal roles associated with the theme of provision of care and resources are the Provider, the Dependent (i.e. the Baby Self), the Ally, the Failing Provider, the Impoverished or Deprived Dependent, and the Competitor. This theme encompasses two related areas, one dealing with emotional presence and care, and the other dealing with the physical aspects of nurturing. Summing up, the roles relating to internal representations of the provision of resources are defined as follows:

**the Provider**
- provides adequate care and resources for a Dependent, the role ranges from representations of expressions of emotional presence and financial provision to representations of care for injuries, corresponding categories: fixing and filling, reunion

**the Dependent**
- receives adequate care and resources from the Provider, the role ranges from representations of gratification of emotional needs for presence and nurturing to representations of gratification of material needs, corresponding categories: loyalty, recovery

**the Ally**
- provides care and presence for the Dependent in lieu of Provider, the role ranges from representations of gratification of emotional needs for presence and nurturing to representations of gratification of material
the Failing Provider - fails to provide adequate care and resources for the Dependent, the role ranges from representations of partial emotional and physical withdrawal to representations of emotional and material neglect, corresponding categories: rejection, deprivation, withdrawal.

the Deprived Dependent - does not receive adequate care and resources from the Failing Provider, the role ranges from representations of mild emotional and material distress to representations of loneliness and poverty, corresponding categories: lack of resources, loss, hoarding, progression or regression, longing and dis-engagement

the Competitor - competes with a Dependent for care and resources of a Provider, the role ranges from representations of mild tensions to representations of open conflict for resources, corresponding category: competing

Excerpts from Adam's first interview are used to illustrate the roles associated with provision of resources. In the following segment, Adam compares the resources going to different internal images.

Interviewer: So, what about his new wife,... I mean, he (Adam’s father) left his debts here (in mother’s realm), what’s he doing now?  
Adam: I think he’s fine. He’s living in a condominium which is quite nice, goes on vacations, takes vacations once a year, goes to the cottage in the summer every other week or something, or weekend. He works from home so he can be with his kid.
...
A: He doesn’t give us anything..... except for what he has to, ... the government makes him.
...
I: What’s that like for you?  
A: Well, I think he’s got money to spare and I need something, but he won’t give it to me.
I: Does he give more to his new son?
A: Yeah. Well, all his clothes are from Gap - he has expensive toys and whatever.
(Adam I, pp. 15, 16).

The Self image and the representation of the original family (this includes Self, mother and brother image) suffer from an acute lack of resources. The role associated with this lack of resources is the one of Deprived Dependent. The internal father has resources, but provides (fix) mostly for the representation of his new family (including new wife and halfbrother). The internal Father is cast in the role of Provider in relation to the internal new family which is cast in the role of Dependent in relation to Provider internal father. At the same time, the internal Father deprives the Self and brother images. Here the internal father is cast in the role of Failing Provider in relation to the Self and the brother image who are both cast as Deprived Dependents. The internal Halfbrother is cast in the role of (successful) Competitor to the Self image for the resources of the internal father.

A representation of the government forces (power) the depriving internal father to provide (fix) a minimum amount of resources to the internal old family, but not enough to ease the sense of poverty (lack of resources) of the Self image. The representation of the government is cast in the role of the Authority, a role already familiar from the set of roles relating to conflict. Adam’s internal images regarding provision of resources are cast as follows in this brief excerpt (table # 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Competitor</th>
<th>Failing Prov.</th>
<th>Depr. Depend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Halfbrother</td>
<td>New Family</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 2: Adam’s relational patterns regarding resources after separation

The relational pattern does not contain an internal image in the role of Ally. All other roles are occupied. It is immediately apparent that the internal father image is pivotal in this relational pattern. In relation to Self, the father image functions as Failing Provider, leaving the Self as Deprived Dependent, while the father image
functions as good Provider for the Dependent halfbrother image.

Each episode was analysed in the manner described above and the roles of the various internal images were then tabulated and compared first within case and then across cases. The case studies are based on the former (within case comparison) and the cross case analysis on the latter.

The Problem of Memory and Imagination

Introduction

The following account describes the conceptual struggle with one of the properties of the internal world, namely the difference between internal events based on memory and internal events based on wishes and fears, that is, internal events based on a combination of memory and imagination.

The question of how to code meaning units expressing wishes and fears emerged during the early stages of the data analysis. The information 'hidden' in what came to be called 'imaginary structures' or 'imaginary solutions' was at first thought to confuse the issue of how the boys had made sense of the real events of the separation. Disposing of the relational information contained in wishful thinking about the future posed a very serious problem for the study because it meant that about 30% of the data could not be analysed with the tools described in the previous chapters.

During the first attempts at data display and during early attempts at linking the relational matrices into one coherent internal structure for each case, it became clear that a distinction had to be made between remembered events and events that were wished for or feared. Initially all statements relating to how the boys saw their future or how they would change either the present or the past if they had the resources, were subsumed under the category Aspirations. Once the relational matrices were constructed with their emphasis on interaction among internal images, this category was disposed of. The segments initially coded as Aspirations usually
contained a description of relational patterns among various internal actors. The coding and linking procedures that had been applied to the relational patterns based on memory were now applied to the ‘imaginary’ relational patterns. This procedure yielded a whole new class of relational patterns.

When these imaginary patterns were compared with memory-based patterns (within case comparison), it became apparent that the imaginary structures often contradicted memory-based structures or reversed their outcomes. The data analysis yields two types of relational patterns:

The first type is called memory-based structures. These structures are representations of relational patterns of what the boys consider the ‘real’ (i.e. remembered) events in their lives. These structures are based on their memories of the past. Memory-based structures form the bedrock of the data analysis. Relational patterns described as memories of events show a snapshot of the boys’ internal images and how these images have been shaped by their memories. It is understood, however, that memory is selective and is in itself a construction based on a selective recollection of the past.

The second type is called imaginary structures. These structures are relational patterns based on how the boys wished their lives had unfolded in the past or wish or fear that their lives might unfold in the future. Some boys made these statements spontaneously. In these cases the imaginary plots became the main thread of the interview. Pepsi for instance, immediately associated the wish for an older brother with the topic of separation and returned to that topic several times spontaneously. Other boys responded to specific interview questions with imagined stories. It is understood that imaginary relational patterns always contain a kernel of memory around which they crystallise. This question is taken up in more detail in the next chapter.
The Reparative Function of Imagination and its Relation to Memory

When the imaginary structures are compared with the structures based on memory, it becomes apparent that they usually take as their point of departure a particularly difficult internal state of affairs and reverse the outcome of that relational pattern. In comparison to memory-based structures, imagined solutions allow for better outcomes because the imagination transcend some of the physical, financial and psychological limitations reality (and memory) imposes on the boys' Self. When memory-based and imaginary matrices are charted for each case, a clear pattern emerges. In each case

- the imaginary structures are attempts (not always successful) to reverse unfavourable outcomes in the memory-based structures
- in the imaginary structures the Self representation is more powerful or rich and motivated by benign motives towards troubled internal images.

The imaginary solutions are responses to problematic relational patterns. Imaginary relational patterns are constructed in an attempt to reverse the negative outcomes of memory-based relational patterns. They provide an imaginary solution for pressing problems that overtax current resources of the ego. In their adaptive aspects imaginary solutions are close to Klein's concept of reparation. "Reparation .... consists of the phantasy of putting right the effects of the aggressive components" (Hinshelwood, 1991, p. 414). In other words, reparation is an attempt to undo harm done by aggressive internal images.

Reparation in phantasy is only possible if the Self image as the author of reparation is vested with more resources and power than it has been in the memory-based matrices. In the successful imaginary relational patterns, the Self is somehow better equipped (idealised or inflated) so that Self's reparative power is increased.

Some imaginary structures fail to provide better solutions because feared
outcomes from the memory-based patterns overwhelm the attempts to imagine a better future. In that case, the Self lacks the power to undo the harm to Victim images.

**Imaginary structures are attempts by an idealised aspect of the Self to repair in phantasy injuries to internal images suffered in the memory-based relational patterns.**

**Conclusions**

In the method section, I have presented the slow emergence of the concepts and tools that provide the underpinnings for the result section. These concepts are grounded in the data and are one way of describing in abstract terms the workings of the inner world. The role of memory and imagination is defined by these concepts, as is the function of each internal image in relation to other images. The latter has been achieved by defining the internal roles as functions of internal images in the internal relational patterns. Ultimately, the relational patterns (in memory and imagination) have become the tool for the data analysis and for the presentation of the results in the result section.
DATA ANALYSIS - RESULT SECTION

Introduction

In qualitative research, the process of data analysis is not linear (Huberman, Miles 1994). As the analysis proceeds, emerging theory often requires that the analyst revisit earlier steps. Initial findings and emerging concepts also direct further investigation and analysis. Earlier findings therefore shape the nature of later results. Later findings also corroborate or call into question early attempts at conceptualising the data.

While this process of building up a theory is not linear, it has been cast into linear form for the purpose of presenting the results of the data analysis. The result section is divided into three subcategories:

- Conventions for the presentation of the results
  language usage in the result section
  the issue of time in the inner world
- case studies. Each case is analysed and its internal structure is presented.
- cross case analysis. Results of the case studies are compared and a typology is developed.

Conventions for the Presentation of the Results

Language Usage in the Result Section

As I have pointed out, this study does not attempt to describe family dynamics. While the boys may well believe that their stories are based on real events, the study analyses the interviews as the boys’ representations of their internal psychic reality.

The only exception to this rule are the few lines of ‘factual information’ preceding the actual analysis of each case in the case studies section. These ‘facts’ were given to the researcher by the parents before the interviews. Strictly speaking
the facts represent the parents’ memories of certain events, such as time of the separation and the composition of the family. In the case studies, this ‘factual information’ precedes the analysis of each boy’s internal world.

The interviews themselves are analysed as expressions of intrapsychic dynamics, that is, as relational structures among various internal characters. The ‘characters’ in the narratives, such as ‘father’, ‘mother’, ‘ex-wife’, ‘step-mother’, ‘ex-husband’, ‘step brother’, are seen as mental representations or mental images of real or imagined people that inhabit the internal world. As Fairbairn (1944) has suggested, these internal images act upon each other in ways similar to the interactional patterns observable between ‘real people’.

Unfortunately, the narrative of the result section becomes very cumbersome if the ‘correct’ descriptors, such as the ‘internal image of the ex-wife’ or the ‘internal half-brother’, are used for presentation of the case studies at all times.

For ease of reading, I have at times opted for a more readable style. To indicate that the analysis is dealing with internal actors as opposed to real people, I have capitalised the names of these actors, and dropped their article. If, for example, a boy describes a memory of his father depriving his ex-wife of financial support, this statement about a memory would translate into a statement about an internal dynamic as follows: Father is depriving Ex-wife of financial support. This statement is defined to be equivalent to the statement: the internal father image (Father) is depriving the internal image of the ex-wife (Ex-wife) of internal support. Both statements are defined to be interchangeable. Ease of reading and conceptual clarity are the two factors taken into account in deciding how the results are presented in any given section.

To denote internal psychodynamic patterns, the following rules are followed: The names of the ‘characters’ of the internal world are capitalised and their article dropped, so as to mark them as internal images and to differentiate
them from real people thought to populate the ‘world out there’.

The Issue of Time in the Inner World

During the process of writing up the case studies it became apparent that the relational patterns could usefully be divided into three groups that are loosely connected, although not equivalent, to the concepts of past, present, and future. The casting of the internal family before the separation of the internal couple is often quite different from the casting of the internal family after separation. Imaginary relational patterns also have their own distinct cast. In the tables imaginary internal images are italicised.

The internal family before separation is thought to be loosely linked to the past, the internal family after separation to the present, and the imaginary internal family to the future.

The division of the internal reality into three segments has proven fruitful and the three segments are presented in the case studies in the following order:

- memory-based relational patterns describing events before separation
- memory-based relational patterns in the aftermath of separation
- imaginary relational patterns

The issue of synchronic and diachronic time (see Ogden 1994) has to be revisited at this point. On one hand, all three types of relational patterns are said to co-exist in the psyche simultaneously (all the various memories, regardless of historical time lines, and the imagined future are potentially available to the person at the same time), and together they make up the sum total of the internal world of each case. This is the synchronic aspect of time as it relates to each case.

It is assumed that the snapshot into the inner world of each boy contains memories of the past that are nevertheless alive in the present of the narrative. In the results section these memories are thus treated as part of the subjective
present of each boy. The boys' statements about their future are handled in a similar way. They are recounted in the present tense because they are thought to be part of the inner world at the time of the interview.

On the other hand, the boys' memories concern themselves with historical time and a historic time line is implied (event A happened later than event B) in their remembered past. The imaginary matrices are set in the future or in 'potential' time, not in historical time. This is the diachronic aspect of time. The case studies take the diachronic aspect into account by presenting the internal events sequentially. The case studies follow a time line of presenting the relational patterns before separation first, followed by the relational patterns after separation, and then the imagined relational patterns.

Thus the narrative in the case studies will present events in sequential order, but employ the present tense throughout.

The necessity to selectively present material poses an additional problem. The task of the writer is to present the cases in such a manner that the reader is provided with enough quotes to enable the reader to critically assess the link between the data and their analysis without overwhelming the reader with 'evidence'. The quotes presented throughout the data analysis are selected to provide the reader with raw data as evidence of the conclusions drawn by the researcher. By necessity these quotes are taken out of their context within the interview. Further complicating the position of the reader is the fact that the quotes used in the presentation of the case studies do not follow the sequential order of the interview because the logic of the data analysis does not follow the sequential order of the interviews. During the case studies, the reader encounters quotes without knowledge of prior sections of the interview.

To provide the reader with the knowledge that is implicit in the interviewer's questions or comments, I have for the most part extended the quotes to the point
that the reader does get a sense of how the boys’ and, most importantly, the interviewer’s statements occurred in context. That approach should give the reader ample opportunity to appreciate how the excerpts appeared in context.

The quotes from the boys’ interviews were chosen so as to provide the reader with the most complete illustration of a particular relational pattern. That said, some aspects of a given relational pattern might be highlighted more strongly in a different excerpt of that same set of interviews. However, this other excerpt might fail to illustrate other essential aspects of the relational pattern in question.

**Abbreviations in the Tables of Relational Patterns**

The following abbreviations are used in the tables due to space restrictions in the cells:

- **Bro.** - Brother
- **Competit. or Comp.** - Competitor
- **Depend. or Dep.** - Dependent
- **Depr.** - Deprived
- **Fa.** - Father
- **Fail.** - Failing
- **Fut.** - Future
- **Grandpar.** - Grandparents
- **Halfbro.** - Halfbrother
- **Imagin. or Imag.** - Imaginary
- **Mo.** - Mother
- **Orig.** - Original
- **Powerl.** - Powerless
- **Prov.** - Provider
- **S.** - Self
- **Sep.** - Separation
Introduction

The results of a general, conceptual nature have been presented in the method section. These concepts amount to a model of mind, that is, a model of how the inner world is structured. Armed with that model of mind, the case studies are now presented. Both constituent concepts of that model,

- the concept of memory versus imagination, and
- the concept of relational patterns (internal images occupying functions in the internal world)

make up the theoretical underpinnings of the presentation of the case studies.

Some boys recounted more than one story in each of the time segments. Therefore, more than one relational pattern had to be constructed for that given period. As relational patterns change, the various internal images are cast in different roles. Generally speaking, the case studies present various aspects of the internal drama connected in a meaningful way (that is, following the boy's logic). As already discussed in the method section, quotes are chosen to best represent a given relational pattern.

The tables of relational patterns are numbered and presented in relevant segments throughout the case studies and in the cross case analysis. For an overview of all relational patterns sorted on a case by case basis, the reader can consult Appendix F. Appendix G shows a comparative overview of relational patterns sorted by dimension and time period. The tables contained in the result section are listed in List of Tables.
Factual Information

Adam was almost thirteen years old at the time of his two interviews. Adam’s parents separated 7 years earlier. His father left the house. Adam has a younger brother who was 8 years old at the time of the interviews. Adam’s father is remarried and the union with his new wife has produced a four year old half brother.

Relational Patterns before Separation

The Internal Family before Separation.

Adam has some sketchy memories of his parents’ accounts of their early life and their early years as a couple. The following matrices and the roles associated with them were based on these memories. This aspect of Adam’s memories mostly concerns itself with the theme of care and resources.

A: He (father) wasn’t too well off at all. He worked..., came here from Cyprus, and he started working in a diaper cleaning shop.
I: Hm...
A: Then my Mom and Dad met and he went to school and got a good job at a computer place (Adam II, p. 15).

A: My Mom, ... she relied on him. She quit her job to take care of me, but ....
I: So, she lost it all. She lost her job.
A: She paid for his education.
I: She did?
A: Yeah. And, after they met, ... when they met, he was, like, working at a crappy job and she paid for him to go to school and then he left his job and became an engineer (Adam II, p. 9).

Here, Father is shown in the role of Deprived Dependent. The union with Provider Mother changes this situation. Provider Mother helps Dependent Father to develop the ability to generate resources and become a Provider. Father is then cast in the Provider role for Dependent Mother, who quits her job and relies on Father’s care. This arrangement works while the internal Couple remains intact, because Provider Father takes care of Dependent Mother. These two sets of roles concerning the
provision of resources before separation are shown in table # 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 3: Adam’s relational patterns regarding resources before separation

The theme of conflict is introduced into the memory-based relational patterns before separation as follows:

A: Yeah. They fought a lot. There was very physical fights and I couldn’t do anything about it. I was too little. I really couldn’t help my Mom.

I: If you, just for a moment, try to go back in your mind, can you describe it - can you describe what it was like for you and what you saw.

A: Yeah. My Dad got mad at something and they started fighting in the kitchen and my Dad put my Mom’s head in the door and started shutting it, ... and it was between the door and the frame, and then my Mom took a broomstick and stuck it in between so the door couldn’t close and my Dad broke the broomstick and they started fighting and I was just sitting there, saying ‘Stop’, trying to stop them, but they’d say, ‘You’ll understand when you’re older’, and stuff like that (Adam I, pp. 13, 14).

In this episode, Father is the Aggressor who starts a violent conflict with Victim Mother. From this account, one can conclude that Victim Mother was threatened with physical injury by Aggressor Father (‘my Dad put my Mom’s head in the door and started shutting it’). A small powerless aspect of Self is cast as Pacifist and makes a futile attempt to stop the fighting.

The following excerpt describes Self’s fears during Couple’s conflict.

I: What did you make of it? You said that you felt very helpless.
A: Yeah. Right. I don’t know why they were fighting. I wished they would stop.
I: How was that for you, .... feeling so helpless?
A: I was scared too, because, if I tried to stop them I might get hit. They might hurt me by accident. I know they wouldn’t mean to, but I was so small. I was, like, six years old. (Adam I, p. 14)

Small powerless Self is cast in the role of Pacifist between angry Aggressor Father and Victim Mother. In the role of Pacifist, Self might get hurt inadvertently in the heat of the conflict. The powerless aspect of the Self as Pacifist is in danger of
becoming a Victim in the conflict. Both the roles associated with fear (Self as Victim) and with a wish (Self as successful Pacifist) are aspects of imaginary patterns.

In the following episode, the function of the Self image has been changed from Pacifist to Rulebreaker. Father’s New Wife is also introduced in this segment.

A: My Dad was always, like, there were two houses (on a trip to Spain, mother’s original home). One was for the old ones, and my Dad was always on the phone.... I never knew why, but he was talking to his new wife (i.e. his future wife, K.W.) ......

I: Right. And how much after that did the split actually happen?

A: Oh - just about six months. My Mom was always crying. My Dad was being not nice. Then one day I remember, in the morning, I dropped this big water bottle because I was trying to carry it to our water coaster, then they had a big fight because I wasn’t supposed to carry it and I had greasy hands, and they were saying it was each others fault and then there was a fight and then that night they told me that, ... they brought me into a room .... and said we’re going to break up.

I: Did you know when that would be?

A: They said my Dad would go somewhere else, and that maybe they would get back together in a little while.

I: Uh huh ...

A: It got longer and longer and then they divorced and then he got married (Adam II, p. 16, 17).

In this segment, Rulebreaker Self damages the watercoaster, a joint possession of Couple, by mistake. This damage leads to conflict between Father and Mother and ultimately to separation. Here, Self as Rulebreaker is seen as the ‘cause’ of Couple’s conflict. Couple becomes the Victim of Rulebreaker Self’s mistake.

New Wife is introduced into the inner world for the first time. New Wife’s function in Adam’s internal world is part of the process of separation and will be discussed later. Table # 4 shows the relational patterns based on the two excerpts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother, Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4: Adam’s relational patterns regarding conflict before separation and in imagination.
Relational Patterns during and after Separation

During Separation.

When Father announces his leaving, Self reacts with anger and a futile attempt to force Father to stay.

A: I was mad.
I: Oh, you were mad. What do you remember?
A: My parents took me into their room one night and my Dad said he was going to leave and I said 'no, no' and I said I'd lock all the doors and, like, force him to stay (Adam I, p. 1).

Father's withdrawal from Family creates a problem in the internal world. Father has been the Provider for Dependent Old Family so far and Father's withdrawal turns him into a Failing Provider and Old Family into Deprived Dependents. Self does everything in his limited power (locks the doors) to force Provider Father to stay, but to no avail. Powerless Self in the role of Authority cannot prevent Father from turning into a Failing Provider.

Father's withdrawal is a concern for Self as Mother does not function as Provider for Old Family. In Adam's view Father's failure to provide is against the rules. Father's withdrawal has a twofold function in the internal world. It has consequences for the resources of the Old Family and it is simultaneously seen as breaking the rules, thus eliciting responses in the realm of conflict. Adam would like a powerful Authority such as Court to step in and divide resources equally ('it should be apparent in court what each one gets'), since Authority small Self has failed to make Father stay.

A: Yeah. And, after they met, ...when they met, he was, like, working at a crappy job and she paid for him to go to school and then he left his job and became an engineer.
I: Hmm... It's rough. What do you think of life, knowing that it can be that unfair?
A: Yeah
I: What do you think should be done about it?
A: ....When they get a divorce it should be apparent in court what each one gets (Adam II, p. 9).

Table # 5 shows the roles for the patterns of conflict after separation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Government, Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 5: Adam’s relational patterns regarding conflict after separation and in imagination

Adam’s attempts to keep Provider Father fail and this has serious repercussions throughout his internal world. Father’s withdrawal creates two internal Families in competition with one another, the internal Original Family (Self, Mother, and Younger Brother), and the internal New Family (Father, New Wife, and Half-Brother).

In the following episode, Adam reveals the internal logic behind Father’s decision to leave.

I: Now, your Dad stopped ‘loving your Mom’, quote - unquote, right, - he fooled around on her. Why do you think that happened?
A: I don’t know. She wasn’t ‘good enough’ any more.
I: She wasn’t ‘good enough’? How was it when you tried to talk to him about it?
A: We weren’t good enough...(Crying) (Adam II, p. 5, 6).

Father no longer loves Mother because Mother is no longer ‘good enough’. Self then feels rejected by Father as well. The Self and Mother image share the fate of not being good enough for Father.

After separation of the Couple two internal Families co-exist in the psyche, Old (Original) Family, and New Family. The life of Original Family is presented first to show the continuity of decline in the wake of Father’s withdrawal. Self’s struggle to avoid integration in prosperous New Family will be presented in another section.

**The Original Family Without Provider Father.**

The Original Family in the wake of separation consists of Self, Mother and Younger Brother. The next segment illustrates the fallout from Father’s withdrawal.

I: So when your Dad left, what happened to your Mom?
A: She lost it all, she started to cry all the time, ... She was always sad and she had to go to court a lot. My Dad was always appearing for custody and stuff. My Mom
told us that he was trying to get us, but don’t worry, because they wouldn’t give us to him.

I: Uh huh.
A: But she used up a lot of money going to court. She’d get legal aid and stuff. ..... My Mom was very sad about court and I didn’t know anything about it.
I: Yeah.
A: I was only a little child when all this happened (Adam II, pp. 15, 16).

In the wake of separation, Deprived Dependent Mother struggles with loss. At the same time, Aggressor Father threatens Victim Mother with the loss of Children, thus continuing the conflictual relational pattern. The cost of the conflict increases the deprivation of Dependent Mother. Self is too small to become a Provider for Mother.

I: How has SHE (mother) been doing since the divorce? How does she manage?
A: Not very well. She doesn’t know anybody. She has hardly one friend left. Um ...
when my Dad left all her friends seemed to leave .... She established this women’s group where, like, every week they came and talked about everything - whatever - but she doesn’t know any of the people any more. There’s one friend and our doctor is her friend, too.
I: Right. Just like you, ... it’s a little bit like you? She lost all her friends as well?
A: Yeah. (long, long pause, soft crying) (Adam I, p. 13)

The loss of Couple’s marriage ushers in a string of losses for Deprived Dependent Mother. As will be shown later, Deprived Dependent Self suffers in similar ways in response to Father’s withdrawal. The next episode will illustrate the effects of separation on Mother’s ability to provide.

A: She was really looking for a job, like, the year after Dad left, but she’s starting to give up.
I: So, what’s that like for you, to watch this?
A: I wish she would find a job. She thinks that when we sell the house, everything will be fine.
I: Uh huh. What do you think about selling the house?
A: I think it sucks, ... I don’t want to sell it.
I: And you may have to because of the financial situation?
A: Yeah. We do. ... it’s just the money..... She’s deep in debt, ... she has tons of debts.
I: To whom?
A: To my Grandma and stuff. Some of them are my Dad’s, but he’s not being charged, so my Mom has to sell the house to pay (Adam I, pp. 11, 12).

After the loss of Provider Father, Mother unsuccessfully attempts to become a Provider for Original Family. Mother fails (has tons of debt). Failing Provider Father
has again broken the rules (does not repay debts). Mother has been unable to become a Provider and Deprived Dependent Original Family (Mother, Self, Younger Brother) is drifting further and further into debt. Mother is forced to sell assets to compensate for debts, leading to further loss (of the Family Home).

Table # 6 shows the roles the various images play in the provision of resources after separation. The roles for the Members of New Family are already included in the table, although the evidence will not be presented until the next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>New Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Old Family, Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Brother, Halfbro</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Old Family, Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 6: Adam’s relational patterns regarding conflict before separation and in imagination

The problematic relational patterns in the area of resources precipitate further internal conflict. In the following excerpt, stress turns into misdirected anger.

A: There’s a lot of stress and she (mother) gets mad at little things, then she says it’s not our fault.
I: Uh huh. So when she gets stressed she gets mad at you? How does that work then, what happens?
A: I wait until she cools off.
I: What about .... what’s that like for you, to .......?? And, what do you think stresses her the most?
A: Everything ...the money, just ‘not having anything’.
I: Is that what your Mom was like before the separation? Was it always the case, that she couldn’t cope?
A: No (Adam II, pp. 4, 5)

Mother’s deprivation creates stress and ultimately anger mis-directed at Self. Deprived Dependent Mother’s anger can be traced back to Rulebreaker Father’s refusal to provide adequately for Original Family. Authority Mother’s perceives Self and Brother as Rulebreakers and gets angry. Pacifist Self waits until Mother cools off. Authority Mother ultimately apologises to Self, hinting, that Father, not Self, is
the Rulebreaker ('then she says it's not our fault'). Here, the theme of resources
dovetails into the theme of conflict. Table # 7 shows the relational patterns for this
episode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Patient Self</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 7: Adam’s relational patterns regarding conflict after separation

Brother seems to occupy the role of Rulebreaker not just mistakenly in
relation to Mother, but also in relation to School (see table).

I: What happened for your brother, ... how did it (the separation) affect him?
A: He didn’t take it well at all. He just, like, ‘lost it’ totally.
I: He ‘lost it’ totally?
A: He got in trouble in school and ... (very long pause, crying)
I: So, he got in trouble in school and what was going on?
A: He picked on all the kids and he acted out in class so he was always sent to the
office (Adam I, p. 9).

In the wake of separation, Rulebreaker Younger Brother ‘lost it totally’ gets in trouble
with Authority School (table # 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 8: Adam’s relational pattern regarding conflict after separation

Father’s absence has a powerful effect on Original family, leaving every Family
Member struggling with deprivation. Members of Original Family in turn react angrily
and blame Rulebreaker Father for the impoverished state of Original Family.

**Father’s New Family.**

Father’s New Family is made up of Father, New Wife, and Half-Brother. This
New Family is in contact with members of Original Family in various ways.

New Wife has played a minor role during separation, but is very prominent in
the relational patterns after separation.
A: First he lived by himself in an apartment and then they (father and new wife) moved to the place they are now.
I: And, what happened then? How were your visits once they moved?
A: Umm... They were still, like, every weekend for a little bit, but then they just stopped altogether for about half a year....Then they started up about once a week..
I: And, do you recall the time just before they stopped altogether?
A: Yeah, I drew a picture of what I thought she (his new wife) looked like, a really ugly devil, whatever - and I gave it to her and she ripped it up and ... I said that I thought they talked about me behind my back ... then he just got really mad at me and said 'Don't come back!' He didn't let us go there anymore (Adam I, p. 4).

In this excerpt, Father leaves Original Family, and joins New Wife. Despite regular presence, Father is cast as Failing Provider to Deprived Dependent Self. In turn, Self is angry at New Wife. Self blames New Wife for Couple's separation and Self's subsequent deprivation as Deprived Dependent. Self turns into an Aggressor attacking New Wife, who functions as Authority (see next quote) and retaliates by exerting influence on Father. Father now in the role of Authority punishes Self on New Wife's behalf (don't come back) by cutting contact, increasing Self's deprivation. In the end, Father relents, now being cast as Pacifist (see table #9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Wife, Father</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #9: Adam's relational patterns regarding conflict after separation.

Father is attempting to integrate Self and Younger Brother into New Family.

Self and Younger Brother remain loyal to Original Family.

I: How much time would you like to spend with your Dad right now?
A: About a day a week for the whole day. I'd like to go places with him, but without his wife and kid....And he says we can go to the cottage but only if his wife and kid come too.... I don't want to.
I: You don't like that?
A: I don't like his wife. She reminds me of a witch.... I don't know what to do. I wish he'd change his mind.
I: Unless he changes his mind, ... do you think he ever will change his mind?
A: No.
I: Why not?
A: Because she controls him (Adam II, pp. 6, 7).

This episode starts with Deprived Dependent Self's longing for absent Provider Father. Self rejects Provider Father as Member of New Family. Self sees Father's absence as a sign that Authority New Wife controls Failing Provider Father.

I: So, do you go to his (father's new) house at all?
A: Well, no. Well, we have, but the past couple of times he's seen us we went there, just for a bit, ... I think he's trying to get us to be a family with his wife and his kid and I don't want that.
I: Hm ... Do you feel welcome there?
A: I feel a 'pretend' welcome.
I: 'Pretend' welcome. So, .... a pretend welcome as in .... what is shown on the outside but there's something underneath?... what do you feel like?
A: He doesn't like me.
I: He doesn't? What do you think he doesn't like about you? (Pause).....You don't know?
A: I think SHE doesn't like me.
I: His wife?
A: Yeah.
I: She doesn't like you ... did it change with your relationship with her ... how he treated you?
A: Yeah. He does whatever she says - like, if she doesn't want us there, he doesn't want us there (Adam I, pp. 6, 7).

Father's attempts at integrating Self into the context of New Family fail. New Wife's invitation to Self and Younger Brother is seen as insincere (a 'pretend welcome'). Father is cast both as Failing Provider vis-a-vis Old Family Ad as somewhat powerless Pacifist buckling under the influence of Authority New Wife. Deprived Dependent Self rejects Competitors New Family, including Father-as-Member-of-New-Family (for relational patterns re resources see table # 6).

I: What do you think about your Dad, ... as a man? Just as a person - not as your Dad. What is he like? What do you think of him, as a person?
A: Well... he says a lot of things that I don't really like, ... that he doesn't like me...He's not a very good man....He's a 'kiss-ass'.

......
I: Was he like that with your mom or quite different then?
A: Different.
I: How do you mean?
A: Oh, he just was bossy (Adam I, p. 8).

In this segment Self rejects Father (he's not a good man). In relation to powerful
Authority New Wife, Father is submissive (a 'kiss-ass'), that is, in the role of Pacifist. This is in stark contrast to Aggressor Father's role vis-a-vis Victim Mother before Couple's separation.

While resources in Old Family are scarce, resources in Competitor New Family are abundant.

A: I think he's fine. He's living in a condominium which is quite nice, goes on vacations, takes vacations once a year, goes to the cottage in the summer every other week or something, or weekend. He works from home so he can be with his kid.
I: What was, ... when was your last vacation?
A: Um .. for Christmas my Mom took us for 4 days to some resort in the Caribbean. That was a few years ago. We don't have a cottage and we don't have a car, so ... we can't go anywhere.
I: So things are not good, financially?
A: He doesn't give us anything..... except for what he has to, ... the government makes him.
I: What's that like for you?
A: Well, I think he's got money to spare and I need something, but he won't give it to me.
I: Does he give more to his new son?
A: Yeah. Well, all his clothes are from Gap - he has expensive toys and whatever.
(Adam I, pp. 15, 16).

Here the competition among the two aspects of the internal world is described. Father is Failing Provider to Old Family and provides abundantly to New Family. Authority Government intervenes on behalf of Deprived Dependents Old Family to ensure a minimum support from Father. As part of Original Family, Self is unsuccessfully competing with Half-Brother and New Wife for Father's presence and resources. Deprived Dependent Self suffers a continued sense of loss, deprivation, and rejection. Self rejects Father's offers to become a better emotional Provider, because this involves a truce with Competitors New Wife and Halfbrother. New Wife functions not only as Competitor, but also as Authority and Rulebreaker (an apt description of the devil) in Adam's inner world and thus Self would make a 'pact with the devil' by accepting Father's offer.
The Withdrawn Self.

Self's initial reaction to Couple's separation bears a strong resemblance to Mother's reaction.

I: And, how did you react at school (after the separation)? How was your school life?
A: I was okay. For a while I was out of it, I didn't have a chance.... (crying) But, I got over it.
I: Any time you talk about it, I can feel the feelings coming out. Is there a lot of feeling about it?
A: Yeah. (crying). I didn't have many friends for a whole long time.
I: Was that before, as well, or did that only start after the divorce?
A: It started after.
I: Why?
A: I don't know.
I: So, did you feel like you were isolating yourself? Would you just keep to yourself?
A: Yeah. I cried a lot in school, ... and other people's places (Adam I, pp. 9, 10).

In this episode, Self suffers a string of losses after the loss of Couple's marriage. Self's losses lead to feelings of isolation, that is, there are no more internal Allies (Friends). In the end, Self proclaims to recover somewhat, although the frequent crying throughout both interviews seems to indicate otherwise. In the wake of separation, Self and Mother have this status as Deprived Dependents without Allies. In the following segment, Adam elaborates on the relational pattern between Self and Mother after separation.

A: I was only a little child when all this (mother’s troubles after separation) happened.
I: So you saw her crying all the time?
A: Yeah.
I: How did you react to that?
A: I don't know, ....I broke down a bit too, ... ?? acting out .... I was fooling around in class, I cried a lot, ...I'd hallucinate in school (Adam II, p. 16).

Deprived Dependent Mother is troubled and Self is then cast in that same role (I broke down a bit too). Self is then cast as Rulebreaker, acting out in ways similar to Younger Brother.

Self's loss of Allies has been discussed already. Further evidence of Self's withdrawal is presented in the next excerpt.

I: What do you think is going to be your challenge - when you grow up what do you think is going to be difficult?
A: Let out my feelings.
I: That's how you have coped, by bottling things up because there's so many feelings?
....So what do you think will be your great challenge if you get married?
A: Being able to talk. Just have a conversation.......I'm going to keep stuff bottled up
and when I let it out It'll be like a big cry and I'll feel really bad because I'll
always be upset and stuff like that (Adam II, p. 6, 7)

In this episode, Self's struggle in the present and past as well as Self's imaginary
struggle in the future are described. Self has 'bottled up' feelings, so as to prevent
feelings from coming out in a 'big cry'. If feelings do come out that way, Self feels bad
for being 'always upset'. Because Self is preventing the big cry from coming out, Self
has trouble just 'having a conversation'.

Self's withdrawal from Providers and Allies has locked Self in the role of
Deprived Dependent and has become a serious obstacle to satisfying relational
patterns with Friends and to the reunion of the imaginary internal Couple in
phantasy.

**Imaginary Solutions**

Adam presents two types of imagined solutions. Belonging to the first type are
relational patterns describing Self's wishes to repair Original Family. These
imaginary structures are immediately followed by assertions that these imagined
solutions are not in the realm of possibility. These patterns therefore immediately
point towards memories of failure and loss. They will be discussed under the title 'the
Reunion of Original Family as Failed Solution'.

Adam's second set of imaginary solutions are successful precisely because they are projections of wishes into the future that allow Self to invent the outcomes of
relational patterns. They will be discussed under the title 'Successful Reparation of
the Internal Couple'.

**The Reunion of Original Family as Failed Solution.**
Adam describes some imaginary solutions arising directly out of problematic states connected to memory. These solutions are discarded immediately because these imaginary patterns are followed by memories of separation, loss, or withdrawal. The reparative properties of the imaginary patterns are thus undone immediately by memory.

I: So, what do you think about this whole business?
A: I just get on with it. ...The only part that I wish is that he (father) was back living with us. That it was back like it used to be....I know he’s not coming back (Adam I, p. 5).

In this failed imaginary solution, Deprived Dependent Self has to ‘just get on with it’ because Provider Father will not return to Original Family despite Self’s wish for reunion. Self knows ‘he’s not coming back’. Self’s longing for Father is futile when contrasted with Self’s knowledge (based on memory) that Father is not returning. If Father were to rejoin Original Family, Original Family would once again have a Provider Father. There would be no need for Self to step into the role of Provider prematurely (and fail in that role).

Similar wishes, albeit with a twist, for a Provider Father are expressed in the following episode.

I: If you had three wishes - what would you wish for in your life?
A: That we had Dad, ... that we had money, ... that’s about all.
I: You only wish for Dad and money -
A: And that I don’t have a brother. (Adam II, pp. 1, 2)

Self wishes for ‘having’ Provider Father and for more resources. The wish to not have a Brother (this eliminates Younger Brother and Half Brother) eliminates all Competitors for Father’s care and resources. (New Wife is eliminated implicitly by the wish ‘that we had dad’). Father would be there for Self exclusively (see table # 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Competitor</th>
<th>Failing Prov.</th>
<th>Depr. Depend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 10: Imaginary relational pattern regarding resources
However, this pattern does not repair the Original Family because Self is certain (based on memory) that Father is not coming back (see earlier quotes).

**Successful Reparation of the Internal Couple.**

Adam's successful imaginary solution is based on dis-identification with Father.

I: How would you behave - what would you try to steer away from to have a good marriage?
A: Do what my Dad didn't do.
I: And, what was that?
I: What about giving her 'whatever she wanted'? Is that something your Dad didn't do when he was still here?
A: Right. He bought himself a bunch of stuff, but my Mom didn't get any (Adam II, pp. 3, 4).

Father has failed to provide for Mother (he bought himself a bunch of stuff, but my Mom didn't get any). Father also 'did not stay married', but has withdrawn. Father has not been kind. Earlier quotes show an angry violent Father. Self-as-Future-Husband, on the other hand, gives Future Wife what she wants, is kind and giving, and stays married. Self-as-Future-Husband becomes the ideal Provider and Pacifist to Future Wife cast in the role of Dependent. The internal Couple of Self-as-Husband and Future Wife is restored to a harmonious state.

I: What do you think that you would like to change, or how would you deal with your children, if you had any?
A: I don't know. Treat them well, give them a good education, spend time with them. (Adam II, p. 7).

Self-as-Future-Father takes care of Future Children and gives Future Children the skills (the education) to become Providers. This short sequence shows Self again in dis-identification with Rulebreaker/Failing Provider Father.

In Adam's successful imaginary solution, Self dis-identifies with Father. Self-as-Husband-and-Father reverses Father's actions and attitudes towards Mother and thus repairs the imaginary internal Couple (table # 11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Loyal Rich Self, Future Wife, Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 11: Imaginary relational pattern regarding resources

However, as shown earlier, Adam is quite aware that Self's withdrawn state is posing a challenge to Future Couple's functioning, because Self is locked in the role of Deprived Dependent to the point where a dialogue with Future Wife is problematic (see table # 6 showing the relational patterns regarding resources after separation).

**Conclusions**

The relational patterns based on Adam's memories of the time before Couple's separation present Self as Rulebreaker who causes Couple's conflict. In the ensuing Couple conflict, powerful angry Aggressor Father injures Victim Mother. Pacifist Self is too powerless to intervene and also fears being injured and becoming a Victim himself.

In the wake of Couple's separation, New Wife appears in the inner world. Self shifts blame for Couple's demise onto Rulebreaker/Authority/Devil New Wife who steals Provider Father away from Original Family. Provider Father, who has played a powerful role as Aggressor/Authority in Original Family, is now shown as submissive to New Wife.

Couple's separation sets in motion two distinct, but connected dynamics in Original and New Family. Original Family suffers from the break-up of Couple, while New Family flourishes.

Father's withdrawal leaves Original Family without Provider. New Family as Competitors has diverted most of Provider Father's resources. Original Family is increasingly impoverished. This state of affairs has led to a breakdown in every internal image associated with Original Family. To prevent further 'breakdowns', Self has withdrawn emotionally (bottles everything up) from Allies and Providers, thus
locking himSelf in the role of Deprived Dependent. Brother has broken down even more severely.

New Family with New Wife at the helm is prospering. Father attempts to integrate Self into New Family, but Self rejects Father's offer. Self relates to New Wife as Rulebreaker and attacks. In retaliation, Authority New Wife curtails access to Provider Father further.

Since Adam is convinced that Father will not come back, Self's hopes of reuniting Original Family are futile. Self's successful reparative strategy involves becoming a better Future Father, who provides for Future Wife and Children and does not leave. However, Self is painfully aware of the limitations Self's emotional withdrawal places on the imaginary Future Couple. The reunion of the Future Couple is only partially successful because of Self's withdrawn state.
Case Study Bob

Factual Information

Bob was twelve years old at the time of the two interviews. His thirteenth birthday was about a month after the second interview. Bob’s sister was ten years old at the time. Bob’s parents separated about ten years ago shortly before the birth of his sister. Since then both parents have entered relationships, but neither parent has ever cohabited with a new partner.

Relational Patterns before Separation

Bob has no memories of his own from the time before his parents’ separation. The memory-based pattern from that time is based on Mother’s recollections.

I(interviewer): So you can’t really remember a time when the whole family was together.
B: Only in pictures and sometimes, like, when they're talking about when I was born and stuff.
I: What do they say about that time - when you were born?
B: Oh - my Dad didn’t want to go to the hospital - didn’t want to go back home and get the car seat because he forgot it and then he got stuck in the parade on the way home and so he had to argue to get through.
I: So your mother was very worried about taking you home?
B: But, he had to go back anyways, because it is regulation - (Bob I, p. 2)

In this segment, Mother is in need of Father’s presence for help. Father’s failure as Provider makes her a Deprived Dependent. Mother gets angry at Father who does not want to fix his mistake. This relational pattern now moves from the area of resources into the area of conflict. Rulebreaker Father is forced by regulations (Authority) to help Dependent Mother. In this episode Dependent Mother is neglected by Failing Provider and Rulebreaker Father.

Bob presents the following episode to illustrate Father’s character.

I: Have you asked why they split up? Have you ever been interested in that?
B: Not really.....But, like, if my Dad’s been mean and I talk about that with her she will say ‘you can see why I broke up with him’ (Bob I, p. 2).

Mother breaks up with Rulebreaker/Failing Provider Father because of his meanness
(‘if my Dad's been mean and I talk about that with her she will say ‘you can see why I broke up with him’), separating and thus harming the internal Couple, who is cast as Victim. Father's meanness encompasses three attributes: Father's lack of caring, Father's negligence, and Father's argumentative style. All three aspects are present to some degree in Bob's account of Father's handling of Mother after Bob's birth, but will be described in more detail later on. Father's meanness and lack of care extends to Baby Self (Father forgot the car seat for the baby).

In the end, Couple separates just prior to the birth of Baby Sister.

I: How old were you then, when your parents split up?
B: I don't really know. I didn't really look. It didn't really matter to me, or anything (Bob I, p. 1).

In the final analysis, Self is not interested in finding out more about Mother's and Father's separation.

I: Do you think it (the separation) is affecting you in any way?
B: I doubt it (Bob II, p. 1).

Bob also does not believe Couple's separation has any lingering effects on the internal world.

Tables # 12 and # 13 show Bob's relational patterns before separation. A depriving pattern in the area of resources (table # 12) turns into a conflictual pattern (table # 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Baby Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 12: Bob’ relational pattern regarding resources before separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother, Baby Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 13: Bob’ relational pattern regarding conflict before separation

**Relational Patterns after Separation**
The relational patterns dealing with the consequences of the separation of the Couple for various internal images are discussed in the sections on Mother’s New Family (with Father absent), Father’s New Family (with Mother absent), and the Independent Self.

**Mother’s New Family.**

The relational patterns of the internal world after separation center around two sets of conflicts among the following internal images:

- Self and Mother
- Self and Sister with Mother as the Referee and Judge (the Authority).

Self and Mother first have an issue concerning resources that turns into conflict. Self fails Mother by not being present, Self visiting with Friend instead. Authority Mother uses her power to force Rulebreaker Self’s immediate presence. Self then turns into an Aggressor towards Victim Mother who reasserts herself as Authority and punishes Self.

I: ... And when do you get mad? When do you start to swear?
B: I don't know - it's if we get in a fight I get mad.
I: About --
B: It's like, really nothing important. It's pointless things that we fight about.
I: Pointless things. Can you remember that fight a week ago when you got your computer taken away?
B: I swore a lot at her over the phone because she, like, she was taking me somewhere and she didn't ask me first and I was at my friend's house (Bob I, pp. 10, 11).

Self’s reaction to Mother is based on Friend’s role as internal Ally. Mother forces Self to leave Friend and join New Family. Mother insist on Self’s presence insinuating a Provider role for Self. As we have seen earlier Father has failed Mother as Provider before separation. Like Father earlier, Self (by refusing to obey) is now in the role of Failing Provider and Rulebreaker to Dependent Mother. Self has turned to Friend as an important internal Ally. Later Friend’s importance to Self as Substitute for ‘mean Father’ will be discussed.
So far, Mother has wielded power and meted out punishment to Rulebreakers/Aggressors Self or Father (Mother instigated separation of Couple). In the next excerpt, Bob describes a set of circumstances where Mother is at the mercy of a more powerful Authority, Mean New Boss after losing a Provider image, Nice Old Boss.

B: She (mother) gets stressed out about her job.
I: Can you say a little bit more about that?
B: Her boss - well maybe not her boss - but someone she works with was really mean - and they just bought, London Life just bought some other company...And so a guy that was really nice to her, that was higher up than her, is leaving for Saskatoon. And so she's sad about that.
I: Is she worried that she will lose the support of her higher-ups?
B: Yeah - and she just got a new project that she didn't want (Bob I, p. 13).

This excerpt shows a vulnerable aspect of Mother. Later in the imaginary relational patterns we will see that Self attempts to become a Pacifist. In the imaginary patterns Aggressor images are stopped from harming vulnerable Victim images.

As demonstrated above, Self has become an angry internal Aggressor, threatening Mother with harm. However, we also see that Self redirects the blame for Self's anger towards the image of a mean Teacher, who replaces Mother in the role of Authority.

I: Any idea why you would be angry (at home)?
B: Maybe school.
I: What about -
B: I don't know - I got a new teacher - she's mean
I: She's mean. What's she like - what does she do?
B: She assigns too much homework and she doesn't give us enough time for projects (Bob I, p. 12).

Mother is no longer a mean Authority and is thus no longer a target of Aggressor Self. Since Self's angry attack on Mother is seen as unjustified (Self should have attacked mean Teacher instead), Mother’s punishment of Self is accepted as fair. In accepting the punishment, Self portrays Mother as a fair Authority.

I: What happens when you get mad?
Mother punishes by deprivation. Both Sister and Self end up as Deprived Dependents. As Rulebreakers both Self and Sister deserve the punishment. For both, Mother is not an accessible Provider during periods of conflict. The relational patterns regarding conflict and resources in Mother’s New Family are shown in tables #14 and #15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Fair Mother</td>
<td>Pacifist</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean New Teacher</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #14: Bob’s relational patterns regarding conflict in Mother’s New Family after separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #15: Bob’s relational patterns regarding resources in Mother’s New Family after separation

Bob mentally represents two different strategies for dealing with unfulfilled need associated with the role of Deprived Dependent. Sister’s strategy for dealing with being a Deprived Dependent is overeating. Self’s strategy involves premature independence from Parental figures, an alliance with Friends as Allies, and overspending. Both, Self and Sister react to the deprivation by craving and compulsively replenishing what has been taken away (Sister’s food and Self’s video
I: Right, okay... and, what happens - how does your Mom deal with you and her fighting?
B: She sends us to our rooms and takes away privileges. She often won't make her lunch and she takes away 'play station' from me.
I: Is that your favourite thing to do?
B: Yeah - pretty much.
I: So, she takes that away and your sister would be most hurt by not getting a lunch - is that the idea?
B: Yeah - because she doesn't want to do anything by herself - usually.
I: Oh - I see - and you do? You're fine with doing stuff independently?
B: Yeah (Bob I, pp. 3, 4).

Sister's propensity to overeat and the lack of exercise has already been mentioned.

I: How is he (father) mean?
B: He usually, I don't know, comments on my sister's health.
I: What about her health?
B: She eats too much and doesn't get enough exercise (Bob I, p. 1).

In this excerpt Bob's represents Sister's solution to the feeling of internal lack of resources. Sister adapts by filling up with food. During periods of peace, Sister, unlike Self, is able to approach Mother as internal Provider (table # 16). Self, on the other hand, is 'fine with doing stuff independently' (no Provider necessary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Competite</th>
<th>Failing Prov.</th>
<th>Depr. Depend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 16: Bob's relational patterns regarding resources after separation

The Independent Self.

As Bob states in the previous excerpt, he sees himself as independent, unlike Sister who is overly dependent on Provider Mother. Despite Self's attempts to replace Mother and Father with Friends, the need to fill the emptiness associated with the role of Deprived Dependent remains an issue for Self. This problem of internal emptiness is caused by Self's inability to stay connected to Parental images as Providers.
Bob’s solution is represented in his internal world as follows. Overspending on computer games allows Deprived Dependent Self to fill the void with an inanimate object as an Ally. Self’s pattern is similar to Sister’s pattern of using food as Ally.

I: What are things that you would like to have changed for the better?
B: Money.
I: What about money?
B: I don’t save it.
I: What do you do with it all?
B: Usually games... For my Play Station... Yeah.
I: So tell me about this money business - what do you think you should be doing and why aren’t you, etc. ....
B: I should be saving and investing. For education and college. I put fifteen into mutual funds every month.

......
I: Okay - there’s the concern about money. Is it, kind of like, you can’t hold onto it?
B: Usually. Yeah.
I: Is it very tempting to go out and spend what you have right away?
B: Yeah.
I: Do you feel after you bought it that maybe you shouldn’t have bought something?
B: Yup (Bob II, pp. 13, 14).

Self’s compulsive spending on inanimate substitutes addresses the momentary need but interferes with longterm accumulation of resources (education and college) (see table # 17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Friend/Computer</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 17: Bob’s relational pattern regarding resources after separation

**Father’s New Family.**

In the wake of Couple’s separation, Deprived Dependent Self has experienced the internal Father as Rulebreaker and Failing Provider and has withdrawn from him. Deprived Dependent Sister also gets exposed to this aspect of the Father image, yet stays engaged in an ambivalent relationship.

B: I didn’t usually talk with him (father) because he was mean a lot.
I: To you?
B: Yeah - to me and my sister - but not so much me.
I: What was it like to watch him be mean to your sister?
B: It was pretty bad.
I: Did you speak to him about it?
B: I don't remember, really.
I: Did your sister ever speak to him about this.
B: Yeah. Yeah, she would say, 'Why do you always pick on me Dad?', because she talks more (Bob I, p. 5).

Self withdraws (does not talk to) from Father and thus becomes emotionally disengaged (I don't remember). Self retreats from the area of conflict to the area of resources by becoming unavailable to Father.

Independent Self has withdrawn emotionally and has to be forced to be present to Father. This issue of 'forced presence', that is, the internal process of a Authority exerting pressure to make another internal image into the role of Provider, has been discussed as one of the aspects of the relational pattern between Mother and Father, and between Mother and Self. In the following excerpt, Father forces emotionally withdrawn Self to be present.

B: No, I was going to say I'd have more weekends in one place because I wouldn't have to go to my Dad's.
I: And you say ... who said you have to go?
B: The courts.
I: Were there court proceedings?
B: Probably, I think.
I: And, so the court said you have to spend every second weekend at your Dad's house?
B: Yeah, like I had to go every week - like it used to be once a day every week, but now it's every other weekend.....My Mom said it wasn't my choice until I'm eighteen (Bob II, pp. 1, 2).

Self is forced by the Courts (Authority) to be Provider to Father. Father is in the role of Deprived Dependent here because he seems to want Self close.

Unlike Self, Sister does not withdraw from Father. Instead, Sister enters into the area of conflict with Father. Authority Sister confronts Aggressor Father directly. Sister feels 'picked on' (victimised), becomes the Aggressor to Rulebreaker/Aggressor Father and starts a conflict. The two tables # 18 and # 19 show the roles of Self and Sister in conflict with Father and Self's withdrawal from Father and turning towards
Friends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfterSep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister, Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #18: Bob’s relational patterns regarding conflict in Father’s New Family after separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfterSep.</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #19: Bob’s relational pattern regarding resources in Father’s New Family after separation

Since overeating has become Sister’s strategy of choice for dealing with deprivation, Food has become the equivalent of an internal Ally. By being critical, Father interferes with Sister’s solution to the problem of deprivation, thus adding ‘insult to injury’.

Father treats Self in ways similar to Sister, but instead of entering into conflict, Self replaces Failing Provider/Aggressor Father with friends as Allies. Independent Self has no further need for Father. This pattern turns the tables on Father who has so far been the Failing Provider. Self relates to Father after separation the way Father has related to Mother and Baby/Self before separation.

B: I do sailing. And I play tennis with my friends sometimes.
I: But you don’t like squash or play with him?
B: No.
I: When you do sports with him (father), how does he behave?
B: He tries to correct me.
I: What’s that like?
B: It’s okay sometimes and sometimes it’s really irritating (Bob I, pp. 7, 8)

While Aggressor Father interferes with Sister’s strategy for dealing with the absence of a Provider, Authority Mother interferes with Self’s strategy. As discussed in the previous chapter, Mother has cast Friends as Competitors, while they are cast as Allies by Self. Mother has forced Self to become a Provider for Mother and give up closeness with Friends, at least temporarily.

Sister on the other hand, has maintained her role as Dependent with both
Mother and Father and longs for each during periods of absence, when she becomes a Deprived Dependent. Sister maintains an ambivalent, but somewhat gratifying relation to Father.

I: And when you were there (at father’s house), did you miss your Mother?
B: Not really. My sister usually does ...... If she goes on trips she misses Dad.
I: So your sister is a lot more torn than you are.
B: Yeah.
I: And - when you go on trips does she talk to you about missing the other parent?
B: No. Not any more.
I: She used to?
B: Yeah, ’cause she had pictures of my Dad....When we’d go to, like, the Dominican Republic and stuff, I had to get Dad to let her call (her mother) and I had to call the number for her because she doesn’t know ... (Bob II, p.5)

Despite Father’s role as Failing Provider (he fails to connect Sister and Mother), Sister stays in the role of hopeful Dependent to Father. Self takes on the role of Sister’s Ally who reconnects Dependent Sister with Provider Mother, foreshadowing Self’s role of Provider to Mother in the imaginary patterns. (table # 20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 20: Bob’s relational patterns regarding resources after separation.

Father’s ‘mean’ attitude has set him on a collision course with the other Members of the internal Family. How Father has handled a collision and its aftermath is described in the following excerpt.

I: And if you had to use three words to characterize your Dad the way you know him, what would you use?
B: Argumentative ..... Sometimes he’s, like, outgoing in a rude kind of way, usually. And sometimes he doesn’t really care if things happen. He crashed the car and just didn’t care.
I: Is that recent? Did that just happen recently?
B: No - it was last year....he was avoiding (not understandable) .... on the highway and he hit the barriers.
I: He was avoiding somebody?
B: Yeah. He has a new car now...
I: Was he actually avoiding an accident with another car, or something like that?
B: Yeah - I think (Bob II, pp. 10, 11).
The most important issue for Bob in this excerpt is Father's uncaring attitude. Since nobody else was involved in the collision, Aggressor Father either does not care about the experience of the accident itself or Father does not care about the damaged Car. Repair was not attempted. The theme of 'Father not caring' occurs over and over in other relational patterns with Self, Sister, and Mother. Father treats the defective 'old Car' (table # 21) similar to the way 'mean' Father treats both, Sister and Self. Father judges and criticises the damaged, imperfect aspects of Self and Sister (see table # 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father's car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 21: Bob's relational pattern regarding conflict with Father after separation

**Imaginary Solutions**

**The Imaginary Self as Powerful Pacifist and Provider.**

Bob's memory-based relational patterns are filled with unresolved conflict. Self's role as Rulebreaker, Aggressor and Failing Provider towards Mother, and Self's role as Victim of Authority Mother leave Self with problematic outcomes. Self's attempts to repair Deprived Dependent Mother by becoming an adequate Provider in phantasy are shown in the following excerpt.

I: What else would you do with the money - buy a house - and what else would you do? B: I don't know - but - I'd probably just put it away in the bank since there's not that much to do....Oh - I'd pay off Dad's settlement for the house (Bob I, p. 13)

Here, Self repairs the harm done to Mother by Failing Provider Father. The reparation in phantasy is successful (table # 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 22: Bob's imaginary pattern regarding resources
Self's roles in the area of conflict as Aggressor, Rulebreaker and Victim of Authority remain unresolved. The following imaginary pattern manages to repair these issues in one grand gesture in phantasy.

B: We play Shadow Run mostly. By the Fawcett Corporation and it's in the future and the world has been awakened and there's magic now and they've developed these artificial parts called cybro-arms and there's bio-arms that increase your reflexes and everything.

I: And what role do you play?
B: I'm a Magi right now --
I: A what?
B: No, a Shamanic Druid actually.
I: A Shamanic Druid. So you are a healer, just like your Dad.
B: Yeah, mostly - I took a pacifist flaw. You can get flaws and that way - they just give you extra points. You get 100 hundred points to make your character.
I: So you took a flaw - meaning a vow kind of thing - that you're going to be a pacifist.
B: Yeah. But it's not as severe as total pacifist. A total pacifist, you can't kill at all, but for this you can only attack in self defence (Bob I, pp. 9, 10).

In this excerpt, Self is powerful. This is already a departure from relational patterns in memory. In memory, Self has been Victim of Authorities Father and Mother (Self is forced to be present). Here, Self-as-Shamanic-Druid is a powerful healer (Provider, Caregiver), and has the tools to cure injury.

Self also takes a 'pacifist flaw', that is, in phantasy Self takes over the role of Pacifist. Self's 'pacifist flaw' allows Self to kill only in self defence. Self is in the role of Authority who can kill (victimise) the Aggressor/Rulebreaker Deadly Enemy. Self is no longer in the role of Aggressor and Rulebreaker and thus Self does not harm other internal images, nor is powerless Self in the role of a Victim. In phantasy, Self-as-Shamanic-Druid has gained control over aggressive internal images (table # 23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 23: Bob's imaginary relational pattern regarding conflict

The Reunion of the internal Couple.
In Bob's case the reunion of the internal Couple has surprising implications.
I: How would that be....living in a family where both parents are together and are actually getting along - because I don’t think it would be different if the parents were fighting constantly.
B: I'd probably have - mmm - I don't know
I: What were you going to say? You'd probably have what?
B: No, I was going to say I'd have more weekends in one place because I wouldn't have to go to my Dad's (Bob II, p.1)

Here the imagined reunion of Couple allows Self to become a Failing Provider to Father (I wouldn’t have to go to my Dad’s) with impunity. Imaginary Self would be relieved of his role as Provider for Father. Provisions for Dependent Father would somehow be made available through the reunited Couple. This imaginary relational pattern solves Self’s predicament of being forced by the Courts to be Provider to Authority/Rulebreaker ‘mean’ Father (table # 24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Reunited Couple</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 24: Bob’s imaginary relational pattern regarding resources

**Conclusions**

Despite his doubts and assertions to the contrary, Bob’s internal world has been strongly affected by the separation of the internal Couple. Father’s negligence towards Mother and Baby/Self are at the root of Couple’s conflict. Mother’s attempt to use her power to force Father’s presence fails. The separation is initiated by Mother, because Father fails as Provider, thus leaving Mother as Deprived Dependent.

In the wake of separation, the Father continues to be aggressive and to fail as Provider. One aspect of Father’s aggressive stance is his use of Authority Courts to force Self’s presence. In a reunion phantasy, the imagined reunited Couple would take the pressure of imaginary Self to be a Provider to Father altogether.

Both, Self and Sister face a dilemma in relation to Mother’s resources. Self has been in the role of Aggressor and Rulebreaker towards Mother who becomes the
Authority and punishes Self. This punishment takes the form of refusal to provide. This deprivation is experienced as fair by Self. Deprived Dependent Self no longer has access to Mother as Provider and has to fill the void elsewhere. Self uses Friends and Computer games as internal Allies. Sister uses Food as Ally for the same purpose. Both internal images, Sister and Self, are described as sometimes losing control over their impulses (Sister is overeating and Self is overspending). While the internal Allies have some beneficial influence in the internal world as substitutes of Parental care, impulsive needs remain a problem for both the Self and Sister image.

Both Self and Sister get angry at attempts by Parental images to interfere with their respective coping strategies for deprivation. Self copes by depending on internal Allies rather than parental images. This strategy results in disengagement from parental images. In Self's case this disengagement protects the Mother image from Self's demands for care and from Self aggressive impulses. Mother interferes with Self's solution of relying on Friends and thus becomes the target of Self's anger. Father criticises Sister's overeating and thus becomes the target of Sister's anger.

Despite Self's attempt to divert aggression away from Mother towards another image of Authority, Mean Teacher, Self remains in the role of the Aggressor towards Authority Mother. While Victim Mother manages Self's aggression without major signs of injury, Mother is shown as vulnerable in relation to New Boss. Self's aggression towards Mother combined with Mother's vulnerability has led to Self's premature independence. While Deprived Dependent Self has had partial success in replacing Failing Provider Mother with Allies, the issue of conflict remains unresolved in memory. Here Self has been cast as Aggressor, Rulebreaker, and Victim.

In Self's reparative phantasy, Self-as-Shamanic-Druid is a Pacifist and Authority, protecting other internal images from Aggressor images. As a potent internal Healer, Self-as-Shamanic-Druid is powerful enough to take on and kill the internal Aggressor images who might threaten Victim images. This imaginary
relational pattern is a counter to the threatened and deprived Mother image found in the memory-based patterns.

Self-as-Shamanic-Druid is a positive male internal image, associated with the roles of Provider, Pacifist and Authority. It replaces the Father image associated with the roles of Failing Provider, Aggressor and Rulebreaker. However, the power of the Aggressor image Deadly Enemy points to the magnitude of the threat to Bob's Victim images and the effort required to control threatening aggressive images.
Factual Information

At the time of the interviews John Doe was 11 years old. He has a younger sister who was six years old at that time. John Doe's parents separated when he was 6 years old himself. His mother eventually moved to Toronto, while his father remained in St. Thomas, Ont. John Doe's mother is single and has worked throughout the period after separation to provide for the children.

Recently John Doe's father moved to Vancouver, B.C. John Doe's father has been unemployed for most of the time after the parental separation. He entered a longterm relationship three years prior to the interviews.

Relational Patterns before Separation

Couple's Conflict

Even though John Doe was fairly young when his parents separated, he has vivid memories of the time before separation. The memories of conflict are very intense and fresh.

I: Oh. Okay. Do you remember the time before they separated?
JD: Like the good times, basically?
I: Is that what it was like? Was it the good times?
JD: Well, not really. Umm .. My Dad didn't fight with my Mom in front of me, but sometimes I came downstairs and they were fighting in the kitchen, at night.
I: At night .... uh huh. And ... what did you make of the fighting?
JD: I got scared most of the time.
I: Okay. Why do you think they separated, and why did they fight? What were they fighting about?
JD: Umm .. They didn't really love each other any more. They were fighting about money and stuff like that sometimes.
I: Umm .. There wasn't enough?
JD: Umm .. I don't really remember ... but they did fight a lot.
I: Uh huh .. And who was the instigator?
JD: Usually my Dad started it.
I: So he would start a fight with your Mom and she would fight back?
JD: Yeah. It wasn't a punching or kicking fight .... It was a verbal fight. I'd wait, sort of, half way down the stairs, and listen to them fighting and then I just got too
scared to listen to it any longer and I ran up to my room and started to cry.  
(John Doe I, p. 2)

In this excerpt, Father is cast in the role of Aggressor. The intensity of the conflict 
scaries Self and scared powerless Self withrades (tentatively Self was seen as 
Pacifist who dislikes conflict, but does not have the means to intervene) . There is a 
suggestion that concern about resources played a role in the conflict. The casting of 
images in the area of provision of resources will be presented later.

JD: She (mother) was okay for the last couple of months of the separation, but for the 
first few she ... I don't think she took it well. 
I: So, who decided to leave.... or to separate? Who was the person that finally said 'this 
isn't working - we'll split up'.
JD: I think it was my Dad. 
I: Uh..... so he left the family. And when you say your Mom didn't take it as well .... 
JD: Well, she cried at night and ...yeah ....and I got sad too 'cause I missed my Dad. 
I: Do you still think about that sometimes? 
JD: Not really. I think about my Dad sometimes. 
I: What kind of a person was he? What kind of a man was he? 
JD: Well, he would get angry very easily ... (John Doe I, p. 4)

In this segment, Mother’s role in the Couple conflict as Victim of Aggressor 
Father becomes clearer. With the addition of Baby Sister to the internal Family, 
Aggressor Father starts conflict not only in response to Mother, but also in response 
to Sister’s expression of need.

JD: Yeah. Then a couple of months after I started going downstairs and listening to 
them fight, my sister was born. She would be crying and need feeding and my 
Mom and Dad would both start fighting (John Doe I, p.2).

Here, Sister is cast in the role of Deprived Dependent, causing conflict between 
Father and Mother. In this segment, John Doe does not discriminate the roles of 
Mother and Father in the conflict in response to Sister. However, other segments 
show Father acting as Aggressor in response to Sister’s distress.

JD: Umm.. sometimes they were good and other times they were bad -'cause when we 
went to my Dad's apartment my sister would cry and would ask to go home 
and my Dad would get mad and start yelling. 
I: Hu huh. What would he say? 
JD: I didn't really listen to the words, I kind of hid under the covers and put the pillow 
over my face (John Doe I, p. 5).
Unlike Father, Mother responds to distress as expressed by Deprived Dependents Self and Sister with caring. Mother takes on the role of Provider.

When does it come up (the feelings of sadness)?
JD: After I try to phone my Dad and I get the answering machine.
I: Uh huh. That's when it's hardest?
JD: Yeah.
I: And, how does your Mom respond? What does she do?
JD: She sits on my bed and rubs my back and tells me that it's okay and that I'll see him soon (John Doe II, pp. 11, 12).

At this point the roles of Father and Mother in Couple's conflict seem clear. Expression of dependency needs (an internal image cast as Deprived Dependent) seem to precipitate Father's aggressive outbursts while they elicit a Provider response from Mother (table # 25). Father is cast as Aggressor in the ensuing conflict while Mother is cast as Victim (table # 26).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Sister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 25: John Doe (J.D.)'s relational pattern regarding resources before separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 26: J.D.'s relational pattern regarding conflict before separation

**Self as Rulebreaker.**

In the following excerpts, Self's role in the Family conflict is shown.

I: What do you see in your mind's eye, right now?
JD: Umm ... My Dad sitting at a table with someone and I spilled food or something and he gets mad and starts yelling at me.
I: Umm... So you can't make mistakes - he can't think that kids do spill their food.
JD: Not really. I remember one time when my Mom was on the phone and I started talking to her, but I didn't know that she was on the phone, and my Dad told me to shut up (John Doe I, p. 6).

Here, Self makes a mistake, and Father turns into a harsh Authority. A minor
mistake casts Self in the role of Rulebreaker in relation to Father. Self is cast in that same role in relation to Mother as well.

JD: Well, I'd make it so ... I'd turn back the time and make it so that my parents don't fight and we could be a functional family.
I: Uh huh. What do you think it would take, ... what would you have to do so that they wouldn't fight? How would you have to change things?
JD: I don't know. Make it so that everything was perfect... nobody did anything wrong.
I: Is there something that you think you should have done differently?
JD: Umm ... (long pause) ... probably should have done what I was told...... Done what my Mom asked me the first time, not the second time or third time.
I: If you had only listened right away that things might have been different ... not as much anger in the house, ... not as much conflict?
JD: Yeah. (long pause, crying)
I: Why do you think you didn't do it right away?
JD: Well, I was usually playing, I guess, with my friends and I guess I didn't want to leave and go do work.
I: Hmm... So you would just not do what you were told?
JD: Yes. Sometimes I'd ignore what my Mom said for a little bit then when she started getting angry I would usually go (John Doe I, pp. 12, 13).

This episode shows Self as a Rulebreaker in relation to Authority Mother. Self is too involved with Friends to listen to Mother. Mother's anger somehow precipitates the Couple conflict. This excerpt also contains an imagined solution for preventing conflict between Mother and Father. This solution entails being perfect, that is, no internal image (especially Self) should ever break the rules. Perfect obedience prevents the Authority Mother from becoming angry. Self's mistake seems quite innocuous, underlining the idea, that only a perfect internal climate without complaints by Deprived Dependents and without any mistakes by Rulebreakers guarantees internal peace (table # 27).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Self, Sister</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 27: J.D.'s relational patterns regarding conflict before separation

**Father's Victimisation.**
So far, Father has been cast in two aggressive roles, the role of Aggressor and the role of harsh Authority. The following excerpt sheds light on Father’s role as Failing Provider.

JD: Well, he stopped and then he worked for Chrysler for a little bit.
I: Uh huh.
JD: And he designed a tank and then he quit that... he quit because he said that none of the other employees really liked him. Because he wore a suit and tie and there was no dress code - so they thought that he was trying to bring the dress code back - so they stole his chair and broke all his pens and stuff. That might have added to his anger that he had when he came home.
I: Huh...
JD: ...Probably did (John Doe I, p. 9).

John Doe recalls that Father has not worked since the conflict with Co-workers. In this conflict, Father is seen as strict Authority (wanting to bring the dress code back) by Rulebreaker Co-workers and attacked. In a role reversal, Co-workers then take on the role of cruel Authority/Aggressor themselves and terrorise Rulebreaker/Victim Father. John Doe explicitly suggests that Father turns into the Aggressor in relation to Family as a result of Father’s victimisation by Co-Workers (table # 28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 28: J.D.’s relational patterns regarding conflict before separation

As a result of conflict with Co-Workers, Father also loses his ability to generate income and thus becomes a Failing Provider. Mother becomes a Deprived Dependent in relation to Father. As mentioned earlier, lack of resources is one contentious issue in the relational patterns between Mother and Father before separation (see table # 25).

Relational Patterns after Separation

John Doe did not mention the actual separation in the interviews. The following
relational patterns are the ones between Mother and Father after separation, followed by the patterns in Mother’s New Family and Father’s New Family.

JD: I don’t think she got hurt as much as I said before, ‘cause actually I think she was kind of happy that my Dad left ... ‘cause they didn’t get along ... and she didn’t like him yelling at her. (John Doe I, p. 7)

The separation of the internal Couple leads to relief from conflict for Mother, Without conflict Mother is no longer in the role of Victim in relation to Father. The separation has stopped that dynamic.

However, the separation also has an impact on the provision of resources.

I: So, how is your Mom’s financial situation, then?
JD: Umm ... Not too good because my Dad doesn’t have a job and he doesn’t pay child support, but she does get the baby boomer thing.

I: The baby bonus, you mean?...And, does she get help from her parents?
JD: Yeah. My Nana and Opa help a lot.
I: And, your Dad has never paid child support?
JD: Um - I think he did at the very beginning, just a little bit,... then he had to quit his job.
I: How long is it now that he hasn’t had a job?
JD: Umm ... Seven or eight years.
I: Really. How does he survive?
JD: I don’t know that much. Umm ... he has a firm ...
I: A firm....?
JD: And his girlfriend helps him out (John Doe II, pp. 17, 18).

In this excerpt, the roles for the provision of resources after separation are mapped out. Father is himself a Dependent in relation to Girlfriend who ‘helps him out’. In relation to Mother’s New Family he functions as Failing Provider. Ultimately Grandparents provide for Dependent Mother and, by proxy, to Self and Sister (table # 29).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Girlfriend</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Mother (Self, Sister)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 29: J.D.’s relational patterns regarding resources after separation

This state of affairs is the backdrop for the functioning of Both Mothers and Father’s
**Mother's New Family.**

Father's absence from the Family has an impact on the resources for Self.

I: When your Dad finally left... how did things change for you?
JD: Umm.. Well, we didn't see him as often and when we did see him I had to sleep in a sleeping bag because he didn't have a job and he didn't really support our family... and .. there was even less money than there was before. So there really wasn't enough money to buy extra clothes or ... before they split up I had a lot of birthday presents ... they kind of minimalized stuff (John Doe I, p. 3).

Father as Failing Provider leaves the Family as Deprived Dependents. Self turns from a satisfied Dependent into a Deprived Dependent. However, Deprived Dependent Self does not want to be a 'drain' on Mother.

I: So, what about the daycare situation?
JD: I wanted to get out of the daycare because I didn't really like it and it was costing $300.00 a month for me. And my sister's going to leave daycare next year when she's in grade 1 and her daycare is costing $600.00 a month, so it was $900.00 a month for my Mom......Down the drain, basically:

I: Down the drain?
JD: Yeah - 'cause it could be used for other things.
I: That's true. Like, what?
JD: Umm .. a new bike for my Mom, a cleaning lady,... somebody to help out around the house (John Doe II, p. 17)

In this excerpt, Self's concern for Deprived Dependent Mother is greater than Self's own dependency needs. Dependent Self becomes independent so as to free up resources for Mother. Self steps into the role of Provider for himSelf to lighten the load for Mother. Unlike Dependent Father who requires a female Provider Girlfriend, Self does not require Mother in the role of Provider, thus unburdening the female image. Sister also helps Mother carry the load of Provider.

I: And what do you think then, when that happens?
JD: That my sister and I should do something nice for her.
I: What do you do,... what kind of stuff do you do to be nice to her?
JD: We, like, wash the dishes (John Doe II, pp. 16, 17).

Here, Providers Self and Sister jointly take on a part of Mother's load (table # 30).
On the other hand, Rulebreaker Sister’s use and damage of Victim Self’s objects leads to conflict in Mother’s New Family.

JD: Umm .. I’d feel very ...good (having a close relationship with his father)
I: How?
JD: Probably I wouldn’t,.. I would be kinder.....
I: Do you sometimes feel that you're not so kind?
JD: Mmmm .... yeah.....When I fight with my sister.
I: And, what does it feel like inside?
JD: I don’t know .. it hasn’t happened in a while.
I: Uh huh..... And when it used to happen in the past,... what did it feel like?
JD: Umm... I felt bad,...... cruel almost ....She used to take my toys and stuff.... And play with them and go up in her room and play with my computer and she broke my keyboard.
I: So, she actually broke something of yours?
JD: Yeah.
I: ... And, that's when you got 'almost cruel'?
JD: Yeah.....I was really, kind of, upset after.
I: When you were upset - what happened,...how did that work out?
JD: My mother stopped us from fighting and .......... I got over it.
I: You got over what?
JD: Fighting with my sister, I do not do that often any more.... I called her names.... "Stupid", things like that.....Once I called her a 'bitch'.
I: How did she handle that?
JD: She cried 'MOMMY'!
I: What did your Mom do?
JD: I told her I wouldn't do it again, that it was really bad (John Doe II, pp. 12, 13, 14).

Self retaliates when Rulebreaker Sister breaks Self’s objects. Self is cast as Aggressor towards Victim Sister. Self would be kinder (more of a Pacifist), if Self had been treated more kindly by Authority Father. In the conflict with Self, Victim Sister gets Authority Mother involved. Self promises to be a Pacifist in the future. Just like Father, Self is attacked by a Rulebreaker image (Co-workers, Sister) in this excerpt, but unlike Aggressor Father, Aggressor Self apologises and becomes a Pacifist in relation to Sister. Self repairs the Sister image.
Rulebreaker/Aggressor Self.

JD: (We should) Probably be nicer to each other.
I: You mean your sister and you?
JD: Yeah. My sister and I should do what my Mom says, the first time.
I: Uh huh. So, you're giving your Mom a hard time?
JD: Yeah.
I: Does she lose her composure sometimes?
JD: Yes.....She gets mad and she goes up to her room.
I: ... and?
JD: I don't know. I've never been up to her room when she got mad.
I: And what do you think then, when that happens?
JD: That my sister and I should do something nice for her.
I: What do you do,... what kind of stuff do you do to be nice to her?
JD: We, like, wash the dishes (John Doe II, pp. 16, 17)

Rulebreakers Sister and Self upset Victim Mother. Rather than lashing out, Authority Mother (she's angry) withdraws from conflict. The theme of perfectionism is raised again (My sister and I should do what my Mom says, the first time).

Pacifists Self and Sister then attempt to repair the Mother image by becoming Providers. This reparation is successful, because Mother, unlike Father does not demand perfection (perfect adherence to rules) of Self.

I: Okay. And how are things with your Mom? ...How are things in your Mom's house? JD: They're better than living with my Dad....Well... We have fun and she doesn't really mind if I make a mistake as long as I fix it - she doesn't really yell at me (John Doe I, p. 7).

Thus Self is not locked into the role of Rulebreaker/Aggressor in relation to Mother.
The relational patterns concerning conflict after separation are shown in table # 31..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict After Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister, Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 31: J.D.'s relational patterns regarding conflict in Mother's New Family after separation
Father’s New Family.

John Doe’s memories of the patterns in Father’s New Family go back to the time shortly after separation.

JD: Umm... sometimes they were good and other times they were bad, ’cause when we went to my Dad’s apartment my sister would cry and would ask to go home and my Dad would get mad and start yelling.

I: Hu huh. What would he say?
JD: I didn’t really listen to the words, I kind of hid under the covers and put the pillow over my face (John Doe I, p. 5).

This segment has already been discussed. It shows Father in the role of Authority in relation to Sister, who is cast in the role of Deprived Dependent and Rulebreaker. Both Deprived Dependents Mother and Sister evoke the punitive aspect of Father, indicating that complaints because of deprivation are against Father’s rules.

Self has struggled with Father’s absence. Father’s absence has been a relief from conflict for Mother, while it has cast Self in the role of Deprived Dependent.

I: How much contact did you have (with your father)?
JD: Well, the last time I saw him was a little after Christmas.
I: Hmm... Do you talk to him over the phone every once in a while or..
JD: Yeah. He phones sometimes. Umm... I don’t phone him that often....I don’t know -- I guess I just didn’t feel the need to or not to.
I: I just wondered. Do you think he should be phoning... not you?
JD: Yeah - ’cause when he lived in St. Thomas and we had just moved here I would usually phone once a week and I would get the answering machine and so I just stopped phoning... I just don’t phone.
I: You didn’t want to talk to an answering machine. Would he call back?
JD: Yeah, if I left a message, but sometimes I didn’t leave one at all..... I got angry and upset and sad. I’d just hang up. I haven’t phoned him that often....
I: And, does he phone enough?
JD: Not really. He could phone more... more often than he does.
I: And, do you know why that is?
JD: Well, I think he doesn’t have enough money to pay for all those phone bills...like the long distance phone bills (John Doe I, pp. 8, 9).

Father’s failure as Provider is twofold. Father inability to care for himSelf also makes for his failure in relation to Self (he doesn’t have enough money to pay for all those phone bills). Faced with Father’s failure as Provider, Deprived Dependent Self gets angry and withdraws. This anger in response to deprivation is an aspect of Self’s role
as Authority towards Father, who is not living up to obligations of Parents towards Children. This failure to live up to obligations qualifies Father as Rulebreaker (table #32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #32: J.D.'s relational pattern regarding conflict after separation

I: Uh huh. When does it come up (the feelings of sadness)?
J.D: After I try to phone my Dad and I get the answering machine.
I: Uh huh. That's when it's hardest?
J.D: Yeah.
I: And, how does your Mom respond? What does she do?
J.D: She sits on my bed and rubs my back and tells me that it's okay and that I'll see him soon (John Doe II, pp. 11, 12).

Mother takes on the role of Provider and Pacifist in the face of Deprived Dependent Self's distress (table #33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #33: J.D.'s relational pattern regarding resources after separation

Father's failure as Provider has left the Father-Self relationship in precarious shape.

I: Okay. So he's now four hours by plane away from you. What do you think that's going to mean to your relationship with him? What's it going to look like?
J.D: It's probably going to weaken even more than it was before,... make it not so much of a relationship.
I: Not so much of a 'love relationship'? Is that what you said?
J.D: I still love him, but we might forget about each other sometimes.
I: Uh huh. And, what's it like to forget about him?
J.D: Umm .... I don't ....it's not so good, because I love him - he's the best.
I: So when you catch yourself,... that you've forgotten about him for a while, what happens?
J.D: Nothing,... I just remember about him more (John Doe II, pp. 4, 5).

**The Withdrawn Self.**

In response to Father's absence Self withdraws. This withdrawal is only partial and Father's or Mother's presence as Provider elicits new hope in Self for better
relational patterns. However, the punitive aspect of Father’s role in the internal world is troublesome for Self. Expressions of need by Sister and Mother and small mistakes by Self have been met with anger and withdrawal from Father. Self thus prefers to be alone in his deprived state. That way Deprived Dependent Self avoids the role of Rulebreaker about to be punished by a Authority Father.

JD: Yeah, um .. sometimes I’m just too upset to talk to anyone so I come upstairs to try to keep by myself as much as possible,
I: Uh huh. Yes. Now,... how do you get to the point that you are so upset that you want to be alone? How does that usually happen?
JD: Umm .. sometimes when I get off the phone with my Dad ...on the rare occasions that we talk on the phone ... I lie down and I think about stuff that just happened and what my Dad said ... and stuff like that.
I: What does he usually tell you, ... what kind of things do you talk about over the phone?
JD: Like, how much we miss each other and when we’re going to be getting back together next (John Doe I, p. 13).

Since Self’s relational pattern with Father is the most difficult aspect of John Doe’s internal world, imaginary solutions have been devised for that relationship.

**Imaginary Solutions**

**The Reunion of the Original Family and the Perfect Self.**

Many of John Doe’s imaginary solutions occur in the context of trying to undo a memory. John Doe mentions wishes that could have changed the situation at hand. In most instances, perfection is required on the part of Self in order to avoid the conflicts that eventually ‘caused’ Couple’s separation.

JD: Well, I’d make it so ... I’d turn back the time and make it so that my parents don’t fight and we could be a functional family.
I: Uh huh. What do you think it would take,...what would you have to do so that they wouldn’t fight? How would you have to change things?
JD: I don’t know. Make it so that everything was perfect...nobody did anything wrong. I: Is there something that you think you should have done differently?
JD: Umm ... (long pause, crying) ... probably should have done what I was told...... Done what my Mom asked me the first time, not the second time or third time (John Doe I, p. 12).

In this excerpt, Imaginary Self listens perfectly. The chain of events set in motion by
Rulebreaker Self’s disobedience does not happen, Imaginary Couple does not fight and Imaginary Functional Family has no reason to disintegrate (table # 34).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad Self</td>
<td>Mother. Father</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 34: J.D.’s imaginary pattern regarding conflict

The same requirement for complete absence of aggression is expressed in the following excerpt.

I: So ...what kind of family would you like to have?
JD: A family that didn’t fight and kids that do what they’re told and I never had to yell at them and stuff like that (John Doe II, p. 8).

Here, Future Kids are perfectly obedient so that Self-as-Future-Father is not cast in the role of Authority or Aggressor. According to John Doe’s logic, disobedient Future Children would provoke his anger. The internal images cast as potential Rulebreakers elicit destructive internal conflict, if Self-as-Future-Father has to yell at them. In imagination, Self is cast in the role of benign Authority. Barring naughty Future Kids, Imaginary Self may not have to take on the role of harsh Authority previously occupied by Father in memory. Even in his imaginary solutions, John Doe exhibits a need for perfect obedience on the part of Rulebreakers (table # 35).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Perfect Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 35: J.D.’s imaginary pattern regarding conflict

JD: Me and my sister going to visit him in British Columbia.
I: And, how do you feel about all this?
JD: It might be fun because we’re going to be on the ocean and we can go swimming a lot and he said we can rent some bikes and go bike riding.
I: So it might be fun.... but you sound worried that it might not be fun.
JD: Umm .. I guess.
I: What are you thinking might happen?
JD: Umm... he might get mad. That wouldn’t be so fun.
I: No, that’s true. What would he get mad at?

JD: I might do something dumb on a bike, or something like that....Umm.. going too fast, or trying to do tricks on the bike.
I: Hmm... and he may not like that?
JD: Because I might get hurt (John Doe II, pp. 1,2).

In anticipation of Father's presence, Future Self is worried about mistakes. In John Doe's imagination, Authority Future Father is angry, because Rulebreaker Future Self does something stupid and gets hurt (and presumably needs help), thus leaving Self in the role of Deprived Dependent (table # 36). The role of Future Self as Rulebreaker and Deprived Dependent in this imagined episode is identical to Self, Sister's and Mother's role in relation to Father in memory before and after separation (see tables # 28 and # 33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td>Future Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 36: J.D.'s imaginary pattern regarding conflict

**The Reunited Family and the Restored Father Image.**

Besides Self, Father is the other internal image cast in the role of Rulebreaker.

In the next two episodes John Doe attempts to deal with Father's failures.

I: Umm.... If you could give him advice,... what would you tell him?....
JD: I'd say that he should move closer and that he should phone more often and just be more of a Dad (John Doe II, p. 5).

Father should be more present and become more of a Provider to Self. Self-as-Future-Father certainly is more involved with Future Children than Father is with Self and Sister.

I: What kind of things you would want to do with your son? How you would treat them (future children)?
JD: I'd probably treat them nicely,... like do stuff with them,... like go fishing with my son, or go bike riding, play catch, stuff like that.
I: How would he feel about you if all that happened? How would he be?
JD: He'd probably be happy (John Doe II, p. 11).

In this episode, Self-as-Future-Father repairs the damage done in memory to Deprived Dependents Self and Sister. Future Children are happy, not crying like Self
and Sister. Self-as-Future-Father also replaces the failing Father image with a better male internal image (table # 37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 37: J.D.'s imaginary pattern regarding resources

**Conclusions**

John Doe's internal world encompasses vivid memories of the internal Family before separation. The two male internal images, Father and Self introduced destructive conflict into the Family. Father attacks all other members of the internal Family for being too demanding (Sister, Mother) or for making mistakes (Self). The Father image is itself victimised by Co-workers. Father feels angry at being unjustly treated and at the same time loses the ability to generate resources, further fuelling the conflict between Mother and Father. Mother is injured by Father's attacks and Mother's relief at not having conflict outweighs the loss of Father after separation.

The Self image is frequently cast as bad, disobedient Child. Self provokes anger from Father and Mother and that anger fuels the Couple conflict. Self is therefore seen as partially responsible for Couple's separation. This becomes evident, when Self introduces an imaginary Perfect Self that prevents Family conflict by making no mistakes and showing no signs of anger or distress.

After separation, the internal Father is a complete failure as Provider for Self, Sister, and Mother. Father, in fact, is a Dependent in his new relational pattern with Girlfriend. Mother struggles as sole Provider for New Family. In an effort at reparation, Self has taken to providing for himSelf, thus unburdening Mother. Mother also gets help from Grandparents.

The theme of conflict is played out quite differently in Father's and Mother's New Families. In Father's New Family the assignment of roles has not changed,
Father remains the Aggressor and Authority, Self and Sister the Rulebreakers and Victims.

In Mother's New Family, conflict between Sister and Self brings out a cruel streak in Self. Unlike his male counterpart Father, Self controls this streak and repairs the damage done to Mother and Sister. This reparation takes the shape of providing for Mother who is exhausted from caring for two Dependents.

John Doe's imaginary solutions revolve around two themes. The first theme is perfection and the second is the re-establishment of a gratifying relational pattern between Father and Son. John Doe believes that perfect obedience would have left the Original Family intact. By the same token, Self's disobedience has led to the demise of the functional Family and the split in the internal world.

In his reparative imaginary solutions, John Doe reunites a Father figure with Future Children. John Doe's main concern here is the wellbeing of Future Children. Unlike the Father image from memory, this Future-Self-as-Father makes Future Children happy. The Failing Father is replaced with a positive internal Father image. That way Future Family becomes functional. This intact Future Family is a very fragile internal construction because it requires complete and perfect absence of aggressive or demanding behaviour by all its Members.

John Doe is not concerned with the relational pattern of Self-as-Future-Husband and Future Wife. The internal Couple is repaired as a parental unit only for the benefit of Future Children.
Case Study Michael

Factual Information

Michael was nine years old at the time of the interviews. His twin brother Zachary also participated in this study. Another brother named Brent was four years old at the time of the interviews. Michael’s parents separated about 1 1/2 years before the interviews were conducted. Both parents currently live in the same city. Michael’s mother is currently involved in a new relationship with a man who also has a young son from a previous marriage.

Relational Patterns before the Separation

Michael was seven years old when his parents separated. He recounted only a few memories of family life before the separation.

I(interviewer):... Do you remember the time your parents split up and what is was like for you?
M(Michael): Yeah.
I: What comes to mind first? What was it like?
M: Well, first I got a parcel from my aunt and then they started to argue and they started to yell at each other and argue a lot. So then I went upstairs and then my Mom came up and said that they might be splitting up and my Dad might be moving to a new house (Michael I, p. 1).

This excerpt offers a very condensed version of the separation of Couple and Self’s role. While Self is occupied with a relational pattern involving the theme of resources, Self as gratified Dependent of Provider Aunt, Couple is in conflict. Separation and the absence of Father are the ultimate outcomes of Couple’s conflict.

Michael does have some ideas about the reasons for Couple’s conflict.
I: And even before they split up they must have..., why do you think they fought so much?
M: Maybe, um, I don’t really know.
I: Any idea?
M: Sometimes they were having like problems like not getting enough money and stuff like that.
I: Oh, they fought about money?
M: Sometimes (Michael I, p. 21).
Couple fight about a lack of resources. From this excerpt it remains unclear, how the roles of Failing Provider and Deprived Dependent are assigned. Later in the interview, in an imaginary sequence, Michael explains that Self-as-Future-Father needs to avoid having a bad job because that might cause friction in Future Couple.

I: What kind of things would you not do as a Dad - what would be the things that you would try not to do?
M: Have a really bad job.
I: What would happen with a bad job ... if you were a father and had a bad job?
M: We wouldn't have enough money...We would have to move to a smaller house and stuff.......We wouldn't have much furniture ...
I: So it wouldn't be that good? ... How would your wife like it if you didn't make enough money? What do you think would happen between you and her?
M: We'd get into fights sometimes, but she would try to get to get a job (Michael II, p. 19).

Self-as-Future-Father's failure to be an adequate Provider for Dependent Future Wife leads to conflict. Self's imagined solution involves a change of roles for both Mother and Father. Self-as-Future-Father becomes a good Provider and Future Wife agrees to help by also becoming a Provider, instead of remaining an angry Deprived Dependent. The imaginary aspect is discussed in more detail in the section on imaginary solutions.

This imaginary solution hints at how Michael has made sense of the Couple conflict. If the imaginary solution is indeed an attempt at righting the wrongs of the remembered past, it stands to reason that Father is cast as Failing Provider and Mother as Deprived Dependent (table # 38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 38: Michael’s relational patterns regarding resources before separation and in imagination

The Couple conflict between Father and Mother is intense.

I: Do you remember those fights?
M: Uh...um...Just a little.
In the following segment, Self’s position as Pacifist observer of Couple’s conflict is troublesome, leading Self to imagine a solution for the conflict.

I: O.K. So if you could have done something about it (the fighting), what would you have done? Have you thought about what you could have done?
M: Maybe told them that...not to fight any more.
I: Did you do that?
M: Not really.
I: No? Why not?
M: Well, once, when I was small my Mom was crying, so I was going to tell them...um tell him not to be mean to her.
I: Yeah... Did you? ... And what did your Dad say?
M: Well, I sort of forgot about it because he wasn’t there.
I: Right.
M: And so I sort of forgot about that. (Michael I, p. 3)

In this excerpt, the role played by the parental images in the area of conflict are finally defined. Father is ‘mean’, that is, Father is cast as Aggressor, while Mother is in the role of the injured Victim. Pacifist Small Self imagines that he would stand up to Aggressor Father and stop Father from harming Mother. In memory however, Pacifist Small Self is not successful (‘I forgot’). Since the Pacifist Self is unsuccessful, the internal Mother remains injured and Father’s aggression remains unchecked.

So far, the Self has been cast in the role of failing Pacifist, who is unable to control Aggressor Father. In the following excerpt, Michael casts Self as Rulebreaker who incites Father’s anger.

M: And he was mad at me sometimes.
I: What do you think you would do that he would get mad at?
M: Sometimes - like - we would play on the bed before we went into the bath.....
I: Uh huh.
M: We were, like, being too rough.
I: Okay.
M: Like - fooling around - acting up.
I: That would be, like, sort of play fighting.
M: Yeah.
I: Yeah - Okay.
M: And getting carried away,.....
I: And what would happen?
M: Sometimes I would - like maybe - whack him on the back when we were wrestling.
I: Who, your brother?
M: No. My Dad.
I: Oh your Dad - so you got him - and what would happen.
M: I didn't really mean to do it that hard sometimes.
I: Oh. So you think you kind of hurt him? Is that what you're saying?
M: Yeah.
I: And then?
M: Then he would tell us to get off the bed and go into the bath.
I: Uh huh. Would he be mad?
M: Um - yeah, sort of.

I: Does that still happen now?
M: Um,... we don't really wrestle on the beds anymore. (Michael II, pp. 13, 14)

In this segment, Self hurts Father by playing 'too rough'. Rulebreaker Self victimises Father by mistake. Victim Father then becomes the angry Authority and sends Rulebreaker Self to bed. In an attempt at reparation, Pacifist Self no longer engages in 'rough wrestling' with Father any more, thus avoiding hurting Father (table # 39).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerful Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 39: Michael’s relational patterns regarding conflict before separation and in imagination

At the time of separation, both Mother and Father, are seen as Victim images. Mother is victimised by Aggressor Father and Father is victimised by Rulebreaker Self. Both images therefore require some form of reparation in phantasy.

M: Well sometimes I'm pretty nervous.
I: Um. O.K.
M: Other times I'm not.
I: Which question was the hardest?
M: About that thing, like, what I would have done if I could have stopped them from, like, fighting (Michael I, p. 21).

In this excerpt, Michael expresses his feelings about Pacifist Self's failure to keep Couple from fighting. So far, reparation has been unsuccessful.
Father’s absence has decreased the tension and conflict in Mother’s New Family.

I: How do you think she (mother) was doing when she was still living with your Dad?
M: Not as good.
I: No. What did you think was going on for her?
M: She was sort of having a hard time.
I: And now? How is she doing now?
M: Better.
I: Can you say how better. What she does now that you haven’t seen before. Are there things that you notice now that you didn’t notice or things that she doesn’t do anymore that she used to do?
M: Well she’s like happier now (Michael I, p. 6).

Before separation, Victim Mother ‘was having a hard time’. Aggressor Father’s absence has resolved that problem, because conflict is reduced. However, Father’s absence after separation also casts Father in the role of Failing Provider.

I: So you thought your Dad was mean to her.
M: Yeah.
I: Yeah. Do you still think that?
M: Sometimes. He sometimes tells that he’s going to come and pick us up for a soccer game and then he doesn’t and we end up being late.
I: So……
M: So then our Mom has to drive us…. My Mom thought that he was driving and she was still in her pyjamas but then he said ‘ask your Mom to drive you guys up because I have to go up to talk to the coaches’. So we told our Mom that he had to go up for the coach’s meeting so she wasn’t very happy… Well she was sort of angry (Michael I, pp. 3, 4).

Father’s unreliability is experienced by Mother as both deprivation and the breaking of a rule or promise. Mother is thus cast in the role of Deprived Dependent in relation to Failing Provider Father. Deprived Dependents Self and Twin are also affected by Father’s failure to provide. Mother experiences Father’s failure as breaking an obligation to her and by proxy her Children. Father is therefore cast as Rulebreaker and Mother as angry Authority. Mother has moved from being in the roles of Deprived Dependent and Victim before separation, into the roles of Deprived Dependent and Authority after separation (table # 40).
Table # 40: Michael's relational pattern regarding conflict after separation

Relief for Deprived Dependent Mother in terms of resources comes from Grandparents.

I: So they're around all the time then?

As has been the case before the separation, Father is again the Failing Provider, while Mother is the angry Deprived Dependent. After separation, Mother has found Providers in Grandparents and has also started to generate resources on her own (table # 41).

Table # 41: Michael's relational pattern re resources in Mother's New Family after separation

Table: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Father's New Family.

Self's connection with Father has suffered in the wake of separation. In addition, the competition of Twin Brother and Younger Brother for Father's presence further decreases Self's access to Father.

I: So how often do you get to sleep over (at father's house)?
M: Well he's like really busy with his job right now so he hasn't that much time. Well, like, usually it's like we take turns like maybe like Brent on Monday, Zachary on Wednesday, me on Friday.
I: So when did you go last? When were you at his house last?
M: Maybe a couple of weeks ago.
I: O.K. Is that enough?
M: Twice like in April or something.
I: Is that enough time for you to sleep over?
M (hesitation)...Um, yeah.
I: It is? You kind of hesitated here. Do you sometimes think you would like to do it more?
M: Um, yeah.
I: Why do you think that's hard to say?
Father is busy providing for himself. Self, Zachary and Brent compete for limited resources from Father. Dependent Self prefers Provider Father to himself, but is agreeable to sharing Father with Competitor Brent. Self does not want to share Father with Twin Brother Zachary because the competition between Zachary and Self is especially fierce. While Father is shown as absent, Self does not express any need for more presence spontaneously. Self's role as Deprived Dependent remains somewhat of a secret. Consequently Father is not cast as Failing Provider, but is considered adequate by Self.

In the following segment the tables of Provider and Dependent between Father and Self are turned.

M: Like he says like 'I miss you' and like he just like talks to us to say that he misses us a lot and stuff like that.
I: Um. It's hard?
M: Yeah.
I: Do you think he's unhappy not living with you anymore?
M: Um, yeah, but ...
I: Can you help him with that in any way? Or do you try to?
M: We, like, are calling him and asking if he can come over and play sometimes.  
(Michael I, p. 16)

In this segment, Self becomes the Provider to Dependent Father, by calling Father over, knowing that Father misses Self and Brothers. By becoming a Provider to Father, Self reaps the benefits of Father's presence without the guilt of casting Father as Failing Provider, a role, Father occupied in relation to Mother (and by proxy in relation to Self) both before and after separation. Self turns Father from Failing Provider into an adequate Provider and that way protects the Father image from further harm. This mechanism is a successful act of reparation of the Father based on selective reevaluation of memory-based relational patterns (table # 42).
Table # 42: Michael’s relational patterns re resources in Father’s New Family after separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twin, Bro.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bad Self.

This theme of protecting parental images from harm is elaborated further in the following excerpts. Bad Self recognises Mother’s vulnerability and has developed a secretive life to protect Mother from harm. (Incidentally Michael did not want his mother to have access to his interview transcripts).

I: .... Are there things sometimes that you think about that you wouldn’t want to share with them (mother and father)?
M: Sometimes,... some things that happen at school?
I: Uh huh. That kind of stuff.
M: Like my teacher getting mad at me sometimes...?
I: Uh huh. Why does the teacher get mad at you?
M: Well, sometimes I’m not paying attention.

....

I: Okay. And you just don’t want them (mother and father) to know about this? ..... if you had the choice to tell one or the other, who would you tell?
M: Ummm ............
I: I understand you would not want them to know at all, right?
M: No.... That’s a hard decision.
I: Yeah.
M: I would probably pick my Dad.
I: Your Dad? How did you make the decision?
M: Well, my Mom is like always having a harder time.
I: Oh, okay. Does your Mom know about these things at school?
M: Yeah, sometimes. .... Usually my Grandpa and Grandma know - there’s a girl in my class who walks up the hill everyday and she tells my Grandpa that I’m bad and that I’m not paying attention.
I: So, do they tell your Mom do you think?
M: No. Cause she’s at work....
I: Do you know how it happens that you don’t pay attention?
M: Well, there’s a boy in my class who I really like named Adrian. He does really funny stuff and I’m looking at him and the teacher gets upset because I’m not looking at everything else...(Michael II, pp. 20, 21).

In this excerpt, Michael shares aspects of a secret life. Rulebreaker Bad Self gets in
Father and Mother. Especially Mother needs to be protected from this information because ‘my Mom is like always having a harder time’. Grandparents are aware of Self’s badness. However, Self successfully protects Mother from Self’s ‘bad’ behaviour (Self believes Mother does not know about the detentions).

This relational pattern shows a peculiar reparative effort on Self’s part. Self is aware of Mother’s vulnerability as Victim and Deprived Dependent. At the same time, Self’s own potential to be ‘badly behaved’ prevents Self from effectively caring for Mother. The best Self can do under these circumstances is to protect Mother from the badness, because Self does not have the resources or strength to repair the internal Mother. Self’s reparation consists of preventing further harm (table # 43).

In his imaginary solutions, Michael revisits this problem of badly behaved Future Kids hurting Future Parents and comes up with a familiar solution (Kids are punished by Future-Self-as-Father) (see the following section, table # 46).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 43: Michael’s relational pattern regarding conflict after separation

Furthermore the relational pattern concerning conflict has consequences for Self’s ability to draw on parental resources. As will be demonstrated in the next section, Self’s attempt to protect Father and Mother from harm coincides with Self’s attempt to become independent.

**Imaginary Solutions**

**Independence as Imaginary Solution.**

Since Self protects Mother from harm by keeping distance, Self cannot get close enough to Mother to be nurtured, Self has to find an imaginary solution to the problem of unsatisfied need.

I: So when you think of that family life and the family life that you have right now - what do you think - comparing those two?
of being, like, a kid......and be able to do more things.... Well, sometime I like to do things but then, like, I'm not old enough to do the sport.
I: Oh. And what kind of things would you like to do that you can't do yet?
M: Like - walk to school by myself and stuff.
I: Yeah - that would be neat, if you could walk to school.
M: Well, I would, sometimes - like - well, I wouldn't fool around.
I: You wouldn't?
M: I sometimes ......if I saw my friend walking up the hill I'd go talk to him a little bit.
I: What kind of fooling around are you not supposed to do?
M: Like, ....wrestling and Nintendo (Michael II, pp. 8, 9, 10).

In this segment, Independent Self is able to ‘walk to school alone’. Self would bend the rules only a little by ‘talking to Friend a little bit’. This way, an acceptable compromise is reached between Self's need to be close to Ally Friend and Self's need to protect Mother from Rulebreaker 'Bad Self'. Self gets emotional resources from Ally Friend, and protects the Mother image (table # 44).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grown-up Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 44: Michael's imaginary pattern regarding resources

As we have seen in the previous section, the bad aggressive aspects of Rulebreaker Self are hidden from the Victim images. But Self not only hides these aggressive aspects, Self also hides his unsatisfied need, that is, his role as Deprived Dependent. By being with Ally Friend, Self's deprivation is lessened. Self has opted for Friend as a substitute for the nurturing presence of the Parental images, who are inaccessible as Provider for two reasons. Mother is in the role of Deprived Dependent (see table # 41) and Father is cast as Failing Provider repeatedly (see table # 41 and # 42). Furthermore, both Parental images are also Victims of 'Bad Self' and require protection (see table # 39 and # 43). This reparative manoeuvre requires a certain distance between Self and Mother/Father. Not only do the parental images lack resources to give Self, Self also cannot use Father and Mother as Provider images. Self opts for premature independence instead (table # 45).
Punishment Reversed.

This solution of premature independence from Provider Mother and Father leaves two problematic issues to be resolved in phantasy, Self's competition with Twin Brother, and Self's feelings about having harmed Father and receiving punishment. In the following episode, Michael imagines a solution to the issue of crime, punishment, and competition.

M: I'd sometimes like to be, like,..... older (than his twin brother).
I: Yeah.....?
M: Sometimes I think about being older and stuff.
I: How would that be if he just didn't grow and you did? What would it be like to be the older brother?
M: Um. I'd sometimes make up stuff and - like,..... if you don't go to bed right now a ghost will come and get you and stuff like that.
I: So you would scare him?
M: Well, I'd just get him to get scared .... but if you go to bed right now nothing will happen and then he'd go to bed... (Michael II, p. 11)

In the memory-based relational patterns, Rulebreaker Self has been punished for 'whacking Father' and for 'not paying attention' in school. Father and Teacher were in the role of Authority in those segments. In this imaginary solution, Self reverses the internal dynamic. Twin Brother is now in the role of scared Rulebreaker and imaginary big Self is in the role of scary Authority, who threatens Twin with punishment. In the end, Twin Brother 'goes to bed' and Authority Self does not have to punish the Rulebreaker Brother. This pattern remedies Self's feelings of powerlessness vis-a-vis a Punishing Force by becoming that Authority and casting Competitor Twin Brother in the role of powerless Rulebreaker. Self wins the competition with Twin Brother. Self's anger is channelled into a righteous cause by scaring a Rulebreaker. However, in the end Pacifist Imaginary Self controls the
impulse to punish Twin Brother. In phantasy, Twin Brother obeys, eliminating the need for punishment.

In this imaginary solution, Self does not simply reverse the memory-based pattern and punish Father or Teacher. That strategy might simply add to Self's guilt for being the Aggressor/Rulebreaker. Instead, Self is cast in the role previously occupied by Father, while Twin Brother is cast in the role previously occupied by Self. In phantasy, Self manages to be powerful and to transfer blame for being 'bad' onto Twin Brother (table # 46).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Smaller Twin</td>
<td>Powerful Big Self</td>
<td>Powerful Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 46: Michael's imaginary pattern regarding conflict

The Reunited Couple.

The following imaginary solution reunites a Future Couple and thus addresses some of the problematic outcomes of memory-based patterns.

M: I would try to be a soccer player.
I: So - what would your life be like -- with your kids and your wife. What would you do?
M: I would try to see them as much as I can. But sometimes I would have to go to different countries to play soccer games. I would try to call them a lot and - like - send letters to them and stuff like that.
I: Okay. And how would they feel when you're not there - what would it be like for them.
M: Well - not as good as it was.
I: So it wouldn't be as good as when you're playing at home?
M: Yeah.
I: What kind of things would say to them?
M: I'd just tell them not to be sad, I'd tell them that I'd be with them a lot.
I: And, what would you tell your wife if you were gone for a while?
M: Try to keep the kids happy when I'm gone.

.....
I: What would happen if one of the kids cried on the phone and said I want to be with you -- I want to be there with you - one of the little ones? What would you say to him -- or her?
M: I'd try to say that I'd try to visit you as much as I can - try to make them happier.

....
I: Ah - you would visit them you mean?
M: Yeah. Like there'd be two days at soccer, five days with my family.
L: Oh - then you wouldn't be gone that much then - they would see you quite a bit?
M: Okay. And what if your wife said I want to see you more? What would you say to her?
M: Like - I would like try to tell her that I would ask my coach if I could not go to some games. (Michael II, pp. 4, 5, 6)

This episode starts out with Self-as-Future-Father’s withdrawal and absence from Future Family (Self-as-Future-Father is a professional soccer player and therefore gone). Self’s emotional absence has become a successful adaptive mechanism for shielding Mother from ‘Bad’ Self. However, in this sequence Self-as-Future-Father’s failure to be a Provider for Deprived Dependents Future Family conjures up a reparative impulse. Unlike Father in memory, Self-as-Future-Father responds to Future Children’s and Future Wife’s expressions of need and becomes a good Provider, changing Future Family’s role to satisfied Dependents. Future Children, unlike Self, are then happy.

The reunion of Future Couple repairs the separation of the Parental Couple. In memory, Victim Mother is injured by Aggressor Father and Deprived Dependent Mother is not cared for by Failing Provider Father. Future Wife, however, is well cared for by Self-as-Future-Father. Not only is the Female part of the internal Couple repaired, the Male image has turned from harmful to beneficial (table # 47).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer Self</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 47: Michael’s imaginary patterns regarding resources

Conclusions

Michael’s internal world is organised around Male images as Aggressors and Rulebreakers and an injured Mother image. Before separation, Father harms Mother and precipitates the separation of the internal Couple. Self is unable to stop
Aggressive Father from hurting Mother and feels bad about this failure to protect Mother. The separation of the internal Couple is beneficial because it removes the element of danger from the internal Family. Self also carries the potential for harm. Before separation, Self’s aggression inadvertently injures Father who retaliates and punishes Self.

While the separation is a good solution to the problem of Couple conflict, it aggravates the lack of resources. Mother is now protected from Aggressor Father, but becomes the exhausted Provider while Father as Failing Provider does not live up to his obligations to Children and Ex-Wife, who then both become Deprived Dependents. Since Father is unable to care for Self (Father is busy), Self protects Father from complaints by Deprived Dependents by becoming Independent. In a role reversal, Independent Self repairs Father by taking care of him. By means of these two reparative strategies Self manages to repair the Father image.

In the wake of separation, Mother suffers from exhaustion. Self’s emotional absence and failure to obey have the potential to hurt Mother. As a solution, Self protects Mother from Bad Self by keeping his ‘crimes’ secret. This also has the unfortunate effect for Self that Provider Mother is out of reach. Self’s source of comfort is Ally Friend who is also associated with the bad and disobedient aspects of the Self in school.

The competition with Twin Brother is another problem for Self. Both Self and Twin Brother compete for already limited resources from Father. In an imaginary solution, Self wins this competition and threatens Twin with punishment. Self becomes bigger than twin Brother who is then cast in the role of scared child, while Self becomes the threatening Authority. Here, Self relates to Twin in the role previously held by Father in relation to Self. This manoeuvre has two beneficial effects for Michael’s psyche. First, Twin Brother is cast in the role of ‘Disobedient Child’ deserving punishment. Self’s role of the Bad Child has been successfully
transferred onto Twin Brother. Secondly, Self's aggressive side has been legitimised in his role as Authority and directed into threatening punishment for 'Bad' Twin Brother.

Self manages to imagine a (re)united Couple. Self-as-Future-Father is frequently absent to Future Family. However, in response to needy Dependents (Future Children), Self-as-Father, unlike Father, becomes a good Provider. This imaginary solution reverses Couple's separation and repairs each Member of the internal Family. Future Children and Future Wife are happy in the end, not Deprived Dependents. Self-as-Future-Father is a positive male figure who does not hurt Future Wife and Children the way Father and Self have hurt Mother.

However, this successful imagined solution also shows Michael's tendency to keep Male images apart from Female images in an effort to protect the Female image from Male violence, a strategy that leaves both Male and Female images deprived.
Case Study: John

Factual Information

John was eleven years old at the time of the interviews. His parents had separated about seven years earlier, when John was four years old. John remained in the custody of his mother. After the separation, John’s mother moved three times, eventually settling in Toronto, a two hour drive away from John’s father’s home. His father has since remarried and lives with his new wife and their young son in Penetanguishene. John’s mother entered a longterm relationship several years ago and her new partner lives with her and John. Both parents now cooperate in driving John for his biweekly visits to and from his father’s house.

Relational Patterns before Separation

John was four years old when his parents separated. John has no recollections of Couple conflict between Father and Mother leading to separation. His memories from before separation are condensed into a relational pattern between Father and Neighbour.

Conflict between Father and Neighbour

Just prior to the separation, John describes a conflict between Father and Neighbour. This is his only memory of conflict before separation and illustrates Father’s pattern of conflict resolution.

J(John): Um - when you asked me if I can remember anything from when my parents were fighting.
I(Interviewer): Right. So that stuck with you?
J: Um - huh.
I: So, ... did any kind of images come up?
J: Yeah, I remembered - um - I think - another thing. Which was, .... I remembered that my Dad was .... that our neighbours had a really junky yard beside us and that they didn’t really bother with it, so my Dad put up a fence and he was out in the rain, and I remember I was with my Mom and some other grown-ups and we were looking out the window and my Dad was in his rain jacket in the pouring rain putting up the fence because he just couldn’t stand the sight of the
other back yard (John II, pp. 1, 2).

In this excerpt, Neighbour is cast as Rulebreaker. Father seems to be the Victim image of Neighbour's negligence ('he just couldn't stand the sight of the other back yard'). Lack of care also designates Neighbour as Failing Provider. Father does not engage Neighbour in conflict. Instead, Father builds a fence that blocks the view to Neighbour's junky yard. Pacifist Father resolves the conflict without confrontation. John associated this story with Parents' conflict. Because of John explicit association, it is assumed that this relational pattern shows Father's role in the Couple conflict (table # 48).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 48: John's relational pattern regarding conflict before separation

If we consider the theme of resources in the excerpt above, Father stops depending on Neighbour for cooperation and takes matters in his own hands, that is, Father moves from the position of Deprived Dependent to the position of independence (table # 49).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 49: John's relational pattern regarding resources before separation

**Relational Patterns during and after Separation**

**The Moment of Separation.**

John does have a memory of the exact moment of separation, although he did not realise the significance of the moment at the time.

I: What do you remember?
J: Um, I remember looking out the window and I saw my Dad driving away and I asked my Mom what he was doing and she didn't really answer me...I think I was four.
I: O.K. Did you later find out what he was doing and what had been going on?
J: Yep. Yep. And he told me that um, he told me I think last year, that he was, he remembered he was outside right by the car and he had his bags and
everything and he just started to cry (John I, p. 1).

He recalls Father leaving, but at the time, John did not understand the significance of the moment and only later realised that this was the moment Father left. The result of Couple’s separation is discussed in further detail in the next two excerpts.

I: What were you thinking about, was there something on your mind, kind of?
J: Well, no, I was just thinking about that I wanted to go live with my Dad when I’m twelve and I know I’d miss my Mom just like I miss my Dad now, but I’d rather live with my Dad than never live with him at all. (Crying....)
I: Can you imagine how that would feel than not being with your Mom? Have you thought about that too?
J: I’d miss her just as much as I miss my Dad now, but I guess it’s not really fair that I get to live with my Mom my whole life and just see my Dad most of the summer and every second weekend. And I’d like to go live up there for not the rest of my life but the other half of it, I guess (John I, p. 10).

John elaborates on the issue in the second interview:

J: Well, I’ve been thinking about if I want to live with my Dad, or if I want to stay here, or...
I: Right....How does your argument go - in your head - when you try to decide this - because this is a big decision for a boy your age.
J: Well - um - I think about that I really miss my Dad and I know I’d miss my Mom, but instead of missing my Dad and never ... I’d rather miss my Mom and actually live with my Dad than never live with him at all. But I don’t really know if I want to leave everything in Toronto. I think it would be really different living in Orillia. Like - I wouldn’t be doing soccer and tennis, like, a lot of those things. But - I think I still want to live with my Dad.
I: And - have you broached this with your Mom and with your Dad?
J: Well - my Dad says - ...well my Mom says that she’s not going to let me go and that she really wants me to stay living with her and my Dad says that he really wants me to live with him (John II, p. 9).

These three excerpts contain relational patterns for both themes. First, Couple’s separation leaves Self as Deprived Dependent of Failing Provider Father. In this case, Father’s failure to provide is seen as the result of Authority Mother’s need for Self. (table # 50).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Competit</th>
<th>Failing Prov</th>
<th>Depr. Depend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 50: John’s relational pattern regarding resources after separation
Concurrently, the separation turns Father into a Deprived Dependent because Father is now missing Son-Self ('she really wants me to stay living with her and my Dad says that he really wants me to live with him'). Because of the separation, Self unwittingly is cast in the role of Failing Provider to either Father or potentially to Competitor Mother. Evidence for this conflict abounds in the interview and is presented most cogently in the imaginary relational patterns. Father's continued feelings of loss and deprivation are one of the pivotal issues in John's internal world (table # 51).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 51: John's relational pattern regarding resources after separation

In the imaginary pattern, Self's and Father's position as Deprived Dependent is addressed. In John's imagination, Self goes to live with Father and reestablishes a mutually gratifying relationship, in which both are simultaneously giving (Provider) and receiving (Dependent), a state of affairs that leaves Mother in the role of Deprived Dependent. In some sense, Self is coveted by both Mother and Father. In phantasy, Self becomes a Provider image and manages to repair Deprived Dependent Father. While that imaginary pattern leaves Mother without Provider Son-Self, Self sees this arrangement as fair (table # 52).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son - Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 52: John's imaginary relational pattern regarding resources

Self is clearly in a loyalty conflict between Father and Mother. So far, Mother as Authority has used her power to keep Self with her. Self does not have the power to chose his own alliance in this situation. Self, just like Father, is powerless. Self thus becomes a captive Provider to Dependent Mother. Father has been cast in the role of Pacifist, who does not really contest the issue at hand, yet becomes the
Victim/Deprived Dependent of Mother's Authority. Just like in the conflict with Neighbour, Father does not have the power to effect a desired outcome (table # 53). The role of Father in conflict with Mother after separation resembles Father's role in the sequence with Neighbour before separation (see table # 48).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 53: John’s relational pattern regarding conflict after separation

**Father's New Family.**

A number of internal images are added to John's internal world after the separation of Couple because Father and Mother enter new unions. In the internal representation of Father’s New Stepfamily, the issue of conflict has become of prime importance.

J: Well a lot of times my step Mom can be annoying. My brother will break something and he'll blame it on me and my step Mom will get me in trouble since I'm not allowed to talk back I get in trouble and... Oh, she's nice most of the time but she's a little strict.

I: What's this not talking back rule?

J: Well I'll try and explain that I didn't do it and it wasn't me but she won't let me talk back because she thinks I'm mouthing back, ..... 

I: Uh huh. Yeah. And does your Dad intervene?

J: Well, um, he all the times takes my side and he tries to stand up for me, but usually my step Mom's the boss in the house (John I, pp. 4, 5).

This sequence of events is so complex that all four members of the internal Stepfamily are cast in the various roles. Halfbrother is the Rulebreaker. However, Authority Stepmother accuses Self as Rulebreaker and then punishes Victim Self instead of Halfbrother. Pacifist Father unsuccessfully takes Self's side. Since Authority Stepmother 'is the boss in the house', her verdict stands. Father is again shown in the role of Pacifist trying to negotiate from a place of relative weakness with a powerful Female image in the role of Authority. Like Mother, Stepmother is more
powerful than Father. Self is at the mercy of Authority Stepmother’s decision because Father is too weak to support Self. Self is unjustly accused of disobedience, but does not defend his position because Authority Stepmother interprets a defence (talking back) as challenge to authority and punishes Self. Like Father earlier, Self takes on the role of Pacifist. In the role of Pacifist both Father and Self prefer to withdraw from conflict with Authority Mother and Stepmother (table # 54).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halfbrother</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>Powerl. Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 54: John’s relational pattern regarding resources in Father’s New Family after separation

Father’s weak attempts to side with Self against Stepmother also have repercussions in the area of resources. Both Self and Father fail to provide each other with care and resources. Both are therefore simultaneously Deprived Dependents and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self. Father</td>
<td>Father. Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 55: John’s relational pattern regarding conflict in Father’s New Family after separation

The issue of Failing Provider Father’s withdrawal is addressed in the next segment describing a conflict between Father and Stepmother.

I: And, what’s that like for you, listening to that (father and stepmother fighting)?
J: Oh - I don't really listen to it - I just go downstairs and play with my brother, or do something..... I'd just be sitting upstairs or something and they'll start having an argument, so I'll just read a bit so it doesn't look like I'm just going to rush downstairs. I'll wait a few moments and then I'll just start walking downstairs slowly.
I: What would they be fighting about?
J: Well, sometimes - I only get the first bit of it, but I think that one of the times that it was that he doesn't pay attention to it - that when she's talking about a problem that because she's a nurse - she's talking about a problem at work - he kind of won't be listening and ....
I: Okay - so she feels that he doesn't pay enough attention to her problems, then.... Does that sound like your Dad?
J: Um - well he usually gets distracted by everything - but he doesn't do that a lot.
I: Uh huh. What would he get distracted by?
In this episode, a conflict involving Father and Stepmother is described. Father is cast as Failing Provider to Deprived Dependent Mother, who needs, but does not get attention. This failure to pay attention to Stepmother can be understood as a consequence of Father’s passive strategy in conflict. In previous conflicts, Father has been cast as Victim or Pacifist who withdraws from conflicts, with Female images cast in the role of Authority. Father avoids both conflict and by implication Female Authority. As a consequence, Father fails Female images as Provider. Father’s withdrawal brings about what Father tries to avoid, a conflict with angry Female Authority Stepmother. In this case Couple settles the conflict peacefully in the end, (both Stepmother and Father in the role of Pacifist) (table # 56).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>Powerl. Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 56: John’s relational pattern regarding conflict in Father’s New Family after separation

We encounter here a relational pattern that we have already encountered in Bob’s internal world. Male images are cast in the role of Failing Providers and female representations are cast as both Deprived Dependents and as Authority. In their role as Authority these Female images use power to force Male images to become a satisfactory Provider. In John’s internal world, Father is forced to be a Provider by Stepmother and Self is in that position in relation to Mother. However, Stepmother’s conflict with Father arises because Father is Failing Provider of emotional support to Deprived Dependent Stepmother (table # 57).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friends, Son-Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 57: John’s relational pattern regarding resources in Father’s New Family after separation

Mother’s and Stepmothers solution to force Male images into being adequate Providers is only partially successful. In the imaginary patterns, Self imagines being with Father (both being Provider and Dependent at the same time in a
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satisfying relational pattern), not Mother. Likewise, Father’s emotional needs are met not by Stepmother, but by other Male images (Son and Friends).

J: Yeah, I usually think that I’d like to be just like my Dad and have a nice house and have a nice wife and just, like, be like him ‘cause he does a lot of stuff and I would like to live in California and go sky diving .....  
I: What kind of stuff does your Dad do? What does he do for a living, ...  
J: He was a funeral director until he, but now he does preplanning for funeral arrangements and he’s home more and he doesn’t have to go, like he doesn’t get called at two in the morning to go over to the house to pick up a body or something...And he, he plays hockey with his friends at Wasaga Beach and he goes golfing a lot and he’s part of a club of guys who really just like play tennis and beach ball sometimes and they sell raffle tickets for charity and everything (John I, pp. 6, 7).

In this excerpt, Father and Friends meet each other’s needs in a mutually satisfactory relational pattern (see table # 52), again each being Dependents and Providers at the same time (table # 58).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Friends, Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 58: John’s relational pattern regarding resources in Father’s New Family after separation

**Mother’s New Family.**

John did not talk extensively about this aspect of his relational world. However, the pattern between male and female images already established between Father and Mother, and Father and Stepmother, holds true for Mother and Partner Mike.

I: What about your Mom and her boyfriend?  
J: She is a, I guess I wouldn’t call her a head hunter but she gets, she helps find jobs for people and if they have the qualities that the company needs for the job, and my Mom’s boyfriend Mike, he’s an architect, so, and he plays tennis sometimes but we do a lot of stuff.....And I think he’s been here for six years. He’s been with us for six years.....  
I: Now, you said at your Dad’s house, that his wife is the boss. Who’s the boss here?  
J: Oh, well, I don’t think anybody is really the boss here, but I guess it’s my Mom and it’s definitely not me (John I, p. 7).

Again Mother is cast as Authority (the boss). Mike is not in that role, yet his
is not in the role of a powerful Authority (it's definitely not me). Again, the relational pattern of powerful female images dominating male images is evident.

**The Powerless Self.**

If we consider the position of Self in the various patterns, it becomes apparent, that Self is regularly in the position of Powerless Pacifist in relation to a female image in the role of Authority (Mother, Stepmother).

J: Well when they (future sons) were old enough I'd take them golfing like my Dad took me and I'd play hockey with them and take them skating and when they're old, when they were about sixteen I'd take them sky boarding.

I: O.K. I've heard of that.

J: I'd take them, if my wife would let me, but I don't think she would, since my step Mom won't even let my brother get on a GT (type of sled), so... (John I, p. 8)

In this excerpt, Stepmother stops Halfbrother from getting on a GT. Similarly, in imagination, Future Wife as Authority would Prevent Self-as-Future-Father from going sky boarding with Future Sons. Powerless Self-as-Future-Father accepts Future Wife's decision. Throughout John's relational patterns, a Punitive Female Force is in the way of realising Self's desire to be closer to a male Provider image (i.e. live with father) or to become a good male Provider image (i.e. go sky boarding with imaginary sons). This lack of power is the major stumbling block to a mutually satisfactory relational pattern between Self and Father on one hand, and Self and Son images on the other.

**Imaginary Solutions**

In response to direct questions about how he would change his life, John presents imaginary solutions that very much resemble his memory-based structures. The imagined future closely resembles the remembered past. These solutions are not truly successful in their reparative function, because the Self is not free of the limitations that make reparation potentially successful.
John also ‘invents’ and draws cartoon stories. The relational structures based on these stories have the properties of successful reparation.

**Two Failed Attempts at Reuniting the Internal Couple.**

In John’s failed imaginary solutions the memory of problematic relational patterns intrudes and overwhelms imagined solutions for the future.

J: Yeah, I want to get married and have two kids, actually two boys..... Well, I don’t really want to have one and have them always complaining about how he’s never got anybody to play with so and preferably have them one year apart.

I: Uh huh. What would you do with them. How would you...? What would you do?

J: Well when they were old enough I’d take them golfing like my Dad took me and I’d play hockey with them and take them skating and when they’re old, when they were about sixteen I’d take them sky boarding.

I: O.K. I’ve heard of that.

J: I’d take them, if my wife would let me, but I don’t think she would, since my step Mom won’t even let my brother get on a GT (sled), so.

I: Oh, right. So you think women are always more careful about these things?

J: I guess.

I: So what do you think has to be avoided when one gets married. What are the things that you would have to watch out for?

J: No more girlfriends and... And, I guess that’s about it.

I: O.K. And what do you think your wife would have to watch out for. What would be the things that she would have to change?

J: No more boyfriends and make sure I’m not going out with any other girls (John I, pp. 8, 9).

In this excerpt, Self-as-Future-Husband becomes a good Provider for Future Sons, reversing Father’s failure to be a Provider for Self. However, Self-as-Future-Husband is faced with the strict limits imposed by Authority Future Wife (Future Self would not be allowed to take Future Sons skyboarding). Future Wife is compared to Authority Stepmother who enforces strict rules governing behaviour for Fathers and Sons. Self-as-Future-Husband is then cast in the role of Pacifist who goes along with the limits set by Future Wife. Self-as-Future-Husband is cast in the same roles for which Father has been cast in the memory-based relational patterns. The memory of relational patterns found in New Family subverts the reparative intent of this failed imaginary solution (table # 59).
Table 59: John's imaginary relational pattern regarding conflict

John expresses a wish to fly in various guises throughout the interviews. Here it occurs as Self's wish to skateboard with Future Sons. Future Wife's role of Authority who can set limits on Future Husband's behaviour prevents Self from soaring. Future Wife is cast in the role of Authority by John's suggestion that Future Wife has to 'make sure I'm not going out with any other girls', suggesting that Future Self might break the rules, if not stopped by Future Wife.

John's wish for the reunion of Father and Mother also suffers from interference from memory.

J: Well I wouldn't really change anything because if I wanted them to get back together they would still be fighting and I guess it would just happen all over again.

I: Right.

J: ...and I'd never meet my step Mom, I'd never meet my Mom's boyfriend and I'd never have a little baby brother. So, I don't think I'd change that (John I, p. 4).

Here the reunion of the internal Father and Mother has two equally unpalatable outcomes. Either the reunion is followed by a repeat of history, or the reunion of Father and Mother implies the loss of rich relational structures in the internal world. With these two outcomes in mind, John gives up the attempt to reunite the original internal Couple in phantasy.

The Successful Reunion of the Internal Couple.

John's successful imaginary patterns are contained in his stories about cartoon characters.

J: Yeah. ... And I started making some guys up, ... of my own.

I: Who did you make up?

J: I've made one guy named 'Q-Ball' and he has a huge pair of eyes and a nose and a mouth and head and coming out of his head are arms and legs, so he has no body.

I: Hmm. And what kind of guy is he?
J: He's ... he's ... umm ... oh, ... he's a good guy and he has heavenly powers and he's really strong and he can fly. I've already made up a comic of him.

I: Okay.

J: I made a comic. He gets his powers by, umm, ... he's testing out a new machine with his professor and he trips when they're testing it on a rat. ... the machine, ... he slips on a banana peel and falls in the ray, and the thing falls over and lands on the professor and crushes him and he gets a shock from it and that's how he gets his powers.

I: So he gets his powers after his professor dies.

J: Uh huh. - From the machine....Well, I guess he misses him (the professor), but he doesn't really have a family but he has a girlfriend named Cindy.

I: Ah - what kind of girl is she?

J: She's the exact same except that she has a bow on her head - she looks the exact same as 'Q-Ball'.

I: Do you have a hero in real life? Like, somebody that you really admire, ... that you want to be like?

J: The only person, umm, my idol is fictional...And he's from the Star Wars Movies and his name is Han Solo.

I: Han Solo. Yes. I remember him. What do you like about him?

J: He's ruthless. He has great Star power and he's .... (John II, pp. 13, 14, 15)

In this vignette, Self's chronic feelings of powerlessness vis-a-vis female internal images cast in the role of Authority (i.e. Mother, Stepmother, Future Wife) are addressed and repaired. Comic hero Q-ball is assumed to be an imaginary aspect of the Self image. Q-ball is powerful and can fly, attributes John himSelf longs for. The two other characters in this episode belonging to the internal world are Professor and Girlfriend Cindy. Professor, as the character of an older male Mentor, is assumed to be related to the Father image. Cindy is assumed to be a variation of the internal image of Future Wife.

Unlike Father and Son-Self, Mentor Professor and Q-ball-Self get to do things together in this excerpt. This addresses the memory of Father and Self being limited in their joint activity by Mother and Stepmother. In phantasy, an accident occurs, that kills Professor and at the same time endows Q-ball with supernatural powers (this includes the power to fly). By killing off Father/Professor, John manages to get rid of Father's association with the roles of Pacifist and Victim in relation to female images. Q-ball-Self no longer follows in Professors footsteps, instead Q-ball-Self can
soar. This powerful imaginary Self image provides a sound basis for the successful reunion of the internal Couple (table # 60).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Q-Ball Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 60: John’s imaginary relational pattern regarding conflict

Q-ball-Self's Girlfriend Cindy is just like Q-ball-Self. Q-ball-Self's power is not diminished in Girlfriend Cindy's company. Previous roles relating to conflict between male and female images do not apply to their relational pattern. By contrast, John-as-Future-Husband lost his power to fly in the presence of Future Wife in the failed imaginary solution (see table # 59).

This imaginary solution repairs the weakness in the male internal image. It also paints a different picture of the female internal image as accepting of male power. The imaginary pattern also severs the identificatory tie between Father and Son images (I want to be just like my dad), allowing the Self/Son image to express independence and strength (Father has no balls, unlike Q-ball). The imaginary pattern succeeds in simultaneously repairing both the Self image and the internal Couple in phantasy.

Conclusions

The outstanding feature of John’s memory-based internal world is the relational pattern between Male and Female internal images. This pattern originates in the area of conflict and has repercussions in the area of resources.

Throughout the memory-based relational patterns, Father is cast in the role of Pacifist and Victim. Before separation Father's relational counterpart is Neighbour in the role of Rulebreaker, who does not cooperate. During separation Mother is the relational counterpart to Father. Mother is cast in the role of Authority, a role that gives Mother the power to force Self to be present to Mother not Father. Self wishes
to be with Father and Father wishes to be with Self, yet, Self and Father images are both not powerful enough to get their wish.

In Father's New Family and in Mother's New Family, the Females again occupy the role of Authority. Both Self and Father are subject to their decisions and verdicts. Both withdraw from direct conflict and from contact with Female images. Father has gratifying relational patterns with Friends instead. Both Father and Self seek gratifying contact with one another, not with Mother and Stepmother.

Conflict between Father and Stepmother occurs as a function of Father's withdrawal from contact with a Female image experienced as too powerful. Stepmother experiences Father's withdrawal as deprivation.

John's imaginary solutions address this relational structure of a weak victimised Father image and a powerful Mother image. In John's unsuccessful imaginary structures, the Self cannot shake the memory of the powerful Mother/Stepmother and the weak Father. The imaginary union of Future Self with Future Wife is only temporarily successful because Future Self repeats in phantasy the union between a weak Male and a powerful Female figure.

In John's successful imaginary solution, Self severs the identificatory tie with Father. Unlike weak Father, Q-ball-Self is an internal image with supernatural powers. This Self image does not fall into the relational pattern of submitting to a powerful Female. Instead Q-ball-Self and Girlfriend Cindy are equal. This solution restores the Self image and reunites the internal Couple in phantasy.
Case Study Pepsi

Factual Information
Pepsi is his parents’ only child. He was eleven years old at the time of the interviews. Both parents returned to work shortly after Pepsi was born. They moved from Montreal to Toronto for professional reasons when Pepsi was six years old. They separated about 1 1/2 years before these interviews and currently live within walking distance of each other.

Relational Patterns before Separation
Pepsi’s case presents a unique challenge for the data analysis and presentation, because many of the imaginary and memory-based relational patterns are so intertwined that they cannot be separated out from one another. Pepsi also reports few emotional responses. In many instances there is no gap between problematic internal states and imagined solutions.

Pepsi remembers a significant loss of Parents as Providers prior to the separation of Couple. Thus two separations are represented in Pepsi’s memory-based relational patterns: the separation of Couple and the premature separation of Baby Self from Parents as Providers.

In all the other case studies, there is a clear distinction between imaginary and memory-based relational patterns. In these cases the imaginary solutions are presented following the memory-based patterns. In Pepsi’s case, there is a distinct difference between the patterns concerning the separation between Self and Parents and the patterns concerning the separation of Couple. A hallmark of the patterns concerning the separation of Self and Parents is that imaginary solutions and memory are virtually inseparable in the raw data. Each segment dealing with the separation of Self and Parents contains simultaneously a memory and an imaginary solution. Since Pepsi’s wish for a Teenage Brother was his first association to the
theme of parental separation, this excerpt will introduce the topic of the separation between Parents and Self and Pepsi’s imaginary solution to the problem.

The Independent Teenage Self.

Pepsi has organised his internal world around two separations, the one between Child Self and Parents and the other between Father and Mother. The wish for an imaginary Brother takes centre stage in Pepsi’s internal World. This imaginary Older Brother provides an imaginary solution to the problem of dependency on absent Parents.

I: The first question I have is, ... I just want to ask you what comes to mind when you think about your parents separating? What is your first thought?
P: I don’t know. Whenever I think about it, I think about having a brother or a sister (Pepsi I, p. 1).

This imaginary Sibling is introduced into the interview immediately as Pepsi’s first association to the theme of separation. Pepsi then elaborates.

P: Well - I don’t really want a younger brother, I want an older brother.
I: An older brother?
P: I wish that could happen because I go to this place that’s like an Adventure Club after school because my parents work and I don’t really like it, it’s with babies, ... so I’d rather have an older brother so I could just come back to the house after school.
I: Right. Okay. What’s going on there in this club?
P: You play games, you go to gym, you play baseball, football, soccer...
I: And, you said babies .. are the other kids younger?
P: Well, I’m the second youngest kid in my group, but we’re not allowed to play baseball without a teacher around and stuff ... (Pepsi I, p. 2)

This excerpt introduces Parents as absent Providers. Deprived Dependent Self is forced to stay in Daycare, a place experienced as Authority, because Self is not allowed to exercise his own decisions. Self also dislikes Daycare because ‘it’s with babies’. Although Self admits to being ‘the second youngest in the group’, Self feels treated by Authority Daycare like a much younger child, a Baby (i.e. Self is ‘not allowed to play baseball without a teacher around and stuff”).
As a solution to this problem, Self imagines having an Ally Older Brother to come home to in lieu of Parents.

I: So, you always wanted an older brother rather than ...

P: Because he could take me out, ... like we could take a drive and go places . . . instead of having to take a taxi or the subway or getting my mom to drive me.

I: So you would have teenage life a lot earlier than other kids if you had an older brother?

P: Yeah (Pepsi II, p. 22).

The relationship between Dependent Self and Ally Imaginary Older Brother is one of almost equals, that is, through the imagined association with Older Brother, Self gains Teenage Brother's privileges. Pepsi's Self representation becomes that of a Teenager (table # 61).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Teenage Self</td>
<td>Teenage Brother</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 61: Pepsi's relational pattern re resources after separation including imaginary solution

This Teenage Self (progressive solution) clashes with the rules at Daycare because the rules are designed for 'Babies', that is, for very Dependent Children who cannot manage without Provider Teacher's care. This latent conflict is and the associated relational pattern are discussed further in the section on Mother's New Family.

**The Separation of Baby Self and Parents.**

The issue of Parents' failure to be present to Baby Self because of careers is raised in the following excerpt.

I(interviewer): And when you were really little .... Did one of your parents stay home or did they work right fairly soon after you were born.

P(epsil): Well, both of them worked, I think, forever. Like, they both always worked.

I: Uh huh. So they liked work . . . Do you think you're going to work - always?

P: Oh yeah.

I: So if you had a little kid you would hope your wife would stay home?

P: Or I would just, like, get a daycare for when they were little, like, after school and stuff

I: Uh huh. So you wouldn't want to force your wife to stop working if she didn't want to.

P: No. Not if she didn't want to.
I: How would the kids feel about that?
P: I don't know. I go to daycare because my parents, ... I go to Adventure Club after school and I don't want to go, that's why I want an older brother (Pepsi II, p. 24).

In memory, Failing Providers Parents have always worked. Parents have chosen Careers (cast in the role of Competitor to Baby Self) over taking care of Deprived Dependent Baby Self. Instead Daycare or Babysitters (in this case the adventure club) are supposed to provide care to Self. Self does not consider the Parent substitutes as adequate Providers. Pepsi's imaginary solution to being a Deprived Dependent is the creation of an imaginary Older Brother who becomes an internal Ally replacing Failing Providers Parents.

While Self creates an imaginary solution (Imagined Older Brother) to the problem of parental failure in this excerpt, Future-Self-as-Father recreates the scenario of premature separation between Future Baby Self and Future Parents.

I: Right, ... and you don't like that. So, how's that going to be if you have a young kid, ever?.....
P: Well, as long as you get paid, I guess.
I: But you don't get paid when you're a Dad.
P: ... As long as I'm not babysitting the kid 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, or something, like, just once or twice a week for a few hours, 'cause then I could do my own thing (Pepsi II, p. 22).

Deprived Dependent Future Baby, just like Baby Self, is sent to Daycare because Future Parents, just like Parents, do their 'Own thing' (Careers etc.). This imaginary relational pattern feeds back into Pepsi's memory of disliking Daycare and imagining an Older Brother as internal Ally in lieu of Parents (table # 62).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Older Brother</td>
<td>Careers</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Baby Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Own Thing</td>
<td>Future Couple</td>
<td>Future Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 62: Pepsi's relational pattern regarding resources before separation and imaginary solution

In response to the early separation, Self has relied on the imaginary solution of
Providers, Self does recall an earlier time of being a satisfied Dependent. Again, this memory is tied to an imaginary solution, this time involving a wish to go back to a gratifying past experience.

P: When I'm older, well, I want to move to a bungalow ....I was born in one....I like it because it's not too big and you don't have to clean a lot of stuff and usually there's kind of a big basement..

I: Yes....
P: So that's where we lived in, in Montreal, ...and we were there with my Dad and my Mom for quite a long time, ... and it had a really, really big basement and I had tons of toys.

I: So, tell me about that bungalow. What was it like living in Montreal in that place?
P: It was fun, because my best friend lived three doors down and we would always play with each other after school and there was a park really close and we would walk down a little street and go to it, ... and it was a really big park with, like a water place where you could push buttons and water comes out of it and tennis courts and basketball courts ...

I: Oh .. so why did your parents move here, then?
P: Well, I think they got better jobs (Pepsi II, p. 13).

In this excerpt, Self revisits a memory of a time of harmony. Self describes a time of plenty (tons of toys). After school, Self has Ally Friend to play with. Despite the absence of Failing Providers Parents, Self does not go to inadequate Provider Daycare. Self is a satisfied Dependent cared for by Provider Friend's Mother (mentioned later in the interview) and Self also has Friend as Ally. Pepsi imagines living in just such a situation in Future. Despite Parents absence, Future Self returns to a state of Satisfied Dependent in phantasy. Pepsi's memory also conjures up a now lost intact Family (we were there with my Dad and my Mom for quite a long time). In the end, Self returns to the role of Deprived Dependent because Parents' Careers again come first. Self resolves a sense of isolation in a regressive fashion by returning to a past Home with an intact Family and an internal Friend (table # 63).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Careers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 63: Pepsi's relational pattern regarding resources before separation and imaginary
The scenario of a harmonious past contrasts starkly with Pepsi’s lack of close friends in the present.

P: I go over to a friend’s house usually, but there’s no fun in going to his house every day. But my best friend in Toronto, ... I don’t know where he lives actually, ... he lives really far away ... (Pepsi II, p. 25).

In this short excerpt, Pepsi describes how inaccessible Ally Friend is to Self, making his imaginary solution of returning to a harmonious past that includes a Friend all the more compelling.

The (Absence of) Couple Conflict before Separation.

Descriptions of conflict are found in every case study but Pepsi’s. Prior to separation, Self has never witnessed Couple’s conflict. Despite an apparent absence of conflict in memory, internal images are cast in roles relating to that theme.

P: Yeah, I think usually, when it (Father’s health problem) was really bad when they were first married, ... she helped him, ... like, when they were on their honeymoon my Dad was in the living room and fell and dislocated his shoulder and so it wasn’t that long of a honeymoon, ... he was just lying in the bed with his shoulder ‘down here’.
I: Right. So it was dislocated?
P: Yeah. So they now had to come back (Pepsi I, p. 15).

In this excerpt, Father is cast as Victim with an injury. Father is also cast as Rulebreaker (Father made a mistake), although Father is certainly not seen as responsible for harm done to Victim Father himself and to Victim Couple (they had to come back from the honeymoon). The internal Father is both the Rulebreaker and the Victim. Therefore the conflict remains within the Father image, while, on the other hand, Couple’s relational pattern is characterised by nurturing. Mother is cast as Pacifist in the Couple conflict (table # 64).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self, Mother</td>
<td>Father, Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 64: Pepsi’s relational pattern regarding conflict before separation
In the aftermath of the accident, Provider/Caregiver Mother nurses injured Victim/Dependent Father. In a sense, Father's injury elicits the nurturing presence of Provider Mother (table # 65).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 65: Pepsi's relational pattern regarding resources before separation

In this segment (and others later on), Pepsi represents internally what one could call a psychosomatic style of relating. This style of eliciting nurturing via somatic distress is seen as a solution to the problem of dependency and of aggression. Need is not expressed through language and thus does not register with Self. Expression of aggression remains within any given internal image (Father is both Rulebreaker and his own Victim) and conflict between internal images does not arise. Instead, internal images take care of one another.

A relational pattern similar to the pattern between Caregiver Mother and Victim Father exists between injured Father and Caregiver Self. Again, Father's somatic needs elicit Self's caregiving response.

P: My Dad used to lift, like, boxes for a job when he was younger and his back got very sore because he didn't lift them with his knees, he lifted with his back so his back was really hurt but now it is better, but even if he does anything the wrong way it might start to hurt really bad again (Pepsi I, p. 8).

P: He (father) sometimes asks me to, like, to give him a massage, about once every three weeks or something, so he doesn't have a lot of pain any more. Before he used to be really careful about what he did, .. so it wouldn't get worse, .. and now it's a lot better.
I: So where is it, ... the lower back?
P: Well, it's lower and upper too, he says that when I do the upper it helps the lower too.... Because it's just a relaxing feeling, kind of (Pepsi I, p. 15).

In these excerpt, Victim Father again injures himSelf by breaking the rules (he didn't lift them with his knees, he lifted with his back). Provider Self restores the Father image by taking care of him (table # 66).
Table # 66: Pepsi's relational pattern regarding resources before separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relational Patterns during and after Separation

**Couple Conflict after Separation.**

Pepsi assumes that there must have been conflict between Mother and Father prior to separation because the separation can only be conceived as the outcome of Couple's conflict, yet so far Pepsi has only described a conflict within the Father image. Self is not aware of either Parental image being the Aggressor or Rulebreaker towards the Other Parent.

I: Then why do you think your parents did separate?
P: I don't know. I asked them and, I don't know, ... they just weren't getting along.
I: Did you notice that they weren't getting along?
P: No. I looked at it, like, they probably do it when I'm not around, like, when I'm at a friends.
I: Hmm... So you wonder what happens when you're not around, ... that kind of stuff? 
P: Yeah.
I: What do you think?
P: Um .. What's happening, ... what are they doing, ... that kind of stuff?
I: Yeah. Do you have any ideas what this could be like... when you're not here? Can you imagine them not getting along?
P: No, 'cause when I see them they're usually getting along fine, ... so, ...I've never really seen my parents fight before or anything ... (Pepsi I, pp. 3, 4)

Self surmises that Couple's conflict happens in Self's absence, since there is no evidence of conflict in Self's presence. This lack of Couple conflict in Self's presence together with the fact that Couple has separated, leaves Self wondering how Couple gets along while Self is absent.

Couple's separation has little impact on the functioning of the internal Family.

Only subtle changes occur.

I: Can you imagine them not getting along?
P: No, 'cause when I see them they're usually getting along fine, ... so, ...I've never really seen my parents fight before or anything ..
I: Right, right. So what happened? ... How did you find out about the separation?
P: Well, I came down from bed in the morning and my Dad and my Mom were standing in the kitchen and they just told me.
I: Hm... And what did you think about it?
P: Um ... Nothing really because after my Mom told me I could see my Dad every day and stuff it seemed exactly like him living here, except I wouldn't see him in the morning.
I: Right, right. So you didn't think this would change your life a lot?
P: And, ... it didn't.

I: Okay. And do you remember having any feelings that day?
P: No (Pepsi I, p. 4).

As earlier described, Self has been unaware of Couple's conflict and impending separation. When Self is told about Couple's separation, both Mother and Father are immediately cast as Providers assuring Self that Father will remain present (my Mom told me I could see my Dad every day and stuff). That way Self is not cast in the role of Deprived Dependent even for a short period of time. Self does not suffer any substantial loss (it seemed exactly like him living here, except I wouldn't see him in the morning). Self 'forgets' that Father and Mother are separated.

P: I don't really think about it (the parent's separation), sometimes I even forget that they're separated.
I: It's so easy to forget in your situation.
P: I mean my Dad's always here, or I'm over there and.... (Pepsi I, pp. 13, 14).

In this short quote, the internal Family seems intact even after separation. Each Member of the Original Family is present in their function as Provider and Dependent to one another, assuring mutually gratifying experiences. Self does not experience the loss of a combined Couple or Self's partial loss of Father. Provider Father's continued presence creates the illusion of an intact internal Family (table # 67).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After-Sep.</td>
<td>Mother, Father, Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 67: Pepsi's relational pattern regarding resources after separation

In Pepsi's internal world problematic relational patterns among various internal images (such as Couple's separation) are immediately followed by a solution (Self is told of Couple's separation and Father already has a new apartment). In so
doing, the gap between problems that occur in a memory-based sequence and their solution is obliterated. Solutions appear simultaneously with the problems. This gap between problematic state and reparation or imagined solution is the space for a potential emotional response. If, as is the case for Pepsi, there is no gap between internal problems and solutions, Self has no transitional space (Winnicott 1971) available for an emotional response to problematic internal states.

The following episode further illustrates this seamless internal life without space for Self's emotional response to Couple's separation and its impact on Family. The following segment starts out describing a seemingly intact internal Family, only to launch, for the first time in the interview, into a description of conflict.

P: That's true. It seems like they're both here all the time. When I'm asleep, my Dad leaves and when I wake up my Mom sometimes drives me to school, or I usually rollerblade with my friends, ... if it's not very nice out my Dad sometimes comes with the car. But recently he was in a car accident and this guy was pulling out from a curb where he was parked and he had no lights on and so he drove right out and it was really rainy, so he drove right out and my Dad drove into him and then when my Dad wasn't looking he flipped on the lights and the cops, and the court and stuff, believed that he had his lights on and that it was my Dad's fault....Like, it was a really old car, it was 14 years he'd had it, since he was a teenager, so now he's planning to buy a Jeep Grand Cherokee. My grandparents, they live in Brockville, and their friends, they own a Jeep company, and he's going to get a nice Jeep from them.

I: So, did your Dad get hurt, or did he just get.....
P: He just hit his head a little bit and had a bit of a bump.....His roommate, he has a roommate, he has a little son who is 4 years old and, um .. while they were driving down he saw this car going the other way with no lights on.... so, only if he was there and back a little bit he would have seen it and would have witnessed it (Pepsi I, pp. 11, 12).

In this segment, Pepsi introduces two versions of the same remembered event. Self's and Courts' version of the accident are in conflict with one another. Pepsi is consciously aligned with Self's version of the event. Self's version maintains the internal Family as a conflict-free sphere. Authority Self's version exonerates Victim Father and blames Rulebreaker This Guy for the accident (symbolic violent conflict) instead. After first damaging Victim Father's car, This Guy further breaks the rules
by deceiving Authorities Cops and Courts.

Court's version, on the other hand, introduces Father, a Member of the internal Family, as Rulebreaker who not only harms himself (as in the honeymoon episode) but harms a Victim image, This Guy. Authority Court pronounces Father guilty (table # 68).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Guy, Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father, Car</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 68: Pepsi's relational patterns regarding conflict after separation

In both versions, Father's car sustains damage. This damaged object is still an aspect of the victimisation of the Father image. This damage also puts Father in the role of Dependent in relation to Provider Grandparents who help replace the damaged object. In an imaginary pattern, Rich Self also comes to Father's aid and replaces the damaged car.

I: If you three wishes ... if you had a magic wand .. if you had ...... if there was magic in life and you could just wish three things ..
P: Umm ... I'd wish for lots of money and .... (long, long pause), I don't know, ... I guess for my Dad to have a new car since his car got wrecked. He bought a car.
I: He bought a new car?
P: He almost bought it, like he nearly did... (Pepsi II, pp. 13, 14).

Both Grandparents in memory and Rich Self in imagination repair the damage to the Father image. Self's version of the accident is also reparative because it maintains an internal Family without conflict (table # 69).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 69: Pepsi's relational patterns regarding resources after separation and in imagination

The Court's version of events, although repudiated by Self, nevertheless introduces a member of the internal Couple as Rulebreaker, harming another internal
image. Earlier, Pepsi reports that he suspects Couple conflict in Self's absence. By definition, internal conflict requires at least one internal Aggressor/Rulebreaker who harms a Victim image (there does not have to be an intention to harm on the part of the Rulebreaker). The Court's version of Father's accident is the only representation of destructive conflict with a Member of the Original Family as Rulebreaker.

**Mother's New Family.**

The following excerpt examines the issue of conflict between Self and Mother.

I: Okay. What about the fighting business? You said that your parents don't fight at all. Do you have fights with any one of them?

P: No....Well, sometimes.

I: About what would you fight?

P: Well, what I'm allowed to do and not allowed to do.

I: What aren't you allowed to do?

P: Well ... stay up and be out with my friends and play and stuff.

I: Out on the street, you mean?

P: Yeah, not for very long ...Like, when it gets dark I have to come in.

I: What about your friends? Are they allowed?

P: Um .. some of them .. not all of them.

I: Are these friends all your age?

P: No. Well, most of them are older.

I: Ah, so you want to have the privileges of boys who are a little bit older than you. P: Yeah.

I: And your Mom disagrees, so you fought about it?

P: Well, we talked about it ....I said I wanted to stay up longer.

I: And your Mom, ... how did she handle it?

P: She said - 'When you're older.'......

I: So, how do you handle disagreements then in general? P: We talk, we each give our point of view and it usually ends.

I: It usually ends. And who usually wins?

P: My Mom (Pepsi II, pp. 7, 8).

In this segment, Self is in conflict with Mother. Self wants Teenage privileges from Authority Mother. Mother refuses to treat Self as Teenager. Pacifist Self accepts Authority Mother's decision. While the open conflict is laid to rest, a hidden conflict remains. Self's solution to Parental absence has been to identify with an imaginary Teenager who can fend for himSelf. Teenage Self is in hidden conflict with Parental images who treat Self based on the assumptions that Self is still a Dependent (table #
Since Teenage Self is independent, this aspect of Self feels constrained by rules made by Provider images, such as Teacher and Mother. These images are experienced not as Provider images but as Authority by Teenage Self. While Pacifist Self does not defy these Parental images openly and become a Rulebreaker initiating conflict, there is hidden conflict because Teenage Self does not see the rules as fair.

**Imaginary Solutions**

Many imaginary solutions have already been presented, most notably the phantasy of an Older Brother and the nostalgic return to a past harmonious Home (wanting to buy a bungalow). Pepsi also imagines a reunion of the internal Couple and a situation that reunites Self with Parents as Providers. Both these imaginary solutions fail.

**The Reunion of Couple as Failed Solution.**

Pepsi's internal structure revolves around not acknowledging the emotional impact (one is reminded of the impact of Father's car in the accident) of separation and absence.

P: Well, I'd like it if my parents got back together, ... but I don't think that's going to happen. And I don't think it would really matter (Pepsi I, p. 10).

Even though Self wishes for Couple's reunion, the reunion does not have impact on Self or the degree of harmony among the Members of the internal Family. Earlier I have mentioned that Self 'forgets' that Couple is separated. A reunion is only desirable as a solution if absence and loss are experienced, which Self does not.
The Reunion of Self and Parents as Failed Solution.

Pepsi also attempts to repair in phantasy the separation between Self and Parents as Providers.

P: I don't know. I go to daycare because of my parents, ... I go to Adventure Club after school and I don't want to go, that's why I want an older brother.
I: Yes. I heard that, that's right, ... so it isn't the greatest solution!?

... P: But, like, if one of my parents didn't work then I could come home but then I'd get bored (Pepsi II, pp. 24, 25).

In this excerpt, Self imagines a Parent image as available Provider. This does not solve Self problem (I'd get bored'). Self has adapted to Parents' absence and Self's role of Deprived Dependent with the two-pronged strategy of early independence and an imaginary alliance with Teenage Bother. The imaginary solution of Parental presence threatens Self's independence because this solution requires Self to slip into the (now unwanted) role of Dependent. The solution of an alliance with an imaginary Older Brother on the other hand bolsters Self's independence. The imaginary solution of a Provider Parent at home fails because it threatens Self's internal adaptation.

Future Family as a Repetition of the Past.

Self's independence affects the imaginary Future Family because Self needs to 'do my own thing'. This imaginary Future Family is introduced in the context of yet another discussion about a Brother.

I: And what about a younger brother? Do you want to be an older brother?
P: No. No.....Too much responsibility.
I: What do you mean by that?
P: Lots of babysitting and having to listen to him whine and having to share a room.

.....

I: Right. What about young kids whining, ... you said that little brothers and sisters just whine.
P: Probably. Because they'd like get up in the middle of the night, like, if I had a really young brother or sister they'd probably just bug me.
I: Right, ... and you don't like that. So, how's that going to be if you have a young kid, ever? What's that going to be like, to have the responsibility for a whiny little baby?
P: Well, as long as you get paid, I guess.
I: But you don’t get paid when you’re a Dad.
P: ... As long as I’m not babysitting the kid 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, or something, like, just once or twice a week for a few hours, ‘cause then I could do my own thing (Pepsi II, pp. 21, 22).

...  
P: Or I would just, like, get a daycare for when they were little, like, after school and stuff (Pepsi II, p. 24).

Self-as-Future-Father steps into the role of Failing Provider just like Father in the memory-based patterns. While Self has shown willingness to become a Provider to injured Dependent Father, Self-as-Future-Father does not want to take care of a ‘whiny child’ Dependent. Pepsi’s solution for the Deprived Dependent Future Child is to arrange for Daycare, so that Self-as-Future-Father can remain independent (do my own thing) and without too much responsibility (table # 71).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Own Thing</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Baby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 71: Pepsi’s imaginary relational patterns regarding resources

In the area of conflict, Self-as-Future-Father would be less of an Authority for Future Children, unlike Mother and Teacher in memory (table # 72).

I: And .... how would you treat your kids, assuming that you aren’t separated, how would you treat them? What do you think is important in being a parent?  
P: Well, ... let them get away with things, and ... um ... (Pepsi II, p. 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Self-as-Father-and-Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 72: Pepsi’s imaginary relational patterns regarding conflict

The Future Couple is shown as a union of two Pacifists. Especially Self-as-Future-Husband seeks agreements so that the Couple remains conflict free. This concept of a conflict-free internal Couple is a repetition of the Couple made up of the Father and Mother image in memory. However, the potential for separation lurks, as can be seen in the following excerpt. Pepsi immediately assumes (wrongly) that he was asked about a future separation not a future union.

I:Um .. Okay, and .. so if you were ever going to marry, how would you deal with
things? Have you thought about that?

P: No.

I: You don’t look that far ahead? ... Do you want to take a minute to think about what you would do and how you would do things?

P: If I got separated? (italics K.W.)

....

I: Uh huh. Okay. But, how would you deal with things, how would you approach the situation so that you wouldn’t get separated, for instance, what do you think is important.

P: Don’t bring up any arguments ... um ... make an agreement (Pepsi II, p. 14).

This excerpt does show a reunited internal Future Couple, albeit one that is threatened by separation through conflict. Self-as-Future-Husband makes every effort to make agreements to prevent just that remembered outcome.

Conclusions

In Pepsi’s internal world imaginary or remembered reparation follows immediately on the heels of every problematic event. Because of the seamless fit between problematic internal events and solutions, Self experiences little emotional life (is frequently bored).

In Pepsi internal world, the separation between Baby Self and Parent images is the most significant event. This separation supersedes in importance the separation of the internal Couple. This separation between Parent images and Child images is a recurring theme in memory, as well as in the imaginary future.

Pepsi has adjusted to this internal separation in various ways. Since Dependent Children are separated from Provider Parents, Self has become independent of Parental Care. Self has accomplished this feat by creating an internal alliance with an imaginary Older Brother. This has lead to Pepsi seeing HimSelf as Teenager. This independent Teenage Self is in hidden conflict with Parent images who are apt to treat Teenage Self as Dependent. This conflict is also evident with substitute Parental images such as Teachers and Daycare.

In addition to conjuring up an imaginary Older Brother, Pepsi also remembers
nostalgic past with Friends who make up for Parents’ absence. Pepsi attempts to repair the original bond between Provider Parents and Dependent Self. The attempt fails because Teenage Self is no longer available for a relational pattern of Parent-as-Provider and Self-as-Dependent.

Despite the deprivation implicit in this early separation, the internal Family is a conflict free zone. Father is cast as Victim of his own mistakes and is immediately cared for by both Mother and Self. This pattern is a mental representation of a somatic strategy for getting dependency needs met. As has been discussed, Self has rejected his own dependency needs in favour of an identification as Teenage Self.

Despite this lack of conflict, Couple separates. However, Self is immediately assured of continued Family functioning and does not experience loss. Instead Mother, Father and Self continue to take care of one another, leaving Self with the illusion of an intact internal Family.

Conflict is introduced into Pepsi’s internal world literally ‘by accident’. This accident is presented in two versions. Pepsi’s version lays blame for the damage on an internal image not belonging to the Family, while Court’s version blames Father as Rulebreaker. In a reparative effort, both Grandparents and the imaginary Rich Self replace Father’s damaged object.

The relational patterns of the past are carried into the imaginary arena. Pepsi attempts to reunite the original internal Couple. He aborts his attempt because there is no need for reunion when the separation has had so little impact on the Family.

Pepsi creates a Future Family in phantasy. Future Parents separate from Future Babies once again. The separation and substitute Care deprives Future Children, but allows Self-as-Future-Father to exercise the independence already developed as a trait of Teenage Self. Self as-Future-Husband makes every effort to avoid conflict with Future Wife, yet the potential for separation is lurking, since the original internal Couple has separated despite absence of conflict.
Case Study Zachary

Factual Information

Zachary was nine years old at the time of the interviews. His twin brother Michael also participated in this study. A 4 year old brother named Brent is also part of the family. Zachary's parents separated about 1 1/2 years before the interviews were conducted. Both parents currently live in the same city. Zachary’s mother is involved in a new relationship with a man who also has a young son from a previous marriage.

Relational Patterns before Separation

The Couple Conflict.

Zachary was seven years old when his parents separated. He has vivid memories of the conflict and other aspects of family life before the separation.

Z: Well, one day my Mom got mad at my dad.... and my Dad started to get upset and then it got worse every time and then he started to sleep on the floor, then he got a new house.

I: OK. So they started fighting?
Z: Yes.
I: And your Mom got mad at your Dad. Why did she get mad?
Z: Every night they fought. It was like, kind of like usual and then my mom got sick of it though... (Zachary I, pp. 1, 2)

I: They were talking like about something, sometimes like about bills, and like they don't get enough money and stuff and other personal, that kind of...
Z: Oh, okay, they fought about money. What else would they fight about? Do you know?
Z: I don't know.
I: And when your Dad......, what do you mean by him sleeping on the floor?
Z: Well, first everything was perfect and he was like sleeping in the bed and all that until one day like they started to fight, I don't know what happened. That night they like, .. our...Dad had to sleep on the floor. They got a mattress.
I: Uh huh. So what did you think when you saw that, that he was sleeping on a mattress?
Z: Well the first time that I heard that they would break up, me and my brother were crying but also playing, I don't know why. ....Yeah like, I tried to like forget about it and my brother was crying even more than me, Michael was, and I was saying it wouldn't be all that bad because he's going to visit a lot and another kid in my class has his parents broke up and he's just fine. (Zachary I,
In these two excerpts, Zachary describes his internal representation of Couple’s conflict and his theory of what led to it. Mother is cast as Aggressor attacking Father who is cast in the role of Victim, who then retaliates and becomes an Aggressor as well. This scenario happens so frequently that conflict eventually seems the norm. In Zachary’s mind, the Couple conflict has to do with a lack of resources. In the end, the conflict leads to the eviction of Victim Father from the bedroom by Authority Mother, because Mother ‘gets sick of fighting’ (table # 73).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 73: Zachary’s relational patterns regarding conflict before separation

Later the separation of Couple is announced. This separation threatens Dependents Self and Twin with the loss of Father. Self then takes on the role of Ally for upset Deprived Dependent Twin Brother (table # 74).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 74: Zachary’s relational patterns regarding resources before separation

For Zachary himSelf, the separation comes as a surprise despite Self’s awareness of conflict between Father and Mother.

I: So you had thought about that (parent’s fighting possibly leading to divorce) ?
Z: Not much.
I: Uh huh. So it was a big surprise then?
Z: ‘Cause mostly they were doing O.K. but...
I: Oh. That’s why you wouldn’t trust when things look like they’re going O.K. Because it looked like everything was fine and then all of a sudden things changed.
Z: Yeah. One day it just happened that they didn’t know what happened ... (Zachary I, p. 23).

Even though Self does not see Couple’s conflict as destructive, the Couple separates.
This event and its surprising nature have profound consequences for Self in the relational patterns after separation.

Relational Patterns after Separation

Mother’s New Family.

Mother’s New Family consists of Mother, Self, Twin, and Younger Brother. A New Boyfriend (and Boyfriends’ Son) has also become part of this internal world. The first segment illustrates some changes in Mother’s New Family.

I: ...how has your life been different?
Z: Well our Mom, we can’t buy much stuff, like, not like as much fancy stuff and all that because our Dad doesn’t live with us.
I: Do you think your Mom is worried about money?
Z: No.
I: No, She’s fine?
Z: Yeah. ’Cause our grandpa helps out and our grandma.... ’Cause they live right next door (Zachary I, p. 11).

Here, New Family suffers from lack of resources (can’t buy fancy stuff) because Father is no longer functioning as Provider. However, Grandparents have taken over the role of Allies for Deprived Dependents Mother’s New Family.

Despite Grandparents’ efforts as Allies, Mother is cast as sole Provider for New Family and this role seems to overtax Mother, leaving her as Deprived Dependent once more (table # 75).

I: If she has to do everything herself. Uh - does she sometimes show signs that she’s ‘running out of gas’?
Z: Nope.
I: No?
Z: Well, sort of sometimes... she, like, says ‘I’m so tired and I don’t know why’...Like she says ‘I’m so tired and I haven’t really been doing much today’ (Zachary II, p. 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Orig. Family</td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother. Orig. Fam.</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 75: Zachary’s relational patterns re resources in Mother’s New Family after separation
There is conflict in Mother's New Family after separation. In the following segment, Rulebreakers Self and Twin damage Victim Mother’s valued belongings.

I: And what about your Mom? What kind of person is she?
Z: Mostly she’s nice, ... but when we do bad stuff like one time we were playing with these knives. Well, I mean they weren't sharp but they were kind of like oval shaped at the end and we didn't know they were a special gift. We thought they were made of plastic, then one of them broke and she got real mad at us ‘cause she only had five and she got them from like her great aunt but she had like six but now one of them busted so she only had five.
I: Oh, so she had a set of six and then she only had five. So what happened?
Z: She got mad at us and sent us to our room.
I:...Uh huh, yeah. It couldn’t be repaired either?
Z: No. It was busted real good. Well, she tried to use super glue. I think she used super glue and just tried to keep it but she wouldn't use it or anything. She just wanted to have her whole set (Zachary I, p. 19).

In this excerpt Self and Twin are cast in the role of Rulebreakers, who inadvertently damage one of Mother’s objects (they thought the knives were oval shaped, not dangerous, and furthermore of little value). Mother turns from Victim image into angry Authority and punishes Self and Twin. Pacifist Mother’s attempts at repair of her valued objects fail (‘it was busted real good’) (table # 76).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self, Twin</td>
<td>Angry Mother</td>
<td>Powerless Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 76: Zachary’s relational pattern re conflict in Mother’s New Family after separation

Before separation, Father was cast in the role of Victim of Couple conflict. After separation, the issue of damage to Victim Mother is raised for the first time. This damage cannot be repaired.

Father's New Family.

Zachary presents his assessment of the fall-out of the separation for Father in an imaginary sequence that is clearly based on memory.

Z: Yeah. ‘Cause say, I put all my money into getting a new house and end up getting split up, I would have to leave my good house and get an apartment...’cause I would have already spent all my money on the house and all that, I wouldn't have any left and I would get thrown out....
I: Right, right. That would be pretty bad?
Z: Yeah, cause the woman always gets to keep the house,...even if the father pays for it (Zachary I, pp. 13, 14).

In this excerpt, Provider Father has spent all his resources on Dependent Family (a new house). He then gets 'thrown out', that is, he is victimised presumably by Authority Mother (see table # 73) and loses everything, leaving Father in the role of impoverished Deprived Dependent. Females always end up as satisfied Dependents, "cause the woman always gets to keep the house,...even if the father pays for it' (table # 77). Self is clearly siding with Father in this excerpt and I will show later in this case study that Zachary as imaginary Rich Self takes precautions so as to not end up in Father's role of impoverished Victim (see table # 85).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Competitor</th>
<th>Failing Prov.</th>
<th>Depr. Depend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Woman/Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 77: Zachary's relational pattern re resources in Father's New Family after separation

After the separation, Victim Father turns angry and threatens Mother and by proxy Self and Twin with complete withdrawal as Provider.

Z: Yeah, it's just that at first, like my Dad was real upset and he was saying he would, like, maybe move away, if, like, he couldn't see us as much any more but, but then I heard him saying he was going to stay here.
I: Right, so first he had said that if he can't see you enough that he would move away, far away?
Z: Only like to Vancouver and he would come visit us like three times a year (Zachary I, p. 5).

In this excerpt, the roles of Mother and Father in conflict are reversed (table # 78). Authority Father threatens Victim Mother with further withdrawal (deprivation for New Family). This threat affects Deprived Dependent Self by proxy. In the end, Father stays and remains somewhat more available as Provider to Mother's New Family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 78: Zachary's relational pattern regarding conflict in Father's New Family after
Father is in the process of repairing himself (earning money in his ‘big job’) and therefore Father’s role as Provider to Self and Brothers is limited.

Z: Yeah, and he (father) comes over to visit and sometimes we take turns sleeping over at his house.
I: Right, right. How often do you sleep over?
Z: Like.... one week my baby brother does and the next my brother does and the next me.
I: So every three weeks kind of thing....Is that enough?....
Z: Yeah.
I: O.K. Have you sometimes thought it’s not enough?
Z: What do you mean?
I: ...Do you sometimes wish that you could sleep over more often?
Z: Yeah.
I: Yeah. Don’t want to get your hopes up though?
Z: No. Well kind of.
I: Uh huh. O.K. Have you asked your Dad?
Z: No, he has a big job, so he doesn’t have much time. He says ‘I’m sorry, I’m doing stuff, I’m busy and….‘ (Zachary I, pp. 8, 9).

Self is cast as Deprived Dependent, but does not make request or demands on Failing Provider Father, who ‘has a big job’ and ‘is busy’. Given, that the Father image is completely impoverished after separation, Deprived Dependent Self allows Father time to recuperate. This off course leaves Self more impoverished.

For Zachary the issue of Father’s absence in Family arises with Mother entering new relational patterns. When the question of Mother’s Boyfriend was raised, Zachary responded with a wish for reunion with Father.

I: Oh, O.K. And what about your Mom’s boyfriend?
Z: Oh, what do you mean?
I: What’s he like and what do they do together?
Z: Just normal things like everybody does.
I: Oh, O.K. Does he stay over,... how often do you see him?....
Z: He sleeps over sometimes.
I: What do you think about it?
Z: What do you mean?
I: Do you like it?
Z: Well, I’d like my Dad to be here (Zachary I, p. 20).

In this excerpt, Boyfriend has become Mother’s Ally. Deprived Dependent Self however wishes that Provider Father comes back instead, because Boyfriend does
not fill the role of Provider or Ally for Self. Boyfriends’ closeness to Mother in fact is a reminder for Self of the loss of contact to Father and stimulates a reunion wish (table # 79).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boyfriend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 79: Zachary's relational patterns regarding resources after separation and in imagination

The Crippled Self.

In the wake of the separation, both Mother and Father have been Victims. So far, Self has been cast in various roles including Deprived Dependent. The following excerpt introduces Self in the role of Victim.

I: What are you going to be when you grow up?
Z: I'm going to be a sports player.
I: Yeah? What game?
Z: Soccer, I guess.....But I don't think I will.
I: You don't think you will? Why not?
Z: I don't know. It doesn't really matter how good you are when you're small. You could get crippled when you get older or something.
I: Oh, I see. I see. So you're small and good but who knows whether you're going to be O.K. when you're older, you mean?...So what do you think can happen?
Z: What do you mean?
I: Well you said that you could get crippled. What kind of things are you talking about?
Z: I mean like, that..., I mean like, I shouldn't get my hopes up...Hardly anybody does.
I: Make it you mean.
Z: Yeah. Only like fifteen for each country.....
I: What if you did get your hopes up? What would you...
Z: I'd be excited. ...'Cause my Dad likes sports too and he wanted to make it to play for the (Montreal) Canadians (Zachary I, pp. 7, 8).

In this excerpt, Future Self suffers a crippling injury. This threat of injury prevents Self from getting his hopes up. If Self gets his hopes up, Self will be excited and join Father (''Cause my Dad likes sports too and he wanted to make it''). However, Zachary fears that Self, just like Father, will not make it because of a feared crippling injury. This fear of crippling injury and Self's adaptive measure of not getting his hopes up, is
a theme throughout Zachary's protocol. Since this theme is so dominant in the imaginary relational patterns, it is not surprising that this theme can be traced back to the memory-based relational patterns. After all the imaginary patterns reflect and repair the problems encountered in memory-based relational patterns.

In the previous segment, an imaginary Future Self sustains an injury and is in the role of Victim. In the following excerpt, Zachary present a memory-based current Self image that does not make it, i.e. fails expectations.

I: Well - you're a pretty smart kid, aren't you? You know stuff.
Z: No, not much.
I: You don't know stuff? I think ...
Z: I mean, I'm not smart.
I: You don't think you're smart?
Z: No...'Cause, I don't get good marks in school.
I: You don't get good marks in school?
Z: Well, actually, last time I got 5 'A's, and the rest were 'B's, except for music, I got a 'D'.
I: O.K. Why would you say you're not that smart then? Those grades sound pretty good.
Z: In school I just don't get things right and all that.... 'Cause, the first report card I got all 'B's and 'C's not one 'A' (Zachary II, pp. 4, 5).

In this excerpt, the injury to Zachary's Self image has already happened. Despite the good second report card, Self sees himSelf as 'crippled', not smart and capable.

Being smart and capable in school is the domain of Girls, that is, Female internal images. Boys are athletes, (who might get crippled).

Z: I don't know. I'd like to have a boy and a girl actually.
I: Yeah....?
Z: 'Cause the girl would like be smart and the boy would be like a good athlete (Zachary I, p. 24).

Zachary's Self image has been victimised in memory-based patterns and this crippled Self is now projected into the future not as desired, but as feared outcome. Zachary does not expect successful reparation for the Self image and has adapted by not getting his hopes up. In Zachary's case the memory of injury by Couple's separation threatens to overwhelm the hopes implicit in a reparative phantasy (table # 80).
Table # 80: Zachary’s relational patterns regarding conflict after separation and in imagination. Zachary does not imagine a better future for Self, instead, he dreads the future as potential repetition of the past and adjusts his hopes accordingly.

**Imaginary Solutions**

Zachary introduces a imaginary Future Family that functions relatively well in the area of resources. Problems for this imaginary Reunited Couple and Future Family arise in the area of conflict. By discharging some of Self’s anger onto misbehaving Future Kids at least a partial imaginary solution is found.

Ultimately, Zachary’s successful imaginary solution involves staying single to avoid separation and injury to all internal images involved.

**Failed Reparation - The Reunion of Future Couple as Threat.**

After separation Mother’s objects were irreparably damaged (see table # 76). In the following excerpt, Zachary expresses his fears about the consequences of forming a Couple.

Z: But I don’t really want to get married.
I: Why not?
Z: Well, ’cause I don’t really like girls and plus if like I’d get married then I start liking a girl, then I shouldn’t get my hopes up because, like, not many people survive having babies..... So...(Zachary I, p. 12)

Future Self does not want to get married for two reasons. First, Self does not like girls and, secondly, marriage is dangerous to girls. In this excerpt, Self’s mere wish to be close to a Female image (‘if like I’d get married then I start liking a girl’) threatens this Female image with destruction (‘not many people survive having babies’) (table # 81).
It is unclear, how Zachary arrived at these powerful conclusions. They are not connected to any concrete memory. However, Self's fear of his own destructive aggression towards Female images is a theme in other imaginary relational patterns. Excerpts will be presented that show Self-as-Future-Father being fired and being so enraged that he worries about the safety of Future Wife and Kids (see table # 83).

**Failed Reparation - The Imaginary Future Family in Conflict.**

Self's imagined Future Family has many of the same characteristics found in his memory-based internal Family.

I: So you would be a sports player. What kind of things would you do in your free time?
Z: Like, in what kind of free time? I would spend time with my kids, 'cause if I was a soccer player I wouldn't see them too often... Say .... I live here and I, like, play in Vancouver, I'd have to take a plane from here to Vancouver or Asia, or wherever I played...So, in my free time I would spend time with my kids.
I: Right. So, how would your kids deal with that ... with you being in Asia and stuff.
Z: They wouldn't deal with it too well, but I mean, like, usually if their parents are playing there, they make, like, ... they play in a good soccer field - they would sleep overnight there.
I: Oh, so you would take your family?
Z: Yeah.
I: Oh good. So you would make sure they don't have to miss you too long?
Z: Yeah.
I: And, if they did miss you,... what would you tell them? How would you help them?
Z: I'd say that I'm sorry but that it was part of my job (Zachary II, pp. 13, 14).

Self-as-Future-Husband-and-Father is absent a great deal and thus a Failing Provider to Future Family, just like Father in memory. Self-as-Future-Husband-and-Father does make an effort to become a good enough Provider to Deprived Dependents Family. However, in response to Deprived Dependents Future Children demands Self-as-Father, just like Father after separation, tells Future Children that absence is 'part of the job'. Therefore Deprived Dependents Future Children suffer the
same fate Self is suffering in relation to Failing Provider Father (table # 82).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 82: Zachary’s imaginary relational pattern regarding resources

While this relational pattern of Future Family is not altogether satisfactory for all internal images involved, it is not as problematic as the relational patterns of Future Family around conflict and aggression.

I: Okay. But, if you had one (a family), how would you run it?
Z: Nice, and, I don’t really know.
I: Uh huh. Would there be days when you would have trouble being nice? ...
Z: Well, there would be trouble, like, if I got fired or something.
I: If you got fired?....You would have trouble?
Z: I’d be, like, real mad.
I: How would you deal with your wife and your kids when...
Z: I’d deal with them good...
I: Uh-huh. And the day that you got fired? How would you deal with them that day?
Z: I’d, like, get real mad - I just don’t know yet...I’d try to keep as cool as I could and try not to get too mad (Zachary II, p. 12).

In this excerpt, Future Self is ‘fired’ from a job. This issue of being rejected has already been part of Father’s fate in the memory-based relational patterns. Father is ‘kicked out’ of the bedroom and ‘thrown out’ of his own house. Self-as-Future-Husband-and-Father tries to stay cool and remain a Pacifist, but fears that he might get too mad, thus slipping into the role of Aggressor. Future Self’s anger at being ‘fired’ is dangerous for Future Wife and Future Children, just like Father’s anger is dangerous to Mother. However, contrary to Father, Self-as-Future-Husband attempts to keep the peace (table # 83).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fired Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fired Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Future Wife, Kids</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 83: Zachary’s imaginary relational patterns regarding conflict

Zachary finally solves the problem of ‘being too mad’ in phantasy, by
redirecting the anger towards misbehaving Rulebreakers Future Children. Self-as-Future-Father is in the role of Authority and thus the threat of aggression against Future Children who deserve tough punishment is justified (table #84).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 84: Zachary's imaginary relational pattern regarding conflict

This punishment takes the form of deprivation.

I: And, what about your kids,... what kind of kids would you want?
Z: Ones that liked sports.
I: And how would you deal with them if they don't behave?
Z: Punish them...Like - no TV. Like, if they were rude to me when I said time for bed and they were watching TV, I'd say 'no TV for like a week'.
I: Is that tough,... no TV for a week?..If you had that kind of punishment - how tough would that be for you?
Z: Tough (Zachary II, p. 13).

Authority Self-as-Future-Father uses deprivation as punishment and thus turns into a Failing Provider, in the process turning Rulebreaker Future Kids into Deprived Dependents (table # 85). This latter pattern resembles the pattern between Failing Provider Father and Deprived Dependents Self and Twin in memory. This imaginary solution is successful because it relieves the pressure of Self's anger for being 'fired' (associated with Self's role of being a Victim) and also exonerates the Father image for failure to provide because 'bad kids' 'deserve just punishment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Competit.</th>
<th>Failing Provider</th>
<th>Depr. Depend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 85: Zachary's imaginary relational pattern regarding resources

**Successful Reparation - The Single Self.**

Zachary's only successful imaginary solution repairs the Self at the expense of repairing the internal Couple. In this excerpt, Future Self stays single and avoids the calamities of the memory-based relational patterns of the internal Couple.
Z: I'd be rich.
I: And you'd be rich...What would you do with your money?
Z: Um...?
I: Being rich, what would you do?
Z: I would put like a quarter of it into my bank account and keep the rest to buy stuff, toys.
I: Yeah. O.K. And a quarter in the bank...?
Z: Well I actually would put half of it in, in case I have a hard time, like...
I: What kind of hard times?
Z: When I grow up, say, I have a bunch of bills and I wouldn't be able to afford it. I'd just like have the money there.
I: Good idea. So then you wouldn't have to fight with your wife about it either?
Z: No, 'cause we would have enough money...But I don't really want to get married
I: Why not?
Z: Well, 'cause I don't really like girls and plus if like I'd get married then I start liking a girl, then I shouldn't get my hopes up because, like, not many people survive having babies..... So...
I: Oh. You mean survive having babies....(puzzled) The marriage or the person, what do you mean?
Z: Well I don't really know yet. I can't tell my future.
I: No, I know but you told me something about not getting your hopes up because sometimes women don't survive when they have babies.... So you think that getting your hopes up with girls.....you may actually ...lose them...?
Z: Yeah. 'Cause say, I put all my money into getting a new house and end up getting split up, I would have to leave my good house and get an apartment...'cause I would have already spent all my money on the house and all that, I wouldn't have any left and I would get thrown out....
I: Right, right. That would be pretty bad?
Z: Yeah, cause the woman always gets to keep the house,...even if the father pays for it (Zachary I, pp. 12, 13, 14).

In this segment, Future Self expresses fears of losing the cherished Future Wife and the New House. Future Self counters these fears by remaining single and hoarding resources. Future Rich Self has finally stepped out of the role of Deprived Dependent.

By not entering into a union with a Girl, Future Self avoids Father's fate. No Female image is injured, therefore the Male image avoids the role of Aggressor towards Victim Female. Nor is the Male image victimised (thrown out, losing everything) by an angry Female image. Future Rich Self remains rich, unlike Father, who, lost everything and turned from a rich Provider into a Deprived Dependent (table # 86). This imaginary solution successfully addresses Self's role of Deprived Dependent and Victim.
Table # 86: Zachary's imaginary relational patterns regarding resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father, Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This solution also protects the Female image from Aggressor Males. Yet the successful imaginary solution comes at a price. Self has to maintain a ongoing separation between Male and Female images in order to avoid potentially lethal conflict. For Zachary, a successful imaginary solution keeps Male and Female images apart.

**Conclusions**

Throughout the memory-based relational patterns, Zachary's internal images end up injured or damaged. First Father is kicked out in conflict by Mother. Self and Twin Brother are injured during separation. Self is crippled in the process. Mother's objects are also damaged by Self and Twin. In addition, Self sees Girls/Women as threatened by close contact with Boys/Men (getting married and not surviving having babies).

Zachary's internal world is littered with the fall-out from conflict. The fallout includes the damage to Victim images (as presented in the previous paragraph) and fear of Aggressor images who cannot be trusted to control their aggression. Self cannot trust not getting fired. Mother is threatened by both angry Self and by Aggressor Father, and Father is threatened with further loss by Authority Mother.

While separation stops the Couple's conflict, the separation itself is seen as aggressive act by Mother towards Father. Since Zachary was taken by surprise, his trust was shaken. The original injury of Couple's unsuspected separation has left Self with a mistrust of relationships. Self and Future Self avoid gratifying relational patterns with Female images because of the threat of repetition of loss and injury.
Zachary's imaginary relational patterns reflect this hopeless state of affairs. The patterns involving a reunion of Male and Female images into a Future Couple end up in a partial repetition of the past. Future Self gets fired and the resulting anger threatens the peace of Future Family. In Zachary's internal world, the memory-based destructive relational patterns overwhelm the effort to repair the internal Couple in phantasy. Since Self cannot repair the internal Couple in phantasy, Future Self stays single.

The only successful imaginary solution involves a separation between Male and Female internal images. In this scenario, Future Self gets rich, but does not get married. This pattern addresses Self's unmet needs and protects both the Mother and Father image from being harmed by one another. By preventing a reunion of Male and Female internal images, Self protects both from further injury or damage. The price Self pays for avoiding injury to the internal images of Mother, Father, and Self is a loss of hope.
At the heart of the cross case analysis is a comparative analysis of the relational patterns of each case. The early attempts to compare cases faltered because the concept of a set of roles in an internal drama with two main themes was inadequately developed. A comparison of relational matrices failed because relational matrices describe slight nuances in relational patterns. Relational matrices are quite sensitive to small shifts in patterns and tend to emphasise the fleeting nature of interaction among various internal images. Relational matrices are not useful in comparing cases because, by definition, relational matrices emphasise the differences and often underestimate common aspects within and across cases.

Since a rudimentary concept of internal roles had already emerged in the case studies, the concept of ‘relational patterns’ was developed further in the process of comparing the data across cases. The concept of relational patterns based on internal images cast in a fixed set of roles was developed to make the cross case analysis possible in the first place. This concept of relational patterns has been described in detail in the method section.

**A Cross Case Comparison of Relational Patterns**

The two themes, conflict and provision of resources, and the set of roles belonging to each of the themes make up the two dimensions of the comparative analysis. The first dimension investigated in the cross case analysis was the theme of provision of resources.

**Internal Images and the Provision of Resources**

First the relational patterns before separation were tabulated and compared. Failing Provider and Deprived Dependent images are highlighted (table # 87).
Table # 87: Cross case comparison of relational patterns regarding resources before separation.

The highlighted internal images belong to two types of unsatisfactory relational patterns, one a frustrating relational pattern between Father and Mother images, and the other describing a failure to provide for Children images by Parental images. The third type of pattern found before separation was a nurturing relational pattern.

The nurturing pattern is characterised by Mother and Father images being cast in the role of Provider and Dependent respectively. Both internal images are part of a gratifying relational pattern. This is the case for Adam. This nurturing pattern does not provoke Couple conflict. John’s case is somewhat more complicated. In his case, no unsatisfactory Couple interaction and no Couple conflict is presented. However, John’s relational pattern between Father and Neighbour is frustrating.

The first type of unsatisfactory pattern is characterised by the internal Father being cast as Failing Provider to Deprived Dependent Mother. This relational pattern is found in the cases of Bob, John Doe, and Michael. Father’s failure as Provider in all these cases precipitates a Couple conflict. Lack of resources (the Couple as Deprived Dependent) provokes Couple conflict in Zachary’s case. In this case, no image is cast as Failing Provider, leaving it unclear which parental image has failed.
The second type of unsatisfactory pattern is characterised by Father and Mother being cast as Failing Providers to Deprived Dependent Self. This relational pattern is found in Pepsi’s case. This unsatisfactory pattern does not lead to Couple conflict. To the contrary, Pepsi’s relational patterns show a remarkable absence of conflict among internal images belonging to the Original Family.

Due to Couple’s splitting of resources and the addition of new internal images the number of frustrating relational patterns rises after separation (table # 88).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>New Family</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>New Family</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Bro. Halfbro.</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Friend/Computer</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Father</td>
<td>Self, Father</td>
<td>Self, Father</td>
<td>Self, Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Girlfriend</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Friends, Father</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Grandpar.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Twin, Bro.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Mother, Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td>Boyfriend</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Woman/Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 88: Cross case comparison of relational patterns regarding resources after separation
In the table, I have highlighted the internal images of Self and Old Family (an internal image that includes Self) in the role of Deprived Dependent. This casting of Self as Deprived Dependent is a feature of six cases. Pepsi is the only exception. This analysis is somewhat deceptive, however, because it does not take into account Pepsi's adaptive solution to the frustrating relational pattern before separation. Pepsi's case study demonstrates, that he has replaced Failing Provider Parents (who are still failing as Providers after separation) with an imaginary internal Older Brother image. Pepsi's imaginary solution is, of course, always available precisely because it is imaginary, preventing his Self from being cast as Deprived Dependent.

Summing up, one can say that the separation of the internal Couple is followed by a great number of unsatisfactory relational patterns. All patterns involve Parental images as Failing Providers and all but one the Self as Deprived Dependent.

Not surprisingly this state of internal affairs is then rectified in the imaginary relational patterns. In phantasy, the Self (highlighted) becomes a rich Provider to images previously cast as Deprived Dependents (table # 89).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self (Mother)</td>
<td>No Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyal Rich Self</td>
<td>Future Wife, Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reunited Couple</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son - Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Son - Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Grown-up Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer Self</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father, Future Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Own Thing</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Baby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends's Mom</td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 89: Cross case comparison of imaginary relational patterns regarding resources
In all cases the Self is in the reparative role of good enough Provider in at least one relational pattern. Surprisingly, Self also occupies the role of Failing Provider in the imaginary relational patterns in five cases, Bob, John, Michael, Pepsi, and Zachary. Only Adam and John Doe cast Self as good enough Provider exclusively.

In Bob's and John's case, Son - Self wishes to be free of the role of Provider for a Parental image, which it has been forced into. For Bob and John, Son - Self being cast in the role of the Failing Provider is the representation of a fulfilled wish.

In Michael's, Pepsi's and Zachary's case, Self's role as Failing Provider is due to a breakdown in Self's reparative capacity. In these instances, the memory of Self's failure is so much stronger than the imagined solution that the memory overwhelms the reparative effort and the imaginary relational pattern ultimately duplicates a relational pattern found in memory.

Summing up, the comparison of cases along the dimension of resources yielded a number of results. The three types of relational patterns before separation each have a distinct set of consequences. Parental images participating in unsatisfactory relational patterns are prone to conflict. However the lone unsatisfactory pattern involving failing Parental images and the Self does not lead to conflict. Instead this relational scenario before separation leads to pervasive imaginary solutions and Self's premature independence.

After separation, the number of deprived internal images increases. Competitor images also increase in numbers. In all cases but Pepsi's, the Self is cast as Deprived Dependent after separation. Not surprisingly, no Father and Mother dyad is functioning as a nurturing Couple.

The lack of resources after separation is successfully addressed by all boys in their imagined solutions. In three cases, a problematic memory overwhelms the Self's reparative ability and the second imaginary solution fails to address the deprivation.

Overall the common features and differences among cases do not allow for a
meaningful typology along the dimension of provision of resources.

**Internal Images in Conflict**

It can be demonstrated that internal images are often simultaneously cast in roles belonging to the dimensions of conflict and provision of resources. For instance, punishment takes the form of deprivation (see case studies Bob, Zachary) or attempts at conflict resolution involve caregiving (John Doe, Pepsi).

In comparing all cases along the dimension of conflict, the cases can be divided into three reasonably distinct groups. In essence this means that each group shows distinct features before and after separation and in the imaginary solutions. That this holds true for the typology suggested here will be demonstrated in this chapter.

The following table shows the casting of internal images in conflict before separation, with the Victim images of the original Couple conflict highlighted for each case. If no Couple conflict is reported in a given case (John, Pepsi), the Victim images of the remaining conflictual relational patterns are highlighted (table # 90).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adam</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self, Mother</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bob</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John</strong></td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Doe</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Powerless Self, Mother</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pepsi</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self, Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zachary</strong></td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 90: Cross case comparison of relational patterns regarding conflict before separation

Concentrating for a moment on the Victim column only, it is immediately
apparent that the Mother image is in the role of Victim in four cases, the Father images twice, and both Mother and Father in one case.

The corresponding Aggressor images also follow a pattern that corresponds with the casting of the Victim images. In all cases with Mother as Victim image, Father is the Aggressor.

The two cases with Father as Victim image have a Rulebreaker image that is not part of the internal Couple (John's Neighbour) or a Rulebreaker image which is also the Victim (the internal Father hurting himself). In both cases the Mother image is not cast in the complementary role of Aggressor.

In Zachary's case, both Mother and Father are simultaneously cast as Victims and as Aggressors in one relational pattern. In Zachary's other pattern before separation, Mother is cast as Aggressor and Father as the Victim.

Summing up, the characteristics of the three types of relational patterns are
- a Victim Mother associated with an Aggressor Father
- a Victim Father associated with a Stranger or himself as Aggressor
- a Victim Mother and Father (Couple) associated with mutual aggression perpetrated by Mother and Father

I have chosen the Victim role as marker for the dynamic relational patterns in Couple conflict, over the role of Aggressor or Rulebreaker, because in two cases the Rulebreaker images would only confuse the groupings (John, Pepsi). The three types of adjustment to separation are named based on the internal image in the role of Victim in the Couple conflict, the Mother-as-Victim type (MaV), the Father-as-Victim type (FaV), and the Couple-as-Victim type (CaV).

The cases belonging to each of the three groups have common characteristics in their respective relational patterns that distinguish them from cases in the other two groups. As will be demonstrated, the role of the Self changes in correspondence with the relational patterns of the internal Couple in conflict.
The typology is based on the dynamic relational patterns of the internal Couple in conflict.

**The Mother-as-Victim Type (MaV)**

**The Couple Conflict.**

The most common internal Victim image in Couple conflict is the internal Mother. The group of cases featuring the internal Mother as Victim of Couple conflict consists of Adam, Bob, John Doe, and Michael. In all four cases the internal Father is cast in the complementary role of Aggressor. In two cases, Father is not only cast as Aggressor but is also cast in the role of Victim. Since these two relational patterns do not involve Mother, Father's role as Victim is secondary. In John Doe's case Authority Co-Workers victimise Father and in Michael's case Self in the role of Rulebreaker victimises Father.

After the separation of the original internal Couple, the central conflict featuring Father as Aggressor and Mother as Victim has 'exploded' into many conflicts involving Siblings, Self, and representations of New Family Members. Nevertheless, the casting of Father and Self (see following section) in the roles of Aggressor and Rulebreaker has remained and provides a link to the memories of the internal world before separation. Mother is gaining strength after separation and is no longer exclusively cast as a Victim. Mother's 'repertoire' now includes the roles of Authority and Pacifist.

**The Role of the Self.**

Next, the role of Self in Mother-as-Victim cases is examined. Three out of four cases, with Bob as the only exception, show the Self in two roles, the roles of Rulebreaker and Pacifist before separation. In each case, a powerless aspect of the Self is cast as Pacifist, leading to Self's failure to stop Aggressor Father from harming
Victim Mother. In the role of Rulebreaker, Self contributes to the internal damage. Adam’s Self harms an object belonging to Couple and ignites a Couple conflict. John Doe’s Self harms the internal Mother and ignites a Couple conflict. Michael’s Self harms Father and also ‘forgets’ to stop Father’s attack on Mother. Table # 91 highlights the role of the Self in conflict before separation for Mother-as-Victim type cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Bad Self</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 91: Cross case comparison of relational patterns re conflict in MaV cases before separation

So far Adam’s, John Doe’s, and Michael’s case have been discussed. In each case the Self is cast as Rulebreaker and Failing Pacifist. As for Bob’s case, it is not surprising, that Bob’s Self is not cast at all in the relational patterns before separation. Bob has no memory of this time because his parents split up when he was not even two years old.

In all four MaV type cases, Self is cast as either Aggressor or Rulebreaker image after separation. However, the Self is for the first time also cast as Victim (Adam, Bob, John Doe) after the break-up of the internal Family.

The casting of the internal Mother has shifted somewhat after separation. Mother is still the Victim of Aggressor Self and Father in some relational patterns, but Mother is now also cast as Authority in relation to Rulebreaker Self or Father
(table # 92) in other patterns (Self's role is highlighted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Fair Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mean New Teacher</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father's car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister, Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 92: Cross case comparison of relational patterns re conflict in MaV cases after separation

In the imaginary solutions, the Self in MaV Type cases is cast in the role of Pacifist for all cases. In three cases, Self is also cast as powerful Authority, thus allowing for punishment of Rulebreaker and Aggressor images. This imaginary pattern reverses the memory of the Self as Rulebreaker being punished by parental images in the role of Authority (table # 93).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imaginary</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>Dead Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Bad Self</td>
<td>Mother, Father</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Smaller Twin</td>
<td>Powerful Big Self</td>
<td>Perfect Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 93: Cross case comparison of imaginary relational patterns re conflict in MaV cases

These four imaginary solutions are vastly different. Adam’s Self fails to stop Couple’s conflict and fears victimisation. This imagined solution fails. The other three
imagined solutions all are at least partially successful. Bob’s Druid-Self as Pacifist and powerful Authority successfully stops Deadly Enemy. John’s Pacifist Self has to be perfect to avert Couple conflict. Michael’s Big Self is powerful enough to punish Twin Brother.

The role of the Self in the MaV type cases in many ways resembles the role of the Father image. In the memory-based relational patterns, both images are cast in the roles of Aggressor and Rulebreaker and both images contribute to the harm done to Victim Mother. However, in the imaginary patterns, the Self image, unlike the Father image is also cast as Pacifist and Authority. In the role of Pacifist, Self tries to avert harm from Victim Mother. As Authority Self punishes Aggressor and Rulebreaker images for the damage done. While both the Self and the internal Father are guilty for damage done to Victim Mother, Self, unlike Father, makes reparative attempts in the role as Pacifist and Authority.

**The Reunion of the Internal Couple.**

Both dimensions, resources and conflict, play a role in whether and how the reunion of the internal Couple is imagined. In the realm of resources, Self’s premature independence is a hindrance to a successful reunion of the internal Couple in Bob’s case. Bob does not attempt to reunite the original or an imaginary Couple.

Adam, John Doe, and Michael all manage to reunite the internal Couple with varying degrees of difficulty.

In Adam’s case, Future Self does the opposite of what Father does in memory, thus achieving a functioning Future Couple. In the reunion phantasy, Adam focuses on Father’s failure as loyal Provider, not Father’s role in conflict. Future Self-as-Husband repairs this failure to provide in phantasy.

John Doe’s successful reunion of the original internal Couple requires a perfect Self. This perfect Self does not ever break rules and thus does not provoke conflict. In
John Doe's case, Self's role as Aggressor and Rulebreaker before and after separation is a formidable barrier that has to be overcome for the successful reunion of the original Couple in phantasy.

In Michael's case, Future Self initially stays apart from Future Wife, but becomes a good Provider on request. Future Self's reluctance to be close to Future Wife is associated with Self's adaptive effort to shelter Mother from the harmful effect of Rulebreaker Self. In this case, a protective relational pattern based on Self's role in conflict after separation has to be overcome for a successful reunion of the Couple.

The Father-as-Victim Type (FaV)

The Couple Conflict.

The second group of cases consists of the two cases with Father in the role of Victim of Conflict before separation. This is the case in John's and Pepsi's internal world. Here, Mother is not cast in the complementary role of Aggressor. In Pepsi's case Father as clumsy Rulebreaker injures himself, and in John's case, Rulebreaker Neighbour is not part of the internal Couple (Neighbour) (table # 94). While Father is implicated as Aggressor when Mother is the Victim image, Mother is not implicated as Aggressor when Father is the Victim image.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Clumsy Father</td>
<td>Self, Mother</td>
<td>Father, Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 94: Cross case comparison of relational patterns re conflict in FaV cases before separation

After separation, the internal conflict in FaV type cases changes complexion. The similarities between Pepsi and John's relational patterns is striking. On first blush, the casting of the Rulebreaker images resembles that of the MaV type. Self and Father are cast in that role. Closer scrutiny (and knowledge of the case studies) reveals that in both cases a male image is accused of being a Rulebreaker after
separation. In John's case, Self is accused by Stepmother of harming Halfbrother. In Pepsi's case Father is accused by Court of causing injury to This Guy. Both John and Pepsi present a revised version exonerating Self and Father. In John's case this revised version casts Halfbrother in the role of Rulebreaker and in Pepsi's case this revised version casts This Guy as Aggressor. In FaV type cases, Father and Self images are accused of aggression, but are exonerated by Self and seen as non-aggressive. Female images on the other hand, are cast as powerful Authority in both cases, not as Victim images (table # 95, Rulebreaker images are highlighted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Halfbrother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>Powerless Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father, Car</td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother, Teacher</td>
<td>Teenage Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 95: Cross case comparison of relational patterns re conflict in FaV cases after separation

The Role of the Self.

In Father-as-Victim type cases, the Self is cast in non-aggressive roles. In John's case Self is accused of aggression, but is exonerated. Self is the Victim of injustice. Pepsi's Self is cast in the role of Pacifist at all times. While Father is accused of being an Aggressor by Courts, Pepsi exonerates him.

In both cases, the Self is cast simultaneously as Pacifist and Provider for the Victim/Deprived Dependent Father. This implies that the injury to Father requires healing by a Provider image. In both cases, the caring presence of Self to the internal Father is reparative for the Father image.

The Reunion of the Internal Couple.
For FaV type cases, the successful reunion of the internal Couple requires the resolution of the problematic relational pattern of Victim Father being associated with Authority Mother.

In Pepsi’s case, Self’s premature independence has become a cherished solution to problematic patterns concerning resources before separation, but proved to be another obstacle to the reunion of the internal Couple. Pepsi maintains this independence in his reunion of the internal Couple. In terms of conflict, Future Self is cast in the same old role of Pacifist so as to avoid Couple conflict. This strategy did not work in memory, leaving Pepsi’s imaginary solution open to fears of separation.

John has come up with a more interesting imaginary solution. In FaV type cases, a close bond between Father and Self is sought throughout the memory-based relational patterns. Imaginary solutions based on this bond fail because they leave Rulebreaker/Pacifist Self-as-Future-Father powerless in relation to Authority Future Wife. In John’s successful reunion phantasy, the Victim Father figure ‘Professor’ is killed. This event bestows power on formerly powerless Rulebreaker Q-ball Self and permits a reunion with Girlfriend Cindy based on equality (table # 96).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imaginary</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father, Son Future Wife</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q-Ball Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 96: Cross case comparison of imaginary relational patterns regarding conflict in FaV cases

In the Father-as-Victim type cases, Self and Father images are predominantly cast in the roles of Victim and Pacifist. Accusations of aggressive impulses by Father and Self images are denied by Self. The Self image attempts to heal the Father image and is not involved much with the Mother image. The internal Mother and other Female images are predominantly cast as Authority and are avoided by Self.

Since the FaV type relational pattern implies a power imbalance between
weak Male and powerful Female internal images, the successful imaginary reunion has to address this imbalance. Pepsi's Future Self achieves this through distancing Self from Future Wife and adopting a Pacifist attitude. John's Q-ball Self achieves this by breaking the stifling bond between Self and weak Victim Father and by retaining Self's power in the presence of Girlfriend Cindy.

**The Couple-as-Victim Type (CaV)**

**The Couple Victimised by Mutual Aggression.**

The formation of a third group became necessary to accommodate Zachary’s internal configuration. In Zachary's case, Couple conflict involves an Aggressor Mother and a Father who retaliates. During the separation angry Authority Mother kicks Father out and Father loses everything, casting the internal Father not only as Victim but also as needy and deprived. Mother is cast as Victim in two ways. After separation, Mother's objects are damaged by Self (more on that in the section on the role of the Self). Female internal images in general are also in danger in close proximity to Male internal images. Both the Mother and Father image are severely injured before and during separation. The internal Couple as a whole is so damaged, that Zachary cannot imagine the reunion of the internal Couple without destructive conflict (table #97).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zachary Before Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table #97: Cross case comparison of relational patterns re conflict in CaV cases before separation

Compared to the two other groups, the Couple-as Victim type case shows the most amount of internal damage and injury.

**The Role of the Self.**

In the CaV type case, the Self does not have a role in Couple conflict before
separation. After separation, Self's role as Rulebreaker who damages Mother's objects is similar to Self's role in Mother-as-Victim type cases. Self tries briefly to fix Mother's objects, but fails. However, Self's reparative capacity is limited by a crippling injury. This injury is a result of Rulebreaker Couple's unexpected separation (the Couple should have stayed together forever). Only in the CaV type case does the reparative effort fail completely, leaving the Self saddled with guilt (table # 98).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zachary</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self, Twin</td>
<td>Angry Mother</td>
<td>Powerless Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crippled Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 98: Cross case comparison of relational patterns re conflict in CaV cases after separation

The Reunion of the Internal Couple.

Zachary's imaginary solutions distinguish him qualitatively from both other groups. He is the only boy who tries but fails to adequately repair the internal Couple in phantasy. The internal Couple is the ultimate Victim of Couple conflict. In Zachary's imagined solution, the memory of the past overwhelms the reparative effort. In the reunited Future Family, Future Self gets 'fired' and becomes a danger to the other Members of Future Family. For Zachary a reunion of male and female images is feared because it leads to the repetition of the internal conflict that precipitated separation (table # 99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zachary</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Future Self, Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Crippled Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fired Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Wife, Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 99: Cross case comparison of imaginary relational patterns re conflict in CaV cases
In short, Zachary does not want to get his hopes up. In the Couple-as-Victim type case, Self does not seek gratifying relational patterns with other internal images, because of the threat of loss to Self and the threat of injury to Female images. Instead, in phantasy, Future Self becomes independent and rich (see table # 89). This imaginary solution avoids the repetition of the past.

This Couple-as-Victim type case is qualitatively distinct from both other groups. However, it shows aspects of both other groups: Rulebreaker Self's guilt for injuring Mother resembles Self's role in MaV type cases, and Victim Self's alliance with Victim Father resembles Self's role in FaV type cases. But Self's own crippling injury and Self's lack of reparative capacity sets this case apart. Because of this lack of reparative capacity, Self's effort to repair the Victim image Couple fails. In this type of internal adaptation, Father, Mother, and Self image are so damaged and angry that the internal Family seems beyond repair.

**Conclusions**

Summing up, the common characteristics of each type of adjustment are presented in a table. The reader has to bear in mind that this typology is based on a small number of cases. This is of concern especially for the Couple-as-Victim type, which is based on only one case, and to a somewhat lesser extent the Father-as-Victim type, based on two cases.

The general characteristics of the Mother-as-Victim type cases are as follows. Before separation, Father is cast as either Aggressor or Rulebreaker. Mother is the Victim and powerless Self is a Pacifist who fails to prevent injury to Mother. After separation, Self is in the role of Rulebreaker and damages or injures Mother. The internal Mother then becomes angry and punitive. Self gets punished. At the same time Self attempts to either repair the injured Mother or protect Mother from further harm by 'Bad Self'. The relational pattern between Self and Father is
ambivalent. Self wants a closer bond with Father but at the same time does not want to be as angry and destructive as Father is in relation to Mother.

In MaV type cases, powerful imaginary Self, in phantasy, is preoccupied with punishing bad Future Children or other Aggressor/Rulebreaker images for creating conflict (table # 100). The relational patterns characteristic for MaV cases are tabulated as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MaV Type</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father, Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Bad Kids</td>
<td>Powerful Self</td>
<td>Powerful Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 100: Relational patterns regarding characteristics of conflict for MaV cases

The general characteristics of the Father-as-Victim type cases are as follows. Before separation, Father is in the role of the Victim. Either a Stranger or Father himself is cast as Rulebreaker or Aggressor. After separation two versions of conflict exist for Self and Father. In one version Father/Self is cast as Rulebreaker and the Victim is a Stranger (not from Original Family). In the other version the Stranger is the Aggressor and Father/Self is the Victim. Self as Pacifist and Provider to Father leaves both Father and Self in the roles of Victim. In relation to Women, Father is both Pacifist and Victim, while Women are cast as powerful and potentially punitive. The Self's relation to Mother is ambivalent. Self fears Mother's presence as Authority, yet there is also need for Mother. Self's ambivalence towards Women is seen in an attempt to simultaneously be close and be distant from Mother/ Women (table # 101).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FaV Type</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Stranger/Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>Father/Self</td>
<td>Father/Self</td>
<td>Father/Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father/Self</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Power/ Father</td>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 101: Relational patterns regarding characteristics of conflict for FaV cases
In FaV type cases imaginary conflict resolution can take two forms. One is to avoid conflict at all cost, that is, to become a Pacifist. The other solution involves an imaginary Self gaining power by overcoming the rules and thus becoming equal to powerful Female images.

The general characteristics of Couple-as-Victim type cases are as follows. Before and during separation, both Mother and Father are cast as Aggressors and Victims in the Couple conflict. During separation, Aggressor Mother kicks Victim Father out. Self, who has so far relied on an intact Couple, gets crippled by the separation, that is, Self also gets victimised. After separation, Self as Rulebreaker damages Victim Mother. Mother becomes punitive. Father and Mother continue to be in the roles of Victim and Aggressor simultaneously.

In Couple-as-Victim type cases, Self cannot reunite a Future Couple without danger of loss to Future Father and danger of injury to Future Mother. For Self, staying single becomes the successful imaginary solution (table # 102).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CaV Type</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Crippled Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Fired Self</td>
<td>Future Wife, Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 102: Relational patterns regarding characteristics of conflict for CaV cases
DISCUSSION

Limitations of the Research Design

This study strictly speaking does not allow for statements about external events and family dynamics. Its subject matter is the inner world of each boy. This inner reality nevertheless does reflect the boys’ external world in unique ways. Like a mirror, the boys’ inner world reflects perceptions of people and events, refracted and distorted in unique and personal ways prejudiced by each boy’s previous history and various psychic adaptive and defensive mechanisms. In this study, we do not gain access to the nature of the boys’ adaptive mechanisms over time. Instead, we get two snapshots of their idiosyncratic versions of an inner world peopled by internal images in relationship to one another. Therefore, the results of this study do not ‘explain’ certain family or peer dynamics found in other studies. While a study of the boys’ inner world has value in its own right, the exploratory power of the study in the realm of observable behaviour, the domain of quantitative studies, is limited. Explanatory connections between the internal world (as revealed in this study) and external reality (as measured in various other studies) have to remain speculative.

A powerful argument against an automatic, ‘naive’ translation from external events to internal representation is presented in this study. The two twin brothers Zachary and Michael were presumably subject to a strikingly similar family dynamic, yet their internal worlds are sufficiently different to place one into the Mother-as-Victim group and the other in the Couple-as-Victim group. The two twins and their internal worlds are reminders that the internalisation of external events is a complicated process influenced by internal and external factors.

Gender is another limiting factor in the study. By design, this study only includes boys. How girls internalise the family dynamics associated with parental separation and represent them as internal reality is certainly an interesting topic for study. Many studies have documented the differential impact of divorce on boys and
Mapping the internal dynamics for boys and girls, as well as young men and women, would give clues about the corresponding differences in the internal worlds of males and females and might explain the gender-specific impact of parental separation.

The last factor limiting the validity of the results is the small number of participants. Since the expressed purpose of this study was the development of theory, the small number of participants was part of the original design. Given the small number of participants one can only speak of validity in a relaxed sense (see methodology section for discussion). More definite statements about the validity of the typology can be made only after further studies have applied the typology to a greater number of participants. Should this typology hold true under scrutiny in various settings, the clinical and conceptual implications for the field are broad. These implications are discussed in the next chapter, with the caveat, that this typology has not undergone sufficient scrutiny at the moment.

**Limitations of the Method**

While utmost care was taken to clarify the definitions of the categories and later the roles, ambiguities could not be eliminated completely. When faced with the difficulty of distinguishing between the roles of Aggressor and Rulebreaker, both were often assigned. Both roles imply harm to Victim images, and thus have a major aspect in common. In some cases, the role of Rulebreaker was assigned when an internal image broke implied rules, such as 'fathers should look after their children', as was the case for Adam.

During the analysis of Michael's case, it became clear that there is a wide range of function for the role of Authority. While in many cases the role of Authority was to maintain peace and ensure justice (i.e. Mother mediating between Self and Sister in John Doe's case), the Authority image became punitive and threatened to
victimise Rulebreaker images (i.e. Self threatened Twin for breaking rules in Michael’s case) in others. The range of functions for the role of Authority therefore stretches from ‘benign mediator’ to ‘harsh punisher’. As benign mediator the role of Authority is close to the role of Pacifist. However, unlike the Pacifist, the benign Authority enforces rules and thus may under certain circumstances initiate conflict.

As harsh punisher the function of Authority is close to the role of Aggressor. The harsh Authority punishes or threatens to punish ‘bad’ Aggressor images. By inverse logic, the harsh Authority may justify an expression of violent aggression by claiming a threat from dangerous Aggressor images. This logic holds sway in both Bob’s and Michael’s imaginary solutions. In Bob’s case lethal force is justified in self defence, and in Michael’s case harsh punishment is justified for Twins imagined transgressions. In both cases Self uses the role of Authority as a vehicle for the expression of aggressive impulses.

In psychoanalytic terms, the role of Authority is similar to the role of the superego in object relation theory. Object relation theory distinguishes between a harsh and a benign superego. Consistent with the findings of the study, the former is associated with punitive internal object relations. A benign superego, on the other hand, requires the ability to repair injuries and forgive mistakes. This ability among internal images to repair and forgive de-escalates internal conflict.

**Threats to Validity in Clinical Studies - The Issue of Bias**

**Researcher Bias During Interviews**

The thorny question of interviewer bias was raised in the chapter on research design. This question is reconsidered in light of the methods of the data analysis and its results.

Miles and Hubermann (1984) have extensively written on criteria of validity for qualitative research and implicitly raised the issue of bias by the data analyst. In
their view, sound analytic procedures all through the various analytic steps from data collection to conclusion drawing are the best defence against this bias taking hold of and skewing the data analysis.

Before I discuss the procedures that were put in place in this study to minimise potential bias during the data analysis, I want to address the issue of bias during the interviews themselves. Since everybody has opinions and positions on issues such as gender, power, etc., it is assumed that any interview (even a structured one) contains a more or less subtle bias introduced by the interviewer and his theoretical stance. In this study, it is assumed that interviewer bias is inevitable and its presence is conceded as a matter of course. Since the presence of bias is conceded, the question is then examined what consequences such a bias might have in terms of the responses of the subject.

When the issue of bias is raised in research, it is often assumed that the data become skewed in the direction of the researcher’s assumptions. According to that logic, an interview conducted by a biased researcher should yield responses in the direction the researcher favours. Clinical experience as well as the results of this study do not corroborate such a simplistic association between researcher bias and subject’s response.

For example, a Social Worker might routinely side with powerless abused children against abusive parents. This bias is both well-intentioned and understandable. Such a Social Worker might take accusations of physical abuse by a child seriously and side with the child against the abusive parent (i.e. prepare to take legal action), only to find that the child later retracts the original statement in order to protect the abusive parent. In this example, the link between Social Worker bias and the child’s subsequent statements is inverse. This very mechanism of protecting one’s own parental figures was indeed documented for some boys in this study.

To continue the example, a different child might well see the Social Worker’s
bias against abusive parents as an invitation or encouragement for further accusations. This is to say, the relationship between researcher bias and raw data is a complex one and it would be overly simplistic to assume that a particular bias held by the researcher generates raw data biased in the direction desired by the researcher.

Once the presence of interviewer bias is conceded, one has to ask the question whether the methods of analysing the data safeguard against or further emphasise the bias inherent in the raw data. It is my contention that the nature of the conceptual framework that was developed after the data had been obtained neutralised this bias. The effect of this bias on the data analysis was minimised by two concurrent strategies. The first was to favour spontaneously produced stories over answers given to closed questions and the second involved shifting the conceptual focus from the data as representations of external reality to the interviews as expressions of the boys’ internal reality.

The data analysis used linking procedures to the point of saturation (see method section). Most sequences are based on extended stories the boys told in response to open questions or comments. When in doubt during the analytic procedures, the researcher put more trust into spontaneously produced stories than statements in response to closed questions. The coding based on spontaneously produced stories form the bedrock of the data analysis.

The effect of shifting the conceptual focus had even more dramatic results in safeguarding against bias. While most people have strongly held beliefs about external structures (i.e. the role of gender in society), they have less emotional investment in how the psyche is structured. As long as the interviews are viewed as expressions of external reality, the temptation towards bias based on judgment is strong. For one’s own reasons one might feel a father to be negligent or a mother to be too strict. Once the boys’ stories were taken as representations of an internal reality,
the analytic focus shifted towards understanding relational patterns in the psyche. It is not very compelling for a trained psychodynamic psychotherapist to side with one aspect of the psyche (i.e. the Self) against another (i.e. a parental image), since such a move inevitably polarises the psyche and leads to increased internal conflict, certainly not a desirable outcome for the boys. Due to the conceptual shift, the temptation of judging family members for their alleged actions based on the researcher's own personal bias receded.

The shift from raw data as representation of external reality to raw data as representations of internal reality also boosts the validity of the results in another aspect. By making this conceptual shift the researcher no longer has to trust that the boys' statements are accurate representations of 'reality'. Instead, he takes the statements for what they undeniably are, expressions of the boys' memories, wishes, and fears. The emphasis shifts from whether the boys' reports can be considered a valid expression of their external situation to how the boys' internal situation is structured. In the former case, the researcher is interested in the external reality described by the boy. In that scenario the raw data of the interviews point to the 'real' data, they are not the real data, as is the case in the latter scenario, where the internal structure of the boys' psyche is the subject of enquiry. While in the former case the researcher has to make assumptions about links between the boys' statements and their 'reality', the interviews themselves are by definition expressions of the internal reality in the latter case. Instead of having to convince the reader that the boys' self reports can be trusted (a difficult task that surely raises questions of validity), the researcher now has to show that his conclusions are based on sound analytic principles that do justice to the material. This, I hope, has been achieved in the section on methods and results.

Treating the interviews as expressions of the boys' internal reality therefore boosts claims of validity for this study because it removes a notorious threat to
validity, the tenuous link between self reports and intersubjective 'reality'.

**Biased Conclusions in Clinical Studies**

The issue of bias is not confined to the collection of data. There are cautionary tales of biased analytical techniques for both statistical and qualitative studies in the social judgment literature. It may be reassuring for a qualitative researcher to know that even statistical analyses are not immune to biased conclusions, as Tversky and Kahneman (1971) have shown. They were able to detect mathematical psychologists making biased inferences from samples to populations.

On the other hand, qualitative research has its own 'favourite areas of analytical bias'. Nisbett and Ross (1980) point out recurring flaws and biases in studies relying on clinical reasoning. Essentially, biases creep in in four areas:

- information selection, clinicians rely too heavily on vivid dramatic data
- clinicians misjudge frequency and probability, ignoring base rate information
- clinicians have trouble revising initial hypotheses, succumbing to an 'anchoring effect'
- in complex situations, clinicians scan the environment for confirmatory evidence, largely ignoring other equally available information.

Any qualitative researcher using clinical tools has to show that his study has avoided these pitfalls.

In my opinion, the methods used in this study have largely safeguarded against the biases mentioned here. While the researcher by virtue of being human had a bias going into the interviews, there were no initial hypotheses. Initially, the researcher was looking not for data pointing into a specific direction, but, instead, descriptive data. Thus an 'anchoring effect' was not a factor in this study.

The process of coding the entire interview and the process of linking the categories into matrices and then relational patterns forced the researcher to give
equal weight to all the raw data. This process safeguards against both a misjudging of probability and frequency and a heavy reliance on dramatic data.

It is also important to note that the researcher only recognised an overall pattern that was then condensed into the typology after about one year of successive procedures of data analysis. To suggest that the researcher may have scanned for confirmatory evidence exclusively to the detriment of other equally available evidence does not make sense in such a scenario because until the very end of the cross case analysis, the researcher would not have known what constituted confirmatory evidence.

The grounded approach taken in this study addresses in my opinion the concerns of biased analytical procedures raised by Nisbett and Ross (1980) regarding qualitative studies with clinical underpinnings.

**In Dialogue with the Existing Literature**

As I have discussed in the literature review, a host of explanatory factors have been advanced to explain the negative behavioural outcomes for children of divorce and adult children of divorce. Amato had hoped to develop and test a unified theory in his meta-analysis (Amato 1993), yet by his own admission, fell short. Amato’s four hypotheses for the decreased well-being of children after divorce have been discussed in the literature, yet the extent of interaction between variables is unclear and leaves the picture muddled and full of contradictions. ‘Conceptual clarity’, especially of the linear mathematical kind, has so far eluded the researchers in the field.

So far the focus in the literature has been to first establish that parental divorce has a longterm detrimental effect and then to find possible ‘causes’. The studies investigating whether or not divorce has longterm implications usually treated children from divorced homes as homogeneous groups and compared them with other groups, such as children from intact homes.
Normative studies such as the longitudinal study conducted by Wallerstein and her colleagues investigated how children of divorce adapted to their life situation. Based on clinical interviews and various psychometric outcome measures, Wallerstein and Kelly (1976, 1980), Wallerstein and Blakeslee (1989), and Wallerstein and Corbin (1989) concluded that children of divorce are not a homogeneous group. She suggested groupings based on the overall functioning of the children. Similar results were found in a Swedish study by Spigelman et al. (1994). They correlated results of a projective technique (parts of the Rorschach) designed to assess psychological adaptation with other measures. They found a positive correlation between outcome measures and the nature of the relationship with the father as well as father’s geographical proximity. While Spigelman et al.’s study used a projective test to provide data about psychological structure, this instrument was used in that particular study to measure the quality of adaptation. In the Swedish study, groups were again established based on how well or how badly the children were adjusting after parental divorce and then correlated with data about the quality and nature of parental relationships.

The results of my study provide a different kind of information. Rather than assigning boys to groups based on the quality of adjustment, this study assigns group membership based on the nature or type of internal adjustment to parental divorce. The study suggests, that there are three distinct types of internal adaptation to parental separation with at times contradictory relational patterns (i.e. in MaV types the internal Father is too powerful and destructive, and in FaV types the Father is not powerful enough to ensure a relationship between Self and Father). Here, groups are based on how children have adapted, not how well they have adapted to parental divorce.

After an extensive search of the literature, I have concluded that this study stands alone in its focus on how the children have adapted. This of course makes a
comparison of my result to findings of other studies very difficult. However, my findings may suggest possible reasons for the lack of conceptual clarity in the field.

If one wants to bring to bear the results of this study on the discussion in the field, one has to first propose a(n arguably) speculative link between internal and external reality.

For arguments sake, I will assume for a moment, that this difference in internal functioning is somehow reflected in a corresponding difference in behaviour. For example, MaV types struggle with lack of control over aggression, while FaV types passively accept their environment and generally show no signs of aggression. While both MaV and FaV types manage to construct a reunited Couple in phantasy, CaV types have no hopes that a Couple relationship might work. This differential reaction to stimuli by different types of boys might then be recorded in quantitative outcome studies based on linear models as contradictory trends within the data. Rather then being able to state a clear linear relationship between separation and aggression for boys, the researcher will again be faced with confused and confusing data.

There are many description of outcomes in the literature that fit with internal dynamics of one or more of the specific types documented here. Usually the outcome measures are in line with MaV and CaV type internal adaptation.

For example, the literature reports two seemingly contradictory trends among boys regarding aggression. On one hand, boys are described as more aggressive after the separation of their parents. Stewart et al. (1997) found that boys six years and older showed more difficulties in their overall adjustment after divorce than girls. The boys tended to have increased behaviour problems. Hetherington et al. (1982) in a longitudinal design found boys and girls improved two years after separation, yet boys from separated families did exhibit more conduct problems than boys from intact families. The findings that young boys show more unrestrained aggression is
consistent with the internal dynamics of MaV and CaV cases after separation. In MaV and CaV cases the internal world contains a memory of violent conflict among the Couple. This aggression was harmful to one or both partners. Because this conflict is internalised, aggression and its control is clearly an issue for the Self image. In MaV cases, Self deals with the added complication of having been the cause of the parental conflict (Adam, John Doe, Michael). For boys belonging to this group, the cycle of aggression followed by punishment has led to an emphasis on control of and punishment for aggression. For this group one would expect either out of control aggressive behaviour (aggression wins out), or self-punitive behaviour (punishment wins out).

In FaV cases, Self's and Father's aggression tend to be inhibited. This inhibition of aggression results in an inability to solve conflict without retreat (see John's Father in conflict with New Wife). Unlike MaV cases, FaV cases have not internalised Couple conflict brought on by aggressive male images. Both John and Pepsi have no memory of Couple conflict before separation. In each case, one male image, either the Self (John) or Father (Pepsi), is accused of and punished for aggression despite claims of innocence. This group of boys does not struggle with control of out-of-control aggressive impulses. Instead, FaV type cases struggle to regain a modicum of aggression necessary for self preservation.

In contrast to the picture of uncontrolled aggression in young boys, the literature describes adolescents and young adult males as depressed and lacking aggression in vital areas. Adolescent boys whose parents had separated during the oedipal period showed a marked inhibition of aggression, while the researchers observed an increase of direct, problematic aggression in adolescent girls of that group (Kalter, Rembar 1981, p. 94). This picture of overcontrolled aggression in adolescents is consistent with Wallerstein and Blakeslee's (1989) observations that many bright young male adults lacked the aggression necessary to achieve,
commensurate with their talent. The young males who had witnessed family violence struggled with their own tendency to lash out violently by inhibiting all aggression. Again the parallels for this type of behavioural outcome in the internal world are found among the MaV and CaV type cases. FaV type cases do not have the tendency to lash out. After separation and in the imaginary relational patterns, the Self struggles against its own aggression and ultimately is able to control it effectively. However, Wallerstein and Blakeslee suggest that the young males pay a high price (lack of ambition and success) for the successful control of their aggressive impulses.

While the literature describes first and foremost psychodynamic patterns of MaV and CaV type cases, one aspect of the FaV type pattern has been well documented in the literature. One outstanding trait of FaV type boys is their mourning for their close relationship with their fathers. While MaV and CaV type boys have an ambivalent relationship with their fathers because they not only long for their father, but also see their father as responsible for mother’s injuries. Their loss of and wish for the return of their father is therefore tempered by worry for their mother. As already presented in the literature review, Hetherington et al. (1982) and Healy et al. (1990) found that father’s presence was positively correlated with children’s adjustment only when parental conflict (as experienced by their subjects!) after separation was low. In MaV and CaV type cases the experience of conflict after separation among parents remains high (see for instance the case studies of Adam, Michael, Bob, and Zachary), thus negating some of the benefits of fathers’ presence.

By contrast, the longing of FaV type boys (see the case studies of John and Pepsi) for their fathers is unambiguous. Many studies report that boys (and girls) express strong longings for absent fathers (Seltzer 1991; Spigelman et al. 1994; Stewart et al. 1997) even after many years of separation (Wallerstein, Corbin 1989; Wallerstein, Blakeslee 1989). This unambiguous longing for the lost father is an aspect of the FaV type pattern that has found its way into the literature.
It is interesting that the findings of most studies in the field describe behavior one expects of boys of the MaV and the CaV type. One plausible hypothesis for the lack of outcomes in keeping with FaV type internal dynamics in quantitative studies is that their presence in this study is a mere coincidence and that their numbers are few and far between in the population.

However, the other hypothesis posits that the stress on performance measures in the quantitative studies has underestimated the psychological difficulties of FaV type boys. They may appear in those studies to adapt successfully because they are ambitious and they try to please both mother and father. Their Self lacks the aggressive edge that would make them disruptive and disagreeable in interpersonal situations. Others would tend to see them as functioning well because FaV types attempt to become high achievers and they are not as overtly isolated and depressed as some of the boys of the MaV type. In terms of outcome measurements, FaV types show few overt signs of distress and function well in their social environment. This lack of overt signs of distress may have tempted researchers to see them as adapting well to parental divorce. To see the FaV type boys as adapting successfully might be a mixed blessing for them because their very real struggle to have power and control over their own life and destiny is ignored.

Implications for Clinical Practice

How the Types Might Present in a Clinical Setting

Psychoanalytic theory assumes that the world of internal images and objects is greatly influenced by external events and vice versa, so that the inner world as described and analysed in this study becomes a mirror, albeit with some distortions, of the external world. "The experience of the internal object is deeply dependent on the experiencing of the external object - and internal objects are, as it were, mirrors of
realty (Hinshelwood, 1991, p. 68). According to this theory, a child harbouring an injured internal Mother image (MaV type) might show concerns about the fragility of the ‘real’ mother or might act in ways designed to prevent injury to her. With this connection between internal and external reality in mind the clinical implications of the results will be discussed.

The internal world of each type of adjustment has its own core conflicts and its own internal adaptation to the core problem. The typology developed in this study allows for a differential diagnostic approach to boys whose parents have separated. This victim image is usually not difficult to detect in conversation. In the interviews for this study, the boys usually mentioned the victim image of the couple conflict within the first ten minutes of the conversation. In a clinical setting, knowing which internal image is injured allows the clinician to target the core conflict of his or her client. The approach to a boy struggling with a sense of powerlessness is different from the approach to a boy who is racked with guilt for victimising Mother.

In the following chapter, I describe based on my own clinical experience the three types of adaptive strategies with respect to overt behaviour and clinical symptoms. This section should give the reader a general idea of how the different types might present in a clinical setting.

The core problem for MaV type boys is guilt over the fact that they believe that they have done harm to Mother, either directly or vicariously through angering Father. These boys believe that they destroyed the parental couple relationship. Father and Self are experienced as aggressive and bad. Uncontrolled aggression and guilt feelings for harming Mother dominate the internal landscape of MaV type boys. MaV type boys in general feel they are ‘bad’ or ‘cruel’. The boys found various strategies to deal with their badness,

- hiding aggression and badness from Mother by staying away
- being the perfect child, denial of aggression
In most cases, a combination of these three strategies is employed by the boys to manage their badness. Because of their aggression, the MaV type boys have difficulty in relation to Mother. The connection between Father and Self in MaV type cases is also tenuous, because fathers tend to stay away (Adam, John Doe, to a lesser extent Michael). The MaV type boys feel abandoned by their Fathers.

In FAV type cases the boys' core problem revolves around power and control. These boys think females are in control of relationships. The Father is seen as weak and ineffective. FaV type boys want to take care of and strengthen their Father. However, they fear that siding with Father may lead to punishment from Mother. FaV type boys long for their Fathers and covertly fight their Mothers for control (Pepsi). When confronted with the evidence of conflict, FaV type boys tend to deny their own (and Father's) aggression, leaving them unable to use their aggression to achieve desired goals. Because these boys avoid conflict, Females may experience them as not engaged and as shirking responsibility.

In CaV type cases, the core problem revolves around the threat of annihilation. These boys see both Fathers and Mothers as aggressive and at the same time badly injured. CaV type boys are badly hurt by the surprising nature of the separation and have very low self esteem. CaV type boys fear their own aggressive impulses and avoid close relationships, especially with females. Like MaV type boys, CaV type boys see themselves as dangerously aggressive and bad and feel guilty for hurting Mother. However, like Father, they also feel that Mother has rejected them. For CaV type boys, the destruction of the parental Couple has crippled their hopes for life. They have lost all hope that relationships can work and prefer to stay single in order to avoid destructive Couple conflict. FaV type boys in general feel they have been 'hurt' and 'crippled'.
Implications for Practice

The results of this study call into question the widely held myths that children of divorce are a homogeneous group. Many clinicians believe that children always feel guilty for their parents break-up. According to the results of this study, this certainly holds true for MaV and CaV type cases. However, in FaV type cases the issue of guilt is more complex. While male images are accused of aggression in FaV type cases, the boys themselves completely deny male aggression and actually blame Strangers for the initiation of conflict. FaV type boys deny that they are aggressive or disobedient and therefore do not experience guilt for the parental separation.

The results of this study suggest that boys of divorce should not be treated as one homogeneous group. Instead the clinician should bear in mind the fact that three distinct psychodynamic patterns have emerged in this study. Their distribution in the population is not known at the moment. This typology, should it be substantiated in further studies, calls for a differentiated approach to the assessment and treatment of boys whose parents have separated.
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Dear Parent or Guardian,

My name is Klaus Wiedermann and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Toronto. As one of my degree requirements I am conducting a study under the supervision of Prof. Dr. O. Weininger.

I am investigating how 8 to 12 year old boys adjust to the absence or partial absence of their father after a marital break-up and how it changes their own development. We do know that boys and girls are affected in different ways by the divorce of their parents. This study concentrates on the experience of boys.

I have worked as psychotherapist for children and adolescents since 1983 and have clinical experience with children of divorce. My own personal experience also contributes to my interest.

The study is designed to find out, in the boys' own words, about their experience before during and after the family break-up. I am especially interested in how these events have changed their view of themselves and their fathers. As clinical researchers we hope to find out more about the developmental needs of boys in the event of a family break-up, so that professionals may become better able to help the boys as well as parents such as you.

If you have questions or would like further information on the study, please call me at the phone number listed below. Should you decide to allow your son to participate in the study and should your son also decide to participate, both you and your son will sign consent forms. The forms for you and your son assure and explain your right to withdraw from the study at any point and your right to confidentiality and anonymity.

Sincerely,

Klaus Wiedermann, M.A.

Tel. (416) 962-6671
Appendix B

Parent/Guardian Consent for Son to Participate

I, ......................
give permission for my son, ............... to participate in a study conducted by Klaus Wiedermann under the auspices of OISE/UT about the effects of father absence due to marital break-up or divorce on male development. I understand that my son will be interviewed twice, with each interview scheduled to last between one and one-and-a half hours. My son will be asked to talk about his experience adjusting to the changed family structure after divorce by an experienced clinician/interviewer.

The two interviews will be scheduled approximately two weeks apart.

I understand that my son's participation in the study is voluntary. As a parent I have the right to withdraw permission for my son to participate at any point in the study. My son has the same right to withdraw from the study at any time. He also has the right to refuse to answer any specific questions.

The interviews will be recorded on audiotape and then transcribed. The material is treated as confidential and the removal of names in the transcripts safeguards my son's anonymity in the write-up of the research.

Dated  
Signature of Parent

Dated  
Signature of Witness
Participant Consent Form

I,........................

agree to participate in a study conducted by Klaus Wiedermann under the auspices of OISE/UT. There will be two interviews scheduled two weeks apart. The interviews will last between one and one-and-a-half hours. I understand that we will talk about the break-up of my family and about what happened to my relationship with my father. I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary. Neither my parents nor Mr. Wiedermann can pressure me to participate in the study. I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time and simply have to say so. There will be no penalty or punishment for withdrawing from the study.

The interviews will be recorded on audiotape and then transcribed. The material is treated as confidential. That means that only the researcher will actually listen to the tapes and read the transcripts of my interviews. My name will be taken off the transcripts, so that nobody will be able to know that I was part of this study.

Dated                           Signature of Participant

Dated                           Signature of Witness
Interview Guide

First two questions are asked first. All other questions are raised in context, depending on the initial reactions of the interviewee.

- Can you tell me what comes to mind first about your parents' divorce. (Central personal theme)
- What do you remember most vividly about the break-up? (Central personal theme)
- What were the reasons for the break-up and when and how were you told? (Cognitive understanding, guilt feelings)
- What has your life been like since the separation, how is it similar, how has it changed? (Comparison of past and present, feelings of loss or relief)
- How are your parents getting along, what are the post-divorce arrangements? (Post-divorce arrangement, level of conflict, internal couple)
- How much did your parents fight or disagree when they were still together? (Level of conflict in the structurally intact family)
- How is your mother, your father doing in her/his own life? (Perceived level of parental satisfaction and need, guilt feelings)
- Describe your life (relationship) with your mother. What kind of person is she? (Internalised mother image, level of satisfaction, desire)
- Describe your life (relationship) with your father. What kind of person is he? (Internalised father image, level of satisfaction, desire)
- Do you have siblings? How is your relationship with them? (Competition, etc.)
- What is going well in your life right now? (Conscious areas of satisfaction, achievement)
- What is not going too well in your life? (Conscious areas of conflict)
- Do you have thoughts or feelings that you find hard to talk about with one parent/both parents? (Secrets, hidden aspects of self)
- If you had a magic wand, what would you do? (Magic reparation, ideal state, desire)
- If you could give your parents advice, what would it be? (area of frustration with parental functioning)
- How has your relationship with your father changed since the separation? (loss, loyalty conflicts)
- If you had a magic wand, how would you change your relationship with your father? (reparation, desire)
- Compare your relationship with your father to your friends’ relationships with their fathers. (Request to ‘objectify’ and contextualise relationship to father)
- How do you imagine your future, future relationships? (Idealised couple, self/other)
- What kind of wife will you choose and why? (Perceived shortcomings of mother, internalised male/female dynamic)
- What kind of husband will you be, how will you treat your future wife and what kind of life will you have together? (perceived shortcomings of father as husband, internalised aspects of male identity, counteridentification to father)
- How will you deal with disagreements? (perceived paternal failure, internalised gender conflict)
- Will you have children, what gender? (Feelings about self and siblings)
- What kind of father will you be to your son/daughter? (Perceived shortcomings of father, nature of identification with father)
- As a father what would you want to avoid in raising your children? (Perceived paternal failure, counteridentification, reparation)
- Who (other than your father) is your hero and why? (Ideal image)
- What kind of things do you like to do? How do you spend your free time? (level of connection to peers, family members, self (including body))
- What kind of work will you do and why? (Ambition, aggression in the service of the ego, recovery)
The Categories and their Definitions

Conflict was scored for descriptions of disagreement, also for tension arising from the collision of interests of two or more internal images. Later descriptions of physical collisions (i.e. accidents) were included.

Anger was scored when an internal image was either described as angry or there was a description of physical or verbal attack on another image or thing.

Mistake or failure was scored for actions that were not intended to harm anyone or anything, but that led to some form emotional harm or material damage.

Power was scored when the outcome of a given situation was determined by use of superior force or authority.

Punishment was scored for descriptions of retribution for mistakes or failures.

Peacemaking was scored for attempts to stop conflict, rein in one's own provocative behaviours or foster peace.

Injury was scored for descriptions of physical and psychological harm to an internal image.

Damage was scored for descriptions of harm to a thing.

Relief was scored for descriptions of feelings of respite after harm or conflict were alleviated.

Fixing was scored for actions designed to repair something damaged or to provide material goods to address a lack of resources.

Reunion was scored for the expressed wish for the internal parents or other previously separated dyads to reunite. Reunion was also scored for any real or imagined formation of a dyadic relationship in the wake of a separation.

Loyalty conflict was scored when an internal image was actively weighing its duty to another internal image in order to determine his allegiance in a given predicament.
Recovery was scored for descriptions of successful endeavours following a period of difficulty.

Filling was scored for actions to occupy the void left by the loss of an internal relationship.

Deprivation was scored when an internal image knowingly withheld either material resources or psychological care owed to or vital for another image.

Rejection was scored when an internal image refused to continue a relationship previously based on mutual respect and gratification.

Withdrawal was scored when an image made itself physically unavailable for communication, or failed to respond to interpersonal or environmental cues or demands. Withdrawal was seen as an adaptive/protective strategy.

Hoarding was scored for descriptions of stockpiling resources for fear of deprivation or poverty.

Progression or Regression was scored for the expressed wish by the Self to be older or younger than the current age.

Loss was scored when an internal image completely or partially lost access to an important thing or relationship.

Lack of resources was scored when an image was described as not having adequate resources to feel comfortable and secure.

Longing was scored for expressions of missing a relationship.

Dis-Engagement was scored when an internal image was disengaged from interactions with available others and suffering from boredom. Dis-Engagement includes descriptions of forgetting or not pursuing knowledge.

Competing was scored when two or more internal images were competing for the limited emotional or material resources of another internal image.
### Adam’s Complete Tables of Relational Patterns

#### Tables of Relational Patterns sorted by Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother, Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>New Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>New Wife, Father</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imaginary</strong></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adam</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Ally</th>
<th>Competitor</th>
<th>Falling Prov.</th>
<th>Depr. Depend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>New Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Bro, Halfbro</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imaginary</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self (Mother)</td>
<td>No Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Loyal Rich S.  Future Wife, Kids*
### Bob’s Complete Tables of Relational Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bob</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Baby Self</td>
<td>Mother, Baby Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Fair Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean New Teacher</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father’s car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Baby Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Friend/Computer</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reunited Couple</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### John’s Complete Tables of Relational Patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halfbrother</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>Powerl. Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Self-as-Father, Sons Future Wife</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q-Ball Self</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Father</td>
<td>Father, Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends, Son</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Friends, Son</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### John Doe's Complete Tables of Relational Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Doe</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad Self, Sister</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td>Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sister, Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imaginary</strong></td>
<td>Bad Self</td>
<td>Mother, Father</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td>Future Father</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Perfect Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### John Doe's Complete Tables of Relational Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Girlfriend</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imaginary</strong></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

"Bad Self"" 

"Powerless Self" 

"Perfect Self" 

"Couple" 

"Future Self" 

"Father" 

"Mother" 

"Self" 

"Sister"
## Michael's Complete Tables of Relational Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imaginary</strong></td>
<td>Smaller Twin</td>
<td>Powerful Big Self</td>
<td>Powerful Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before Sep.</strong></td>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twin, Bro.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandpar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imaginary</strong></td>
<td>Grown-up Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-as-Father</strong></td>
<td>Future Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-as-Father, Future Wife</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pepsi's Complete Tables of Relational Patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pepsi</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Mother</td>
<td>Father, Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>This Guy, Car</td>
<td>This Guy, Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother, Teacher</td>
<td>Teenage Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Husband</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td>Older Bro</td>
<td>Careers</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Baby Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends' Mom</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother, Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Mother, Father, Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Teenage Self</td>
<td>Teenage Brother</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td>Own Thing</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Baby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends' Mom</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Zachary's Complete Tables of Relational Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zachary</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td>Self, Twin</td>
<td>Angry Mother</td>
<td>Powerl. Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crippled Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td>Future Self, Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crippled Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fired Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fired Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Fut. Wife, Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Sep.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Orig. Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Orig. Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boyfriend</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Woman/Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table #1: Roles of the internal images before Couple's separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Sep</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother, Self, Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Regulations</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self, Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Father, Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #2: Roles of the internal images after Couple’s separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After Sep.</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Brother</td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Fair Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father’s car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Halfbrother</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>Powerl. Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td>Powerl. Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sister, Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>This Guy, Car</td>
<td>Father, Car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>This Guy</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crippled Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #3: Roles of the internal images in imaginary conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imaginary</th>
<th>Aggressor</th>
<th>Rulebreaker</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Pacifist</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adam</strong></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
<td>Imaginary Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bob</strong></td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Druid Self</td>
<td>Deadly Enemy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John</strong></td>
<td>S.-as-F., Sons</td>
<td>Future Wife</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q-Ball Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Doe</strong></td>
<td>Bad Self</td>
<td>Mother, Father</td>
<td>Perfect Self</td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>Future Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Self</td>
<td>Future Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Perfect Future Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael</strong></td>
<td>Smaller Twin</td>
<td>Powerful Self</td>
<td>Powerful Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pepsi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Husband</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zachary</strong></td>
<td>Future Self, Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Crippled Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fired Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fired Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Powerless Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fut. Wife, Kid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Provision of Resources.**

Table # 4: Roles of the internal images before Couple's separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M., Baby Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbour</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother, Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Older Brother</td>
<td>Careers</td>
<td>Father, Mother</td>
<td>Baby Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Careers</td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>Self, Twin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table # 5: Roles of the internal images after Couple’s separation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Wife</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>New Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bro, Halfbro.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend/Computer</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Father</td>
<td>Father, Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends, Son</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stepmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Girlfriend</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandpar.</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>(Self, Sister)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self, Sister</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandpar.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Old Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twin, Bro.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepei</td>
<td>Mother, Father, Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grandpar.</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Teenage Self</td>
<td>Teenage Brother</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Orig. Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Orig. Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boyfriend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Woman/Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table # 6: Imaginary relation patterns regarding resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Self (Mother)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyal Rich Self</td>
<td>Future Wife, Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reunited Couple</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td>Son - Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Grown-up Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soccer Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future Wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father, Future Wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi</td>
<td>Daycare</td>
<td>Own Thin Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Baby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends's Mom</td>
<td>Child Self</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td>Rich Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-as-Father</td>
<td>Future Kids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>