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Abstract

The current research focuses on the study of power and commitment within heterosexual relationships. The research reviews, compares, and contrasts the theoretical perspectives of Nietzsche through the work of Kaufmann and Gordon, the epistemologies of Post Structuralism and Feminism and utilises a qualitative research method of Narrative Inquiry. These theoretical, epistemological and methodological perspectives are used in conjunction with the method of semi-structured interviewing to identify thematic phenomenological descriptions of participants’ stories. I have created the three discourses of the Fear Discourse, Protective Discourse and the Detached Discourse and in conjunction with the writings of Nietzsche concerning the “Will to Power”, they have been used as thematic guidance discourses for this study. In order to reveal these discourses, the research question “How does an individual’s styles or themes of commitment change within and between three of their previous heterosexual relationships?” was examined. The research found that commitment is understood as another name for responsibility, males are most often understood as behaving with a lack of responsibility, females in overly responsible ways. The research concluded that the production of a balanced responsible sharing approach achieved through creativity is the most desirable to accomplish self-overcoming, independence and freedom, within all situations.
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Introduction

Within any relationship, power can influence the commitment demonstrated by each individual within the relationship. It is my hypothesis, following Nietzsche, that this feeling of power occurs from taking power, by ruling and dominating others, as well as from recognising the experiences of power shared with others within any interaction. Nietzsche argues that individuals are continually attempting to control others by inflicting their will on them so they feel powerful within themselves (Kaufmann, 1968). He argues that an individual who has the ability to share power with others will also feel powerful. These feelings provide the individual with a more stable position for increasing their understanding of both self and others. These controlling actions, stemming from Nietzsche’s “will to power”, are demonstrated in interactions with others (Kaufmann, 1968). Patton (1993) extended this concept of power one step further by introducing power as the mechanism by which an individual achieves their instinctual desire for freedom.

Feminist research for many years has focused on power, and power over women as essential components between women and men. Patriarchal power over women is a central feature of women’s oppression (Tapper, 1993). In my own life experiences, issues of power and domination have been central from childhood onwards. Both men and women I have come in contact with in various experiences have spoken of the values regarding responsibility or commitment with high regard and have then demonstrated these values incongruently by the use of domination. I was concerned that a number of men would talk of their demonstrations of commitment and would then express commitment as domination. This led me to want to research how commitment is expressed within heterosexual couple relationships.
and the place of power within that relationship. To do this I turned to the work of Nietzsche. I found Kaufmann’s (1968) reworking of Nietzsche’s approach helpful because he identified power as the internal desire, which motivates the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of all. He argues that both men and women have this internal desire for power, leading to the event of patriarchy and in more recent times the empowerment of women, has led to the rise of women taking more control in all aspects of their life. Men have often demonstrated the values of patriarchy or domination over women, thus attempting to position women as less than themselves. Nietzsche’s work provides an approach for women to also increase their feeling of power as they too have an internal desire for power.

The focus of this study is the examination of couple relationships to determine how and why power is expressed within narratives of commitment in heterosexual relationships. The thesis explores the way in which heterosexual men and women produce accounts of commitment within relationships and, using a narrative framework, explores the production of discussions of power and commitment within these. Indeed the research question of “How does an individual’s styles or themes of commitment change within and between three of their previous heterosexual relationships?” will be utilised as a commencing point for the analysis of power within heterosexual relationships within this study. Each participant explores these issues of power and commitment through personal accounts of the internal feeling of power, in heterosexual relationships, as demonstrated through the themes of commitment. The method of narrative analysis assists us to understand each participant’s reality, which emerged from within the data collected while interviewing.
Commitment narratives are explored through the thematic expressions of personal themes (fear, protection, detachment), revealed through the responses by participants to semi-structured questions. The participants' interview transcripts were scrutinized for differing themes that would reveal how the internal feeling of power and the external historical, social, cultural and political influences guide the participants' on: how to commit; what commitment means to them; how commitment is personally accounted for and affected by these influences; and how different participants manage commitment within their lives. The themes of commitment are explained through 'comparison' and 'contrast', through analysis of participants' discussions of power relations, myths of power or basic needs being met by participants in their relationships.

The method of narrative analysis focuses on an individual's story to assist in revealing how the individual's understanding creates stability within their experiences and how they make sense of these experiences. Narrative analysts are interested in how the story is told, not just the language used to tell the story (Kohler-Reissman, 1993). Within such a context fine-grained analysis often reveals different interpretations and meanings of a story by dissecting the communicative language of the text into themes and specific stanzas, lengths of pauses, emphasis of speech, repetitions of language and metaphors. These thematic views allow a greater understanding of: the internal feeling of power; an individual's knowledge; the positions chosen by the subject; why the positions are chosen or changed; and the outcomes and consequences within and between heterosexual relationships. By deconstructing the participants' narrative texts into differing themes, an outline of
each participant’s interactive position can be obtained along with an understanding of the impact these themes have on them and their partner.

The theoretical frameworks and principles of Nietzsche, feminist writings, post structuralism and narrative inquiry have been used to explain these participant positions and narratives, which are described in detail within the second chapter, Power and Relationships. The third chapter, Method, discusses the development of the methodology and provides a description of how the research was executed. Chapters four through to chapter ten contain the seven themes which were used to analyse the narratives of each participant. The fourth chapter, History of Power and Domination, reveals power as stemming from an individual’s recurring history.

Chapter five, Power Domination and Power Sharing, therefore illustrates how pain can guide an individual to a creative problem solving position, rather than a position of power over others. Following this, chapter six, Communicating Commitment Discourses, discusses open communication as the catalyst for increasing self-overcoming, which therefore leads to a greater understanding of various thematic demonstrations of commitment. Chapter seven, Performing Commitment, shows how the changing of discursive practices can be utilised as the turning point, which encourages a position of increased self-overcoming and changed themes of commitment. The Discursive Practices of Men, found in chapter eight, revealed that for most men to gain a greater understanding of commitment, they would need to change their position of fear or lack of commitment to a position of detachment. Whereas chapter nine, The Discursive Positioning of Women, states that the majority of women need to alter their position from one of protection or over-responsibility to a detached discursive position to increase their demonstrations of commitment.
Chapter ten, Creative Problem Solving, enlightens the reader of the benefits for creative problem solving, which also encourages a position of increased self-overcoming and a greater understanding of commitment. Chapters eleven and twelve, the discussion and conclusion respectively, have been included to highlight the outcome of all the participants’ narratives. Each of these chapters have been positioned within a sequence to show a possible direction leading to further self-overcoming, freedom and independence. I also believe that this sequence will assist the reader in their understanding of how the participants’ demonstrations of commitment, are underpinned by an individual’s desire for power. Thus through this sequence another narrative has been created, which will constitute further understanding through the eyes of the researcher, of the desire of all participants to increase their feeling of power and how this power is often demonstrated.
Chapter 2  Commitment within Relationships

2.1  Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss critical psychological approaches to heterosexual relationships and the place of power within these. The work of theorists such as Hollway, Foucault and Nietzsche in relation to subjectivity, discourse and power will be discussed. It is these theoretical frameworks that will assist in the analysis of commitment within heterosexual relationships in relation to the individual demonstrations of power.

I chose this topic because of my experiences within heterosexual relationships and within friendships with women that power is important and that all individuals are desirous of increasing his or her feeling of power. During my heterosexual relationships, I created three discourses that I believed my male partners words and actions could be allocated to eg: a discourse of protection or fear, or one rarely used, a discourse of detachment or sharing. Within the discourse of protection he would insist or expect that I do things the way he would prefer because his ideas for completing a task were in the best interests of all involved, even mine. The discourse of fear, which was used by my ex-partners was simply to avoid making a decision about what should take place. I was left to carry the responsibility and blame if my ‘female’ decision went wrong or was not as accurate as it could have been. It was at these times that I felt powerless because even if I did or did not attempt to put my perspective forward I was greeted with patronising or condescending responses, blame when I failed or even to be ignored or laughed at. No matter what choice I made I could not gain a feeling of sharing the responsibility between my partner and myself. The male in these situations usually felt powerful because either his decision
of action was successfully carried out or if it was not successful, he was able to place the blame on me by stating that I had carried out the action. By me carrying out this action it was not done in a manner that he had directed or the third response was that he was not responsible because he did not contribute in the decision making process. I have found that female friends were also interested in increasing their feeling of power and were rarely interested in finding a balanced or sharing method of responsibility to thus increase her feeling of power, as well as mine. These women have also utilised the same method of acting overly responsible, such as not listening to the needs of others or by avoiding responsibility and thus blaming another individual or myself when something did not go exactly as they wished it to. Therefore my feeling of power was undermined once again.

There have been many theoretical approaches developed to address the issue of power. Foucault (1990) stated that psychologists tend to approach power as being owned by the individual and increased due to his or her developmental position, goals and information-processing skills being accomplished and recognised within an external reality. Thus he or she feels either powerful or powerless depending on the degree of recognised accomplishment of self and acceptance by others. Whereas, certain social theorists eg: Foucault, Touraine and Durkheim, argue that ideology or social beliefs impact on the individual’s information-processing abilities and developmental positions. Some theorists argue that production eg: economic positions of the ruling class continue to lead to the development of ideology and that it is the economic level that has determined private and economic power as a result of men (owners and controllers) in whose hands power lies (Marx). This power influences society and political systems such as policies, decisions and actions.
Feminist theorists have traditionally understood male power as patriarchy. Dworkin, Millett and Greer are three of the theorists who recognise that a male’s power can be demonstrated as patriarchy eg: head of household or controller within the family home. Dworkin (1987:13) argued that men have intrinsic authority and that male power is not just an internal combination of feelings and ideas or that “the self is ... merely subjectively felt”. She stated that laws and customs supported and affirmed by art, literature, history and wealth have defined the self through male power. This she argues is why male power or patriarchy is absolute and without challenge or denial. If this internal self becomes unsteady the above mentioned institutions of society devoted to maintaining male power will provide support indefinitely. This indefinite legislated and institutional support through literature, history and wealth provide supreme power for men which subordinates women legally eg: positioning her primarily with duties within the home, or illegally eg: prostituting her, which “separates women from each other” (1987:197) and positions them as servants dominated by male power. This male power thus positions women as the slave or victim and the male as the hierarchical master the tormentor. Millett (1994) supports this argument when she states that when an individual is positioned within the hierarchical master-slave duality it is a form of torture. This torture, when related to the sexual domination of women, is felt in two ways. The first is the knowledge that she is “being deliberately harmed” and second by the indefinitely legislated, institutionally and socially identified act of prostitution as a sexual torture, which is where “being (sexually) harmed in a way regarded as the most humiliating of all humiliations” (Millett, 1994:35). A more acceptable argument by Greer (1999:134) is the male power play that “he has no intention of losing”, is in action when he leaves numerous dirty dishes putrefying in the sink. This is a form of torture for the “house-
proud woman” whose self worth is increased when she “equates her spotless house with her virtuous self”, rather than defining herself through the “qualities of her mind and (self) soul.”

These approaches to power understand it as a simple possession of men. More recent work in social theory, notably the work of Foucault (1977), has demonstrated that in liberal democracies, power is not a simple possession of any group, eg: men, but can be understood as contained within the discourses and practices through which populations are managed and regulated. Feminists such as Chris Weedon (1997) have adapted Foucault’s approach to think about gendered power relations.

In Weedon’s (1997) approach, researching power relations involves examining the discourses and practices which are used to manage and govern the lives of women, through which the truths of women are told. Within feminism and critical psychology, the work of Wendy Hollway stands out in that she has applied these ideas to the study of heterosexual couple relations. Hollway has identified three discursive themes, which assist in the production and reproduction of power within couple relationships. These themes are the male sexual drive discourse, the have/hold discourse and the permissive discourse (Hollway, 1989). Hollway has utilised these themes in her research to reveal the historically produced and present social reproduction of these positions for subjects in today’s society. The historical base of the male sexual drive discourse is of course domination and power, which has been generated from the male belief that all men have a biological drive for sexual relief and reproduction of the species. This male generated discourse has been revealed to be securely positioned within the most accepted of discourses eg: medical,
psychological, and thus perpetrates and continues to perpetuate the oppression of woman. The have/hold discourse is also historically situated, its position coming from the beliefs, values and norms of Christianity. This position supports the ideal that women should be protected from the sexual advances of males in order to save the family honour, preserve the beliefs of monogamy, family and partnership and to endorse the subservience of women to male control. This discourse positions women as objects in a male dominant socially driven discourse, where women are positioned as needing to be attractive to keep a man in their lives.

The final discourse Hollway elaborates is the permissive discourse. The permissive discourse, even though it was voiced to provide sexual freedom for both men and women, only succeeded in camouflaging the male sexual drive discourse and in positioning males again as the sexually free, and the women who participate in these out of marriage sexual encounters, as sluts. Again men are the sexually appropriate beings, women are positioned as being disempowered, and are the objects that satisfy the male's sexual need. Hollway (1998) argues that femininity and masculinity have been defined by these historical, social, patriarchal discourses and it is the meaning that each individual allocates these discourses that creates the multiple positions, expressed or suppressed. As previously discussed, these discourses relate to the demonstration of power over others by men, and it is these discourses that position women as powerless no matter what meaning they allocate for themselves, due to the socially perpetuated nature of the discourse. It is power difference between men and women which "is both the cause and effect of the system of gender difference and provides the motor for its continuous re-production" (Hollway, 1998:228). The recognition of this socially motivated and constructed power
difference and its effect assists individuals to understand that subjectivity is inseparable from the male dominated social domain and the discourses that it perpetuates. It has also been this historically positioned male power within discourse that has produced the qualities of femininity. On recognising these discourses and their impact on society, women may wish to create change for themselves, however, it would be necessary for them to compete with these male discourses. Competition with these male discourses may only lead to an outcome of reaction such as being defined as unchanged or as negative due to her challenge of the male dominating power within society. These male discourses are reproduced everywhere within society as they have been legitimised by experts who utilise social theories which are oppressive of women and categorise women as either “fallen or not yet fallen” (Du Boulay, 1974 cited in Hollway 1998:232) and as the object of a man’s desire. In accordance with the male dominant discourse of Hollway’s (1998) known as the “have/hold discourse”, the woman’s role is to attract and keep a man, and it is this discourse which endows women with status and power for those who position themselves within it. Each of the three socially constructed discourses defined by Hollway (1998) provide positions that are in relation to other people and are available for all subjects to adopt, even though the positions are not equally available to both men and women.

I will discuss the issue of power in relationships by referring to Nietzsche’s discussions of power, which I have found very helpful. These discussions will be accessed through various rereadings of Nietzsche’s work. Nietzsche’s work in relation to his principle of there being an internal desire for power has been very important to this research as it is this principle that is the basis for the entire study.
These rereadings of Nietzsche were specifically used in an attempt to bring Nietzsche's work into relevance of the present day in order that psychology may find his work more accessible.

Power, according to Nietzsche, drives or motivates all actions taken by an individual. This "will to power" of Nietzsche's influences the thoughts, feelings and behaviours of all individuals in order for them to gain freedom (Patton, 1993) through self-overcoming (Kaufmann, 1968). To achieve this outcome an individual must overcome numerous barriers, including: external pressures from social, political, historical and contextual sources; the perception of loss of the internal feeling of power; and the personal conflicts/struggles inherent within many interactions (Hill, 1960).

Nietzsche argued that all individuals have this internal feeling of power and are driven to increase the level of this feeling (Kaufmann, 1968) by their hidden need for freedom or self-overcoming. He saw the seeking of power as a universal struggle that occurs throughout all everyday events, such as the comparison of one's hair, clothes or shoes with those of another person. The patriarchal values of society from all classes have placed men in powerful positions while women have often experienced a sense of powerlessness. Within the area of personal relationships, the struggle for power is often exhibited through conflict. This conflict results from the desire to take control and change the partner's thoughts, feelings and behaviours. Indeed the conflict has sometimes become fearsome, even to the point of violence. Sometimes people can achieve a greater feeling of power by befriending others who are more powerful than themselves or who have less power than them. Such an
attachment is created by the desire to access the other's power, and thus increase their internal feeling of power (Gordon, 1980). Both conflict with others and accessing the power of others fails to address the positive side of the “will to power”, viz. through service to others. Nietzsche's 'gift-giving' virtue of recognition or sharing, assists in helping self and others to feel more powerful (Patton, 1993).

2.2 "Will to Power" as Power over Others

According to Kaufmann (1968) Nietzsche believed that this “will to power” is the internal desire of individuals to increase their feeling of power within self and between self and others. Originally, Nietzsche believed that the “will to power”, was an internal theme of a psychological presupposition, viz. to “exert one’s will over others” (Dennison, 1999:1). In later years, Nietzsche increased his understanding of this psychological assumption of the “will to power” to being not only the use of power over others, but also the sharing of power. This sharing of power occurs when a person recognises and provides the position for self, and or others, to increase through expression e.g. behaviour or speech. This position of power sharing thus gains both individuals within an interaction a superior position than previously experienced. Foucault (1990) challenges Nietzsche's belief. He defines this internal originating power as being externally created and self-reproducing. The external creation of power operates in relation to all situations as the consequence and condition of discursive practices of social relations and in particular the practices of modern government (Foucault, 1990). Foucault (1990) developed Nietzsche's account by locating the “will to power” within liberal practices of government, rather than an internal will or motivation. I have found that Nietzsche's formulation of this idea of an internal desire to increase one's feeling of power is useful, as I am not
convinced that it is possible to simply locate this within discourse while ignoring a psychosocial dimension (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000). In contrast the recognition of the sharing of the feeling of power with others, Nietzsche’s “will to power”, constitutes a greater understanding of this feeling of power (Patton, 1993).

2.3 Power Sharing between Self and Others

Denneson (1999) stated that Nietzsche supported the concept that struggles, even those to access a position of power over others, e.g. patriarchy, democracy and autonomy, are necessary to increase an individual’s desire for power-sharing activities. Examples of power-sharing and the transformation of the human subjectivity include the establishment of discursive spaces where subjectivity can be expressed as interpretations through interactive experiences (Tapper, 1993). If these interactive spaces did not exist then the claiming of autonomy by individuals would never be denied (Tapper, 1993). For example, self-determination, autonomy and political democracy for some individuals was possible only after discursive spaces for feminist values had been established within dominant groups. However, in the past, these discursive spaces had often been denied as a result of “patriarchal discourses and social and political structures” (Tapper, 1993:141). As described by Denneson (1999) Nietzsche argued that the “will to power” was a necessary destructive or nihilistic “reality of the universe”, containing both positive and negative manifestations, which can be both obvious and hidden. Patton (1993) argued that Nietzsche understood suffering as a necessary consequence of power over others.

Nietzsche argued that some individuals, the state or societal institutions could extinguish an individual’s natural instinctive desire to gain power through beliefs of
social needs, rather than individuals' needs. This power over others was achieved by institutionalising the typical behaviour of humans (Freedman & Coombs, 1996), such as an individual's freedom to vote or not. The fear of the individual losing their own power (Denneson, 1999:3) has led to society valuing "obedience, duty and patriotism" (internalised hidden values), as well as society valuing "strength, pride and revenge" (obvious externally demonstrated values) (Denneson, 1999:2 & McClelland, 1975:3). While Nietzsche did not support majority ruled state regimes, such as the government institution of education, he declared them an excellent example of internal violence, which can be associated with the "will to power", and may be demonstrated as the internal desire of any individual (Denneson, 1999). However, when the desire to hurt others was utilised as a means to obtain a heightened feeling of power, then Nietzsche viewed this position as one of relative weakness and thoughtlessness towards others (Patton, 1993).

Any internal desire to have power over others, Nietzsche's "will to power", is demonstrated through an individual's desire to overpower others or to gain power through pleasure of their opponent's weaknesses. Denneson (1999) expanded upon Nietzsche's "will to power" by identifying four negative subtle or disguised forms of the performance of the "will to power". The first form is the desire for freedom, independence and peace; the second is the enrolment or submission to those in power with the desire to control or take advantage of the individual's weakness, isolation and need for assistance; the third is the sense of duty and conscience; and the fourth is the act of praising others. The desire for freedom, etc. could be explained through the example of all individuals knowing that, to survive, their goal to gain power necessitates acting in a manner that is acceptable to others. If this does not occur,
then they may be enslaved themselves through submission and their continual attempts to gain acceptance. They would then lose any previously gained self-empowerment. The second disguised “will to power” enrolment or submission occurs when an individual positions himself or herself so as to be indispensable to others. An example would be a carer who may receive power and pleasure from any financial gain, thanks or goods willed to them by a deceased client. The third form, a sense of duty and conscience, addresses the “will to power” by highlighting the superior feelings that an individual may feel as a volunteer for an organisation. The volunteer may adopt, practice and enforce the rules and values of the charitable organisation, to gain power within the hierarchy of this same charity (worthiness of honour). Finally, the act of praising others is a demonstration of power. Through praise the individual assists another to feel happy or superior, as well as, declaring the individual’s capability and accomplishment in judging another’s actions. The other person is then placed in a position of being grateful to the individual and is thus placed under their power (Denneson, 1999).

2.4 Four Value Positions Increasing the Feeling of Power

Kaufmann (1968) and McClelland (1975) both saw that Nietzsche’s idea of power had a dual nature. That is, power could be either positive or negative. The demonstration of this power is dependent on the value ethos of an individual. McClelland (1975:13-21) identified four value positions within an individual’s self-development to achieve self-overcoming or freedom. These positions, which may be experienced at different or at similar times are: “It strengthens me”, “I strengthen myself”, “I have impact on others” and “It moves me to do my duty”.
The first position occurs when an individual acquires power through service to powerful others (shared power). However, negative power occurs if the individual feels that these powerful others are more in control of their life than they are. The second position could be exemplified through the occupation of psychology. A psychologist has the sensation of greater personal power by being able to understand another individual’s thoughts, feelings and behaviours. A pathological example of position two is obsessive compulsiveness, where an individual attempts to control every thought or action they understand and/or experience. Position three could occur when an individual has become a highly influential competitor in the game of life, such as sports people, sales people or even the gurus within the helping professions. Their goal is often to compete, win and have power over all others. Even helping behaviours implicitly entail power, sometimes with a racial tone. For example white Australians may have felt more powerful at the expense of the black indigenous population, after imposing their superior paternalistic or maternalistic values through the act of caring. An extreme case of this is where an individual may feel so ‘overpowered’ that they may become overpowering themselves and want their way always and may revert to violent crimes, such as rape, theft or murder, or even smother love of a child (McClelland, 1975) to achieve it. The fourth position involves an individual who may decide to become a member of a group and “act on others, on behalf of a higher authority” (McClelland, 1975:20), such as managers of large corporations. The manager’s actions are always on behalf of the company, not manager’s own. Indeed some individuals may believe they are working on behalf of God and commit crimes against others to achieve that end. McClelland (1975:21) believes that ‘power plays’ may lead to murders or wars, and that the “power plays, based on collective authorities, carry a far more dangerous potential than power plays
based on individual authority”. Nietzsche believed that the feeling of power, gained through collective authorities, such as the State or societal institutions, was an error of judgment and that individuals would be best to experience their “will to power” personally, through the utilisation of independent interactive situations rather than through collective actions (Denneson, 1999). With such collective actions the impact of the individuals’ personal “will to power” over others is reduced. This allows the collective others greater space to make their decisions with a lesser fear of punishment.

Those collective actions that inhibit bad behaviours, e.g. those of self-interest and against the institutions of the church, became sinful and immoral and in need of correction or legitimisation. Societal behaviours of self-abasement and conformity, performed in the interests of others only, were seen as correct and legitimate (Kaufmann, 1968 and Denneson, 1999). Nietzsche viewed actions performed for another individual as being psychological errors, declaring that no action was enacted from a truly altruistic position (Denneson, 1999). Consequently, Denneson (1999) argued in support of Nietzsche’s belief that to force individuals to act in an altruistic fashion was to keep them at the level of the herd and suppress any natural instincts of the feeling of power.

Nietzsche also argued that it is possible to achieve the “will to power” through performing egoistic actions for an individual to fulfill their “will to power” and possibly provide another with an opportunity of fulfilling their “will to power” also. This behaviour could create a situation where it was possible to have a balanced recognition of power for all involved. As stated previously, McClelland (1975) has
shown through his four positions of power development, and Nietzsche through his writings on the “will to power”, that power has a dual nature and may be monitored via different power performances (Kaufmann, 1968). Thus when an individual is aware, understands and monitors their own underlying theme of power by observing its severity, the individual will be in a far greater position to take control and redirect any destructive behaviours they experience. Therefore, it is possible to recognise that, through cooperative behaviours with others, all individuals are capable of experiencing power (McClelland, 1975). For Nietzsche happiness is “the most alive feeling of power” (Kaufmann, 1968:196) because happiness is freedom. If this is so, then the culturally invoked “will to power” operates with happiness at the upper most end of an individual’s understanding. Nevertheless desires of envy and admiration are also to be expected. Additionally, individuals operating from either a Fear Discourse (FD) or a Protective Discourse (PD) have the least understanding of power and Nietzsche believes may often be involved (consciously or unconsciously) in the inflicting of hurt or injury on another individual (Kaufmann, 1968).

It could be said that life is essentially not a struggle for survival, rather, a basic psychological drive for the “will to power” in order to gain personal freedom. This “will to power” can be either a positive, creative understanding of the “will to power” understood through a Detached Discourse (DD), or a worldly power (FD/PD), which was administered originally from the patriarchal institutional regimes that Nietzsche discusses (Kaufmann, 1968) as being evil and culturally and societally invoked. Nietzsche was supported by Kaufmann (1968) and Patton (1993) when he revealed how to transform this everyday theme of evil (worldly power - FD/PD), into artistic creativity of power sharing (overcoming of resistance - DD) self-awareness, self-
growth, self-preservation. The demonstration of the sharing of power increases through the transformation of the positive higher feeling of Nietzsche's "will to power" within all individuals (Kaufmann, 1968). This transformation from worldly power to the creative sharing of power occurs through the experiencing of suffering, struggling and the feeling of pain; mental, emotional and physical. When this pain becomes too much for the individual to withstand, the individual will search for another way to experience and express a heightened internal feeling of power.

The psychological phenomenon of fear of further pain, as described by Nietzsche, drives an individual to change (Kaufmann, 1968). Furthermore, this psychological phenomenon, illustrated by Nietzsche, identified fear as the most deplorable universal human trait (Kaufmann, 1968). Indeed, Nietzsche's idea of fear e.g. fear of loss, together with strong considerations for the opinions of others, has led individuals to conformity, powerlessness and the betrayal of their destiny (Kaufmann, 1968). Individuals, after allocating their interpretation e.g. religious beliefs, to another's values, have then used these values to make valuations about others. Nietzsche described this behaviour (essential rationalisations or self interest interpretations) as a blind desire for/against something, even though the individual may have no, or very little, estimation of its value (Kaufmann, 1968). In society when the powerful and supposedly good people dictated certain values as good, they were accepted and enforced by laws and societal norms. Nietzsche stated that as the creative internal feeling of power within individuals increased, so too did their awareness of morality. This created a transformation from a supposedly powerlessness and oppressed position, to a sharing of power, which in turn, has led to the present day ethics code of practice (Kaufmann, 1968). These powerless and
oppressed individuals inspired pity, sympathy and humility within others. This then made the powerless and oppressed powerful over others, especially through their power to manipulate and hurt others. Nietzsche believed that this subtle/hidden state of power was envied by the so-called powerful, who then changed the ethics codes, values and morals to create an illusionary position from which to enforce the illusionary state of democracy (Kaufmann, 1968).

Kaufmann (1968) and Denneson (1999), did not see Nietzsche’s idea of desire as evil, but saw it as a necessary part of human existence. Indeed Nietzsche believed that desire was a necessary element of survival. Consequently, speaking out about sex could be seen as providing an individual, through this acceptable form of discourse, with an avenue for the gaining of power. By appearing weak or enslaved by their problem and in need of therapeutic assistance by a professional or master these individuals attained a form of power over another. Such situations form an avenue for working towards an individual’s future goal, freedom. Those individuals who did not gain freedom were placed in a position of relative weakness. Although weakness is often thought of as being totally without power, Nietzsche identified those who have the desire to hurt others as individuals who lack the sense of their own power, but have the desire to increase it in their lives (Patton, 1993). Thus, one way to increase the feeling of power is for an individual to act in the position of the weaker or enslaved.

Nietzsche believed that an individual’s “will to power” was not within the possession or control of professionals within institutions (Kaufmann, 1968). Instead he argued that individuals retained such power, even though it may be unacknowledged by that individual. Nevertheless, the institution provided a safe
location within which the individual could gain their pleasure and happiness (which could be against the values and morals of the powerfully established institutional laws if expressed elsewhere). The speaking out against such institutional laws, in a safe location, was essential for the individual’s understanding of their own hidden feeling of power (Denneson, 1996 and Kaufmann, 1968).

Within today’s society many individuals are speaking out against the regulation of pleasures that were previously hidden through the many laws established by political and religious groups (Foucault, 1990). The gaining of pleasure through power, Nietzsche stated, has been recognised and fought for as a means of increasing one’s feeling of internal power via a pleasurable interaction (Kaufmann, 1968). Foucault (1990) recognised the increasing of one’s power within relationships as occupying a productive role, and as being exercised within numerous interactions that have been of a non-egalitarian nature.

2.5 Gender Differences

In past generations, the domination by men within relationships has been socially sanctioned, allowing for individuals to believe that masculinity is more powerful than femininity. Physical strength was seen as placing men in the stronger gender position. Males have successfully overpowered females who were positioned as the weaker gender. Women were believed, by many men, to be a ‘necessary’ possession that enabled the continuation of the human species, as well as the patriarchal males object of desire for pleasure through power over others (Kaufmann, 1968). Hence, women were used for their reproductive capabilities and their position as an object (Hollway, 1998). In spite of this, women struggled against their
oppression by men. At times women appear to have utilised the two weaknesses of men eg: desire for pleasure and a reproductive possession to their advantage and to increase their position of power and status through being attractive to men (Hollway, 1998).

Society, through the Christian church, had and has the advantage of unquestionable power over others through the faith and fear of its parishioners. Despite this, it has supported values that have allowed women to be considered worthy of a man’s respect, and the commitment to marriage before reproduction or sexual intercourse. These conditions, however, still permitted the achievement of the goals and values of men, being to reproduce the human species and the desire to control women by positioning them as objects of ownership.

Nevertheless, women over the years have questioned this subordinate position in their desire to feel in control of their own life and be an active participant to initiate sexual relations, not just to be positioned as a male play object. In the past, men learned many harassing actions, such as wolf whistling and bottom pinching that created a position of domination over women. Many women who fought for their freedom through resistance conflict, sought a powerful and influential position of respect, that could lead to a further redefinition of both the masculine and feminine roles within society. MacKinnon (1987) supports this by stating that women often needed to occupy a male position of aggressiveness in order to achieve a position of power and respect.
2.6 **Resistance**

An effective instrument of resistance and change has been the pen. The writings in feminist discourses have reached many individuals within society. Foucault (1990) has observed that where power resides, within an interaction, particularly in the forms of opponent, object, champion, master or manager, so does resistance reside. An example of this would be the slave (the object/victim) who challenges or creates conflict in regard to the master’s dominating directives (chores). However the slave can also participate in power sharing by accepting the master’s directives and fulfilling them. By accomplishing their chores the slave’s (victim’s) position is respectfully appreciated and enhanced in the eyes of the master and the slave, thus increasing the feeling of power for both individuals and the possibility for freedom of the self. Nietzsche has defined the increase in the feeling of power as evolving from the slave’s understanding or recognition of the master’s ignorance of the consequences of their domination and the desire of all individuals to increase their feeling of power. This understanding of the inviolate nature of the feeling of power allows the slave to increase their feeling of power. The enslaved individual only achieves this recognition, once they have experienced suffering or pain, through feeling they are powerless and through their actions of resistance. These actions of resistance provide the individual with conflictual situations which, if the individual is in a position for personal change, will lead them to the understanding that to defend or show resistance for their position, will only lead to more conflict and struggles for self. It is through the recognition of not wanting to experience more conflict for self that the individual is able to refrain from demonstrating resistance, and understand that they are now able to reposition themselves beyond their previous position of self-awareness. These actions of recognition, understanding and accomplishment,
Nietzsche believes, enhance the slave's/victim's feeling of power to a greater degree than any confrontational interactions, towards the master would have (Patton, 1993). The result of such recognition is the overcoming of the desire to show resistance to the master's orders. To have an outspoken voice is no longer necessary for these individuals as they have enough self-awareness that they can recognise the issues of the other and leave these issues to the other, without their interference. Burr (1998) claimed that these different positions (slave/master:victim/dominator) within relations of power, had eventuated from the individual's personally learned interpretations of family and social situations, which have at times prevented them from further self-awareness. The discursive approach of some feminist writers (for example Hollway, 1998) has challenged the previous male dominated psychological discourses. Indeed Foucault (1990) and Gergen (1991) have helped in the understanding of an individual's recreated position of freedom. This change in discourse, in part, has been accomplished through the deconstruction of existing discourses. It was also through the individual's struggle against the oppression of women that many women gained a new sense of their own power. These historical and new discourses have assisted individuals in the reproduction of the heterosexual relationship in a multitude of reflexive states. Thus Burr (1998) has proposed that even these self-aware, positive and powerful positions that many feminists describe in their discourses, are only an illusion of democratisation within any relationship because they have further constructed themselves into the vain dominating male position, for example, the former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.
2.7 Democratisation

The illusion of democracy exists because not everyone is equal or receives the same benefits, be it in the working environment (the glass ceiling), the home environment (the allocation of housework) or in personal relationships, (dedication to sexual partner or carer role) such as the heterosexual relationship. Denneson (1999) argued that Nietzsche rejected the idea of democracy, and declared it the state of the consciousness of the herd, where the institutional dominating members of society would like to position the others as powerless. The implications of this state of powerlessness have often been resistance. An individual who is aware of the many relations of power may act to increase their feeling of power by moving onto another experience that is beneficial to them without becoming attached to the previous, unbalanced dominating herd like experience. It has been through discourse that many individuals have created differences in their relationships due to their past experiences, which influence their interpretation and meaning allocation to any situation. Indeed, the performance of democracy in past patriarchal generations has not always been obvious, as many discourses have consisted of both suppressed and expressed knowledge. These suppressed and invisible discourses created the environment where resistance and struggle by many females could occur, and at times, increased their feeling of power (Hollway, 1998; Kaufmann, 1968). As knowledgeable individuals, females within their personal (heterosexual) relationships have struggled for the same goals as females within society generally, and they have thus achieved a more positively shared dominant position for all females. Nonetheless, Nietzsche stated that it was the belief in this illusionary democracy that led to an individual’s lack of self-awareness or understanding of self and others, resulting in painful experiences that help them to re-evaluate and reinterpret their
democratic values, leading to change and increase in self-overcoming (Denneson, 1999). Kaufmann (1968) supported Nietzsche when he stated that all struggles, even the struggle for equal rights and democracy, are really only a struggle for power over others (vanity), to achieve increased happiness, to gain lasting pleasure and satisfaction, as well as to increase self growth and self-preservation (Denneson, 1999).

Nietzsche argued that some individuals have renounced this illusionary gaining of the feeling of power through power over others. When this has happened they have often experienced an internal change or self-overcoming by reversing their desire for the feeling of power over others, replacing it with the feeling of power over self (Patton, 1993 and Kaufmann, 1968). This experience of their own destruction or change in consciousness of the former vain self occurs through personal growth as the individual enhances their understanding of self and others, leaving behind their old outdated understanding of power. Such actions of recreating self then result in consciousness enhancement, which Patton (1993) understood from Nietzsche’s work as being described as self-overcoming.

2.8 Self-Overcoming and Fear

Self-overcoming, according to Nietzsche, creates individuals who demonstrate power sharing within relationships, and counter balances the historically, culturally and socially learned need for power over others which is seen as paramount for survival (Patton 1993). Patton (1993:156) supported Nietzsche when he defined this cultural perspective as no more than a “spiritualisation and intensification of cruelty” thus leading to a position of power through the use of fear over others. Flax (1990 in
Gardiner, 1992) was in accord with Nietzsche's ideas and believed that culture of male dominance creates many problems that harm and plague society today. Some societal expressions of harmful power over others have been identified by Gardiner (1992:440) as: the fear and hatred of men towards women (possibly leading to violence); the positioning of women as merely mothers or sexual partners; and the "repressed middle-class nuclear family" that Freud believed was the norm. Nietzsche believed that if it were necessary for an individual to use power over another, it was most important to not harm the other and that the increasing of the feeling of power, through the use of harmful power over others, was only a temporary state (Patton, 1993) of vanity. These expressions of power over others have been interactively installed within society's system of rules, values and norms. Indeed Patton (1993) maintained Nietzsche's belief that the process of interactive power relations, where the passion of even distress or fear was initiated, created a most advantageous position for change, leading to self-overcoming. This self-overcoming involves an individual learning how to share the feeling of power with self and others through the process of giving of self or the giving up of their power position. This self-overcoming is important for the altering of an individual's internal feeling of power and the recognition of the differing instances of the sharing of power. Such a repositioning allows the individual to reclaim their feeling of power over their own bodies, to stop harassment, to discourage bias and sexism within language and discourse, and to encourage an objective view of themselves. These representations give highlight and acknowledgment of the situations where fear and hurt occur through discourse and discursive practices.
Those individuals who have continued to successfully advance their state of consciousness through self-overcoming have recognised the above practices as necessary for personal growth. Unfortunately for some, this goal of personal growth has been unknowingly, defined as dominance. Where such domination has occurred, interactive or shared responsibility has been of paramount importance (Gordon, 1980) and has provided the necessary painful experiences, which have lead to self-overcoming. The dominant relations of men within society have been recognised by many theorists (Hannam, 1993; Wang, 1999 & Flax, 1990 in Gardiner, 1992) as the instigators of culture, and the dominators of women and nature. They have also defined society as masculine, with femininity being compared to nature and thus powerless and subordinate. Hence, the feeling of power by men, through the domination of women and nature, or even the domination of one warring party over another, appears at that time to be a hindering process. However, this process of domination actually continues to assist all individuals within the interaction, with another opportunity to learn about the experiences of the qualitative active response of self-overcoming, through these continual recurrences of domination (Gordon, 1980). When an individual is detached from, but accepts, these continual changes of both fear (hate) and joy (love) of life and rejoices in them, they then allow self and others to further enhance their position of self-overcoming or self realisation (Twitchell, 1977 and Gordon, 1980).

2.9 The Reproduction of History

Stambaugh (1985) and Preuss (1980 in Stambaugh, 1985) supported Nietzsche by stating that an individual’s consciousness holds the dual meanings of ‘history’
(states of consciousness of the past). These dual meanings of history are both the understanding of the wider cultural roots of society and the individual's understanding of their own roots within society. These historical roots have provided a basis from which knowledge construction is being regenerated from within relationships between individuals (Gergen & Davis, 1985) and where creative action is decided upon, taken and re-experienced. A position of joint responsibility and an opportunity for an active sharing in the process of interpretation is thus created. This process has provided many positions for the remaking of cultural standpoints, and has been an inescapable part of knowledge making (Williams, 1999), while also providing positions relative to the increased sharing of the feeling of power.

These positions or performances have been dependent on their locational relationship within a particular sequence of contextual events, e.g. family relationships, development of intimacy and the aging process. They need to be analysed in relation to their interactive patterns across extended periods of time and within many different contextual situations. An individual needs to be reflexively accountable for any interpretations of the other's stories, as well as, his or her own process of uncovering or recognising the differences that impact on those interpretations (Reay, 1996). The magnitude and intensity of an individual's responses, therefore, must be considered in relation to the multitude of simultaneously occurring contextual situations (Gergen, 1978) and the individual's overlayed differences of interpretation (Reay, 1996). For these reasons the cause/effect duality, under these conditions, has been found to be inappropriate when studying individuals. Nietzsche and ecologists, such as Colwell (in Hallman, 1991) and Hallman (1991), state that all living things in nature are dependent on the interrelated and
interdependent workings of life and their recurring nature. While the life of all living things, both human and animal, is a continuously living, growing and decaying process, where culture perpetuates domination over others, and is only found favourable to those individuals who legitimise self serving discourses and discursive practices. Thus, shared power and shared responsibility create the balance of nature (Hallman, 1991) and increases the opportunities for further recreation of the internal feeling of power.

2.10 Harm

Those individuals who are not involved in power sharing and who practice harmful power over others, re-instigate and allow for an endlessly repeated history of harmful cultural domination over others (for example, males over females) through their human patriarchal values of domination (Wang, 1999) and arrogance (Hallman, 1991). They are neglecting their responsibilities to themselves and others. The accepting of these responsibilities would lead to the performance of the feeling of creative qualitative inner power over self, and the willingness to enhance the feelings of power in others, which would lead to a greater degree of self-overcoming. Individuals who have this ability, due to their understanding of past experiences, Nietzsche stated, creatively increase their feeling of power through qualitative self-transformation and thus become sovereign individuals (Patton, 1993). Indeed, these individuals do not require a political ruler or state rules. They are individuals who "possess a heightened sense of their own power; are capable of responsibility for their own actions" and are willing to stand in a power relation of mutual respect for one another, known by Nietzsche as honour (Patton, 1993:159). They will, Nietzsche believes, grant concessions of the sense of power to others, based on their own sense
of power (Patton, 1993). Such individuals are mostly self-legislating, responsible and, depending on their degree of self-overcoming, may leave harm caused by another to go unpunished eg: by not suing others. When most individuals are of sovereign self rule, the state’s rules and its power will be made obsolete. For example, Nietzsche stated that when criminals realise their error and punish themselves, the justice system will overcome itself and be unnecessary (Patton, 1993). Hallman (1991) further relates Nietzsche’s belief in this process of self-rule and self-overcoming to a world where there is no beginning or ending, where life continues to transform itself, through growth and self-deconstruction. Thus human culture is of no greater force than nature itself.

2.11 Shared Responsibility and Self-Overcoming

These views of Nietzsche are supported by Summers and Tudor (2000) who believed that all individuals hold a position of responsibility that is mutually constructed through the discourse of shared power and commitment. Conversations or interactions allow for the further recreation of self and others (Patton, 1993). This process of the recreation of self and others (self-overcoming) may be achieved through an interaction that allows for the individual’s understanding of their internal desire for power and the external realities or interpretations of their past and present experiences. In Gordon (1980), Nietzsche’s presentation of the teachings, visions and thoughts of Zarathustra in relation to internal desire and external realities, provides the basis for the construction of these multiple positions of self-overcoming:

1. Responsibility
2. Strength and Courage
3. Creativity
4. Giving
5. Acceptance
6. Listening to the Inner Voice of Self

These positions often reflect the dual nature of beliefs and their consequences. The first position occurs when an individual endeavours to accept and acknowledge their responsibility within many situations for self and others. These burdens of responsibility have been accepted because the individual believes that personal destiny will be revealed through their ability to withstand many difficult interactions that strengthen their personal endurance. However, if the individual becomes overly attached to these responsibilities, then envy, resentment and even revenge, may dominate their attitude (Gordon, 1980).

The second position, that of strength, occurs when an individual learns to live courageously with the freedom that they have attained, through the responsibility and overcoming of old historical values and attachments. Initially, the courageousness of the individual is dominated by the struggle to capture freedom. The struggle provides many individuals with the opportunity to learn the discourses and discursive practices of balanced courageousness (Gordon, 1980).

The third position is the use of creativity within all situations. Individuals often overwhelm themselves as they strive for ultimate power and ultimate responsibility within all situations. It occurs when an individual learns to express their will to power in a creative fashion by revealing alternative options. Within this position individuals also experience how to have conscious power over others, if
desired. It is the time when they can creatively determine how to experience the feeling of power for themselves, and offer this feeling of power to others, for their personal experiential growth. These three developmental positions are inter-experiential and may not always occur in chronological order. Indeed, all three may occur at one time, or be experienced in differing orders.

The fourth position, the giving of self, occurs when an individual identifies the necessity to give, and gives willingly to self and others. At times, however, the giving can overwhelm both the giver and the receiver. The giver can become either subservient to the giving or self indulgent to the praise of others through the giving, while the receiver can react by demonstrating resistance to the constant unnecessary giving.

The fifth position, acceptance, shows an individual’s recognition for the need of warmth and support from others. This attitude allows for an individual to have the freedom to accept what others give, without the sense of obligation. For those who have not developed this self-overcoming there is no acceptance or the acceptance is conditional on subjugation.

The sixth and final position, listening to the inner voice of self, involves inner voice of self (or intuition), not a dialogue with self. Stambaugh (1985) identified this as the art of listening to the inner or internal voice of Soul, the self, and the sensing of their relation to nature. This then provides “freedom” in the true sense and allowing Soul recognition and recreation, through self-overcoming. Such dialogue, the talking to one’s self, Nietzsche believes hinders the progress of self-overcoming, and
prevents the inner voice of Soul from providing the true sense of freedom (Stambaugh, 1985) and prevents the power to overcome oneself (Kaufmann, 1968).

2.12 My Reworking of Nietzsche

It has been through the dedicated work of Kaufmann and other theorists that Nietzsche's theory of power, known as the “Will to Power”, has allowed individuals to understand patriarchal power and it has been these thoughts that have led to a greater understanding of a form of power that is balanced. I have taken ideas of a patriarchal power to a position of balanced power within this study, although the outcome of balanced power through power sharing will be shown not to be the inevitable outcome of most interactions. Kaufmann (1968) argued that Nietzsche wrote how power drives or motivates all actions of men and women and that this power influences all thoughts, feelings and behaviours that may ultimately lead to freedom through the increasing of an individual’s feeling of power. Kaufmann goes on to acknowledge that social institutions have dictated who may or may not increase this feeling of power, and how this feeling of power may be increased or extinguished. He also identified that there are barriers to overcome in order to reach a position of freedom, however, this position may not be gained without experiencing pain, suffering and the perception of loss in relation to this internal feeling of power. From this position of difficulty and pain an individual may look for alternative positions of the “Will to Power”, such as a position of sharing power. To understand this position of sharing power, men and women would need to be aware of how negative (patriarchal) and positive (altruistic) actions suppress any natural instincts of the feeling of power and that the most alive feeling of power is happiness, which leads to the ultimate goal of freedom.
I have reworked Kaufmann's (1968) rereading of Nietzsche's approach into three simple discourses. I did this to provide individuals with multiple organisations of the different ways that power may appear in couple relations. It has been my experience that power is the underlying current behind all interactions and it is this current that is made obvious through the verbal and nonverbal demonstrations of individuals. To me the only possible way to highlight and simplify these verbal and nonverbal demonstrations was to utilise discourse analysis. Discourse analysis provides an avenue of analysis where the deconstruction of people's demonstrations can be made obvious and simple. After making the discourse of individuals obvious and simple it is my desire that they will look more deeply into his or her inner self and discover the peace, love and shared current of the true self, rather than, just addressing the external automatic demonstrations that keep them operating from the level of the herd. This reworking has acknowledged the two parts of Kaufmann's work and Nietzsche's theory, the internal desire for power and the external manifestation of this desire for power through narratives and discourses. The three discourses I have developed are the Fear Discourse (FD), the Protective Discourse (PD) and the Detached Discourse (DD). The FD and the PD are discourses that constitute power over others, whereas the use of the DD is a discursive position that focuses on the sharing of power and the increasing of the feeling of power for all within any interaction. Thus their approaches have been made more conducive with narrative analysis by presenting them in the form of discursive organisation.

The internal "will to power" may be exercised as a less appropriate (Fear Discourse-FD or Protective Discourse-PD) or more appropriate (Detached Discourse-DD) means for attaining an increased feeling of power. The Fear Discourse and
Protective Discourse involves the feeling of power gained by exerting one's will over another individual, while the DD involves an increase in the feeling of power through the knowledge or recognition that all individuals have unequal and differing levels of power within an interaction. It is through this recognition and understanding that the DD allows an individual the position to behave or speak in such a way that they inevitably feel they have gained superiority over others, which thus increases their feeling of power. This desire to increase the feeling of power may appear in disguised forms, such as the desire for freedom, peace, submission, shame and guilt or through the act of praising others. As Wang (1999) stated, power is not always obvious and, as the history of culture concerning power over others has emphasised, the master and slave consciousness of using fear to gain the feeling of power has been pervasive. According to Kaufmann (1968), Nietzsche's concept of the development of consciousness enables the position of self-transformation or the "overcoming" of nihilism, i.e. over coming external feelings of power, such as the lack of belief in moral principles, religion, duties, established laws and institutions or where there is only an interest in self-promotion.

Hollway (1998) argues that an individual commits to a heterosexual relationship due to their desire for the other, and that the discourses in which they take up positions within this relationship allow individuals to increase their feeling of power. This desire reproduces discourses that perpetually reconstruct gender differences, meanings, values and practices to recreate the individual's subjectivity or position the individual as an object or subject, within the discourse. Relationships can become unbalanced when one individual is always positioned (FD & PD) as 'object' and the other is always positioned as 'subject'. A balanced relationship occurs when
each individual recognises their dual or changing role as subject or object in different situations (DD). Hollway (1998) and Nietzsche both believe that discourse is an external source for the fulfillment of desire or the external expression of an individual's values and practices, which help to increase their feeling of power. Hollway (1998:228) contends that "heterosexual relations are the primary site where gender difference is re-produced" and that the externally constituted desire for power is the motivating force for the continuance and reproduction of these differences. This feeling of power will be shown to be a socially or externally driven worldly power over others, as well as an internally driven creative problem solving feeling of shared power, or a combination of both.

2.13 Creativity and Sensitivity

The third position of Gordon's (1980), creativity, can be defined as being like the child using imagination in acts of play or the ability to be imaginative within all situations. It is this creativeness that nurtures a zest for life. Through this zest for life complete freedom from the past, shared power and shared responsibility can be experienced by all within any interaction (Gordon, 1980 and Troemel-Ploetz, 1994).

At times solitude or withdrawal from society is necessary for further creativity, self understanding and the strengthening of the inner feeling of power. A person with some self-understanding, who has abandoned many societal values, and does not desire to accept or create new values, may find him or herself trapped in the claws of passivity or apathy, with fear eventually consuming them and preventing their further acceptance of responsibility (Gordon, 1980). Such passivity and fear, including the leaving of responsibility to others, may eventually blind the individual
to the necessity of all individuals, to interact with shared responsibility. If this shared responsibility is overlooked, or is believed to be occurring when it is not, the individual may erroneously believe they are increasing their position of sharing over control and vanity. This action creates an illusion of personal growth when there is none. Indeed, there can be only personal growth when there is interaction with life.

The only danger with this creative love for life, and the individual’s internal desire for the feeling of power, is the demonstration of over responsibility. By acting overly responsible the individual relieves another individual of their responsibilities and thus influences them to feel powerless. Such an experience of powerlessness can lead to passivity and disinterest in creative thought. An example of this situation would be a wife who has taken on the many responsibilities of the family. Consequently, learning how to share the feeling of power and responsibility with all members of the family is at risk and may blind them to their unconscious adopted role within the family. An experience that challenges the status quo may be necessary to assist the family members to creatively re-evaluate their roles, the values pertaining to these roles and their life style, and to creatively develop more power sharing roles to achieve self-overcoming accomplishments.

2.14 Choices of Action (Giving or Taking)

In order to find the balance between the internal unconscious desire for the feeling of power and the external performances created through the mind, known as creativity, an individual needs to use discrimination. Solitude can be a necessary element for increased self-overcoming, when the discriminatory experience of decision making between staying or going, stopping or starting occurs (Gordon,
This same decision-making ability is utilised when deciding whether to be authoritarian, powerful and controlling over others (masculine) or creative and transformational (feminine) (Rosener, 1990 in Troemel-Ploetz, 1994, Gardiner, 1992, Hannam, 1993 and Wang, 1999). Men and women achieve this transformational creative style of interaction through power sharing with others (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994). The authoritarian style of action, however, is the more traditional patriarchal dominating male style used to gain the feeling of power (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994).

This feeling of power may be accomplished by understanding one’s own experiences through increased communication and participation in interactions. The skills associated with this style (increasing the feeling of power for the self and others) encourages participation with others through the sharing of power and information, through enhancing other people’s self-worth and encouraging others to be self-overcoming (Rosener, 1990 in Troemel-Ploetz, 1994 and Worzbyt & Zook, 1992). To enhance another individual’s self worth and to encourage their enthusiasm within a situation, it is necessary to ‘give’ praise, positive feedback and compliments (position four) or to utilise the terms ‘us’ or ‘we’, when talking with others to encourage or include them into the present situation (Worzbyt & Zook, 1992). These behaviours achieved in conjunction with the art of communication and the individual’s ability to overcome their own fears, “suspend their own reality and empathically deal with the reality of others” (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994). In giving, many individuals have also learnt that the giving of service or assistance to another individual is more important than the working project or being totally task orientated. Many women, through their experiences within patriarchal dogmas, have faced their fears through the positive internal evaluation of self, to overcome fear and develop a
more relaxed and loving manner. They have also developed enough humility and objectification, through self understanding, communication and patience, to openly discuss and write about how they faced their fears and took the positive actions necessary in overcoming any socially constructed, negative male biases (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994). Thus, many women have become master of their own destiny, by recreating the most important insight in life, and through the joy of giving to others and not being the slave to another individual’s domination.

Gordon (1980) supported Nietzsche by stating that withdrawal, isolation or the act of solitude, is sometimes necessary for clear detached thinking, and to further personal growth and self-overcoming. For example, a couple own a business and there are numerous activities that each of them must accomplish. When the wife cannot creatively problem solve in one area of the business, she may ask her husband to take over some of her other activities so she can withdraw from those activities to gain a clearer and more creative perspective. When this is done some patriarchal barriers may be broken down, leading to the sharing of responsibilities and providing support to each other (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994).

Pile and Thrift (1995) have identified some men, within a male created rational culture, that believe they are able to survive and grow without love or support. This is in contrast to many women who have learnt to creatively love and experience life, through discussions with other individuals, despite their experiences of domination. Thus they are able to strengthen their own feeling of power and share those feelings with others within many interactions (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994). As the self is mutually constructed through narratives or stories, a sharing of similar and
dissimilar information, between all individuals within an interaction, allows for new and creative meanings to be allocated to old transactional truths (Summers and Tudor, 2000). Instead of the old traditional truths of domination, shared power through shared responsibility is available. It can be seen that the sharing of power becomes the mutual construction of meaning within an interaction. This occurs through the principles of “we”-ness and shared responsibility. If disagreement occurs within the interaction, then the sharing of power has not been appropriately utilised and so another possible learning experience has presented itself. These actions provide individuals with an increase in their feeling of power, and promote a situation of shared responsibility, encouraging the goal of increased self-awareness and development, for example self-overcoming (Summers & Tudor, 2000).

These shared realities have been constructed, and may be performed, through language as a social practice (Williams, 1999 and Gergen & Davis, 1985). Knowledge in this respect is not something we possess but something we perform, act or do. It is also dependent upon a collective use of the many different forms of language that are shared practices or demonstrations of knowledge. Inter-subjective knowledge demonstrations, through corresponding language use, have also led to preconditions for social constructions.

Therefore, it is of great importance for all individuals within their couple relations to be observant of these social constructions and creatively problem solve their own demonstrations of power sharing and commitment, not only their partner’s. This greater understanding of both individual’s demonstrations of commitment and power sharing within their relationship will lead to a more fulfilling experience for
increasing the feeling of power and responsibility through commitment, for both individuals, while in the relationship or not. Those individuals seeking power over the other, lack shared responsibility. The research question of “How does an individual’s styles or themes of commitment change within and between three of their previous heterosexual relationships?” has provided a commitment point from which further research about commitment within heterosexual relationships has been made possible. From this research, further research questions will be asked as it has provided three different themes (FD, PD, DD) that are practices of commitment with existing society. These practices provide the opportunity for critique and their existence thus provides a commencing position for their social change. The next chapter will describe the development of this piece of research and will address the research question previously mentioned.
Chapter 3  

Method

3.1 Introduction

Narrative Analysis is a method of qualitative research that is growing in interest. Researchers are realising that quantitative research methods can be limiting when trying to gain insight into an individual’s life experiences (Kohler Reissman, 1993). “It is possible to examine gender inequalities, racial oppression, and other practices of power that may be taken for granted” (Kohler Reissman, 1993:5) by individuals. Through the implementation of Narrative Analysis, researchers support participants as they explain and attach meaning to personal stories. Researchers then transform these stories into written texts (narratives), examine and analyse these narratives for common profiles or themes. These researchers identify relationships, develop understanding and create meaning of the participant’s experiences (Oliver, 1997).

The question guiding this research is “How does an individual’s styles or themes of commitment change within and between three of their previous heterosexual relationships?” As Nietzsche has argued, an individual’s feeling of power changes due to the life struggles they experience. It was Nietzsche’s work that guided me in my research to reveal an individual’s styles or themes of commitment, which are influenced by their feeling of power, and may have changed within or between an individual’s present or previous relationships. Three styles or themes of commitment emerged from the reading of participant transcripts. These three styles or themes were demonstrated within discourses of fear, protection and detachment. The Fear Discourse, which will often be referred to as (FD), was demonstrated when a participant utilised power over others through avoidance, denial, domination and control. The Protective Discourse, which has been referred to as (PD), was demonstrated by participants through the
discursive practices and discourses of over protection, smothering, mothering, control and domination through being overly responsible for others. Whereas, the Detached Discourse, which is often referred to as (DD), was demonstrated through the discourses or discursive practices of participants as a balance of sharing power with others. Thus three specific styles or themes constitute this study. In chapters four through to ten I will analyse the twelve participants’ narratives using these three styles or themes as my framework.

3.2 Narrative Analysis

Within Narrative Analysis the skills and procedures associated with semi-structured interviewing have taken prominent importance for me when performing my research. These skills and procedures, such as my prepared questions (Appendix D) have guided the interaction to a conversation style interview. This guidance allowed both parties the opportunity for the narrative to direct the course of the interview and the giving of greater control to the participant (Kohler Reissman, 1993). Contrastingly, participants within a Narrative Analytical style of interview are viewed as experiencing subjects who actively construct their social worlds, while the primary issue is to generate data which gives an insight into people’s experiences. A main way of achieving this has been through semi-structured, open-ended interviews with individuals whose information is usually based upon prior, in-depth participant observation (Silverman, 1993). Thus researchers who apply this methodology prefer open-ended interviews (Silverman, 1993). Denzin (1993 in Silverman, 1993) offers three reasons for this preference:

1. it allows respondents to use their ‘unique ways of defining the world’
2. it assumes that no fixed sequence of questions is suitable to all respondents
3. it allows respondents to raise important issues not contained in the schedule

When interviewing, the relationship between researcher and participant is one of collaboration. Participants are provided the opportunity to tell their stories, reflect, and retell stories, while the researcher listens to gain an understanding of the experience (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The researcher during the interview may challenge the participant's narratives to create further reflection and re-evaluation (Opie, 1992), therefore identifying the participant's meaning of the experience and enabling further constructive alternative possibilities for their future demonstrations within similar experiences (Green, 1995). The empowerment of these participants on a personal and broadly therapeutic plain can be achieved through the development of this qualitative interview style by using the practice of deconstruction of their narrative. This may lead to political reform that encourages the participants to recognise that they have a voice and are able to recreate social policy (Opie, 1992).

3.3 Participants

Due to the in-depth qualitative work necessary when researching the detailed reading of transcript data, individual interviews for this research study were conducted with a limited number of twelve participants (6 men and 6 women). The purpose of the interviews was to highlight the many aspects of participants' narratives of commitment within three different heterosexual relationships that have occurred within their life span. These participants were aged between forty to forty-nine years in order to secure participants who were more likely to have experienced three different long standing heterosexual relationships.
Participants were recruited through advertisements on notice boards (Appendix A) at Griffith University, on the Gold Coast, Queensland. On initially speaking with prospective participants, contact details were gained, and an information sheet (Appendix B) explaining my thesis and a consent form (Appendix C), were posted to each participant. These papers provided all the necessary information for them to make an informed decision as to whether to participate in this study.

After five days, I made further contact with these prospective participants, asking if they would like to participate. There was no further contact concerning this topic if participants declined to participate. If participants did wish to participate, the first to confirm their desire for participation were accepted, and a day and time was arranged for individual interviews, at Griffith University Library.

3.4 Materials

A semi-structured questionnaire was designed incorporating demographic information and a verbal feedback and debriefing instrument (Appendix D). The questions developed were asked in a sequential format, and were aimed at eliciting the many personal themes of participants relating to commitment. These personally spoken themes of data were gathered through the use of audio-tape recordings, which were later transcribed into written texts where each line was numbered for easy referencing. Initially, a detailed word for word transcription of conversations was completed with each line of text numbered. On completion of transcription, analysis was undertaken for the transcripts to be incorporated into my thesis.
3.5 Procedure

Griffith University Library was a safe environment and provided sound proof rooms for interviewing purposes. In addressing my own safety, I informed a friend of my appointments and whereabouts, and arranged a proposed time for me to contact them after completing the interviews.

The relationship between the researcher and the participant was one of collaboration and sharing. Throughout the interview I attempted to put the participant at ease. Initially I did this by introducing myself and speaking to the participant generally about the research. After this the participants were provided with the opportunity to tell their stories, reflect, and retell their stories, while I listened to gain an understanding of their experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). At different times during these interviews I asked more probing questions eg: tell me more, about the participant’s narratives to create further reflection and re-evaluation (Opie, 1992). This probing assisted in further identifying the participant’s meaning of their experience, and enabled a greater understanding and construction of alternative possibilities that they may utilise in the future (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

Each individual interview continued for approximately one and half hours and provision was made for participant debriefing and personal feedback before ending the session. I had previously arranged for a psychologist to provide free counselling for any participant who may have found himself or herself distressed due to the interview session. By being empathic and understanding of the participants’ experiences being discussed within this research, the participants and I found the study to flow with a shared feeling of power for individuals concerned.
All interviews were audio-tape recorded then thematically transcribed into narrative text, then analysed through the methodology of narrative analysis, which identified the meaningful themes of commitment within the interview text. Initially, a detailed word for word transcription of conversations was completed with each line of text numbered. On completion of transcription, analysis was undertaken for the transcripts to be reduced. The name of each participant was changed at the time of analysis in order that their identity not be revealed.

The text is selected by marking the passages that related to my research questions, which highlighted specific information of importance to the research question. I was then in a position to reflect on the intensity in which the participant spoke, the emotional content or tone of voice, contradictions, repetitiveness (Opie, 1992), unfinished sentences, as well as pauses in the narrative scripts (Kohler Reissmann, 1993).

On completion of highlighting those narratives of interest, I was able to construct profiles or common themes in the data. This process was conducted by classifying narratives and by grouping these narratives into relevant categories (Seidman, 1991), thus reflecting the shared aspects of participant’s experiences (Smith, Jarman & Osborn, 1999 in Murray & Chamberlain, 1999). It was also important that I allowed the narrative scripts to determine the categorising process (Seidman, 1991), rather than control them myself as would occur in traditional psychological research (Kohler Reissman, 1993), because this process allows for the similarities and differences of participants to become more obvious.

The final steps to narrative inquiry are the storing of the recorded interviews
securely by November, 2001 and all participants should be provided feedback on completion of the study, through the provision of a written copy of this research report. The purpose of this report is to provide readers insight into the motivation behind, and understanding of other people's experiences and truths, and to make obvious the knowledge gained from the project (Martin, 1994).

3.6 Epistemological Standpoints

Many truths and dichotomies have been found within the theory of traditional scientific research, which permeates western culture today. These truths have been presented as correct or incorrect, significant or non-significant. Some dichotomies, or dualities have included reason/emotion, objective/subjective, general/specific, knower/known and power/love, to name only a few. This research discusses truth and dichotomies, which I recognise as being in relation to the epistemological standpoints of Post structuralism and Feminism. The highlighting of these standpoints has been achieved by defining knowledge as an external, and objective reality, accessed by individuals who have knowledge through reason, and perception. Post structuralism involves the study of the social, contextual, historical, and political means of how individuals constitute knowledge, and interpret truth through their shared realities, while Feminist perspectives focus more specifically on the political aspects of human interactions (Hollway, 1989 and Weedon 1987 in Hollway, 1989).

Post structuralism will be presented here as an ethical epistemological perspective for inquiry into social processes. This standpoint has directed individuals in the understanding of how knowledge, in relation to shared realities and truth, would be better understood, or made more obvious. Post structuralist researchers have supported the
following assumptions in order to provide a working basis from which to position their research: there are multiple socially, contextually, historically, and politically constructed realities, which are open to contestation; these realities are both created (written) and interpreted (read) by individuals in relation to their present position; both the subjective (knower) and objective (known) states of self are mutually constitutive of one another, and are inseparable; it is necessary to reject determinism, the cause/effect duality, and appoint an interpretive approach for a greater understanding of individuals; knowledge is historically located, and culturally contingent, and individuals are motivated to be self-reflective of each of their positions, as knowledge is inescapably associated with the issues of value and power (Gergen, 1991). This research focuses on Post structuralist principles addressing the gaining of knowledge and power relations, and the corresponding use of these concepts within relationships. The individuals who utilise these concepts have acquired knowledge through their contextually constructed representations of reality, and the possible future realities, which are influenced by interactions with others, and the allocation of meaning by individuals.

Post structuralism is principally concerned with explaining the 'how', or the processes by which individuals arrive at a description, explanation, or account for the world in which they live. This epistemology can be divided into two elements: the social practices and multiple discourses. The social element supports the view that situations are always being challenged through discourses and discursive practices within any interaction. The element of multiple discourses supports the view that individuals are free agents in their selection of a discursive position, and are able to form their own realities from the infinite, available realities within this world (Hollway, 1989). Gergen (1991) has attempted to make obvious, or give life to, the many common forms of reality,
awareness, or understandings as they now exist, and investigates how these realities have existed in prior historical periods. It is important in researching the future existence of these individual realities, to determine how creative attention may be focused.

Reality has often been viewed as a continuous series of pendulum swings between quantitative analysis (for example, traditional psychological analysis), and critical qualitative investigations of research procedures, which have focused on questioning the notion of “truth”. Traditional analysis has defined the knowledge of an individual as being mental representations of an external and objective reality of a unitary rational subject, which has been accessed by individual ‘knowers’ through reason, and perception. This unitary rational subject’s nature is noncontradictory (accepting of truth), does not acknowledge the social and historical realities impacting on the present situation, and assumes that all individuals are fully equipped conscious single subjects, which are always rational and cognitive (normal). These unitary rational subjects are therefore defined by psychologists as having an altered degree of knowledge when performing outside of the acceptable limits of society (Hollway, 1989). This traditional understanding of knowledge supports the belief that, regardless of context, knowledge is accepted through the expression of verbalisations, which provide a ‘descriptive form of language’ (Gergen & Davis, 1985:10 and Williams, 1999). Within the context of the epistemological argument, the post structuralist perspective has supported the view that “knowledge making is an activity that takes place only within an interaction, and has been deeply shaped by a cultural context” (Gergen & Davis, 1985:10). Shared realities within interactions are constructed, and may be performed through language as a social practice (Williams, 1999 and Gergen & Davis, 1985:10). Knowledge in this respect is not something we possess, but something we perform, act,
or do. It is dependent upon a collective use of the many different forms of language that are shared practices, or demonstrations of knowledge. Inter-subjective knowledge demonstrations, through corresponding language use, have led to preconditions for social organisation. This is particularly important if an individual does not have an understanding of these knowledge demonstrations (Williams, 1999). For example, within a relationship individuals discuss themselves or their contextual realities from the point of view of what they know. If however, the partner has not had similar experiences, or has a limited understanding of the language descriptions being used, they may not comprehend the reality their partner is expressing from his or her own personal knowledge of truth. A consequence of this may be the belief that the partner is not telling the truth. Consequently, resistance, both verbal and non-verbal, may be experienced. This resistance may be believed to be unkind, negative or detrimental as few individuals are aware of the need for resistance and change, or it may be seen as unnecessary, and even welcomed as an avenue for improving the relationship and increasing each partner’s feeling of power.

3.7 Weaknesses and Strengths of Narrative Analysis

Even my verbal and non-verbal behaviours within the interview may create resistance and also enables the process of Narrative Analysis. Cortazz (1993) agrees and adds that social and cultural background, as well as gender, race and the age of the researcher and or the participant could lead to resistance or the enabling of this process. The limitations that Kohler Reissman (1993) has identified are the use of narrative analysis when interviewing a large number of participants. She believes this would not be advisable as specific outcomes would be difficult as the method is slow and painstaking due to the narratives of each individual being interwoven with social
discourses and relations of power, which will alter continuously within any given context. Seidman (1991) has recognised that Narrative Analysis has the limitation of generating large amounts of text and have the possibility of being time consuming and demanding on the researcher. Additionally, this style of narrative inquiry may involve moral conflicts. Moral conflicts can be represented as differing responses from participants due to the context or situations in which the interview is conducted. These contexts can be influenced by the conduct of the interview, the relationship between the researcher and the participant and their relative power, the strength of the connection between these individuals, the environment where the interview is conducted, what role the participant played within the situation being discussed, and the personal and cultural history of the participant in relation to the researcher. This potential for moral conflict was lessened when I first commenced my explanations of the study to the participant. As I attempted to perform the entire interview with an attitude of power sharing, it was believed that the participant’s feeling of power was increased, and conflictual situations decreased.

Seidman (1991) stated the strengths associated with narrative inquiry have been that researchers are able to understand people’s experiences from the individual’s perspective. These experiences have identified the social and organisational practices of tradition that have pervaded the contexts in which individuals function e.g. personal life and work. In addition, knowledge and understanding of individual realities is increased through interactions within a shared environment.

The ethical considerations of informed consent, no harm to clients, grief or distress and acknowledgment of any deception (Martin, 1994), confidentiality,
researcher’s experience and judgement of other people’s words (Stenner, 1993 in Burman & Parker, 1993) are necessary within any research. It is always necessary for all participants to be fully informed of any activities to be conducted within the research, as well as the gaining of their voluntary consent to these activities. All interview activities are to be structured in such a way as to not cause harm, grief or distress to participants. If these negative consequences are experienced by the participant, then appropriate counselling or debriefing is to be made available, and the acknowledgment of this possibility highlighted to the participant before the interview commences. Deception, the final though very important ethical consideration, is at times necessary when attempting to gain the desired information appropriate to the research criteria so as participant biases only minimally influence the data (Martin, 1994). The aspect of internal power was not overtly discussed in this research as it may have influenced the participants’ responses. The participants may have hidden their true feelings and beliefs concerning commitment and power when responding to the questions. These elements of power and commitment will be discussed in the following analysis chapters, thus recreating knowledge and understanding of the topic commitment within heterosexual relationships.
Chapter 4  

History of Power and Domination

In developing this analysis, I have been guided by the following themes which I have developed from my discussion of participants in chapter two. These themes were History of Power and Domination; Power Domination and Power Sharing; Discourse; Discursive Practices; the Discursive Positioning of Men; the Discursive Positioning of Women and the theme of Creative Problem Solving. Each of these themes will form a chapter as a basis of the transcript.

I will begin by discussing the theme of History of Power and Domination, which will provide the reader with a glimpse of the participant’s personal histories. This theme in particular discusses the way in which past relationships were reworked and rethought in the present and in the light of relationship failure. The three themes of Fear Discourse (FD), Protective Discourse (PD) and Detached Discourse (DD) will be utilised throughout this study to explain the stories of each participant. I developed these three themes after reading each of the participant’s transcripts. It became obvious to me that each of the participants used one of these themes, when demonstrating commitment within their relationships, or a combination of the three themes.

In this particular chapter I will talk about the participants, Keith, Phil, Wilma, Carmel, Melissa, Missy and Tony, as they have identified that the choices and positions that they have chosen in their life were often influenced by the historical doctrines of their past.
Keith

Keith expressed the view that he and his first wife, due to their historical or past experiences before marrying, had encountered many tensions and challenges during their marriage. Keith revealed this belief when he spoke of his "macho image from Sydney, and the way [he was] brought up" [line 187], as well as, his background of being "uneducated..., not having a trade..." [line 286], and having to "adapt to the situation as best as possible" [line 287] (FD). Keith also believed that these issues, that came into their relationship were some of the reasons for their marriage difficulties and eventual divorce [line 187, 188]. He went on to say that due to their historical background, and its effect on their relationship, "it was also very hard [for him] to change [his] personality, in some ways, when you don't know you've got the problem" [lines 188, 189 & 189.5] (FD). It was at these times in Keith's marriage that he felt it necessary to draw back or withdraw (DD) from the relationship in order to gain a clearer perspective about his fluctuating degree of commitment and provide his partner with a position she could use to reflect back on the situation.

119  ...It was sort of waving up
120  and down, up and down, all of a sudden I'd be fully committed, then I'd
121  draw back and then I'd fully commit meself. Then we split up in '85
122  and come back

Keith also believed that his wife brought with her a history of abuse, e.g. "molestation by the father" [line 453], which encouraged her to "fall in love with him as she was in need of a father figure" [lines 450 & 452]. Even so, Keith adored his wife, and stated he was very much in love with her.
...I loved her...
...and admired everything she did. That’s how far I committed myself...

Additionally, Keith identified the tension between his past macho, uneducated image [line 205,467], and his desire to change himself to someone within my discursive frame to who functions from a position of power balance. Due to Keith’s patriarchal background he demonstrated a macho image that correlated with the value position for increasing his feeling of power of “It moves me to do my duty”. I argue that Keith’s values and beliefs directed the theme of power over others, and his struggle was in attempting to change this theme to one of shared power by sharing responsibility with his wife, and working towards a position of self-overcoming.

These two positions were the catalyst for the interactions that he later chose to participate in, to reconstruct his knowledge, and thus his feeling of power.

I went back and studied at TAFE Adult Literacy Course.

Keith revealed the type of relationship he and his wife had, as being one which fluctuated between dominator (master) (FD) and victim (slave) (PD), not one of power sharing (DD). Keith stated that his wife, due to the abuse in her past, was very much the powerful or masterful individual, who he defined as the “...ruler” [line 244] of the relationship, and that due to this, they “virtually lived two different lives” [line 245]. The position that Keith stated that he had chosen for himself within his marriage was one of being a caring person [line 193]; he recognised that a macho dominating position, similar to the position he had held in the past, would be detrimental to them having a committed relationship [line 205,207]. This was not
how I expected a street young man living in Sydney to construct himself. Keith was aware of his lack of education and skills, and he spoke of how he demonstrated a lot more effort towards nurturing a creative, caring, responsible and power sharing relationship (DD).

192 My appreciation for the relationship was done in a different way. It
193 was done in an emotional.. caring way. I did let [Jane] all the way through
195 the relationship stand on her own two feet, be her own person. I give her
196 that much freedom that when she started to work that I wanted to show
198 her my commitment towards her amm getting ahead in life, that I looked
199 after the children a lot [of the] time

Keith's many struggles led him to identifying that change was necessary, he chose to alter his demonstrations of commitment by using the third position of Gordon’s (1980) six positions. Within the third position an individual learns through experience about different ways to express their feeling of power through creativity within many situations, thus recreating their previously learned historical values, norms and beliefs. It is the time when individuals creatively determine how to experience the feeling of power for themselves and offer this feeling of power to others. This third position of learning creativity through experiences is very important as it provides abstract possibilities for the demonstration of increasing the feeling of power e.g: in this study, creative methods of demonstrating responsibility and commitment. It is the play, or the love, joy and freedom that may be found within this time of creativity, which is experienced when learning the cognitive function of creativity. It is this function that assists in increasing the feeling of power in a balanced way that would be best continued throughout all of life’s experiences.

It was through Keith’s further education, and the creative function of writing, that he was able to record the stories of his married life and remember the joy, love
and freedom that he did, at times, experience within this relationship. Keith recorded these stories in order that his sons would be able to know the positive power sharing side of the commitment that their parents shared during their marriage, not just the negative ones.

466.5 ...I couldn’t
467 write a letter when I started adult education in 1990 ...the only way
468 they could get me to use a computer, was to type... they said what
469 can you write and I said our holidays, our marriage, honeymoon and
470 that’s the only way they could get me to actually start to read and write.

462 I still believe that amm that we enjoyed ourselves, that it is part of me
463 and I’ve written that down for the kids to read later on. That they have
464 a memory of the commitment their mother and I did have at certain
465 periods of times through that relationship.

It is these responsible stories or narratives of power sharing, as well as, previous power domination experiences that Keith was involved in, that have shown him how to assist his children to learn creative ways to solve a problem. Keith’s children have already traversed with him through many difficult situations. He believes that they will remember and recreate these situations as their own historical norms [line 464], and take them into their own relationships, now and in the future. Without these added positive narratives of power sharing, the experiences these children remember may not have included an accurate example of the good times, due to the upsets and blaming that took place before and during their parents’ marriage break up. Hence, it may be these sharing narratives that assist in transforming the lives of these children, so that they to will know how to utilise power in an effective manner, and understand that Nietzsche’s concepts of power can be felt during both positive and negative experiences (Denneson, 1999). I have identified Hollway’s (1998) Have/Hold Discourse being unconsciously utilised by Keith as he appears to
be experiencing the struggle and pain between acting in a dominating manner (FD) and a giving and protective manner (PD). This struggle may be a result of the tension between his histories reproduction and his present situation. This struggle is one Keith is finding difficult to release himself from, and it is possible to infer that this struggle could be motivated by an unconscious internal drive to increase his feeling of power.

**Phil**

After leaving home and getting married, Phil expressed the view that his historical background, through the cultural and family training of morals, had led him to feel guilty when he did not abide by these socially accepted moral principles. The moral principles upheld within Phil’s family subsystem were the traditional capitalist and religious values, one such value being that to divorce was to fail as a man (Have/Hold Discourse). The belief that getting a divorce was not acceptable was so instilled in Phil that when it did come to the point of leaving his first wife, he also felt it was necessary to leave his hometown. Phil was a failure in his eyes and he believed himself to be a failure in the eyes of others. Phil did not realise, or maybe did not know of, another patriarchal belief connected to this Capitalist Christian principle: he should feel guilty because he was unable to control his wife. Social institutions have supported patriarchal beliefs and encouraged men to dominate women (Gardener, 1992), the object of useful pleasure in a man’s life. Control, domination or power over others, according to Denneson (1999), was generally Nietzsche’s theory for the negative driving force of the ‘will to power’. Wang (1999) stated that the will to power utilised the feelings of guilt and failure to gain power over others, as capitalist patriarchal beliefs have done. Hence, Phil’s belief that he was a failure could be
understood as a reaction to his historical, and traditional moral principle for the need to control, and to increase his own feeling of power, at the expense of another individual.

Failure as a man was not a position new to Phil. He spoke of himself as feeling a failure when he had “been estranged from [his] father, since [he] was about seventeen” [lines 562, 563]; this was not the appropriate demonstrations of support to the head of a Capitalist Christian family. However, “when [he] deserted [his] first wife, [while living] in that home town” [line 563, 565], he felt very ashamed and voiced the opinion that his mother also felt shame. His shame, he said, was so great that [he] only ever “went home but rarely” [line 566], and then only after dark. Even though it may seem an extreme measure for an individual to believe it necessary to leave their hometown due to the shame of a divorce, Gordon (1980) argued that, at times, it is necessary for an individual to withdraw from a particular situation. Such action may enable clear, detached thinking for personal growth and self-overcoming. However, Phil did not give himself space and time for such thinking. He found himself in the same painful situation, once again, when he married another woman (Denneson, 1999), and it was not until after this relationship he was able to recognise that there were other options in life that he could consider, e.g. living with a woman, not marrying her, and not having children. When Phil discussed his third relationship, he told how he no longer supported his past social belief of marriage and children. After two very painful divorces, Phil decided he did not need to be married, or have children, or to be as socially acceptable as he had needed to be in previous years. Indeed, Phil had reconstructed his knowledge of what was necessary for him within his life, and moved on to a greater awareness of himself and his needs, leaving behind
some of the Capitalist Christian principles from his past. Nietzsche has stated that
pain and suffering are often necessary for individuals, so as to fulfil their desire to
reconstruct themselves with a greater feeling of power. The suffering experienced by
Phil provided him with the training in how to be more creative, increase his
knowledge and construct a greater feeling of power over himself (Patton, 1993).
Dennison (1999) contended that these tensions or painful experiences, that Nietzsche
defined as necessary, were experienced when an individual had not progressed in their
learning of power sharing, to the position of personal growth. Phil, after many
struggles within his relationships, has now been able to make the decision not to
follow society’s ‘will to power’, and to be more aware of his own needs, thus
Nietzsche would understand him as acting in a more self-responsible manner.

In his interview, Phil contradicted his beliefs of traditional values and morals,
by leaving and divorcing his wife. Originally, Phil stated, that when you are brought
up a certain way, and with a certain set of traditional principles, you keep those
principles for the rest of your life; “women did what women did...men did what men
did” [lines 182,183,186]. Phil understood the contradiction of his own beliefs in the
stability of marriage and his final position, in terms of the struggle and the pain of the
married relationship. Nonetheless, he found it difficult to break free of those values
because of family and societal pressures eg: marriage, children. Phil decided to avoid
the pain of emotional and financial responsibility by avoiding certain situations in the
future. Phil described these as altered principles, to be kept for the rest of his life
[lines 462.8, 463, 464 & 464.8], and stated that these values or principles were
maintained even when experiences challenged their validity [lines 379, 438.5 &
441.5]. This dominance and avoidance are demonstrations typical of the Fear
Discourse.

404 I would never get married again
464.8 I certainly wouldn’t have any more children

Wilma

Wilma found it very difficult when she moved from New Zealand to Australia. She came to believe that the culture in Australia was so different from that of New Zealand, especially for males.

119 ...It was when we moved to Australia ...[that] the culture changed...
121 ...our environment changed.

Her partner, after interacting with the Australian males at his place of work who believed in the patriarchal way, changed his behaviour to that indicative of dominating, selfish and patriarchal males. Wilma’s partner started to come home and say

131 ...I’m going out with the boys tonight. We’re going to go to the
132 casino and I thought gee, [laugh] where’s this come from. This is not the man
134 I know. and he’d go off to the casino with the boys. amm Things started to
136 change he started to be much less committed.

Wilma spoke of how her partner’s performances or behaviours were socially acceptable in his work environment and may have assisted him in feeling more powerful. However, when they were performed in their home environment, she found it impossible to continue her relationship with him. No longer did they have a power sharing relationship whereby they listened to each other, were giving, utilised
creativity, and enjoyed freedom of joint participation in social interactions. The discourses of creativity, giving, freedom and sharing, that Gordon (1980) sees as so important for balanced power sharing relationships, were no longer a part of their relationship. Wilma’s partner’s discourse was now with his Australian mates. Wilma experienced psychological and emotional pain and suffering due to this tension between their past sharing relationship and the patriarchal relationship she and her partner were now experiencing. Denneson (1999) argued in support of Nietzsche that without suffering there would be no chance for change, growth or creativity. There would be no reason for loving and enjoying life, no chance through effort to value life, and the wisdom that comes through suffering. This suffering would be glanced at casually and tossed aside, unappreciated, if the pain was not great enough for each specific individual to increase their chance for change. This pain, experienced with change, was demonstrated in Wilma’s interview when she spoke of a conflictual situation that led her to become more aware of her and her partner not retaining their personal identities.

148 ...he started expecting ...to be spending all this money on him going out, when we had agreed we would come here and focus on getting our money behind us

157.6 He started to like a different life style to what I liked

158 and he liked it very much and it caused a lot of conflict

174 ...the mistake we made [was] that we didn’t retain our individual identity

Denneson (1999) sees this as a painful environment necessary for personal growth for both individuals, as neither individual is able to reconstruct any situation on their own. The couple did not have the knowledge and skills to work through the tensions that were being created, as a result of their changed performances. It is my
interpretation that the new performances propelled Wilma back into her previous avoidant, and self-interpreted, powerless position of awareness and knowledge (FD). Nonetheless, these experiences were a necessary part of Wilma’s reconstruction of self. Wilma was in a position where she could gain further knowledge of herself, and others, increase her feeling of power, and enhance her endurance in difficult situations (Gordon, 1980). Wilma accomplished the first four positions of Gordon (1980), however, the fifth position of acceptance eluded her, even after she had left the relationship, as she continued to desire her partner to change and was not accepting of his ways. Wilma was able to escape from the clutches of the herd consciousness within society through greater endurance and self-responsibility (PD). During the breakdown of Wilma’s relationship, creativity was minimal, as resentment dominated the couple’s interactions. As Wilma preferred not to be involved in a relationship of resentment, she chose not to endure these tensions and removed herself, as situations were occurring that were not agreed upon [line 192].

Carmel

Like Wilma, Carmel discovered that the Australian culture was not to her liking in relation to male behaviour.

104 The cultural things really irritated me...
390 ...I didn’t like the fact that he was Australian because
391 I couldn’t identify with it.

In Carmel’s narrative she stated that she was raised within a traditional French Canadian cultural background, where the social laws also held a position of importance. This cultural background influenced her beliefs concerning commitment
within her relationships, and influenced her responses to the questions asked during the interview. As Carmel believed in traditional law, which stated that commitment only occurred when an individual became engaged or married, she found it very difficult to answer questions of commitment in connection with the unmarried relationships she had experienced. Whenever, the focus returned to the topic of commitment she struggled and was challenged as to how she could answer the question. Carmel would stammer over words and state she did not understand what I was talking about, which seemed to indicate some kind of struggle for her and it appeared she was having trouble grasping the concept of commitment being within a relationship in any other way except through getting married.

132  ...it's difficult for me because to me commitment  
133  equals amm getting engaged, married amm because of my traditional  
134  background. amm I s'pose everybody knew of it because everyone knew that  
135  I was his girlfriend and he was my man.

Carmel had previously had relationships with a man of Italian descent and another man of Jewish heritage. Both these men would voice their opinions and beliefs, while maintaining respect for her. “[They] ...would voice [their] opinion” [line 559], without ordering her.

565  ...[they never stood] over me saying you have got to give that up or you  
565.5  can't do that  
567  ...it's sort of a mutual agreement.

This method of interaction she believed was due to their having similar cultural backgrounds to her (French Canadian), and so she felt more comfortable with them [line 391, 392]. Carmel still, however, demonstrated confusion while talking about these relationships in regard to the topic of commitment (Have/Hold
Discourse).

The opportunities for the sharing of power within Carmel’s third relationship, with an Australian man, were minimal [line 111]. Carmel disapproved of, and was irritated by, some of the behaviours her third partner exhibited [lines 113, 114].

394. There were certain things he did and certain things he wore that really irritated me.
114 It was little things
115 ...he used to put ketchup on everything [he ate]
116 ...if we went to an Indian
117 restaurant he’d eat a meal that was as Australian as possible in an Indian
118 restaurant. He’d wear thongs. I hate thongs.

I propose that Carmel positioned herself as an overly responsible instructor, or the person to help this partner, by trying to control the behaviours of which she disapproved (PD). These instructional behaviours were solely chosen by Carmel without her partner’s acceptance of this behaviour in his life.

103 ...I used to say to him don’t flick your fork at me when your talking to me.

These controlling behaviours that Carmel performed, influenced by her social and cultural up-bringing, became an issue of tension for her as she preferred to be in a relationship that exercised balance for both parties. This balance, she believed, could be demonstrated when each partner was in a position to go about their own lives independently, and then come together in the middle to share their lives at other times [lines 545, 545.3]. Carmel’s resolution of this tension was to abandon the relationship, without endeavouring to act in a way conducive to learning further
responsibility, which is indicative of avoidance, that being an element of the Fear Discourse. This may have been the best option to take at the time, rather than discussing the troublesome issues with her partner, Carmel avoided them. The incongruence could have been between her family values, in relation to sharing, and her present knowledgeable values of sharing, which were not able to be bridged at this time. This is similar to the first position of Gordon’s (1980) six positions leading to self-overcoming. If these positions of responsibility, through discourse or discursive practices, had been administered through power sharing behaviours, Carmel may have been in a position to strengthen her personal endurance, and thus create a power sharing relationship with this partner, or to withdraw from the relationship without more tension. Within this situation, Carmel unconsciously supported that differences are unwelcome within any relationship. This avoidance was identified by Nietzsche as necessary for change. Denneson’s (1999) view is that differences and inequalities are necessary elements for self-overcoming, and that without the use of the behaviour styles of avoidance and neglect, the exploration of further growth would never be necessary. Avoidance and neglect paved the way for further growth by struggling with the differences between self and others.

Melissa

Melissa supported the belief that culture played a very important role as a guiding force in the lives of her and her then husband. This cultural influence was expressed when she stated that “[they] started out with many winners [as]...a young couple” [line 129]. These positives occurred as her parents had taught her, and her partner’s parents had taught him, to value the same traditional cultural ideals, and to hold similar expectations of life [lines 129.8, 130, 133, 134]. These ideals and
expectations focused around “commitment to children and child raising” [line 201], and the “honouring of family life” [line 103], the traditional values and ideals of patriarchy (Have/Hold Discourse). Melissa and her husband held these values, which were similar to their parents, in addition to performing similar actions to their parents, such as fighting between themselves [line 505]. Nietzsche sees these patriarchal ideals, and the expectations of life, as being endorsed by the State. McClelland’s (1975) fourth value position “It moves me to do my duty”, could also be related to these ideals, which could be used for the increasing of the feeling of power. Nietzsche believed that the State, through supporting these values, had endorsed what it believed to be the correct and legitimate societal behaviours of self-abasement, and the conformity as moral actions, which were to be performed in the interests of another individual only (Kaufmann, 1968 and Denneson, 1999). In this case study, the challenge appears to be between Melissa’s societal supported values of how she should respond to her husband’s needs, and any possible opportunities to address her own needs. Melissa’s own needs were rejected, neglected, and thus forgotten by her husband, as they were not the socially acceptable or legitimate behaviours of a wife and mother. She stated that her husband was very restrictive with food and was very strict in his parenting [line 123,124], and he believed she should behave in the same manner [line 128].

These socially acceptable legitimate and illegitimate behaviours have been termed by Freedman and Coombs (1996) as the processes that have provided authorisation within society. These processes via society, or society’s laws, support acceptance or non-acceptance of certain behaviours, which in turn, often lead individuals to readjusting their responses. Denneson (1999) rejected the notion that
some behaviours should be classified as non-acceptable. He believed, like Nietzsche, that no action was legitimate or illegitimate, rather that, all ‘will to power’ actions, are acceptable, in one form or another, to all individuals.

The socially acceptable behaviour for Melissa’s second husband was that he loved to buy her gifts, e.g. flowers. However, he was also like her first husband [line 94, 95], a very dominating and jealous man [line 97], who would prevent her from performing actions he did not approve of and he would say, “this is my territory” [lines 105, 106]. She stated that, at times, “he felt insecure” [line 146], and so for him to feel secure, he would brow beat her [line 147]. In the case of Melissa, the powerless position she believed herself to be in, due to her legitimate response of over responsibility, Nietzsche would argue, was necessary to encourage her to perform different actions that would increase her feeling of power, through being self responsible. This socially legitimised position became apparent to me when she spoke of how over responsible she was in regard to taking care of her husband’s needs. An example of this was when she had moved away from this dominating relationship, and had bought “a car, a house [and] everything was set” [line 171] and “within twelve months to two years” [line 172] of her husband moving in with her again, she had to sell both the car and house [line 173] to pay his debts. He refused to act in a responsible manner concerning financial matters [line 181], and continued to spend more money [line 182]. Melissa, at this time, chose to be responsible for him by “earn[ing] more money and cover more ...ground” [line 183], in order to maintain [family] stability [line 189.5], and their dream of sharing the journey [line 156]. Melissa’s dream and her husband’s dream, due to their similar upbringings, followed the historical views of patriarchy. His dream of sharing the journey was for her to do
exactly as he wanted her to do, and her dream of sharing the journey was for both individuals to show support, warmth and giving to each other. Denneson (1999) argued that these actions would have been seen as enforcing individuals to act in an altruistic fashion, of being overly responsible for others, and not responsible for self, so as to keep them at the level of the herd, and suppress any natural instincts of the feeling of power. He classified altruistic actions as psychological errors. This position he believed to be truth, as no actions could possibly be done from a truly altruistic position.

Melissa, during her childhood and first two marriages, believed it to be always necessary “to hold the families together” [line 505]. As a result of upholding this value, Melissa “has paid a massive price” [line 505.5]. After the end of her third marriage, she now believes if she cannot “play happy families” [line 516], then she will “play whatever game [she] plays when ...not playing” [line 517] happy families. Melissa, during the interview, appeared to me to be unaware or mentally blocking out the actions she needed to demonstrate to be happy in her life, and when I mentioned that she and her two children are a family [lines 523], without a man, she avoided answering me by saying, “yes, I thought of that one too” [line 524], and then burst out laughing hysterically. Melissa’s laughter identified, to me, another tension in her life. The tension being that she knew she could have a family without a man, however, it was not what she wanted, as she had been taught a family must have a man as their leader. She was willing to devote her freedom and power to doing what her husband wanted, in order to receive the payoff of having a man as the head of the family, and for someone to share the journey. Melissa appeared to not be able to address many of her own personal needs eg: selling her house and car to keep the family together, but
met many of her partner's needs while in her three relationships. At times throughout the interview, when she spoke of confronting opportunities leading to change, she would appear to be unable to talk about the topic any further and would simply laugh [lines 32, 56, 67, 109, 157, 366, 377, 470, 561].

Melissa held fast to the one major value she knew to be true for her. The value of "I wanted to share the journey" [line 176] eg: McClelland's third position. Melissa and her third husband attempted to hold their relationship together after many separations. They both "shared [the] dream of what it should be like, and could be like" [line 156], of "yummy family stuff" [line 158.3], and still, Melissa stated that even after many separations, these "dreams [are] still holding on there" [line 157.8] for their relationship to be secure.

Whenever Melissa was separated from any of her previous husbands, she was "always more relieved, [and quite] capable" [line 162], even though it was "a lot of work" [line 162], to support herself and her children. Melissa had educated herself through university studies, and had creatively constructed additional values and beliefs, even though she still held true to the matriarchal beliefs of holding families together, through domineering behaviour, and having the company of another individual to share the journey. I argue she was able to increase her feeling of power through the domination of her partner and revive her self worth enough, to verbalise that she would prefer a relationship of support, friendship and freedom. Her demonstration of domination over others, however, belied these verbalisations.

674 ...being supportive and being a friend and allowing the other person to
have their own space at times, would be how I see someone acting within a
good relationship.

In Melissa’s case, she was unable to recognise the unconscious motivation for
domination thus impacting on her self worth. It was only through the encouragement
from her fellow students that she felt able to support herself and her children [line
162], and continue to give to others (position four of giving). Gordon (1980)
identified the act of giving through praise, positive feedback, and compliments, when
talking to others, as necessary actions to help them feel included in a situation, and to
assist them develop more humility, self awareness and patience. The act of giving
can assist the individual on his or her journey of becoming master of their own
destiny, however, this has not occurred for Melissa. Gordon (1980) believed that
those individuals who strived for peace, freedom, or independence, like Melissa,
through performances of giving and acceptance from others, were individuals only
striving to survive and have power over others. This form of survival may not have
been to live or die physically, but was survival so as not to be enslaved, or lose any
previously gained self-empowerment. Thus, Melissa in her attempts to gain support,
peace and freedom, may eventually come to another crossroad of tension. These
socially acceptable behaviours of giving and domination have led to painful
situations, though not painful enough to create change within Melissa’s life, and her
discussions remain within a Protective Discourse.

Missy

Children may experience verbal, physical and emotional abuse within their
family, which can often scar a child for life, as memories remain. In the case of
Missy, the abuse she experienced as a child [lines 183-187], and her lack of
knowledge concerning power sharing options, became obvious through her life stories
discussed during her interview. Missy explained how her parents verbally abused her
by telling her continuously that she was the stupid and dumb child of their family.

Well I wasn’t allowed to talk to... any of my sisters [and if they]
...talked to me they would cop a belting [from] Dad
...he would be drunk
...I didn’t have to do nothing
wrong and I would cop a belting anyway. Everything was my fault.

I was always
the stupid one, I was always the dumb one, the others were very
intelligent. ...brought down everyday of my life.

Gordon (1980) believed that it was necessary for power and responsibility to
be given, or shared with others, for the enhancement of self-overcoming. Denneson,
(1999) also stated that if there were no painful or even uncomfortable experiences in
an individual’s life, they would not be interested in, or need to change his or her
outlook, performances or beliefs, as they would be continually in agreement with all
individuals. Nevertheless, even though Denneson (1999) and Patton (1993) believed
power used by one individual to dominate another individual can be necessary, they
did stipulate that power, used to harm an individual, was definitely not necessary.

Missy said that as a result of this abuse and the treatment she received from
her first husband, she was always attempting to prove that she was not stupid and that
she was not just something, but was somebody [line 325, 326, 327]. Within the three
relationship stories that Missy shared, I argue that the common experiences that
emerged were power over her at the hands of others;
the women had to stay home have the kids, cook
meals, not allowed to talk to anybody, amm basically it was, I merely
existed in the relationship

and her lack of knowledge concerning how to behave within an intimate heterosexual
relationship.

I thought amm it’s like a fairy tale relationship,
because ...you get married, you have the brick home, ...the
new home and all that sort of stuff and everything is supposed to fall
into place

The tensions that emerged for Missy were a consequence of the disparity
between her fairytale understanding of relationships, which she often saw on
television [lines 74, 75, 76, 77], and the domination that was experienced in reality.
She found these tensions very confusing. Missy responded with sudden mood
changes, as evidenced by violent outbursts.

everyday ...the pain, you become somebody else
that’s what I had to overcome
if he amm, if he accused
me of something I didn’t do, I just switched off and became this other
person, this stronger person.

...unless you identify
there’s another personality there and start learning about that
personality, you can’t identify with it, because you just go, you blank
out ...you... wake up and you think how did that pot plant get in the
amm... TV. I was watching a movie, what happened? and I was
constantly saying what happened, what did I do then, what did I say? I
was constantly doing that to people around me all the time and to my
husband and other people say oh what did I say, did I say anything
wrong? yeah, like that was, that was the other per, that was the other
personality, ...the stronger one was very destructive, very vicious, very
...very violent in a lot of ways too. And then the weaker personality
went when I was left alone, it felt comfortable, that was ok. Any sort of
threat I’d change, but I didn’t understand the changes...
Like one day I’m placid and the next minute I’m very
aggressive and next minute I’m ok so I, I, I never ever blamed him for
217.3 the break down

Within society, an extreme patriarchal role for women is when women must stay at home and tend to the house, cooking and children. Missy described this role as the only one she knew [line 30], and that it was not until much later in life that she was able to understand her actions differently, with the assistance of her doctor. This assistance helped her to feel more confident with her interactions with others [line 202].

351 I must get help. I must find
350 somebody to answer these questions.

Even-though Missy had been previously taught to position herself, as a female, in a patriarchal world, she still experienced a desire to increase her feeling of power. It is proposed that due to her historical background, Missy chose to increase her feeling of power at the expense and domination of others, as she had experienced the demonstration of power throughout her lifetime. The positions of dominance may be interpretive of an individual’s lack of self responsibility, which may create a “pleasurable feeling of sweet revenge” for the individual blaming others.

Missy was able to increase her feeling of power by performing from the position of a psychologically ill individual who was able to avoid the actions of self-responsibility.

130 ...I learnt to identify [with the stronger personality]
131 ...unless you identify there’s another personality there and start learning
132 about that personality you can’t identify with it
While Missy did not wish to perform in the same abusive manner as her parents [line 111], it appears that she did perform in a dominating manner eg: acting destructively, viciously and violently [line 141,143]. She did not have to be responsible for her actions. A State recognised doctor [line 202] had declared her to be ill, and at times, in need of hospitalisation [line 374, 375] when she was unable to be responsible for herself.

372 nine years I went through counselling
372.6 ...I used to go sometimes like four times a week to see my
doctor. And then if I got really bad ...really confused... he
374 would always put me in St Andrews Private Hospital so that way I
375 could just have a rest and that way he would come up there and see me.

Denneson (1999) believed that the ‘State supported institution’ of the medical profession created external laws that assisted in scapegoating behaviours, culminating in an individual’s lack of self-responsibility. These legitimate social or external laws of the State have provided protection for the honest and giving citizens (even those who give too much) within a community. At the same time, they provide protection for the dishonest, taking and controlling citizens. This outcome, I argue, ensures the continuance of the value of power over others as being legitimate and preventing individuals, legitimised by the State, from facing the painful consequences of their actions and their incumbent suffering. This became obvious to me while interviewing Missy, as she continually blamed others or her professionally diagnosed and labelled disorder. This label, legitimised from a collective authority, enabled her to not address her behaviour and act responsibly, and to manipulate and dominate others in her life. These legitimised behaviours prevented Missy from searching for options of change necessary for self-overcoming.
This method of control, used by Missy, progressed throughout her third relationship. Her third partner was a quiet man who was willing to do anything she required to make her happy, yet still she felt it necessary to have power over him. At times she would hope to gain this power by telling her third partner that she was psychic. She would tell him she knew what his problem was and that he needed to do exactly as she believed, otherwise she claimed he was punishing her just like her family and past partners [line 575].

401 I don’t know if you believe in it or not but ...you can tell them exactly
403 what’s wrong and what they need to know, for them to change their
404 lives, so then you can move them on and it’s like psycho’s. It’s to do
405 with psychics and spiritual things.

Kaufmann (1968) stated that strong considerations for the opinions of others eg: collective authorities, have lead humans to conformity, a belief in their powerlessness, and the betrayal of their destiny. Furthermore, individuals after allocating their interpretation to values, e.g. commitment within heterosexual relationships, have then used these interpretations to make valuations about others. These interpretations are rationalisations, or self-interest interpretations (Kaufmann, 1968), have been driven by a blind desire for or against something, even though they have none, or very little, estimation of ‘real’ value. In society, therefore, when the powerful, and supposedly good people, dictated certain values as good, they were accepted, and enforced by laws and societal norms. Missy followed these societal norms and values, and neglected to address her blind faith in the collective authorities value, within her interactions. The Fear Discourse identifying avoidance of responsibility, being the first position of Gordon’s (1980) six positions, has been illustrated here by Missy. Missy’s willingness to participate in this research could
imply that she is now searching for different methods of change within herself.

Tony

Dominating traditional beliefs held by western society may be challenged at any time. Tony demonstrated this challenge of belief when his partner became pregnant while living in a country town. Christian beliefs were strongly enforced by the residents of this town. The traditional Christian belief that pregnancies should not occur out of wedlock had been supported throughout many generations. In city areas, it has often become accepted that marriage and pregnancy do not always occur in the traditional sequence; it is a broadminded Christian country society that does not hold individuals, who fall pregnant out of wedlock, up for criticism. Tony and his defacto partner, at the time of her falling pregnant, found not being subjected to repercussions unexpected and surprising. The challenge of the belief was explained during Tony’s interview when he spoke of their pregnancy.

36 Everything went
37 according to plan, there were no repercussions of being pregnant in a small
39 country town or anything like that

Such a reaction challenged Tony’s patriarchal belief concerning the demonstration of control and domination through societal norms and values, with the town residents demonstrating a balanced sharing of power through responsibility. Tony’s recognition of responsibility demonstrated by the collective authority, town’s people, reveals his position of understanding, the fifth position of self-overcoming, and leads him to operate within a Detached Discourse. The fourth value position of McClelland (1975) has been demonstrated positively by the town’s people in
supporting individuals having children out of wedlock.

It has been through these learning experiences of social acceptance that individuals have learned to share the feeling of power, and responsibility, with all members of their family and society. In addition, power sharing can be an illusionary experience, where individuals are blind to their unconsciously adopted role learned from external pressures, such as the historical values their family have accepted and enforced on them as truth.

I argue that historical roots are the basis for creative future action to be decided upon and taken. Thus power over others or power shared in an individual’s history is the base from which all behaviours stem. As Nietzsche postulated, history, through its continual recurrence, is reoccurring now as a human cultural practice due to the actions of individuals becoming appropriate, acceptable or common place. It is through these accepted actions of power between all individuals within present social interaction, and upon self, that history is being re-experienced. When individuals believe they are demonstrating power sharing, they may not, as shown by McClelland’s four value positions. These four positions, McClelland (1975) says, illustrate how the values of individuals direct their responses without the individual understanding the underlying principles of why they are performing in this manner. Thus an illusionary experience of power sharing may occur as individuals could be blindly demonstrating their adopted roles and values that they have learned from external forces of power, such as their family, peers, society and institutions, as truths for power sharing, when they are only using power over others. Therefore, an eye opening experience, even an unpleasant one, may be necessary to assist an individual
to consciously re-create their role and the values pertaining to that role, to provide further opportunities for self-overcoming.

This chapter has been provided to highlight a basic socially acceptable commencement point from which individuals have gained their understanding of the wider cultural roots of society, and their families roots within society. Throughout this chapter Denneson’s (1999) writings have shown that an individual allocates their personal meanings to discourse and discursive practices that provide opportunities for social change for many discourses and their demonstrations. It is with these historical roots in mind that individuals may be more creative of their future actions. Thus Nietzsche’s power over others or power shared is demonstrated in relation to the personal histories of the participants and its continual recurrence may become a recreated position, which increases the opportunity for the sharing of the feeling of power (Patton, 1993). For example, I argue that Phil’s beliefs about relationships, due to his religious and cultural background, gradually altered but were still similar within his third relationship to his first. These historical bases may lead to creative alternatives, which could be redemonstrated through socially accepted actions of power domination, and available avenues for increasing the feeling of power through power sharing.

In light of my presentation of these cases it can be concluded that the historical roots of individuals influence and even motivate the present actions to increase the feeling of power through fear, protection or detachment, without many individuals being aware of this influence.
NOTE
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Chapter 5  Power Domination and Power Sharing

The second theme of Power Domination and Power Sharing will be addressed in this chapter after acknowledging these historical roots of individuals within society as having stemmed from an individual desiring to increase their feeling of power, which thus influences their future actions. This seeking of power is a universal struggle that occurs throughout everyday events. Indeed participants within this study have struggled, at different times in their lives, to gain a greater understanding and awareness of self and others in relation to the feeling of power. As it has been revealed, history has a great influence in the gaining of this understanding and so the struggle appears to be still based on the value of increasing their feeling of power through power over others not through power sharing. Questions concerning the power that individuals may take into consideration are: How can I have control of the situation (FD)? What can I do to help others through their problem (PD)? The alternative question that individuals could ask instead of the above is: How can we both feel powerful within this situation, without hurting self or others (DD)? Unfortunately, in many cases, due to historical influences, the asking of this question has been neglected.

Nietzsche has proposed that the development of the consciousness of all human beings, to a position of self-transformation, or the “overcoming” of nihilism, will only be created by sharing power, without harm to another individual (Kaufmann, 1968 and Patton 1993:156). Even though this position (DD) is available, in interviews there was a lot of fluctuating between the two discourses of fear and protection, by many individuals. It is my considered position, taken from a careful
reading of these transcripts, that this could be because many individuals are not aware of a third discourse of detachment. Such individuals, who fluctuate between the fear and protective discourse, never actually find a balance in, nor an understanding of, the belief that all individuals within an interaction need to feel powerful in many of their interactive experiences. This feeling of power being the ‘will to power’ can be either a positive, creative understanding of power, or alternatively it can be a performance of worldly power, administered originally from the patriarchal institutional regimes that Nietzsche discusses (Kaufmann, 1968). The later, worldly power of Nietzsche, is seen as being evil and culturally and societal invoked. Kaufmann (1968) and Patton (1993) revealed that Nietzsche’s transformation of this everyday theme of evil, worldly power (FD/PD), into an artistic creativity, or the overcoming of resistance through the sharing of power (DD), was essential for self-awareness, self-growth, self-preservation and the increase of the feeling of power, through the transformation, to the positive higher internal “will to power” within all individuals (Kaufmann, 1968:180,181).

The consequence of internal and external conflict, in having to accept or reject these various positions, was illustrated when Keith spoke about his first marriage to his wife Jane. Keith found it very difficult to give his wife as much as she desired, and so he became ill from the strain of her demands [lines 708, 709, 710, 711, 712].

708  ...I don't know I s'pose it was a mental breakdown within meself at the
709  time, because I couldn't give [Jane] what she wanted.
710  So it depressed me even more. That's how committed I was. I couldn't
711  give her enough. She got, she virtually when she brought me up here
712  she got her freedom one hundred percent.

686  When it pounds ya and pounds ya in incidental little
ways. Use of power of persuasion... it just beat me down and down and
down, until I said ok just have em.

Keith identified these situations as being very traumatic, and he fell into a
state of depression two to three years into their marriage [line 704, 705].

...I got the depression when I was... two or three years into the
relationship, I nearly, I thought about killing meself.

After all this pain and conflict, Keith rejected his wife’s demands. Keith’s
actions may be seen, in such a way as to take control of both their lives, thus
increasing his feeling of power and decreasing his wife’s feeling of power. This
outcome of power domination may not have been Keith’s conscious desire at the
time; it was history repeating itself. He was unaware of how to commence sharing the
power in a more balanced and agreeable manner, due to his past learned behaviours.
Keith spoke of these stand off positions of power domination in his interview. I argue
that Keith has positioned himself within the Fear Discourse of domination and power
over others, and is struggling with the responsibility associated with the second value
position of McClelland (1975) known as “I strengthen myself” through change.

...we moved up here [and] ...her commitment was dominating me.
She had to rule the roost. She had to get her own way in every way
whatevsoever within the relationship. And, and one started when I started
to educate myself and pull her up and say well no, no, no, no she wanted
to go more than I’d let her. You work, I give you one Friday night out,
that’s it. No, you’re not going to go out and that’s not going to be every
Friday night either. I will decide when, maybe once a fortnight.

yeah and that’s when I started to pull her up from going out so much.
So that’s when I started to pull back and she didn’t like
that because she took her wedding rings off
My interpretation from Tom’s discussion is that he found it difficult to share power in a balanced way, and consequently, was accepting of one of his wife’s behavioural characteristics. His wife would act in a very friendly manner towards other men, which would encourage a number of men [line 284], due to their patriarchal values, to think she was prepared to offer them sexual favours. By behaving in this way, and by not attempting to change her behaviour, even though it had caused some embarrassing situations for both her and Tom, she was not considering his feelings, as she enjoyed this form of attention [line 282]. Her enjoyment may have stemmed from her support of the patriarchal value, viz. that women are objects of pleasure for men, or from her increased feeling of power because of her position of acceptance by the other men. A person, who is unresponsive to changing a behaviour that has caused a loved one embarrassment, may have an inability to overcome their own fears, to “suspend their own reality or empathically deal with the reality of others” (Troemel-Ploetz, 1994:200,208). In this case, I argue that the reality of others was the socially endorsed belief that women are objects for a man’s pleasure.

282  she enjoyed a lot of male company and male attention..
283  ...on her behalf it was more just being friendly and wanting to have
283.4  male friends.

284  ...unfortunately a lot of males [took] ...it the wrong
286  way. That caused a few problems. Mostly at work more than anything.
287  Where she worked was a hot bed of office scandals etc. etc. That caused a
288  lot of, quite a bit of tension.

293  ...it was a case of ...I
294  had to accept it, which I did I mean there was no, ...on her part
296  ...she wasn’t playing the field, put it that way. You know. It was
297  just how she was ...a very outward, outward sort of person. She used
298  to be like the centre of attraction and the centre of attraction ...used to be
298.4  in the group of males.
In Tom’s more recent relationships, his knowledge of what he liked to have happen, and did not like to have happen, was made clearer to him due to the tensions and insecurities he had previously experienced. Tom identified that sharing had been reconstructed in more recent relationships, because of his present situation where his present wife would only participate in a sharing relationship. These recent experiences had taught Tom to become more aware of his own needs, as well as, the needs of others. Tom showed that he was still looking to improve his self-awareness, by stating that he could be selfish and that he was no angel [lines 459, 459.5].

457 I’ve probably become more amm
458 aware of what someone else needs since I’ve been in this relationship than the 458.5 other relationships.

459 so I’ve become less selfish. I might have been a little bit self-centred in the 459.5 other ones. I’m, I’m not saying I’m, I’m, I’m no angel...

It is interesting to note that Tom, supporting his present relationship as being one of sharing, believes that the reciprocal feelings that are demonstrated to him by his wife are genuine, whether they are performed when they are alone or in company [lines 547, 548, 549, 550]. Tom and his wife give freely to each other, not by making continual sacrifices, but by sharing power, as Kaufmann (1968) and Patton (1993) have argued may occur after much conflict.

419 So I mean there had to be give and take on both sides
425 we sort of worked together and we solved the problems, if there was any

Indeed Tom and his wife openly communicate [line 402.5] about difficulties they may be experiencing, for example differences of opinions, and they give of
themselves in an affectionate manner [line 532]. These actions of giving, through sharing within many alternative situations, have creatively constructed an environment were both individuals continue to develop their understanding of self and others.

531 ...I've received more, because it's a more personal hands
532 on relationship in as much as there is more affection being shown
534 ...I've learnt to reciprocate. Not initially, because it didn't work
535 initially because I wasn't used to it. ...I never came from a particularly loving
535.3 family.
547 and genuine with [her] feelings. It wasn't a facade
548 which in the later years of my other relationship, it was all
549 done for show. Whereas, ...I honestly believe this one is genuine. The
550 feelings you were shown are genuine. Whether in private or in company.

Gordon (1980) identified that self-overcoming is inter-experiential or the comparing of experiences, and may not always occur in a chronological order. Indeed, all positions of self-awareness may occur at the same time, or be experienced at differing times. Tom has experienced multiple positions of self-awareness during his relationship with his first partner, pain within his second relationship due to his wife's numerous sexual interactions, and his third relationship was one of responsibility. Even though he and his partner experienced disagreements, they were able to resolve them and move on. When his wife stopped communicating with him about their disagreements [line 520.6], and was acting in ways that created tensions within their marriage, their marriage ended. Nevertheless, Tom was still able to learn from his experiences and demonstrate responsibility [line 572], understanding and creativity when it came to resolving his problems. Gordon (1980) argues that such a process of personal development occurs within the six positions of awareness that
lead to self-overcoming.

you have a disagreement, depends what the disagreement was, I mean that, that can eat away at you very, very badly ...and I personally ...have to resolve a problem and if ...it's not resolved at the time then ...it tends to eat away at me. So yes communication is very, very important in that respect. Some people don’t, some people clam up. I mean, I'd rather have a good slanging match, get everything out in the open and then, shake hands and off you go

The fourth position of self-overcoming occurred for Tom and his third wife when they both were able to give to each other [line 419]. Giving, Gordon (1980) says, is of great importance within the function of self-overcoming. This self-overcoming only occurs through the sharing of power. The sacrificing of spite and loneliness is a necessary component to achieve self-overcoming (Gordon, 1980). Tom, however, not only trod the path of positions one to four, he was able to also work through his difficulties into the fifth position, acceptance to self-overcoming. The fifth position is where a recognition and acceptance of the warmth and support from others occurs. Tom spoke of how he found this a difficult position to be in, as he was not used to being situated within a loving family environment [line 532], and he had to learn to be more creative in order to reciprocate [line 534] and accept their sharing of love.

...I never came from a particularly loving family.

But being in a ...family environment initially in the first few years, when Renai the youngest daughter was at home, you saw how a family integrates with each other and shows commitment ...and cares for each other. ...how it makes the whole situation so much better.

I realised it was a better way [to behave]. It was more of a family commitment and so I’ve had to change. I’ve changed and learnt to change, I hope.

...I am open with my feelings
They were more open with their feelings and genuine with their feelings. It wasn't a facade.

Gordon (1980) sees these expressions of warmth and support as what creates the self, as with Tom's family situations. This self is an individual who has obtained the ability to withstand loneliness, has a heightened understanding of knowledge and courage, and has the willingness and ability to give, and know when not to give, of themselves to others, continuously and unconditionally, through recognising the other individual's need to express themselves within the interaction, as Tom and his wife did [line 552, 553]. This self-awareness may be demonstrated when an individual is able to understand the reality of another, by knowing and understanding the self. This occurrence of knowledge results from the continual recurrence of learning experiences that a person is able to interpret as another's desire or dream for the feeling of power, without transferring any of their unresolved personal experiences being placed onto the other (Gordon, 1980).

The external art of listening is a method that has also been utilised to increase understanding and self-overcoming. It has been through the external art of listening to self that individuals have become aware of the different creative avenues of problem resolution, leading to self-overcoming without actually re-experiencing the situation (Stambaugh, 1985 and Gordon, 1980). Tom used and endorsed this art of communication or dialogue throughout his power sharing relationship [lines 385, 445, 445.4]. Nonetheless, Gordon's (1980) sixth position of listening to the inner voice of self was still to be revealed to him. Tom is demonstrating a Detached Discourse, but is fluctuating in understanding the balance between his external and internal
experiences.

When Russell’s three relationships were discussed, he stated that he had laid down the rules for each of these relationships at their inception, and that he was not interested in facilitating any dialogue with regards to the changing of his rules. He believed this approach to be necessary to prevent any misunderstandings of his wishes for the relationship. Kaufmann (1968) stated that individuals often engaged in rule taking behaviours to hide the fear, that their feeling of power would decrease.

...I’d sort of stated early on what I would like to happen

Because I’d already voiced my opinion on commitment in A, B & C relationship, it was understood right from the start that, that was what I wanted and if they didn’t like it at that point well then things didn’t happen the way they were going to happen. In other words the relationship would break up or something would change.

Patton (1993) extended this concept of power further by introducing the idea of power as commencing from an instinctual desire for freedom. Russell was conscious of his desire to feel free, reinforced by his rule setting within relationships, which restricted his relationships to the point of going out and having fun. This position appears to me to support the historical patriarchal belief that women are pleasurable objects, and that if commitment or responsibility were introduced to the relationship, then marriage was inevitable, as evidenced below.

...to be involved with someone to the point where you’re going out and enjoying each others company

It was like the proverbial boyfriend, girlfriend relationship.

...I’m only there as fun, I don’t want anything serious, I’m not
Russell did not mention wanting to be responsible in any way for any part of the relationship. This discourse of responsibility was not specifically one of a gender issue where men do not talk about commitment or responsibility, rather, it was that Russell was not interested in any other style of relationship than one of pleasure. He further stated that he felt comfortable when the relationship continued from within the parameters of his rules [line 339] and that his relationships were not about getting too serious.

Well going out and havin a good time, without getting too serious.

Russell did admit that over the years his views on commitment had changed [line 388]. He stated that at one time he was more involved within his relationships, but now he was not interested, and that this had come about due to age [line 390]. Russell used the words ‘involvement’, ‘serious’, and ‘tied down’ to define what he did not want within his relationships. These words all point in the direction of responsibilities encountered during a more permanent relationship with another individual, which Russell distinctly did not desire in his life.

...I used to be ...more involved I guess, with the relationship. Whereas, now I tend to stand off more. I don’t want to get to the point of involvement. I don’t want to be sort of completely tied down. I want to be more of a free agent.

It appeared that Russell was performing from his limited creative knowledge of power sharing at the third position of self-overcoming. This position reflecting
Gordon's (1980) ideas where an individual is in a position to experience the feeling of power for themselves, have power over others, or share this power with others, if they desire. Russell, even with his rules, appeared to be attempting creativity and power sharing, through his demonstrations of fun and enjoyment with his partner. Gordon (1980) defined these demonstrations eg: fun and enjoyment, as the most important position of personal growth. It is these demonstrations that enable an individual to learn the balance between the sharing of the feeling of power and the function of creativity. The creative constructions of the feeling of power are essential, and must be continued throughout all of life's experiences. These activities of fun [line 265], going out to dinner [line 54], and enjoying each others company [line 54], of which Russell spoke, are thus some of the most important elements of experience for an increased understanding of self-overcoming. Russell may not be interested in the positions of responsibility at this point in his life, however, as time progresses he may become so. Even his willingness to participate in this interview was an indication to me that he was investigating new possibilities for himself.

John demonstrated his commitment in his first marriage through being the partner who acted responsibly. He acted in an overly responsible way for many household activities, as well as, working as a shift worker to financially support his family. His hours as a shift worker provided him with the opportunity to not only financially support the family, but to be responsible for the children, perform the cooking tasks, and any day-to-day activities that needed attention. This approach worked well for the first few years [line 11] of his marriage.

4 oh I used to give her breakfast in bed every morning because I used to work a
broken shift and used to look after the kids all the time and do the cooking and virtually whatever she wanted virtually and she, because she used to work, but she didn’t have to work I used to look after the kids so she could go and work ...and have her time with the girls

Through John’s stories it became obvious that he often took the role of being overly responsible within his relationships, aligning him within the Protective Discourse. The women within his three relationships behaved in a manner that John did not believe was appropriate while in a committed relationship with him [lines 14, 31, 32, 131, 132. 229, 230, 231, 232], and interpreted partners as lacking responsibility.

This lack of commitment, by his partner to the relationship, was again demonstrated when John secured a position of employment in the desert in Central Australia and was unable to travel home at night. His first wife satisfied her sexual appetite through many sexual encounters with other men [lines 14, 16].

In his new position of employment John received a large increase in pay, which he sent home to his wife, thereby, maintaining his financial responsibilities.

...then I got a job working in the desert where I used to go away all the time and she was getting double the money that I normally give her and when the cats away the mouse will play and that’s what happened. and that’s what sort of started it all off. I sort of spent too much time away I suppose and all the favours were given to everybody else except me.. and I was paying for it

Indeed, it could be said that John’s wife, when faced with the commitment (responsibility) of being a sexually faithful wife, was unable to be one, and so she
demonstrated behaviours of avoidance (FD). John’s wife, however, may have been
gaining an increased feeling of power while participating in these behaviours, as she
may have chosen to discontinue them.

John struggled to understand the reasoning behind his wife’s actions. He
believed that to provide financial security [line 134], a home, food [line 140], and any
possessions [line 141] that the family desired, as well as, sexual relations with his
wife [line 153] when she was willing to participate, were the most essential elements
necessary for a sharing relationship. This decision-making demonstrates John’s
willingness to strengthen and further their relationship, and relates to Gordon’s
positions (one to four) of responsibility. When John married his first wife, he
believed that they had made a decision to remain faithful to each other, and to
continue to follow through on personal, family, financial and home commitments.
Through John’s continuation of these overly responsible commitments, associated
with the first value position, he unconsciously decreased his position of power
enabling his wife to increase her feeling of power.

Tension occurred again within John’s second partnership, when he followed
through with the previously mentioned commitments of cooking and cleaning for
himself and the family. His partner’s actions within the relationship, John believed,
were of laziness. She would sit in front of the television watching videos all day [line
131, 132]. Within this relationship, John again experienced the problem of not being
permitted, by his wife, to continue a sexual relationship with her, unless he really felt
he had to [line 145, 146]. This feeling of a male needing to have sex is consistent
with Hollway’s (1998) Male Sexual Drive Discourse associated with domination of
others. John believed that the third relationship was an improvement on the others. For about twelve or eighteen months everything was all right and then difficulties began occurring [line 236, 237]. Again, sexual relations within the relationship ceased to occur. This issue eventuated because his wife’s daughter had a child, and continued to have more children [line 229]. Each of these children were looked after by the grandmother, John’s wife, to the point that the children stayed over night nearly seven nights a week and slept in the double bed with the grandmother and John [line 234]. Eventually, John moved into the second bedroom, as there were too many bodies in the one bed. John still continued to help with the care of the children and to take the lion’s share of the household responsibilities [line 238].

John saw himself as an easygoing man [line 387] who found it difficult to become close to women. He would act overly responsible when he did finally enter a relationship. He believed that a broken relationship, when he was young, had impacted on his attitude to dating for the rest of his life [line 109]. This attitude, he stated, was one where lust played the most important role in the relationship [line 110]. Therefore, it may be argued that he accepted women who were willing to accept his actions of over responsibility (PD) in order to gain their sexual favours and also protect himself from his fears and his decreased feeling of power.

107 I was engaged to a girl I think when I was about twenty. I broke up with her a few weeks before we were married and I never ever really got over it and I think that affected my relationship with women all the way along the way.
108
109

110 It was more lust than anything else I suppose. But I was never one for going out and picking up women and that you know just out of practice. I didn’t know how to do it. I’d never been that way inclined or not inclined but I’ve never been that lucky.
Even though John offered financial security and responsibility, he was actually more interested in a sexual relationship. John was looking for a wife who would appreciate what he could provide for them, and in return, provide him with a satisfying sexual relationship. Men and women have practiced such values for generations. They have been defined as common gender differences between men and women (Hollway, 1998). Hollway (1998) positions such relationships within her Have/Hold Discourse, which relates to the domination within the Protective Discourse.

For Hollway (1998:228) “heterosexual relations are the primary sites where gender difference is re-produced”. Hollway’s (1998) suggestion of gender difference highlights Nietzsche’s belief that the desire for power is, therefore, the motivating force for the continuance and reproduction of differences.

Wilma’s experience with her first partner was different from the traditional male domination of women. Wilma welcomed the fact that her first partner, at the beginning of their relationship, did not respond to his mate’s sexual comments about women.

94 He didn’t look at other women, never made comments about other
96 women. If his friends were around and made comments about women, he
98 didn’t buy into that, he just sort of waved it off.
100 And then would shift his focus onto me.

After talking with Wilma about her three relationships, it became obvious that she would go out of her way to make her partner feel good about himself, which I argue, also helped her feel good, by increasing her feeling of power. A challenge,
however, presented itself to Wilma when her first partner commenced part time work. He began mixing with other men at his work, and thus shifted his focus [line 154, 154.5] from one she believed was sharing (DD) to one of avoidance of her needs within the relationship (FD).

154  ...then all of a sudden he started shifting his focus onto party, party, party with 154.5  all the boys from work.

Wilma and her partner no longer communicated as well as they had and their actions of shared responsibility decreased. Wilma’s desire for them to share the feeling of power, within their relationship, through the reaching of joint goals [line 149, 151], was neglected and even rejected, thus creating tensions between them [line 142]. According to Wilma her partner became more interested in spending their money on himself and going out with the boys from work [line 148, 149], than showing interest in their shared relationship goals.

142  well I started to feel a bit annoyed,
148  ...he started expecting, you know, to be spending all this money on him
149  going out, when we had agreed we would come here and focus on getting our
151  money behind us and all of a sudden I was sticking to that, working, working
152  and getting the money behind us

She was unable to creatively turn this situation into one of power sharing, and became very annoyed when she was “shut out of the equation, when she had been working in with” her partner [line 199]. Her partner, Wilma stated, had made decisions that were different from their previous joint decisions, and she was “pissed off” [line 180] because she was shut out by this man. Wilma stated that he did not choose an alternative female partner, as many men do, but rather an alternative lifestyle that she did not like [lines 155, 155.5, 157.6] nor fit into. It was these
behaviours, which created a situation where power domination of each other occurred (FD).

Within Wilma’s next two relationships similar events occurred, except Wilma actually did the withdrawing [line 166] from her second partner. She structured her life around her partner for eighty percent of the time [line 209], however, she stated that there were times when she focused even more than eighty percent on her work, as she loved it [line 255]. Unconsciously due to the pain Wilma experienced in her previous relationship it appears she automatically responded with avoidance in this relationship. Thus, her second partner began to feel insecure. Conflict arose [line 274] as she was not providing her full attention to her partner.

274 I think his insecurity bred from there and we had a lot of conflict over it.

Wilma stated that her partner saw her removal of her time from him to her work as a lack of commitment [line 248] and began drinking alcohol heavily [line 278]. The relationship ended after he found another woman. Wilma believed her partner to be selfish, as she was attempting to gain financial security for herself and her family, and held the value that selfish people do not really care about anyone but themselves. Therefore, she believed her partner did not care about her and so removed her commitment from within that relationship. I argue that Wilma’s avoidance led to a lack of responsibility as aligned within the Fear Discourse eg: second value position of McClelland (1975). Denneson’s (1999) belief that an excellent external source for the fulfilment of desire, or the external expression of an individual’s values and practices, which help to increase their feeling of power,
involves constructive discussions or discourse. Wilma stated that it would have been more functional for the relationship had she and her partner been able to sit down and talk constructively [line 337]. Unfortunately, they did not know how to do this [line 339].

Wilma demonstrated in her third relationship all the womanly commitments found within a traditional relationship, such as cooking for the family (him and his children and her children) their favourite foods [line 355] and helping to make their life easier [line 356]. Wilma’s partner displayed traditional responses in his demonstrations of commitment by buying Wilma flowers and chocolates; driving to her house to visit [lines 370.5, 372]; giving her a front door key to his house [line 384]; and giving her the use of his car for one week while she stayed on holidays at his house to look after his children during school holidays [line 390, 474.6]. Wilma in her third relationship has returned to the Protective Discourse, acting overly responsible, as she demonstrated in her first relationship. Wilma’s third relationship ended when she discovered her partner was talking with another woman on the Internet. M interpretation is that she saw this as increasing the commitment between her partner and his Internet friend, at the expense of the commitment between herself and her partner. It was this behaviour that initiated immense emotional suffering for Wilma, through her jealousy. Wilma responded to her partner’s behaviour by wiping his personal Internet messages from his computer.

432 ...I got to use his
433 computer one night, when he was at work and I found he’d been chatting to
434 other women on the Internet

436 Alternatives crept in and so of course I ...confronted him
about it, after I deleted all her messages. [laughing] Bit of a jealous streak.

...Like I said, I take my commitment very seriously, particularly in terms of fidelity. And to me if you are happy in your relationship there is no need to find any level of satisfaction out there with another women.

Emotional, especially the physical. Your relationship should be satisfying enough. Plus also, I mean I can appreciate that they have a female friend but a female friend, you would be aware of. They would be honest about it.

Nietzsche concluded that suffering and conflict within a relationship were necessary elements of commitment, which would enable the continuation and recreation of the relationship (Denneson, 1999). However, Wilma saw this suffering as not a reason to recreate and build the relationship in a positive sense, but as a negative construct. She re-enforced this negative construct by decreasing her trust for her partner, which therefore lead to the relationship’s closure.

Wilma believed that the style of communication between herself and her third partner had been very good. However, she did state that she should have listened more carefully, at times, to what he was really trying to communicate to her, and she may not have found herself in this same situation [lines, 451, 452, 453]. Gordon (1980) agreed that one method that has been utilised to increase understanding and self-overcoming through power sharing is communication or dialogue. It has been through the external art of listening to another, and dialogue with another individual, that individuals have become aware of the others different creative avenues of resolution, leading to self-overcoming, without actually experiencing the situation (Gordon, 1980).

Traditional and moral commitments exist because of the accepted laws of society concerning commitment, which are upheld, while demonstrations of
commitment occur when the individual both believes in these moral laws, as well as, enacts upon them. I argue that Wilma is struggling to find the balance of the moral law of acting responsibility, which is demonstrated by her fluctuation between the actions of over and lack of responsibility, thus preventing her from experiencing other positions that lead to self-overcoming.

Melissa’s husband followed the traditional moral commitments that his parents had taught him, and so neglected many creative and positive alternative methods of behaviour. One traditional commitment that Melissa’s husband performed was possessiveness. She discussed how she had a habit of running away when he performed in this patriarchal manner [line 142.5]. Melissa’s husband’s behaviours also included jealousy [line 142.5], constant verbal attacks [line 145] on her, as well as, actions to increase his position of hierarchy and his own feeling of power. Denneson (1999) declared that these traditional, patriarchal and State regimes recognised by Nietzsche, are an excellent example of unconscious violence. Additionally, they may appear from within any individual and can be associated with the acceptance of the worldly ‘will to power’ (Denneson, 1999). When these regimes are utilised, in conjunction with the desire to hurt others, as in Melissa’s husband’s case, then Nietzsche viewed this position as one of relative weakness and thoughtlessness for others, with a temporary increase in the feeling of power for self (Patton, 1993).

This internal desire to have power over others, such as in the argument of Nietzsche’s ‘will to power’, is often demonstrated to gain power through pleasure using their opponent’s weaknesses. These patriarchal norms wore Melissa down
mentally, emotionally and brought her to the point where she felt overwhelmed, and where she believed her only option was to run away [lines 147, 147.5].

142 One thing that came out of [Melissa's family visiting] was jealousy.
142.5 Possession stuff.
144 He was very proud of me outside of the home but inside the home there were constant attacks on me.
146 ...I think it was just that he felt insecure and he just had to... brow beat me to feel more secure.
147 Well because I kept running, ...my technique was to run away whenever it just got too much.
148 ...I did that three times but I always returned.

Melissa, on three occasions, came back to this dominating relationship after running away. The reason she gave for returning to the relationship was that both her and her husband shared a dream [line 152]; a dream of having the traditional happy family. It is my interpretation that this belief in the traditional happy family environment, and how this should be accomplished, has been demonstrated through Capitalist, Christian and socially dictated laws. The values of traditional society, through State rules, have been enforced on all individuals, both within and outside the institution of the family. Advertising, schools, churches, places of work, and even parents, have often supported these State laws that dictate how a happy family is supposed to behave (Dennison, 1999). Still this struggle with State laws (the right and the wrong principles of life) continues for Melissa. As illustrated, the Fear Discourse through the use of avoidance, continued as a pattern in Melissa’s life, thus preventing change and the development of shared responsibility.

152 What would bring me back? Dreams mostly. Shared dreams about what it 
153 should be like and could be like. Our home and this and that. It’s taken me all 
154 my years to get mature enough to realise that dreams can’t abate and that
dreams can’t be realised all by themselves, that you have to do something about it. [laughing again] dreams, they’re still holding on there oh yeah, yummy family stuff. We both wanted to keep together and hold it together ...and be a family

Shirley unconsciously challenged these patriarchal views of power over others by saying that she was not interested in marrying again; she was not interested in having any more children [lines 163, 164], thereby defying the norm of the Christian faith where two people are there for each other, marry, have a sexual relationship and then have children together. Even though Shirley supported these rules of faith, she did break the sequence of these rules by not getting married, and having a sexual relationship with her third partner [lines 169, 170, 171].

I just don’t want to get married again.

It’s not as if I want kids and that again, so you don’t really need to get married again these days...

Well the meaning is just the fact that you don’t play up on each other. and you’re there for each other and you don’t have to be married to do that.

An avenue for change is a recognition of the fifth position, acceptance, and was demonstrated by Shirley when she accepts another’s view, but does not necessarily believe this herself. Thus I argue Shirley’s acceptance is unconditional and demonstrates a form of Detached Discourse; increasing the feeling of power for self and others.

This breaking of the rule sequence may be a change in the patriarchal, societal and Christian laws that have in recent years occurred due to the continual resistance
its supporters have experienced. It is my view that the patriarchal male has not been an individual that women have found easy to co-operate or share with. He takes control of others and situations and is often not interested in participating in activities that the “little wife” is interested in. This demonstration of power over another was revealed in Margaret’s interview, when she stated that her first husband was very selfish, full of himself [line 51] (FD), and was the opposite to her: she gave and gave of herself, and did as he wished [lines 54, 56] (PD).

51 He was very selfish and full of himself
54 where I was the opposite and gave, gave, gave. Like I’d give in and do
56 what he wanted to do
57 not what ...I wanted to do

Margaret voiced her fears that she did not wish to be left unmarried, and an “old maid”, and expecting her first child. These two positions were frowned upon and unacceptable under the reinforced and unconsciously supported patriarchal values of the late 1950’s. This social value became apparent to me when Margaret spoke about the life of women as being, “ya only ...got married and had kids” [line 137].

130 there was my younger sister married, ...all the friends around all had
132 boyfriends and whatever... Maybe it was just the feeling that
133 ...I’ve got someone now.
134.5 But ya fit in the click
135.5 yeah You weren’t just one of those that were going to be an old maid.

You are married, you are now somebody, you had a husband [Line 136]. Patriarchal values enforce the belief that women needed a male to look out for them. Hollway (1998) identified this style of care as the positioning of women as merely mothers, or sexual object and reproductive incubators. This view was often found within the “repressed middle-class nuclear family” that Freud believed to be the norm.
These expressions of power over women that have been allowed, and supported, within society, as they have been interactively installed within its system of rules, values, and norms. Margaret was even willing to accept the attention of, and marriage to, a man who was not understanding of her needs, so that she would not be left without a male partner to care for her, and so she would be someone (not just a woman). With a male partner, I argue, Margaret’s family and society would classify Margaret as being a worthy female in society. This position is a relationship where Margaret was accepting of male domination and was operating from within a Protective Discourse. Margaret’s pain occurred by sacrificing her own needs for the acceptance of the collective authority’s values. By aligning herself with a powerful male she was viewed by family and society as a ‘good woman’, thus denying responsibility for herself.

In Missy’s case, the laws of patriarchy not only worked against her, but also worked against her second husband. Missy’s husband, she revealed, was a homosexual male, who wanted to further his employment prospects with his employer. The only way that this was possible was for him to get married and have a family. Again, under traditional patriarchal and capitalist laws, homosexuality was not an acceptable option. Any individual who was known to be homosexual risked losing their position of employment, were ostracised from the community, and were therefore dominated by those in power and their associates.

382 ...the day after I got married he turned around and said that ...he
383 was gay.
386 so basically I was used there, but I wanted so badly to bring in the baby
387 into the world and ...have that family
In society, the powerful, and supposedly good people, dictated certain laws and norms as good, and they were accepted. These laws and societal norms reinforced the powerful as good people, and men as powerful. As Nietzsche stated, no individual wants to be known as a bad person, the ethics of the past developed into acceptable codes for the societal or worldly powerful (Kaufmann, 1968). Missy, by getting married and bringing a baby into the world (having a family), was supporting these patriarchal norms, values and beliefs of the good people within society. Through her support of these values, I argue Missy temporarily increased her feeling of power, as she was acting in agreement with the majority of individuals within her family and the community. This behaviour correlates with the Protective Discourse and leads to her lack of responsibility to self and overly responsible actions to others. Using Gordon’s (1980) fourth position of giving to others and not to self, has led to a position of internal conflict.

The traditional views that Carmel’s family had taught her, led her from one man who lavished her with flowers, gifts and attention, to two others who acted in the same manner. Carmel, even though she supported the traditional values of society [line 189, 200, 344], was very certain about how she should be treated [line 348, 363]. She believed that a relationship where her need for trust was not met was a very difficult one [line 362] and would lack intimacy. Her steadfast support of the positive values of respect, intimacy and trust, that she believed should be demonstrated towards women within a relationship, within the demonstrations of traditional patriarchal norms, was also the accepted values of her partners [line 363]. Carmel was also mindful of being responsible in all actions and frowned upon any of her partners expressing irresponsible behaviours, as her first partner had done.
Because I [am] more responsible
I didn’t think he was very responsible with his money. His
...behaviour wasn’t very responsible.

I argue that the difference between Carmel and the other female participants was her knowledge of what she wanted and how it was to be demonstrated. She had more control over her life and silently demanded respect from others, due to the self-awareness and knowledge she had learned. Even though Carmel followed traditional values, norms and beliefs, she would not settle for a man with whom she did not feel comfortable with [line 376], or who did not treat her with respect [line 380]. This attitude positioned her so that she was able to increase her feeling of power, and at times, at the expense of others. Patton (1993) identified individuals, in a position of relative weakness, as those who have the desire to hurt others, in order to increase their feeling of power. Carmel’s position, I argue, was one of power, as she was able to gain the feeling of power from males, who were able to understand her values and act in a supportive manner. Although her third partner was a strong individual, and was able to understand and provide support for Carmel’s values, he had his Australian cultural values that Carmel struggled with, and was irritated by [line 394]. This struggle became upsetting and a problem for Carmel [line 399]. She demonstrated this through her words when she said “I used to say to him don’t flick your fork at me when your talking to me” [line 405]. There were times when she felt it necessary to tell this man what to do, and through her orders, be dominant over him. It is my interpretation that Carmel’s fear is evidenced through her continued domination of her male partners. This fear has prevented her from recognising the benefits of change, which may lead to power sharing activities. Carmel’s blaming of others for their lack of responsibility hides her own lack of responsibility to self and others.
Burr (1998) has argued that even these self-aware, positive and powerful positions, that many feminists describe in their discourses, are only a reproduction of historical values, which supposedly create a position of democratisation within a relationship. They have been constructed from the positions of all participants, not just the dominating male position. Indeed, it has been the meanings that individuals have derived from historical and new discourses, which have reproduced the heterosexual relationship in a multitude of reflexive states (Foucault, 1990). These changed states have constituted an increased feeling of power for many women, and have led to the situation where some women are now in a similar position to that which the dominant men have held: power over others. This power dominant position of women was obvious to me from the data transcripts of female participants. These positions of domination for both men and women have been illustrated in Figure 1, which follows. The balanced detached position of power sharing (Figure 2), I argue, is often a very difficult understanding to achieve and will only be learned when an individual chooses to look for creative alternatives to their present demonstrations of power.

When the pain of power domination over self from others, through discourse or discursive practices, becomes too great to withstand, individuals may compare and question their own demonstrations to those of others, and look for possible changes of non-resistance or creative power sharing within self. Tom was one participant who did question and compare his conflictual situations and with the assistance of his third partner was able to identify alternative methods of responsibility, which led to a power sharing relationship. I found it quite distressing that so many opportunities for change in the lives of the participants have been made available to them and they
were not taken up. The missing of these opportunities has indicated to me that for individuals to change, they need to first become aware of the need for change and then search for assistance from another individual who is understanding of how to create this change. An example of these missed opportunities was with Missy when she was talking about her present actions in life. These actions, I believe, fluctuated from a discourse of fear to one of protection and it did not appear that she understood there to be another position for change through a detached discourse, and therefore her struggles still were continuing. These actions of power sharing will increase the feeling of power for all individuals within that situation. The theme of the Detached Discourse, where all individuals have a position to voice their beliefs, will be discussed in the following chapter as being a necessary element for the demonstration of power sharing, and the progression of consequences for the increasing of the feeling of power.
Figure 1. Progression of the feeling of power into the commitment themes illustrated as the fear and protective discourses.

(Wallace, 2002)
Figure 2. The progression of the feeling of power into the theme of commitment known as the detached discourse.

(Wallace, 2002)
Chapter 6  Communicating Commitment Discourse

Discussions of commitment have traditionally focused around the socially acceptable roles of both men and women. The socially acceptable discourses of commitment that this study challenges are where men act in ways that dominate and women act in ways that position them as the dominated. I argue that power sharing needs to be recognised as a significant medium of communication, for increasing the feeling of power that could change these socially accepted discourses of domination and dominated to a discourse of detachment and sharing. In this chapter I demonstrate how discourses of commitment within the sample follow these patterns and explain the consequences for the participants.

Tom believed that communication must be present in every walk of life [line 245.5]. He went on to say that struggles may occur when communicating between a number of individuals, however, there may be one individual within the group who is able to openly communicate with you, on a level similar to your own. This open communication is accomplished through being able to put aside the socially acceptable norms and explain your own beliefs without being dominated, or corrected, with the other individual feeling free to do the same. Gordon (1980) supported this belief, stating that the art of listening to another individual, and through dialogue with this individual, a person is able to be in a more aware state of self-overcoming. Hence, sharing through open communication can lead to the sharing of the feeling of power for both individuals thus enhancing their relationship.
really well,
...those you just can’t talk to, you got nothing in
common what so ever, and yet there’s always one special one that you become
either a really good friend with, or a lover.

This need to communicate with one individual, more than with another, is
illustrated by Tom in his attempts to discuss issues with his second wife [line 239].
Tom preferred to talk to his partner about any difficulties that they may be
experiencing, so both perspectives on a topic could be explained and examined [lines
321, 322, 323, 324, 325]. However, she was unable to or unwilling to fully engage in
any meaningful discussions and tensions that occurred [lines 520.6,521,522]. For
Tom, while open communication within his relationships could often be difficult, he
continued to pursue this goal.

...I personally ...have to resolve a problem and if ...it’s not
resolved at the time then ...it tends to eat away at me. So yes communication
is very, very important in that respect. Some people don’t. Some people clam
up. I mean I’d rather have a good slanging match, get everything out in the
open and then, shake hands and off you go...

Tom held open communication in high regard. He introduced his value of
open communication, even more strongly, into his third marriage [line 384.4, 385].
At times, when Tom’s third wife would bottle her problems up inside herself [line
405], he would speak with her until she was able to talk about her problem [line 406].
Tom used whatever form of verbal persuasion he thought necessary to draw out the
issues his wife was withholding and worrying about. Tom did this so that they could
work together and solve the problem [line 425]. Even though Tom performed in this
way, believing it was the best for both of them, it could be argued that he was actually
utilising power over his partner, by not allowing her to be silent, or to withdraw, when
she needed. Gordon (1980) supported this need for withdrawal, by stating that, at
times, solitude or withdrawal from the masses was necessary for further creativity and
self-understanding. It was important for the strengthening of the inner feeling of
power. Thus, while open communication is beneficial individuals may need space to
work through their issues personally, before discussing them with someone else.

384.4 ...I'm a great talker
385 I'd rather talk it out, than fight it out.

403 In her own way, she's not as ...open about things as I am.
405 ...like I said before, sometimes she'll bottle things up, which to me is
406 not good, but I can usually get it out of her eventually and once it's out, it's
407 usually resolved.

For Tom, relationships are being formed or constructed while an individual is
getting to know another individual. This construction of a relationship is achieved
through communication, while the individuals are enjoying each other's company
[lines 346, 348, 349]. Additionally, Tom believed that an individual might experience
difficulties in communicating, due to the experiences that the person had in past
relationships [line 331]. Tom revealed that he struggled with the art of
communication [lines 331, 332, 346, 348, 349], and believed this was due to his
inability to leave an issue alone, and his need to voice his views. Tom's second
partner disregarded his views that related to her inappropriate behaviour towards
other men at work, and he was forced to accept these unacceptable behaviours [line
294] if the relationship was to continue. Tom struggled with his unwillingness to
leave any issue alone, and his partner's disregard, in addition to, the conflict between
listening to others and listening to himself. Change may have occurred if he was able
to accomplish a balance between open communication and dominating
communication to respect and accept self and others as displayed in a Detached Discourse.

331 ...what had gone on in the past i.e. failed
333 relationship, failed marriage, initially it was test the water and see
346 all relationships are formed, certainly in my opinion, formed
348 in the same way. i.e. the first thing is you enjoy each others company, you’re
349 able to communicate...

In contrast, Russell revealed that it was very difficult for him to communicate with his partner, even though she voiced her concerns, that she needed him to provide more input and suggestions [line 127]. He was not sure if he had accomplished the task she set. Russell stated that he was “just that way inclined” [line 133, 134]. It appears that Russell was not comfortable communicating, and left the structure of conversation to others. Even when he did attempt to communicate, he was unsure if he had succeeded or not. Such inability, and fear, did not make for an open style of communication between himself and others. Nevertheless, I argue he was able to gain control and power over others, through his silent behaviour, by forcing them to instigate and continue the conversation if they wished to hold a discussion with him. This contrasted with his partner’s wish to have him contribute to their conversations. She was trying to create a more balanced situation, whereby they both felt comfortable in their discourse.

127 She wanted me to be more, to have more input, as far as suggesting
130 things.
133 ...oh well I took it on board, but whether it made any changes I don't
135 really know. I’m just...just that way inclined.
The skills of communication and participation within situations are associated with an increase in the feeling of power, for self and others. Such skills encourage the sharing of power and information, enhancing other people’s feeling of power and self-worth, and encouraging others by producing enthusiasm (Rosener, 1990 in Troemel-Ploetz, 1994 Worzyt & Zook, 1992). Participation by others is increased by the acknowledgment of another individual’s presence, and by showing them respect for their ‘creative’ ideas and suggestions (position three). Sharing power and information is about explaining one’s own thoughts and experiences, and ‘listening’ to what other individual’s think of the experience (Gordon, 1980). Furthermore, Russell believed that his partner had her “own issues about [him] that were never brought out and discussed” [lines 221,223], and continued to control the situation, by not communicating with him about their relationship difficulties.

As the interviewer, I found myself having feelings of frustration, and powerlessness, when attempting to communicate with Russell during his interview. While being open about the rules he saw as necessary within his relationships, he appeared to be unable to provide in-depth information, in relation to the questions that I presented, e.g. “I don’t know, can’t remember” [line 144]. Russell often repeated himself, through varying answers, in relation to the issue of commitment; I’m only there as fun, I don’t want anything serious [line 265]; just going out and enjoying each other’s company [lines 52, 54]. Russell took the position of not participating in the interview and relationship interactions, both situations that may be seen as requiring a form of commitment. By not committing to interactions, Russell positions himself to powerfully block and control situations, as demonstrated through his responses. By Russell involving himself in this research he has identified his personal
struggle with open communication.

345  Because I'd already voiced my opinion on commitment in A, B & C
346  relationships, it was understood right from the start that, that was what I
348  wanted and if they didn't like it at that point, well then, things didn't happen
349  the way they were going to happen. In other words the relationship would
350  break up or something would change

It became obvious that it was this behaviour that allowed Russell to avoid the
challenges, tensions, or problems, that may arise when an individual attempts to
discuss, understand, and resolve difficulties within personal relationships (FD). For
all three relationships that Russell discussed, he made it very clear that he had not
been interested in any form of a serious relationship with any of his partners. Indeed,
many of Russell’s partners had ended their relationship with him [line 362]. This was
possibly due to the unavailability of opportunities to assist in increasing his partner’s
feeling of power through verbal sharing of individual, or joint struggles. It appears
his fear was that sharing within a relationship might lead to a more serious
relationship outcome and exposure of his self. I would like to argue that Russell’s
dominating behaviour sustained his present feeling of power, however, prevented
personal growth through interactive communication, and opportunities arising for
power sharing relationships.

Phil explained he experienced difficulty in solving problems [line 700]. He
tended to act in a more domineering manner [line 702], rather than, sharing the
tension with any of his wives (FD). A lot of conflict [line 704] occurred between Phil
and his second wife, who was also domineering [line 704]. Consequently, they often
found themselves unable to reconcile their differences within their relationship [lines
708]. Phil stated this was because they “just did not know ...how the hell to do [it]”
...I was very underdeveloped obviously... whilst I'd had quite a lot of experience... I found difficulty in solving differences with other people.  
caused a lot of conflict when I came up against very solid people like my ex-wife who had worked out who exactly, where she was going in life and then we couldn't reconcile. We just didn't know how...the hell to do that.

In contrast, Shirley believed, in all three of her relationships, there was an open communication style, and her partners became her best friends. Shirley stated that as her partner was her best friend, she felt comfortable to speak to him about everything and anything [lines 30, 31]. It is my interpretation that they had developed a trusting relationship, wherein they were able to share personal views, and hold general discussions, aligning with the Detached Discourse.

We both talk to each other
He talks to me as much as I talk to him.
If I, if I didn’t like anything I'd tell him

Carmel’s second relationship was described in similar sharing terms to Shirley’s relationships [lines 168, 168.5]. However, during Carmel’s third relationship, she found it necessary to tell her partner how to behave, rather than, participating in a discussion about his behaviour [line 403].

So he would tell me all of his thoughts. You know we just had great communication

Carmel experienced many struggles and still she remained in the relationship. I perceive Carmel's communication style within the relationship enabled her to
experience an increase in the feeling of power through teaching her partner how to behave in a socially appropriate manner. This situation is aligned with the third value position of McClelland’s (1975) where an individual uses helping behaviours, which implicitly increase the feeling of power for the helper. The third value position encompasses a sense of competition, and the belief that it is a duty to enlighten the other individual to their illegitimate behaviours. Carmel, as the teacher, was positioning herself as the more knowledgeable individual within the situation (FD). I argue that as Carmel progresses through similar new experiences and situations, she may creatively construct and demonstrate other possible methods of power, such as power sharing. If new and creative meanings were to be allocated to the traditional truth of domination, shared responsibility may become more noticeable and meaningful to her, providing the opportunity for the experience of shared power.

Interestingly, Melissa believed that an open style of communication was performed within her relationship even though her partner would talk for hours on any one topic, and not reach any resolution [lines 278, 279]. Speaking at a person, I argue, does not provide a position of power sharing, rather, a power-dominating situation. Melissa blames herself for not being able to think more clearly [line 282, 283], providing herself as the excuse for his behaviour (PD), thereby minimising her partner’s behaviour.

Denneson (1999) rejected the notion that individuals could perform in a democratic fashion eg: equal participation in discussions. For individuals to accept this notion, the effect would be that no individual could internally feel himself, or herself, to be superior over others, or take pleasure in its force, because they were
supposedly equal. Nietzsche proposed a maximisation of this internal feeling of power, through actively striving for the transformation of human selfhood, through the exercising of power sharing activities between self and others (Patton, 1993). Melissa’s partner may have been seen as unconsciously providing her, through their struggles, with the opportunities for her to learn not to blame herself, rather to measure her internal feeling of power through an increased understanding of his verbalisations of domination. Through her acceptance and understanding of verbal domination she may creatively transform her understanding of self and others (DD). Had Melissa decided that the values she held within this relationship were no longer appropriate, she may have creatively constructed new values that would provide her with an increased feeling of power. These creatively constructed values could have provided Melissa with other options to make further decisions about the different ways she would prefer herself, and her partner, to show their commitment to each other.

While communicating with others, I argue a problem may eventuate when individuals do not verbally dominate, but continuously keep their views to themselves, and will not explain, or even tell another individual that they are experiencing a difficulty. Tom, Russell, Tony, Wilma, Margaret, and Missy all declared that, at times, they had either bottled up problems they were experiencing, or that their partners had done the same. Consequently, further difficulties arose within the relationships.

405 ...she’ll bottle things up (Tom)

221 I’m sure she had her own issues about
Wilma, Russell and Melissa felt uncomfortable discussing their beliefs concerning the topic of commitment within heterosexual relationships for fear of negative consequences. These fears were, at times, made obvious through the participant’s unconscious responses, such as laughing and coughing, which indicated to me that another discourse was present but unrecognised by the participant. These unrecognised discourses Nietzsche argued were individuals often feared hurtful consequences and have avoided or shown resistance to them. Individuals at these times may have readjusted, or withheld, their verbal responses to appear to be in accordance with the legitimate laws upheld by society (Denneson, 1999 and Freedman & Coombs, 1996). Wilma, Russell and Melissa demonstrated tensions during their interviews, when they laughed (Wilma and Melissa) or inhaled deeply (Russell) on numerous different occasions when the discussion was not conducive to this behaviour. Kaufmann (1968) argued that the psychological phenomenon of fear was the most deplorable universal human trait. Nietzsche also argued that this trait of fear, and intensive consideration for the opinions of others, conformity,
powerlessness, and the betrayal of destiny have occurred (Kaufmann, 1968).

Nietzsche has stated that self-preservation, when used as a controlling, or fear-inducing device within an interaction, is the utilisation of the external ‘will to power’ to further increase the feeling of power (Denneson, 1999). Self preservation is involved in protecting an individual’s own present state of the feeling of power, as well as, increasing it. These responses of participants indicated to me that there was other information that could have been brought out during the interview and was not. I was constantly phased as an interviewer with the feeling that there was more that the participants could have said. This interpretation was compiled by the fact that very often participants would make responses like laughing, which indicated that something was not being said. I put this together with my interpretation of Nietzsche and believe that if the participant had been in a position to allocate discourse (Denneson, 1999) to what was not said, the participant’s interpretation of their position in that experience may be different. It is my opinion that allocating further discourse to the topic being discussed would mean they may have to change something or even address another issue, which may be too confronting for the participant at that time.

Wilma’s story has been included here to show how easily language, even by a trained professional, can be unintentionally influenced and changed, to the point of neglect, through the external pressures of society within varying contexts. Even though Wilma was discussing important and sensitive events, that constructed major tensions within her relationships, she often burst out laughing, and at times, blew raspberries, or coughed. The laughter, a high pitched, long lasting, hysterical kind of
laugh, was the most predominant response throughout her interview. Wilma’s laughter signified to me the importance of the topics being discussed, and that Wilma was, at some level, uncomfortable with the topic being discussed. Wilma appeared very sensitive about discussing her past relationships, and at times, was unable to express her thoughts and feelings in any other manner than through laughter.

...and if he didn’t like it well that’s sorry [laughing] I want to talk to other people here.

...oh it compounded it. [laughing] You’ve got a man feeling insecure because he’s feeling I’m not as committed and I start feeling well I’m not going to invest in this as much [blows raspberry] because frankly, it’s not appreciated and I start pulling back and he’s already feeling like I am well, she’s bailing out even more.

Because sometimes when I’d try, I’d get, oh don’t be ridiculous
R: so he wasn’t very good with open communication?
no, no.
R: we’ll move onto the third [relationship].

oh [laughing] oh ok [still laughing]
R: ok So the same question applies again. How did you demonstrate commitment within this relationship?
In very much the same way. [laughing]

...because if I’m committed. [still laughing]

If I care about someone I’m committed to them and when I’m like that, I like to do things for them to show it, to show that I care.

I wasn’t so open with him anymore.

I’d been punished for it before.
And I had my second chance. I didn’t want to blow it.
And I felt I had done before, when I’d been so open and honest.

I learnt that there was, you could be punished for it too. [laughing]

R: So you have a conflict there.

[still laughing] You have to be very careful who you are like that with. But in the mean time I’ve learnt that’s a very valuable risk to take.

At this point in the interview, Wilma was speaking of a situation that occurred within her third relationship, which she defined as her most distressing break up [line 469]; she laughed throughout the conversation. I kept wondering what she would
have said, or even done, if she had been able to demonstrate the words or actions, of this other discourse, that described her thoughts and emotions concerning that situation. The following narratives further illustrate these responses of laughter utilised by Wilma. Importantly, her tone of voice, and the story shared, revealed the importance of the situation being discussed.

431 Any other conflict? amm [cough] mmm yes [laughing] I amm actually
432 yeah. It was very interesting how it popped out of the blue. I got to use his
433 computer one night when he was at work and I found he’d been chatting to
434 other women on the Internet.
446 But because these [discussions with other women] were hidden. I took that as
447 not very amm... honest. [laughing again]
454 But because I had it so fixed in my head, what I wanted and what I wanted
455 to see and what I wanted to get out of it, I didn’t really listen to him and see
456 what was really there. [coughing]
463 So I said to him, I think we’ll finish it here and now, because you haven’t been
464 honest, in my opinion you’ve been unfaithful, but that, I recognise is based on
466 my standards but they’re my standards. And so we broke up. Very, very hard
467 for me, very, very easy for him. He had the next one lined up. [laughing
467.5 again] But amm, mm. yeah
468 R: That sounds as if that, that would have been very sad for you actually.
469 That would have to be amm I would say, the most distressing break up I’ve had.

Russell’s answers were vague, and he continuously peppered his discourse with the sounds of irritating deep breathing, sucking noises, or air and bubble blowing from his mouth. It was within Russell’s interview that I struggled to understand his style of communication. I asked him, after the interview, if my questioning irritated him. He said no, and that he was actually trying very hard to provide me with accurate answers to the questions. His intense level of concentration was the reason he gave for these responses. However, instead of these responses, I wonder about what would have been said, had he been able to verbally voice his feelings and
thoughts instead of deep breathing and blowing bubbles. Below are only a few
selected unspeakable responses that he utilised during the interview.

12 I didn’t want to get married. [deep breath]

20 [deep breath] amm none. Just take it as it comes.

30 [deep breath] Well nothing was ever really discussed as far as commitment

46 [deep breath] seeking contact with the female variety.

85 oh same understanding, as far as I was aware. [deep breath huffing strongly]

119 amm.[deep breath]. Are you meaning there, as in niggling things to
124 her, that she’d say to me, that she wanted to change. Is that part of what
124.5 you’re trying to get at?

127 She wanted me to be more, to have more input, as far as suggesting
130 things. That was the only thing.
133 amm oh well I took it on board but whether it made any changes I don’t
135 really know. [deep breath] I’m just, just that way inclined [deep breath].

376 a definition [of commitment]. amm well [blows air like bubbles]
378.5 well I guess the ultimate things in commitment for a relationship is
379 obviously marriage. amm [deep breath in, then blew it out loudly] [another
deeep breath in and out]

I had a similar feeling about Melissa who laughed most of the way
through her interview. In contrast to her response of humour, I found her story sad
and her responses quite confusing and distressing.

16 [laughing loudly] wasn’t yeah for a sixteen year old I think it was pretty good
19 No I thought that was more than enough. [laughing]

37 yeah it was sort of like oh ok and the off on the motor bike thing was just a
37.5 big shock. [laughing] That even now I can remember being shocked by that.
38 yeah, yeah. I can remember thinking oh ok
39 [laughing] aren’t they terrified of these things. Because I was. It was
terrible [laughing].
41 [still laughing and talking loudly] It was a long time ago.

97 [husband was] extremely dominating in interpersonal ways [and] ...very
jealous. I mean retrospectively of what truly matters [laughing]

It’s taken me all my years
157 to get mature enough to realise that dreams can’t abate and that dreams can’t
157.5 be realised all by themselves, that you have to do something about it.
158 [laughing again] Something like that.

But then you know I put up with it [laughing].
179 [laughing] Unwise and stupid [laughing at herself]

They’re going to screw things up. But you can’t actually stop
409 them from doing it. yeah, so yeah been, I’ve always tended to stay focused on
410 What are my responsibilities here, What can I do? yeah But sometimes that
411 back fires on me. So, don’t look at,.. well don’t look at the stuff that I can’t
412 catch up. Except then I’d say what, oh no way, no more. [laughing loudly]
413.2 Sorry I’m off. Bye. [laughing]
415 [still laughing] I have one way of dealing with everything, run away. Put up,
416 put up, put up run away. [screeching and laughing] It’s a terrible pattern.
443 This is no ideal situation. It’s not going to work. I just hung in there for
444 another twelve months. [laughing and screeching]
510.5 and get out of my road and so cut your losses. That’s not where we’re
511 supposed to be but you know it’s very hard isn’t it. But fun [screeching and
smiling]

I argue that it has been these unspeakable responses that have provided a
smoke screen for the participant’s feeling of power, or their belief in their lack of
power within their relationship. It could also be that the participants were positioning
himself or herself to experience an increase in their feeling of power at the expense of
their listener by using these confusing, and frustrating responses such as laughter,
screeching or deep breathing.

It was during Tom’s interview, that I first realised that individuals expect,
assume and take for granted that other individuals understand what they are
experiencing, or have experienced, e.g. even their unconscious responses. This often
becomes apparent when the words ‘you know’ are introduced into the conversation.
The statement ‘you know’, often indicates that the other person must know what the
first person knows. Gergen (1991) has stated that even though all individuals have lived different or similar experiences, they will construct knowledge and create interpretations, that may only be pertinent to them. Without observing it, or consciously knowing it, Dennison (1999) argued that an individual’s beliefs will have influenced, or impacted on, their interpretations within any situation, as it is impossible for any individual to be neutral and unbiased.

47 I think it was just amm, you know, it was a
48 first serious foray into male, female relationship on my part

296 she wasn’t playing the field put it that way. You know. It was
297 just how she was...

298 ...the centre of attraction used ...to be
298.4 in the group of males.
299 so yes you know. You had to learn to live with that one.

301 ...you either trusted them
301.4 or you know

When Margaret was asked about her first relationship, she appeared to become quite upset, and even distressed, at the very thought of her ex-partner [line 12]. This relationship was not one of joy and happiness for Margaret. It was one of sacrifice and responsibility at an early age. To avoid discussing such sensitive information, Margaret expected me to know what she had been through, without having voiced it. I did not challenge her on these points, as she appeared distressed, and I did not wish her to become more upset.

37 Well we enjoyed doing the same things. you know.
40 I s’pose the weird thing about it was, we
43 really didn’t do that much. You know, just the drive in.
46 I really don’t know now.
67 I don’t know, because I s’pose you know, like thirty years ago, oh
probably more when we started going out. It was just the way I was brought up that the man was dominant. You know what I mean. You did what they said. You didn’t do what you wanted to do.

In the past, discursive spaces have often been denied due to “patriarchal discourses and social and political structures” (Tapper, 1993:141). Even though Nietzsche’s work challenges these structures, his work does support the concept that struggles are necessary, even those to access a position of power over others, e.g. patriarchy. Indeed, it has been through these struggles that further discursive spaces have been revealed. These spaces have allowed for creative construction of discourse and discursive practices, open discussion, personal growth, and the interaction of awareness and knowledge.

Tom voiced the idea that an individual can talk about their problems in the open, but they may experience major difficulties in the process of attempting to resolve them. For Tom, this practice may have contributed to the end of his relationship.

...I mean the fact that you could work round [problems] and progress again, then you sort of start thinking that maybe this might go a little bit further... I mean if you came to absolute loggerheads you’d think well, stuff this and that would be the end of it.

All individuals have different views about problems and how to solve them. Post structuralists believe that there are many solutions to a problem, and that another person’s difference of opinion to solving a problem may assist others in choosing an appropriate solution (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn & Walkerdine, 1998). Keith
approached a counsellor to help him with his relationship problems [line 174]. Keith had his opinions, and his wife had her opinions. She would hound and hound and hound him [line 406], until she got her own way [line 407]. Keith believed the input of a third person would provide them with a helping hand over this struggle. For Melissa the case was different. She felt the only option was to run away [line 151] and to avoid the constant attacks [line 145] by her husband. Neither of these options have created the desired outcome for the participants.

Margaret voiced the belief that a resolution was more often constructed when both parties have been able to voice their opinions; have been heard by the partner; and have been able to find a solution that was satisfactory to both; or where one partner was able to step back, and allow the other to have power over the situation. Margaret experiences this state by demonstrating to her partner that he was important, and by sharing the feeling of power, can lead to an increase in each other's feeling of power and commitment, especially when the partner gave to her in a similar way. This giving was how Margaret defined her style of communication with her third partner [lines 405, 406], following her two previous relationship experiences, where she did not have a life of her own [line 89] with open communication. She had previously gone along with what her partners wanted [line 89], and was not allowed to have a voice [lines 77, 78].

404 we worked together to overcome that.
405 by discussing it and talking about it, and him saying how he felt and me
406 saying how I felt and
407 sort of bringing it out in the open and talking about it

Denneson (1999) stated that, without suffering, e.g. not being permitted a
creative voice, inequality, mistrust, domination, privileges and an authoritative power over others, self-reflection, self-determination and self-overcoming for any individual, was unavailable. The values of democracy e.g. equality are the exact opposites of self-overcoming, however, democracy does provide the experience of suffering, which encourages an individual to change (Denneson, 1999). If there were no painful, or even uncomfortable, experiences in an individual’s life, they would not be interested in, or need to change their outlook, performances or beliefs. These individuals would be continually in agreement with all other individuals, and a situation of power sharing would not be created. Indeed, closed styles of communication would be retained, and remain unchanged, until the individual experienced conflict as a response to their communication style. This closed style of communication may account for Margaret being unable to demonstrate her style of sharing power with her first two partners.

In Tom’s story, personal awareness and the development of integrative or shared styles of commitment [line 539] were the most beneficial aspects for open communication [line 542].

536    But being in a, a family environment
537    you saw how a family
539    integrates with each other and shows commitment...
540    ...and cares for each other. How ...it makes the
542    whole situation so much better. They ...communicate...
543    ...I realised it was a better
543    way of carrying on. It was more of a family commitment and so I’ve had to
544    change. I’ve changed and learnt to change I hope (Tom)

While an open style of communication may be sought, vocabulary skills may be quite ineffective. Gergen and Davis (1985) stated that individuals have often been
limited by the lack of vocabulary skills in relation to forms of narrative and oral stories, and their knowledge of narrative conventions. This lack of vocabulary could have been the case for Keith, as he did not receive a formal education when he was younger. Keith had grown up in a low socio-economic environment, and did not have the skills of reading and writing. Even under these conditions, Keith found that the stimulating conversations he experienced with his second partner assisted him in constructing a close bond between them. It appears that Keith and his partner were able to function in a power-sharing manner in relation to their discussions to increase their commitment to each other.

486 she was a lot better educated than I
486.5 was, through her schooling. So she's could ...talk about different
487 things in a different way than I understood. So I loved havin a
488 conversation with her. We could sit there and talk ...for
489 four or five hours. No TV just sit there and communicate on that level
490 and I loved that. That we could do that. That was part of my
491 commitment to enjoy the conversation.

The discovery of open communication for Missy [line 912] helped her to understand more clearly how another individual constructs knowledge. Now when she has a doubt, or has misunderstood [line 909] what she has heard during a conversation, she will ask questions to increase her understanding [line 911].

Carmel stated that it was important what you do together as a couple, as well as, the way you communicate with each other [lines 154, 155]. Therefore, she believed that the intimacy and trust that her and her partner experienced in her second relationship, was possibly due to their open style of communication, where they had no secrets from each other [line 156].
Wilma found that even after using an open communication style, at times, it was necessary for her to readdress past seemingly resolved issues with her partners. She found that, in some situations, the issue was resolved at that time, however, at a future date and time, it was necessary to revisit this situation as she or her partner had begun struggling with their past decisions. Wilma did not mind revisiting a past difficulty, as she would rather the problem be out in the open, and discussed again, rather than, withheld and cause problems. Wilma believed that the need to revisit a situation might have occurred because she had not listened to what her partner was actually trying to communicate to her [line 451, 452] at that time. She may have had fixed ideas, and may have been obscuring her understanding of the situation, rather than seeing the situation as her partner may have done [lines 454, 455, 456].

194 If they come and talked to me about it and say look, I know we’ve agreed on
195 this, however, I’m finding now we’re doing it
196 ...that’s not quite what I’m comfortable with, I am more than
197 happy to talk about it and work out another workable solution.
199 But when the person shuts me out of the equation, when I have been
200 working in with them, then that’s when I get annoyed

Melissa, Missy and Carmel acknowledged that they believed that misunderstandings, between their partners and themselves, might have occurred due to the words used during their communications. For Carmel, her interpretation of the differences in language while communicating lead her to first doubt her partner’s level of intelligence. She later realised that her partner, while intelligent, was just a man who had very little to say.

225 one of my problems in my relationship is that we don’t use words the
225.5 same way [laughing] (Melissa)
...like they can’t if you’re on a higher plain or level... [of] ...communication than what they are, they get scared of that they get frightened they don’t want to know, they’re just safe in their own little world (Missy)
His personality, they usually have a fairly vibrant personality amm amm he wasn’t, he wasn’t quite so intellectual. Actually he was quite a smart guy, but he didn’t have a lot of conversation I didn’t think. amm I don’t know. (Carmel)

For all these participants, open communication, has played an enormous role in the direction of their relationships. This communication has influenced whether their relationship continued or not, as well as, the individual’s awareness of self and others, and the method/s utilised to resolve, or not resolve, their relationship difficulties. Language thus provides the ground for inquiry into meaning, and its allocation within differing contexts of historical variability (Oliver, 1997 and Hollway, 1989).

An individual’s freedom to interact and communicate, provides a position for themselves and others to reconstruct their knowledge and understanding of a situation. If this freedom was not available their understanding would be minimal and the taken-for-granted social norms may not be recognised and the utilisation of various sounds such as laughing and blowing bubbles may become prominent in their discourse. Where this greater knowledge base and understanding of self and others is gained, it may provide a position from which all individuals within an interaction are able to identify socially acceptable and historical discourses of commitment and increase their feeling of power. With this accomplishment, a position for personal growth, self-overcoming and a greater understanding of the different styles for demonstrating commitment may become available.
Commitment in heterosexual relationships can be demonstrated not only through written and verbal communication but through actions performed. The discursive practice or performance of commitment is obvious through the actions of gift buying, money earning, and within some partnerships, child bearing. Nietzsche sees these actions as being another important aspect of the “will to power” (Patton, 1993). These power-increasing actions, that Nietzsche argued, also include actions of service to others, through the ‘gift-giving’ virtue (Patton, 1993) of recognition or sharing, which assists in helping self, and others, to feel more powerful. Each individual brings to their relationships, their previously interactively acquired norms, values, and beliefs, such as their knowledge of, and opinions on, how commitment within a relationship is best performed. The styles or themes of commitment performed within a heterosexual relationship will be dependant on the historical, social, and political (external) influences, in addition to, an individual’s understanding of self (internal dedications, interpretations, and meanings). I argue that if both partners strongly support their own norms, values and beliefs, and are inflexible and use power over others, then tensions will eventuate. These tensions may be revealed in how the commitment has been recognised, or understood, by the partner. If the demonstrations of commitment of an individual are not recognised, or are misunderstood by their partner, the partner may respond with actions that do not appear appropriate to the situation, and thus lead to the first individual feeling neglected, or even rejected.

Misunderstandings have often occurred when the demonstrations of
commitment of one partner have not been in accordance with the demonstrations, or interpretations, of commitment of the other partner. Although partners may find a balance in their individual demonstrations of commitment, especially when their awareness of their internal desire for power increases, and their external experiences of power become more obvious, and thus highlight the individual’s present position. When this happens, Denneson (1999) argued that the evaluation and interpretation of norms, values, and beliefs will change, increase, and grow. This new knowledge will culminate in the overcoming of the previously selected position, and now outdated knowledge, and consequently recreate the knowledge and demonstration of power sharing, as well as, the understanding of commitment within heterosexual relationships.

Tensions arising between individuals and their partners were often cited by participants as occurring frequently in relation to financial difficulties and gender differences, as a result of struggles to increase the feeling of power. Hollway (1998:228) contended that “heterosexual relations are the primary site where gender difference is re-produced”. In addition, the externally constituted desire for power is the motivating force for the continuance, and reproduction of these differences. Tom stated that he did not experience tension within his relationship, but rather, within himself. He felt he received greater financial gains from the relationship, than his partner [line 448], and he was concerned as to how he would, in return, be able to fulfil the needs of his partner, in a balanced and sharing manner [line 567]. At the time of interviewing, Tom was still at a loss as to how he could resolve this internal struggle.
She probably gives more than I do in lots of ways. Probably financial. From a financial point of view I would get more money spent on me

For Keith, the problem was that his first wife was hungry for money [line 311], and that money made her happy [line 313]. Keith explained how he had let his first wife pay fifty-fifty towards expenses [line 16] and described how he had let her go out and buy their house with his money from his insurance payout [line 145]. He described how he did not take money from her when he worked as her employee [line 318], so she would have more money. Keith went on to say that their difficulties became obvious when his wife wanted to have a family, and requested he return to full-time work. These difficulties stemmed from his wife’s need for increased financial security for the future children. Keith, however, felt that he was not physically, or emotionally, well enough to return to full-time work. He previously had three car accidents and was still recovering. Keith was not in favour of having children, because of his lack of education, and the crime he had seen around him while growing up in a low socio-economic environment, made him fearful of raising children in that environment. He did not want children [line 56], especially while still living in Sydney. Keith’s struggle generated a discursive position where a lack of responsibility, due to his fear was demonstrated through his dominating wish to not have children (FD). Thus his dominating position prevented him from working towards a detached creative position of power sharing (DD).

Keith believed these two issues of financial security, and having a family, contributed to the increased difficulties that he and his wife experienced when trying to communicate effectively. When they moved to Queensland [line 71], Keith
attempted to assist his wife with her goal [line 198] of increasing their financial security, by assisting her in her work. However, he was concerned that his commitment was not totally there [line 72], and he was still hesitant about starting a family. Due to these conflicts, additional everyday difficulties developed, and Keith felt something was just not right [line 74] within their relationship.

14  So I let her keep her wages when it came to paying bills we
16  automatically put the money in 50-50 each and that way I let her keep
20  her independence.

55  That's when ...the commitment for having
56  children off me wasn't there. Because I had been brought up in a
57  socio-economical difficult background with parents and Housing
59  Commission Area and the way I lived.

144 When we
145 got the payout for the house, [my wife] went and picked the house and where
146 it was. That's how much committed I was to saving the marriage

195 I give her
196 that much freedom that when she started to work ...I wanted to show
198 her my commitment towards her [and her] getting ahead in life, that I looked
199 after the children a lot of the time

Keith's lack of full-time employment, or equal contribution to the financial security of the household, his wife believing he was well enough to return to work, and he believing otherwise, perpetuated the continuance of the difficult situations. No matter how much communication took place, there was no resolution. Eventually, as Keith stated, 'the brick walls went up' [line 322] as his wife could not see the physical pain he was experiencing [line 442].

Keith and his former partner were a couple who believed in democracy and equal rights, and strived on many occasions to secure it, however, democracy eluded
them. Their arguments often focused around what one partner had, or had done, and what the other partner did not have, and wanted to do.

316  Her commitment was
317  ...I work ...I deserve to go out. And I thought I'm at home
317.5 looking after the kids and I go out and help you when you get behind in
318  your work. I go out and help you, I don't ask for the money. She gives
320  people money, but if I go out a couple of Saturday's or during the week
321  with her, I don't keep the money I don't ask for it. And you could feel that
322  brick wall building up between us gradually but surely.

439  It was the point that she wanted me to go
440  out and work, didn't matter what and I'd suffered certain injuries in the
441  car accident and I knew that I would come home ag, aggravated, angry,
442  in pain but she didn't worry about it. She didn't worry about that. Not
443  what, not commitment for my anxieties, and pain that I do, did suffer
444  during that time. Because unless you see pain people discard it.

Kaufmann (1968) argued for Nietzsche's position that it has been a lack of awareness of self and others that has brought about the idea of stable mediocrity, or equal rights of democracy. According to Nietzsche, these beliefs of equal rights and democracy will never be achievable. This struggle for democracy, however, may provide individuals with an increased, shared and balanced, sense of power, for many individuals. Nietzsche argued that all struggles, even the struggles for equal rights and democracy, are really only a struggle to increase the feeling of power (Kaufmann, 1968). These necessary struggles Denneson (1999) believed have eventuated from an individual's desire for increasing their happiness, of gaining lasting pleasure and satisfaction, and for increasing self-growth and self-preservation.

No matter how often Keith demonstrated his commitment to his wife, he believed she was unaware of it. This lack of awareness may be seen as ensuring that the positions for further personal growth are blocked, and that the balance of the
feeling of power, for both individuals, is not achieved. Her commitment to the relationship “waned and lost its way” [line 208], “and in the end the relationship...split up” [line 210]. This split came abruptly for Keith, when he discovered his wife in bed with another bloke [line 211] who was willing to perform in the manner she requested. Due to the trauma of this experience, Keith, in his more recent relationships, lays down the rules for the relationship at its conception, and if anything goes wrong after that, the relationship ends (PD). These rules may be utilised as a justifiable method for power over his partners to enable him to protect himself. These rules, however, may not create a power sharing relationship, and until he is able to trust his partner to be interested in his needs, and committed to the relationship, he could find himself unable to step back from his rules, to encourage power sharing actions, rather than, power dominating actions.

771  I’m up
772  front at the start. I try and lay down ...mutual rules within the
773  relationship that if anything goes wrong, bang it’s finished

Similarly, Russell had rules that he told his partner, one rule being that he was not interested in being part of a serious relationship. Russell has nonetheless, expressed a liking for taking his partner out to dinner, listening to music, or sharing adventures together. Russell experienced internal struggles when it became obvious the relationship was progressing to a more serious level. Going out, having fun, and enjoying each other’s company, was as far as Russell was willing to demonstrate any form of commitment [lines 242, 291, 294, 295].

52  Well, to be involved with someone to the point where you’re going out
54  and enjoying each others company, whatever that entails, dinner or
55  whatever.
Russell had good ideas about how to demonstrate commitment, which other male participants appear to have forgotten e.g. taking to dinner [line 54], and respectful sexual relations [line 418]. However, due to his fear of the traditional form of commitment, that of marriage, he appeared to be unable to step back from his goal of not wanting to participate in any serious relationships. Russell's approach may have prevented him from increasing his feeling of power, or freedom, which may have been gained through an in-depth demonstration of commitment through power sharing. Such commitment may have lead to further constructions of knowledge for both Russell and his partner.

The tensions in Tony's relationships commenced whenever any of his previous partners wanted him to demonstrate commitment through the act of gift giving. Personal demonstrations of giving can be demonstrated by, in Russell's case, taking his partner to dinner [line 540], and in Keith's case, giving flowers and chocolates [line 190]. Tony's commitment was primarily shown through his demonstration of working continuously [line 169], to be financially secure at all times [lines 88, 101, 103]. Tony did demonstrate commitment in other ways to his previous wives, by assisting them in the kitchen, cleaning up after dinner [lines 193, 194], and always trying to be open and friendly [line 669]; his third wife was not impressed with these and wanted more. When Tony tried many different ways [line 648] to provide her with what she wanted, his position was literally shot down in flames [line 645]. Consequently, he was hesitant about having a child and purchasing a new home, which were the two demonstrations of his commitment that his wife wanted.

As far as my commitment was mainly to try and get the business established, get it going where it was comfortable so I could look after the family but we never pinned for anything as far as [money] goes. But
I think I over did it work wise. Rather than pushing it our as much effort into the family, which is part and parcel of survival cause without three meals on the table each day and mainly to pay the rent and whatever...it’s not a bottomless pit sort of thing. You’ve gotta have the income coming in but unfortunately I probably put the commitment as far as the bank loans and business first, cause we just grew apart. Simple as that.

Cause I said look I have to get up early in the morning and go to work. That was my commitment because I’d signed the papers for the mortgage on the business and whether it was to my detriment or not I don’t know, you can’t change history but it’s just a shame that we couldn’t get over that hurdle of worrying about the finances and having to work so hard.

It was these two issues of children, and the purchase of a new home, that brought Tony and his wife to a crossroad. Tony’s wife wanted to have children, but Tony already had a daughter to each of his two previous wives, and was not really interested in being financially responsible for another child. Tony attempted to explain his position to his wife, the responsibilities and sacrifices that would need to be made, and after the children from previous marriages had been dragged through the past two divorces, he did not want another child [line 367, 368]. Tony expresses that even when adults are determined not to involve the children in their divorce, they usually do. He believed troubles were imminent when children and money came together [line 369]. The financial responsibility associated with having children was very important to Tony, as his whole existence revolved around financial security, and working. He was not prepared, at that time, to support another family. The mention of finances in relation to children was enough for his third wife to end the marriage [line 603, 604, 606.5]. Tony’s third wife was very money orientated [line 626]. She declared she wanted to commit to other things in her life, e.g. her own mortgage [line 626], and if he was not willing to provide her with a child, then it was over [line 623, 624]. Tony’s wife was not willing to step back from her desire for
another house and children, and attempted to use power over Tony in order to fulfil her desire. Tony was over responsible in his desire for financial security, and he was not willing to step away from his goal either. My interpretation is that both parties contributed to the decline of the commitment within the relationship, by using power over each other.

602 It’s all right for you, you’ve got children.
603 But what I was trying to explain was, it’s
604 not ideal timing because she was just in a new position with her job only by
605 months
606 I was just in a new position with
606.5 my job only by a couple of months on a trial period

The struggles experienced by John were associated with financial issues also. John’s second wife was not interested in waiting for John to come back from the desert where he had secured a new job. She began having sexual relations with other men [line 14]. This behaviour upset John as he was working to support her, providing double the money [line 13] that he previously brought home and, when he did come home, she did not provide sex for him. Yet, as he put it, ‘he was paying for it’ [lines 16, 17]. Again, this may be a situation where both partners desire their own goals, but neither party appeared able to step back, observe, and understand the other’s position. It is my interpretation that John was operating from the fourth value position of McClelland (1975) and preventing himself from developing an attitude of acceptance, which is the fifth position of Gordon (1980), that enhances the possibility for self-overcoming.

6 [I worked night shift and provided her with] ...virtually whatever she wanted
7 I used to look after the kids so she could go and work
11 ...it worked out good for the first few years, then I got a job working in
the desert where I used to go away all the time.
...she was getting double the money that I normally give her and when the
cats away the mouse will play and that's what happened.
...I sort of spent too much time away I
suppose and all the favours were given to everybody else except me and I
was paying for it.
I used to give her money wise everything, virtually everything she needed.
We
never went hungry or went without anything.

Provider of financial security was John's primary position within his relationships. Within one relationship, he was working night shifts [line 312], and his wife would watch television all day, and refuse to cook his meals for him [line 314, 315]. John did not approve of this behaviour, as he was paying more than a boarder would, but not receiving what a boarder would receive, such as a decent meal [line 321, 322]. However, John says he would have been happy with this situation, if he had been provided with sex [line 320]. John did not see the point in continually giving her money, and assisting with the household duties whenever possible, to receive nothing in return. It is my interpretation that a form of empowerment that may have been useful in John and his partner's situation was acceptance for each other and for the effort that they had contributed to the relationship. This may have increased their feeling of power, and may have alleviated their tensions in some way.

At the time I was earning nine hundred bucks a week and giving her seven hundred a week. I used to be out sixteen hours a week worked night shift doing security work. I'd come home eight o'clock in the morning my food would be a plate of weetbix. Cook us a meal. No I'm not cooking at this time of the morning you have weetbix. By the time I had a shower and got to bed, I had to get up at three o'clock in the afternoon to get to work by four, cook us a feed. No I'm not cooking this time of the afternoon I've got to cook when the kids come home, have a sandwich. So I was living on weetbix and sandwiches at home and I figured if I couldn't get a feed and I figured you know, as long as I got sex once a week I was happy. But what's the point of me giving her seven hundred bucks a week for virtually, I'm not even classed as a boarder because at least a boarder gets a decent meal.
Phil said he “wasn’t able to take care of [his] own responsibilities, without
taking on [his] first ...wife, and then a couple of kids” [lines 67, 68]. He believed it
was his immaturity [line 141] that lead him to make decisions that brought further
struggles and difficulties into his life [line 145], such as going swimming, instead of
earning enough money to survive [line 145.5]. Even the responsibility of being
sexually faithful to his second partner, his fiancé, was a problem for Phil, as he found
it very difficult to say no to a women who demonstrated a desire for him [line 385.5,
385.8]. Later in his life, the actions Phil spoke of appeared to be more financially
responsible, and sexually faithful, to his third partner. Phil stated, “she was
understanding, of her Chinese culture, and his Australian culture” [line 655, 659].
Therefore, she did not try to dominate him in any way [line 651], and he found he no
longer emphasised any achievements, or domination over others, and his life became
a process [line 773, 776] of continual changes, rather than a number of winning
situations of domination.

469  ...I had very little money because I
470  was sending home money to support my previous family
471  ...and I had a responsible job and a good income, but I was broke as
471.5  broke.

522  ...well there was a two way street there, but whilst I didn’t have much
523  money we wound up in a very comfortable situation.

There appeared to be very little differences between the female participants
when it came to issues of financial security. Wilma, Shirley, Melissa, Missy, and
Carmel all cited money spending or earning, as difficulties within their relationships.
During Wilma’s second relationship, as the financial breadwinner of the family, her
partner struggled to understand why her attentions were not focused on him, as they
were traditionally to be. This was despite her performing the non-traditional act of working to support the family. Due to his traditional beliefs that women were to focus attention on their men, which Wilma did not do as often as he would have liked, he felt as if she was withdrawing from him.

266 ...I think he saw my withdrawal of some of my time
268 because I had to shift it to my job,
269 he saw me breaking away from him.
280 he'd express [to me]
281 ...you know your happier at work than you are with me and it was
282 horrible

For Melissa the financial story of commitment was a little different. As she had a dream of having a sharing partnership in her marriage [line 177], she continued to support her husband’s financial behaviour. The financial problems within the relationship took the form of her husband spending money in an irresponsible manner [line 181], and so Melissa was forced to work harder to make up the differences [line 183]. The problem became so taxing for her that she asked him to leave, as she would be more financially secure without him [line 186].

103 the fights were really around financing
123 Mostly it was money ...issues were money
172 [her husband had spent all the money] within twelve months
173 or two years of him coming out. [Melissa] had to sell the house, ...the
174 car. 1 ...was then put through three years of being careless [and] renting a
175 house with my mother.
182 He was always spending money and my response to that
183 was to earn more money and cover more, cover more, cover more ground

With regard to Missy’s situation, she stated that her partner typically provided her with money eg: if Missy was upset about anything, so that she could go out and
have a good time. If she did this, he believed her problem would be solved [line 431]; this did not solve the problem. Missy wanted to feel happy, and she found that money was not the key to that [line 435] happiness. It could be argued the problem for Missy was that her husband was gay and was uncomfortable having sex [line 441] with her. As he always held back his emotions [line 440], she began to feel angry, and really confused [line 442]. Missy’s husband could have been attempting to substitute emotional commitment with a his style of financial commitment. It recreated a situation of unhappiness, confusion, and anger, and constructed further issues in the use of power over others.

In contrast, Carmel’s partners were men who appeared to be very generous and thoughtful of her needs. Even though her first partner, a restaurateur, appeared to be sensitive to her needs, he also appeared to be very irresponsible, and would spend his family’s money on her, and she would then feel as if she were being bought [line 58]. His sensitivity did not go as far as being aware of her feelings in this matter. It appears his actions of striving for her attention, seemed to overpower his sensitivity, and so he performed another form of power over others, his family. This third form of domination found in McClelland’s (1975:19) Four Value Positions, “I have impact on others”, when used by Carmel’s partner, may have increased his feeling of power, through the abuse of his family’s money due to his possibly irresponsible behaviours, and lead to Carmel feeling very uncomfortable. Indeed, it is my belief, that Carmel’s first relationship ended because of the use of power, which had lead to a style of commitment within the relationship that did not assist with the relationships progression forward.

53 ...I probably argued with him over how much money he spent. Always he’d
just buy me these really expensive gifts
...I felt like I
was being bought or something

He used to get into trouble with his
parents a lot because it was a family business ...and he was
spending their money. So maybe I felt a bit guilty about that, that he was
spending all this money. When he probably should have been doing
something else with it.

I didn’t think he was very responsible with his money.
...his behaviour wasn’t very responsible.

It was only Shirley who was comfortable with the way she and her partner
discussed and shared their responsibilities. Her partner was able to assist her
financially at times [line 135]. Shirley worked and earned her own money, however,
her income was very minimal. When her partner was in a position to assist her [line
136], she did not mind. Financial difficulties did not occur within Shirley’s
relationships and may be seen as a result of Shirley and her partners giving to each
other in an unequal, but balanced manner, and creatively showing a balanced style of
financial commitment.

I argue that the socially constructed culture of humanity is supposed to
provide individuals with a higher or better understanding of personal interactions,
especially when compared to the cultural environment of animals, where cruelty and
direct power of others is paramount for survival. Patton (1993) defined this higher
cultural perspective as no more than a “spiritualisation and intensification of cruelty”
(Patton 1993:156). He believed that, if it were necessary for an individual to use
power over another, it was most important for them not to do harm to the other
individual. Flax (1990 in Gardiner, 1992) supports such a claim, commenting that,
through these dominant male cultural relations of power, culture had created many
problems that harm and plague society today.

Patton’s (1993) belief that an increase in the feeling of power and self-consciousness, experienced through the use of harmful power over others was only a temporary illusion. Expressions of harmful power over others, have been identified by Gardiner (1992:440) as including: the fear and hatred of men towards women (possibly leading to violence) and the positioning of women as merely mothers and/or sexual partners; and the “repressed middle-class nuclear family”, that Freud believed was the norm. These expressions of power over others have been allowed and encouraged within society, because they have been interactively reproduced and installed within its system of rules, values and norms. They provide the expression of power as a position of resistance for each individual, enabling them to develop and maintain the process of transformation, or self-overcoming, of the human self-hood or subjectivity (Patton, 1993) through the expression of conflict. Indeed, Nietzsche believed that the process of interactive power relations, where the passion of distress or fear was initiated, created a most advantageous position for change, leading to self-overcoming (Patton, 1993). Self-overcoming through problem solving ensures that an individual learns how to share (giving) the feeling of power with self and others. The individual’s overcoming of resistance to the feared or revengeful style of the “will to power” within a situation, while still satisfying their desire for the feeling of power, occurs through giving or the giving up of (gift giving virtue) their present position of power. Such discursive practices provide the other individual with a position from which to interpret themselves as being powerful. It is this giving or changing of position (discursive practice), which has often been related to gender and finance that has been defined as the turning point for further self-overcoming. Indeed it is the link
between discursive practices and discourse that enable the discursive positioning of both men and women. It is my argument that each partner brings with them to the relationship a set of norms, values and beliefs, which are made up of their internal understanding of self together with their acceptance of certain external influences. It is my interpretation that these norms, values and beliefs hinder the individual from understanding or even noticing their partners demonstrations of commitment and when the partner’s demonstrations go unnoticed or understood tensions arise. This tension could be used as a benefit to further personal growth and assist in greater awareness of self and others or blame could be generated towards the partner, possibly causing the partner to feel neglected and the participant’s opportunity for awareness also neglected. This tension was demonstrated in a number of the participants’ relationships. It was Tom and Shirley who acknowledged and accepted their partners’ demonstrations of commitment and what their own demonstrations were and that they wanted to assist to create a more balanced situation between their partner and themselves. They also acknowledged that they were searching for ways to demonstrate further commitment to their partners thus providing verbal and nonverbal feedback, which can lead to alternative positions (DD) to increase self awareness and further improve their relationship. The other participants may have been trying to demonstrate alternative ways to show commitment, however, they did not speak of the efforts that their partners were contributing. They at times due to their own norms eg: rules, were not interested in their partners contributions of commitment and it appeared that they had not noticed the benefits of their partner’s demonstrations. These participants mostly spoke of how to get their partner to see what they were doing or of wanting their partners to accept their demonstrations, which is, in my view, a method of power over others either through the FD or the PD.
Chapter 8  
Masculine Discourses

Traditional psychological practices have looked to ‘blame the individual’, and hold the adult individual responsible for his or her demonstrations of resistance, or performances of difference, when compelled to comply with legitimised rules of society that may be seen as maintaining a minority group’s position of privilege. Adult white males, who historically have had power and domination within mainstream western society, commonly established such rules. The resultant discourses and practices impact on, and influence an individual’s immediate and future responsive behaviours, limiting the development, choices and actions of all members of society.

Contrastingly, critical psychologists and some feminist theorists have investigated the discourses and practices displayed in a situation that create an individual’s immediate and future response, and that challenges the male-dominating approaches of power and domination. This challenge to the male hegemony within psychology and society, thus supports the approach of shared responsibilities, which may lead to shared power within relationships. These balanced discourses and practices provide future opportunities of empowerment for all members of society, only if they address conflicting situations they find themselves in.

I argue, men are positioned as privileged individuals within society, with the support of legitimised social practices. Consequently, men have continued to dominate within relationships, and experience considerable independence and freedom in their lives, ultimately increasing their sense of power. Men have
experienced resistance, and at times, domination by women, as women attempt to create a more balanced sharing of power. I would argue that, within the present study, men position themselves within one of three discourses (Fear Discourse, Protective Discourse, Detached Discourse), depending on the situation and their own sense of power.

The Fear Discourse is where individuals demonstrate a lack of responsibility leading to control, domination, avoidance; the Protective Discourse is where individuals demonstrate over responsibility leading to rescuing, smothering, domination, control; and the Detached Discourse is when an individual is able to provide space for both individuals to feel powerful leading to balanced sharing of responsibility, commitment, power. I interpreted Russell’s discourse, as one of fear (FD). He spoke of always trying to get his point across [line 282] to gain an understanding [line 283] from his partner that his beliefs about a relationship were how things were to be and, if not, she had an out [line 274]. The Protective Discourse (PD) was identified in John’s interview when he spoke of how he raised his partner’s three children [line 136], got up and did the housework and the cooking [line 137], and how he would provide her with everything she needed [line 140]. Whereas the Detached Discourse (DD) was evidenced in Tom’s discourse when he spoke of his relationship with his partner. He said how he had to change his ways to fit in with his partner and her two daughters [line 440], that there was give and take in their relationship [line 446], and that they would discuss their difficulties [line 445].

Often within the fear discourse (FD), individuals who lack responsibility, who find they are struggling within a confronting situation, interpret what is occurring as
being against them, and have a sense of losing some or all of their power. The experiences shared by Phil assist in illustrating the positioning within Fear Discourse. Phil experienced a conflicting situation due to the religious teachings of his Church and his personal desires. The conflict concerned a sense of conscience and morality [lines 231,233] and the conflicting desires he experienced through his upbringing of sand, sex and sun [line 233], and his need to ‘sow his wild oats’ [lines 238].

292        ...I fell in love with her, or I thought I did  
293 and then time went by because her father asked us to wait six months,  
294 which I did and ...by that time even though I’d cooled off, I went on  
297 with the commitment and married her because I thought it was the right  
297.5 thing to do  
298.5 strange behaviour I must admit but that was my sense of morality  
307 I was already having a relationship with another girl. She  
308 was back here in Melbourne, I was in Tasmania, I met another lady. So  
310 the other lady wasn’t the kind of person that I thought one should marry  
or  
311 I didn’t wish to marry her, so I came back to the mainland and married the  
311.5 other one because I said I would

Further into the interview, Phil states:

377        the conquest was over and a lot ...started to change  
378        ...then there were a few temptations that  
379        ...really got in the road ...I still kept on with all this heavy  
381        morality thing ...it makes it very difficult for a  
383        fellow [who]  
385        ...comes back home and gets into bed and finds that there was  
385.5 another lady in his bed without any clothes on. That makes it very  
385.8 difficult for him.  
387        ...that was the sort of things that was happening so I didn’t feel too  
388        good about it, but that was her best friend  
388.5        ...one of her close friends in the same year of nursing as she was, so  
389        there was a lot of conflicts ...going on so I just kept directly down the line  
391        of one things playing around and the other things serious

Phil acknowledges he now recognises that his need for a permanently temporary
relationship on a needs only basis [lines 622,623], rather than the bound and bonded [line 623] commitment of marriage, was far more important to him, than his moral obligation to marry.

In contrast to the Fear Discourse I argue that positioning within the discourse of Protection is the most unlikely stance for men within an interaction. Men tend not to be overly responsible, that is, overwhelming the self with the responsibilities of others, through rescuing and smothering, which are a tendency more reflective of women. When a male’s feeling of power is increased through these actions, the increased feeling of power will be experienced temporarily, and will at some time in the future be challenged.

As illustrated through John’s experiences, his position was one of rescuing and smothering his partners. In his first relationship, John explains that he used to give [his wife] breakfast in bed every morning [line 4], look after the kids all the time, and do the cooking, and virtually whatever she wanted [line 6]. John stated that commitment to the relationship by each other was not really similar [line 17]. It turned out she was lazy [line 18], and I got a job working in the desert [line 12] and wasn’t around to keep her happy, so she went and looked elsewhere [line 23]. She liked getting into the grog and I didn’t [line 26]. John states that they ended up having blues over it [line 28] and it came to parting ways [line 32].

Presently, John is living alone. John stated that his idea of commitment and a proper marriage was when you give your family all the needs as far as food, the house, and you’ve got to have that affection [lines 362,363] (PD).
Differing from the discursive practices found within the Fear Discourse, and Protection Discourse, are the balanced discursive practices exhibited within the Detached Discourse. An individual positioned in this discourse shares power with others, responsibilities are balanced and there is a shared sense of empowerment. These features of the Detached Discourse were evident as Tom spoke of his second relationship. Tom stated that he and his partner satisfied each other’s criteria’s [line 198] of a partner, by both individuals getting as much out of the relationship as the other [lines 200,202]. Tom believed that he and his partner experienced a good relationship because of their ability to communicate well together [line 239] and enjoy their life together [line 257]. Tom spoke of his financial responsibility, his caring responsibility [line 583.4], his responsibility to be there for the other person [line 584] and the responsibility of each individual to communicate with each other openly [line 587]. Tom even went as far as to say that he believed he had a health responsibility to his partner [line 590].

On viewing the position of Keith throughout his relationships it is evident that an individual who learns, and gains an understanding of the power relationships within interactions, is able to move from the position within Fear Discourse, to a position of self-overcoming within the Detached Discourse. When speaking of his first relationship, Keith stated that he was not one hundred percent committed [line 151].

10 ...when my wife worked... I showed her the understanding that she was
11 the breadwinner in the family also. So I let her keep her wages when it
12 came to paying bills we automatically put the money in fifty, fifty each
13 and that way I let her keep her independence. ...when it came to
14 associating with friends, I would let her
...took five years before I would actually commit to [Joan] that we’ll have children and then I still had doubts.

But the commitment on my part wasn’t totally there

It was sort of waving up and down, up and down. All of a sudden I’d be fully committed, then I’d draw back and then I’d fully commit meself.

I was always doubtful of the commitment

I loved her, loved the children. I used to put her up on a perch. that’s part of what me problem was. I used to sit her on a pedestal

the commitment was

...the love and energy [I put] into the children that weren’t physically mine. That bit did change

At this point in the relationship, Keith stated that after putting her on a perch or pedestal, felt he was probably in the panic stage [line 166].

[after] ...three car accidents ...the sterilisation problem with me going and having the artificial insemination. Letting also [Joan] when we got the payout for the house, [Joan] went and picked the house and where it was. That’s how much committed I was to saving the marriage and trying to get on with life.

I was going to the doctors and sayin there’s somethin wrong in my relationship ...how do I go about alleviatin it. I’ve got this problem, I’ve got that problem. ...after two years of me going and complaining about it, he put me on prozac. ...I went to a counsellor ...to alleviate the problems within the relationship

The counsellor asked:

...when you go out to darts do you take her to darts, when you go to cricket do you take her. I said I do all that already. That is my way to bring her into my life. ...introduce her to me friends and everything like that.

I used to buy her flowers

...and chocolates and things
In addition to all these events, Keith stated that his wife wanted him to return to work [lines 439,440], when he was not physically, mentally or emotionally prepared, and Keith progressed into depression.

195 I give her that
196 much freedom that when she started to work that I wanted to show her my
198 commitment towards her ...getting ahead in life, that I looked after the
199 children a lot of the time. Because we discussed ok you go ahead, you get
200 a career.

201 said once you get on the road, I'll look after the kids and then I can get
202 myself going.

210 I found her in bed with another bloke. Actually sprung her.

227 It's got to be let go because I can't
228 Trust the lady anymore. It's the old saying a leopard never loses its' spots.

229 I went on to continue me life from there on.

288 It wasn't
289 until we moved up here [Qld] that her commitment was dominating me.
290 She had to rule the roost. She had to get her own way in every way
291 whatsoever within the relationship.

303 I was depressed

Within Keith's second relationship with Michelle, I argue that changes of power sharing began to emerge:

481 I hadn't met anyone before that had been on the same level
482 as me

486 ...she was a lot more well educated than I was
487 ...she could talk about different things in a different way than I understood.
488 So I loved havin a conversation with her. We could sit there and talk we
489 could talk for four or five hours. No TV just sit there and communicate on that
490 level and I loved that.
494 I started my higher school certificate at TAFE

508 I did my high school certificate over two years.
Now her commitment towards me was egging me on

...her commitment towards me and encouraged me and help me out with me homework and me understanding of English. Cooked for me children when I got them every fortnight. Lent me her car to go and get em and bring em back. She would have walked on hot coals for me.

All the relationships she had, had in her life had all gone terribly Wrong. She’d been used and abused and she couldn’t get over my...she couldn’t get undressed in front of me. She was that embarrassed about her body. I said no [Michelle] it’s your body love it. I love it. So don’t worry about it. Don’t get embarrassed about it. Be happy that you are who you are. You shouldn’t have to hide it. She was very reserved person with her emotions. Because of these relationships...she’d been chewed up and spit out that many times and used and abused. That we were both like a bit of fresh air...with each other

...and I brought another side out in her ...and she brought another side out in me.

Through Keith sharing his experiences with me it is again my assertion that difficult situations such as he has found himself in where resistance was experienced, the opportunity for self-overcoming characteristics are able to emerge. As when Nietzsche argues that the experiencing of painful situations offer individuals another opportunity for further understanding of self and others.

My interpretation of Keith's case study, is the progression from the male dominating role of the Fear Discourse to the Detached Discourse subtly began to present itself after his many painful experiences where he felt as if he was powerless. Keith was not one hundred percent committed within his first relationship and was struggling. Consequently, he saw the need to utilise the traditional legitimised social norms of domination and control (FD) within a heterosexual relationship, where the male permits his wife to perform certain activities. Associated with these traditional behaviours of the Fear Discourse was the discursive practice of blame. Keith blamed
his wife when he stated that she didn’t want to understand his feelings about their
difficult situations [lines 116,117]. It was at this time, Keith’s attitude about life
began to deteriorate, and further doubts continued to haunt him [line 152]. These
doubts only provided him with increased opportunities for him to avoid sharing the
relationship responsibilities with his wife (FD). Keith’s wife commenced being
responsible for all the activities that could have been shared with him. As a result of
Keith’s avoidance, further psychological distress in the shape of depression began to
impact on his life. These actions of avoidance progressed to additional difficult
relationship experiences, where his wife refused to follow their agreed on goal of both
of them working towards a career. Keith fulfilled his share of the agreement by
caring for their children while his wife gained a career. When the time came for Keith
to commence TAFE to gain a high school education, she refused to help. His wife
wanted him to return to work in order to gain a greater income in the home. Shortly
afterwards, Keith discovered his wife in bed with another male. After this experience,
Keith lost all trust in his wife, left the relationship and went on to continue his life in a
fresher self-fulfilling manner. He returned to school, met a new ‘lady friend’ and
experienced a sharing relationship where they both participated in many sharing
activities. I argue that within this power sharing relationship each grew personally
towards a greater state of self-overcoming and increased feeling of power (DD).

Phil is discursively positioned within the Fear Discourse. I argue that his
dominant position was not challenged, and therefore, there were no opportunities for
any opposing resistance, which would be great enough or painful enough for him to
learn and develop a position within the Detached Discourse, that pertains to shared
responsibilities and shared feeling of power. Even though Phil was aware of his
socially acceptable moral obligation, and did not feel good about his sexual encounters, he still continued with these interactions and avoided having to acknowledge his affair with the second female with whom he was having a sexual relationship. He also avoided the moral implications that he had originally said were important to him from his religious teachings, which originated from the Church. Therefore, in Phil’s case, as in many cases, the male dominant position of power has continued to be maintained unchallenged.

Resistance within a relationship may be so great that one of the partners may leave. When John continually acted in an overly responsible manner (PD), by completing all household duties, caring for the children, and doing everything for his partner, I assert that the resistance was so great the relationship ended. Through my interpretations it became obvious within the interviews that most of the male participants have been involved in relationship interactions, in which they were positioned within the Fear Discourse, primarily, or Protective Discourse supporting the male-dominated approaches of power and domination. It was within these interactions that these men operated from a position of power and control over others, and at times, inflicted blame, hurt or pain, through the self-serving ways (vanity), which is demonstrated through domination, avoidance, rescuing or smothering.

As Nietzsche has stated, where there is power there will be resistance. When men have used domination and control to increase their feeling of power, other men and women have shown resistance, and thus, under these circumstances, conflict and struggles have arisen (Patton, 1993). Men who have perceived this internal feeling of power, may have seen the resistance from others as a threat to their position and thus
have fought not to lose it. This conflict or struggle provides another interaction for further self-overcoming. There have been, however, some men who have changed to a position where the feeling of power is shared. This has occurred because of their many struggles of resistance to their previously self-accepted male position of domination (worldly power - FD/PD), such as Tom in the present study. I argue that Tom has been able to recognise his own performances of domination, and has learnt from these experiences. He has moved to a new position with a balanced sense of responsibility and shared sense of power that is found within the Detached Discourse. Tom recognised that by sharing the responsibility or commitment of many issues within his relationship, with his partner, was the only way to increase both and his partner’s feeling of power [lines 257,583.4,587,590,594]. Indeed this sharing creates a position of balance and the use of the DD which allowed both Tom and his partner to gain something from the relationship and enjoy their life together [lines 200,202]. Such a discourse enables an individual, either man or woman, to increase their feeling of everlasting power through the transformation to this position, with independence and freedom for all. From this study, for most men, this will require a shift from the position of fear or lack of responsibility and commitment to the Detached Discourse (DD).

I argue that the majority of male participants interviewed in this study were continuing to function from a discourse of fear (see Figure 3), however, there was one participant who appeared to be demonstrating discourse of sharing. Tom was a participant who spoke of sharing responsibilities with his partner and who believed it was necessary for individuals, within a relationship, to act responsibly to their partner, by trying to encourage their partner in areas that the partner wished to succeed at in
their life [line 594]. It is this understanding of responsibility or commitment that enhances the feeling of power through sharing for both individuals within the relationship. Indeed, this position of responsibility and commitment is a stepping stone for a balanced position of self-overcoming (DD).
Figure 3. Progression of the feeling of power into the theme of commitment illustrated as the fear discourse.

(Wallace, 2002)
Chapter 9  Feminine Discourses

For many years, women have struggled to position themselves as independent, and free from the traditional patriarchal values of society. To illustrate, in the present study, an analysis was conducted on the struggles confronted by women. The study explored women's commitment within heterosexual relationships, and focused on the participants' interpretations of, and the meanings they have attached to, the discourses or discursive practices of others, and their self-responsive performances. Three discourses were reflected from within this study: the Fear Discourse (FD), the Protective Discourse (PD) and the Detached Discourse (DD) in relation to commitment within heterosexual relationships. Nietzsche’s descriptions concerning power over others, as well as Gordon’s (1980) pertinent points on power sharing, have been adapted to secure a more in-depth understanding of the discursive positions available for individuals within society. Nietzsche’s descriptive points of domination, avoidance and revenge, through blame, hurt, pain and control, which relate to lack of responsibility, have been used to analyse the Fear Discourse. Nietzsche’s concepts of rescuing, smothering, controlling and domination, which describe an individual’s response to over-responsibility, have been applied in the analysis of Protective Discourse. His beliefs of shared power, and balanced responsibility, for self and others, have provided a position of analysis for Detached Discourse. The women within the study revealed, through my interpretation of their responses, that to support patriarchal discourse and discursive practices of domination and control, was to consequently position themselves as traditional women who either acted with a lack of responsibility (FD), overly responsible (PD), or their reactions fluctuating between the two. Differentiating, female participants may display balanced responsibility
congruent with positioning in Detached Discourse (DD).

Often individuals, who lack responsibility (FD), find they are struggling within a confronting situation, interpret what is occurring as someone acting against them, and it could be argued that the individual’s belief is what leads them having a sense of losing some or all of their power. This lack of responsibility can be revealed through an individual’s responsive action, which was highlighted in this study by Missy, Wilma and Carmel. My interpretation is that each of these participants, during their interview, blamed their partners’ actions for the problems they were experiencing within the relationship and did not mention the possibility of them addressing their actions and what they could learn from the experience.

A number of elements of the Fear Discourse were revealed throughout the interview with Missy. Initially, Missy allocated the blame for her behaviours as her partner’s fault. She believed her partner was someone who accused her of doing something that she did not do.

122 ...Like I used [to] if he accused
124 me of something I didn’t do, I just switched off and became this other
125 person, this stronger person

Further in the interview, Missy stated that it was this stronger personality’s fault that she displayed dominating and controlling behaviours, such as throwing a pot plant through the television. Missy continues the interview, and acknowledges that she would seek revenge through violent and hurtful behaviours.
It was just a ... part of who I was. See unless you identify there's another personality there and start learning about the personality, you can't identify with it, because you just go, you blank out, you like, wake up and you think how did that pot plant get in the .. TV. I was watching a movie, what happened? ... I was constantly saying what happened, what did I do then, what did I say? I was constantly doing that to people around me all the time and to my husband and other people say oh what did I say, did I say anything wrong? that was the other personality, like the stronger one was very destructive, very vicious, very... more like, very violent in a lot of ways too

Missy's life, prior to this relationship, had been fraught with violence. Hence, it was not surprising to me that she would exhibit the behaviours indicative of the Fear Discourse, as it was these behaviours that were displayed by her parents [line 174]. Missy even after numerous difficulties within her past relationships still continues to blame her partner for any misunderstandings or struggles. An example of this was when in her third and most recent relationship, she identified her partner as being the problem and needing to change [line 592], as well as stating that she did not deserve this and that she did not want it in her life [line 591]. The position within Fear Discourse, one of avoidance and revenge, through blame, hurt, and pain is accentuated through the sequence of events identified by Missy. The position of avoidance when attempting to protect self is a demonstration of resistance (FD). This position does not lead to a position of shared power (DD), only one of fear.

The discursive practice of avoidance, displayed within the Fear Discourse, I assert can be understood by examining Wilma and Shirley's experiences. In order to protect herself from further pain or unhappiness, as previously experienced in relationships, Wilma would withdraw or avoid the situation. When Wilma interpreted an interaction with her partner as him changing or not reciprocating her emotional
investment [lines 540, 541]; she would thus respond by pulling back [line 537]. Wilma stated that she would create a cyclic [line 539] sequence of events that she performed throughout all three of her relationships [line 534].

Shirley stated, about her past three relationships, that she has committed herself to them, however, her partners have been a little bit more full on than [she has] been [line 155]. Most recently, Shirley described how she had refused the numerous proposals of marriage from her present partner [line 159]. She did not want to get married and believed it unnecessary to demonstrate any further commitment with their relationship than to not play up on each other [line 169] and to be there for each other [line 170].

In Carmel’s third relationship, she found herself confronted by a man who did not do everything the way she preferred, he went against her (FD - sense of losing power). This partner did not eat Indian food when he went to an Indian restaurant [line 436], as she believed he should. Nor did he wear the footwear of which she approved. At times, the third partner wore thongs, and Carmel hated thongs [line 437]. Carmel, being of European decent, believed it was his Australian culture [line 431] that she could not identify with [line 395], and that irritated her [line 433]. Carmel believed it was his culture that influenced his behaviours, and proceeded to tell him when he was breaking a cultural rule that she supported. Carmel stated that she did try to make the relationship work [line 186] and even attempted to convince herself that she could ‘feel for this guy’ [line 188], however, it was not to be and the problematic relationship [line 412] ended after much irritation [line 413].
In contrast to the Fear Discourse, an individual positioned in the Protective Discourse, I argue, may maintain power over others (vanity) through the discursive practices of domination and control, or overwhelm themselves with another's responsibilities, to the detriment of themselves, through the discursive practices of rescuing and smothering. The interview with Melissa emphasises the discursive positioning within the Protective Discourse.

In the interview I conducted with Melissa, she spoke of how from her earliest relationship she had performed many acts of responsibility within her relationships. Expressions of over-responsibility displayed by Melissa included travel to the male's home every weekend [line 4], phoning them, and cooking for them either at their house or hers [line 5]. When she did get married at eighteen, she married a male who was safe [line 79,78] and with whom she would not risk being rejected [line 81], or anything nasty happening [line 82]. Her husband was a gift buyer, e.g. flowers [line 84,85], and placed limits on what she was allowed to do [line 89], as her husband was very dominating [line 97]. Conflicting situations within the relationship were centred on financial issues, and verbal put downs by him. Her husband continuously spent money, and Melissa often had to bail him out. He was also very restrictive of food, strict with his parenting [line 124], and verbally abusive to her [line 145,147]. Melissa left her husband, and later returned. Prior to her return, Melissa had purchased a car and a house, without his assistance, and had to sell them within twelve months or two years of her return, due to his irresponsibility [line 181], to pay his bills [line 172,173]. It seemed her husband was always spending money, and her responsive action was to earn more money, and cover more ground [line 182,183]. Even though Melissa continued with the journey with their husband [line 176,177] for
a number of years, she put up with it [line 178], until she finally told him to leave [line 184]. I assert Melissa continued to dominate within her third relationship evident by her statement that she could urge anyone to be a sharing type individual. Melissa's statement highlights her belief that her discourse is one of sharing [lines 190,190.5,191], however, I would argue that her discourse correlates with a Protective Discourse. Since the end of this marriage, Melissa has spoken of how she has choices for change, and that they are real [line 192.5]. No longer is it necessary for her to be the packhorse [line 202.5] and carry the full load of responsibilities within a relationship. This is a position more conducive to a Detached Discourse relationship.

Diverging from the discursive practices found within the Fear Discourse, and Protective Discourse, are the favourable discursive practices exhibited within the Detached Discourse. I argue that on viewing the positioning of Margaret throughout her relationships, it is evident that an individual who learns, and gains an understanding of the power relationships within interactions, is able to move from a position within Protective Discourse, to a position of self-overcoming within the Detached Discourse.

When speaking of her first relationship, Margaret stated that her husband and herself got on very well [line 30], and that they enjoyed doing the same things [line 37]. Later in the interview she said that they did not do much together [line 43] and that he was selfish, full of himself [line 51] and a dominating [line 71.5] male. Margaret identified past experiences as being what was expected of a female growing up thirty years ago [line 67]. In those days, it was expected that [women] accepted what males wanted to do, and [they] do it, and go along with it [lines 77,78].
Margaret identified that for her second relationship she did not want any commitments as she had been bitten once and did not want to be bitten again [line 202.5]. Within this relationship Margaret performed the behaviours of just going out and having some fun, which she had not had in her previous relationship [line 213]. She spoke of how some of the time she felt as though she would have liked more out of the relationship but did not want to step on anybody’s toes and tell them how [she felt] deep down [lines 290, 293, 293.5]. The partner only wanted to hear that she was having a good time with them [line 297].

In regards to her third relationship, Margaret stated that this partner was not like the males she had previously hung around with [lines 346, 346.2] and was a totally different person [line 346.6]. She stated that in this relationship both of them could voice how they felt [line 360], whereas with her previous relationships she could not [line 362]. Within these discussions the problem was brought out in the open [line 407] through him saying how he felt and by her saying how she felt [lines 405, 406]. Margaret stated that her and her partner did have problems, however, they worked together to overcome them. These struggles made the relationship stronger [lines 400, 402]. Her third partner paid her more attention [line 427], which therefore, made her feel he did care about her [line 428], as she had never had that done before [line 430]. No longer did Margaret have to do things on her own [lines 506, 508]. Her partner was willing to help with the responsibilities and to look after her [line 509], thus I assert led to Margaret’s self-overcoming through her changed perspective on relationships. She no longer had an agreement of rules for the relationship, and that it wasn’t about only having a good time and one sexual partner and that was it. This was there to grow into something [lines 517, 518, 519].
In the present study, women were positioned in one of three discourses (FD, PD, DD). The women have found themselves in different situations of confrontation, with individuals involved in previous interactions or individuals in new interactions. These confronting situations and struggles have provided a position for either decreasing or increasing the woman’s feeling of power, as well as, maintaining a sense of empowerment through the detached discourse. The women revealed, through their responses, that to support patriarchal discourse and discursive practices of domination and control was to consequently position themselves as women, who acted with a lack of responsibility, in an overly responsible manner, or with their reactions fluctuating between the two. Each participant spoke of their painful experiences, when faced with confronting situations, while in relationships. The recollection of these painful memories has assisted in identifying the points from which creative change emerges, that is, from the Fear Discourse or Protective Discourse, to the Detached Discourse. The tensions for women that have been associated with the discursive positions of lacking in responsibility (FD), overly responsible (PD), and sharing responsibility (DD), will be discussed in relation to the demonstrations of commitment within heterosexual relationships and women’s desire to increase their feeling of power.

It has become apparent through these examples that a balanced form of commitment within heterosexual relationships is only available within a Detached Discourse. Within the Fear Discourse, individual commitment is specifically focused towards the self and may be displayed in behaviours such as harming others and withdrawing from others. Whereas, the Protective Discourse focuses commitment to others and may be displayed through behaviours such as overwhelming themselves
with others’ responsibilities or through dominating others in order to protect them.

I argue that once individuals, within an interaction, have created knowledge of responsibility, the meaning and value of their position is then attached, and the duties associated with their accepted position is performed. If a discourse or its practices were interpreted, by the individual, as being the demonstration of power over others (FD or PD), then as Nietzsche has stated, the consequence that could be observed is resistance from the dominated individuals (Dennison, 1999). In accordance with Nietzsche’s belief, these demonstrations of resistance provide an individual with an increased feeling of power. This increased feeling of power is only temporary, as further struggles eventually occur. Nevertheless these further struggles can provide an opportunity for learning more about the position of self-overcoming. Within the current research, both male and female participants spoke of the fear and protective discursive practices utilised by others, and they interpreted these practices as demonstrations of power over them, and responded with resistance.

In arguing my position on the discourse practices, it is important to note, that by women demonstrating power over others through Fear Discourse or Protective Discourse, they have succeeded in taking on the responsibilities of the traditionally and socially supported patriarchal role. These responsibilities were demonstrated by the female participants, within the study, who were employed full-time, cared for their home and family, and provided financial security for their family, without demonstrating a balanced caring and responsible manner for themselves (PD). Some women in the study became protective of themselves, through the resistant behaviours of avoidance (FD). These women cared less and lacked responsible behaviours when
faced with a confronting situation.

I assert that it has been due to the two discourses of fear and protection that men and women have been blinded to observing the alternative discursive position of detachment. Detached Discourse requires an individual to perform with a balanced sharing of power and responsibility, towards both self and others. If this position of shared power and balanced responsibility was demonstrated with the balanced emotions of creativity, supportiveness and caring for self and others, together with courage, the interaction would provide a subjective position conducive for self-overcoming. I argue that in the present study, if the women demonstrated any of these positions, these women felt a greater sense of power.

Nonetheless, moving to a position within Detached Discourse, and experiencing independence and freedom, I assert, has become an illusion for women who have found it difficult to recognise the difference between their responsibilities and those of others. This illusion has been created when these women have increased their feeling of power, within Fear Discourse or Protective Discourse, and so believe they have achieved independence and freedom. However, they may not have realised that they have only succeeded in positioning themselves to where they can demonstrate power over others, a temporary position for increasing the feeling of power. Carmel [line 188] and Melissa [line 181] spoke of situations where they temporarily felt more positive (increase in the feeling of power), then of the challenges they experienced after these situations and their decrease in the feeling of power and how this decrease may be due to the demonstrations of resistance from their partners.
To achieve a feeling of power and demonstrations of self-overcoming, independence and freedom, an individual needs to be positioned within the Detached Discourse. Nietzsche argued that life is essentially a basic psychological drive for this feeling of power, in order to gain personal freedom, not a struggle for survival (Kaufmann, 1968). This feeling of power, he believed, was demonstrated either as a positive creative understanding of qualitatively shared power, or as a quantitative negative power, such as worldly social power. Margaret was the one female participant I interpreted as speaking of and demonstrating the feeling of power through the values and beliefs of sharing, and thoughtfully considered herself and all individuals involved in any interaction she was a part of. The other females participants spoke of how their partners could change and their difficulties would lessen (see Figure 4). Individuals who demonstrate power sharing activities are those who have an increased knowledge of responsibility for self and others, and are able to provide a sharing position of power, not one of over or lacking of responsibility. I argue that without such a positioning women may continue to find themselves limited by their gender or financial situation and that the benefits of the Detached Discourse (DD) would be equally valuable to both men and women. The Detached Discourse, through the sharing of power using Gordon's (1980) six positions, enables issues that cause conflict with commitment between heterosexual couples to be overcome, in full or in part, through creative problem solving.
Figure 4. Progression of the feeling of power into the theme of commitment illustrated as the protective discourse.

(Wallace, 2002)
Chapter 10  

Creative Problem Solving

The “will to power” may be achieved through performing with vanity or egoistic actions. Additionally, it is possible to provide another individual with an opportunity for resistance or a position where that individual may fulfil their “will to power” for self and others. This position would create a situation where there was a balanced recognition of power for all involved. McClelland (1975) has shown, through his four positions of power, and Nietzsche through his writings on the “will to power”, that power has a dual nature, and may be monitored via different power performances (Kaufmann, 1968). When an individual is aware, understands and monitors their underlying theme of power by observing its severity, the individual will be in a far better position to take control, and redirect, any destructive behaviours of commitment they experience. Whereas the unaware individual may experience a lack of awareness, understanding and an inability to monitor the themes of power. I argue that it is also possible for individuals to recognise that, through cooperative behaviours, such as acting responsibly, listening to others, and by giving and sharing, through acceptance of others, all individuals are capable of experiencing power (position three) (McClelland, 1975 and Gordon, 1980). Kaufmann (1968) argued that some individuals increase their feeling of power through envy of and admiration by others. While others may be involved consciously or unconsciously, through the demonstrations of domination, selfishness and the use of control behaviours that inflict hurt or injury on another individual. It is these individuals who may not recognise the value in their challenging experiences and blame others for their troubles rather than utilising Gordon’s six positions eg: listening to their internal self (position six), understanding and demonstrating actions of acceptance, giving,
creativity, courage and responsibility (position five, four, three, two, one).

It may be argued by Nietzsche that life is essentially not a struggle for survival, but a basic psychological drive for the understanding of the “will to power”, in order to gain personal freedom through the demonstrations of the “will to power”. Nietzsche’s “will to power” is recognised as either a positive, creative understanding of the “will to power”, or worldly power, administered originally from the patriarchal institutional regimes (Kaufmann, 1968), which are seen as being evil, and culturally and societal invoked. Kaufmann (1968) and Patton (1993) argued that Nietzsche’s transformation of this everyday theme of vanity and evil, worldly power, into artistic creativity, or overcoming of resistance, through the sharing of power, was essential for self-awareness, self-growth, self-preservation and for the transformation to the positive higher “will to power” within all individuals (Kaufmann, 1968). This transformation from worldly power to the creative sharing of power may occur through suffering, struggling and the feeling of pain, e.g. mental, emotional and physical. When this pain becomes too much for the individual to withstand, the individual will search for another way to experience, and express, a heightened internal feeling of power. Two societal expressions of harmful power over others have been identified by Nietzsche and later by Gardiner (1992) as: the fear and hatred of men towards women (possibly leading to violence); the patriarchal traditional positioning of women as merely mothers or sexual partners. These expressions of power over others have been allowed, and supported, within society as they have been interactively installed within society’s system of rules, values and norms. I argue that these expressions of power over others, which are demonstrated within social systems, have also allowed recipients of this domination a position of resistance,
enabling him or her to develop and maintain the process of transformation, or self-overcoming, of the human self-hood or subjectivity (Patton, 1993). The recipients of this domination may or may not recognise the opportunity for change and the possibility for creative problem solving, which could lead to them sharing in the feeling of power with the dominator.

Feminist theories highlight how power over others has resulted from the production of discourses that have identified truths and falsities with “specific effects of power attached to them” (Tapper, 1993:141). This belief includes the discursive legitimisation of the domination of women by men, through patriarchal norms and values. Nietzsche rejected domination and oppression, as these conditions caused self-aware individuals to feel internally weak, or powerless, and he further rejected the concept that discourses have power attached to them (Denneson, 1999). Nietzsche identified these conditions, of male dominance and repression, as avoidance behaviours for an individual’s lack of self-responsibility, creating a “pleasurable feeling of sweet revenge” for the men who blame others (Denneson, 1999:5).

I assert that the stories of Russell, Keith, Phil and Tony highlight their understanding of self, and their “will to power”, when they demonstrated behaviours of domination and repression towards their female partners. Russell did not dominate or repress his partners through violence, an extreme form of domination; rather he dominated and repressed his partners by withholding discussions, especially those about commitment [line 181]. This dominating position led to his third partner asking him to alter such behaviour, as she wanted him to provide some form of discussion
within their relationship.

127 She wanted me to be more, to have more input, as far as suggesting
130 things.
133 ...well I took it on board, but whether it made any changes I don't
135 really know. [deep breathe] I'm ...just that way inclined. [deep breathe]

I argue that, had changes occurred through the use of any of Gordon's (1980)
six positions eg: having the courage to make suggestions or provide more input, a
greater level of compatibility, and an increased sharing of power, may have become
apparent. As Russell was unaware of any changes in their discussions I suggest that
their discussions and activities did not increase in quantity or quality, shared power
and compatibility may also have decreased and their commitment within the
relationship. This lack of discussion or input [line 127], I also argue, prevented
further personal growth and awareness.

The lack of discourse between Russell and his partner continued. It was
illustrated by Russell acknowledging that his partner probably did have issues with
him, however, she was unwilling to discuss them.

221 I'm sure she had her own issues about me, but they were never brought out
222 and discussed.

Keith and Phil both introduced and maintained their method of domination,
where their relationship rules were enforced within their relationships. Their
domination, like Russell's, involved them designating, and enforcing, the rules
governing their relationships. They all refused to change the rules even if their
partners did not agree with them. Denneson (1999) would argue that their unwillingness to creatively discuss with their partners possible changes to their rules, was a position of dominance over their partner and a use of power over others, leading to the demise of their relationships.

770 ...when I go into a relationship I’m up front at the start, I try and lay down
771 ...mutual rules within the relationship that if anything goes wrong, bang it’s
772 finished no coming back. [Keith]

518 I said well if you give me any trouble you’ll go [Phil]

Phil further acknowledged his traditional patriarchal male behaviours when he defined his belief of how traditional women, and men, are supposed to behave within a heterosexual relationship. He spoke of how he was very dominating, and lacked skills, when it came to resolving difficulties within relationships.

182 well in those times it was expected that women
183 basically did what women did and men did what men did. So we went off
186 huntin and shootin and fishin and in our relaxation time we also went off to
186.5 earn the bread and we brought it home.

695 I was
698 very under developed ...I’d had quite a lot of
700 experience [however] I found difficulty in solving differences with other
702 people. So I was most likely fairly a domineering type character

Tony, I assert, was also influenced by traditional patriarchal dominating discourses that encourage men to be the individuals who supply financial security, while his modern day wife, not only cared for the home, but also worked part time.

115 I would try and if there was washing up to be done after
116 the meal, I would always give her a cuddle kiss, say how was your day, is
118 there anything you would like done? Would you like to go out to dinner
for instance rather than cook, cause you cook every night type thing? I'd try
and ease the burden there as such and naturally if there was any sexual
involvement to be had after dinner or before dinner or during dinner
it was able to be done so, if necessary... There was a commitment with
the loving side of it which was involved in the business side of it, because she
also enjoyed the challenge of seeing the money come in so to speak, because
she knew what it was going to provide.

...I said look I have to get up early in the morning and go to work. That
was my commitment
because I'd signed the papers for the mortgage on the business

The discursive positioning of feminist writers has often challenged, and in
some cases changed, the previous male dominating discourses. Foucault (1990) and
Gergen (1991) argue that this change of discourse was accomplished through the
deconstruction of existing discourses, which united and assisted in grouping
individuals into a position of freedom. These changes occurred as a result of the
increased degree of awareness by many different individuals, especially those in a
more liberated position. These individuals, because of their life experiences and self-
aware positioning, were able to secure a greater self-awareness, self-reflectivity and
positions of respect, for all individual unities and across many social stratifications, as
they reflexively interpreted each discourse.

It is my interpretation that both Tom and Margaret eventually position
themselves within relationships where they felt free to discuss their personal beliefs
and feelings and creatively approach any difficulties or problems in their lives. It has
been these open and sharing discussions that have eventually led both participants to
enhance their relationship, and further commit themselves to the responsibilities
involved in power sharing.
...all relationships are formed, certainly in my opinion, formed in the same way. i.e. the first thing is you enjoy each others company, you’re able to communicate ...and you take it from there [Tom]

I’d rather talk it out, than fight it out. [Tom]

I had to adjust and she had to adjust ...we both, again, ...we sort of worked together and we solved the problems, if there was any. [Tom]

I s’pose in a way we sat and talked to each other which I ...never did in my first ...marriage and relationship.

There wasn’t that sitting, talking, communication ...and ...that didn’t seem to exist in the first relationship. [Margaret]

...whereas this one was, I s’pose he paid me more attention. I felt that he did care about me because he was doing these things and I’d never had that done before and we sat and talked, ...which I hadn’t done before. So the communication and the showing how much he thought of me [Margaret]

Indeed, it has been the meanings that many individuals have derived from these historical, and new discourses, which have reproduced the heterosexual relationship in a multitude of reflexive states (Foucault, 1990). Nevertheless, Burr (1998) has proposed that, even these self-aware, positive and powerful positions that many feminists describe in their work, are only an illusion of democratisation within any relationship, and that they have been constructed from the positions of all participants, even the dominating male position. Many women, in their struggle for freedom from the patriarchal values within society, have not only successfully managed their home duties, but also employment duties performed outside the home, which has led to further responsibilities. These modern women, within this study, have discursively positioned themselves as complying with the six positions (Gordon, 1980). I argue that even though they have achieved such outcomes, for these women to increase their feeling of power and experience a greater form of balance within their interactions, it would be necessary for them to address their over responsible
behaviours that have developed during their struggle for freedom. This struggle for freedom was made obvious to me within Wilma's interview when she spoke of how her commitment, within her relationships, was to act in a responsible manner. This responsible manner was demonstrated by completing full-time study at university, caring for her home and two children, as well as her partner [line 392], her partner's two children [lines 477, 477.6], and her partner's home [line 394], which was an hour and a half drive from Wilma's home (PD).

Wilma performed her responsibilities from the positions of both a modern and traditional value conscious women. As a modern woman, she worked full-time to assist in the financial support of her family commitments and, after work each day, she came home and performed the traditional tasks of homemaker, wife and mother. Wilma worked six days and a couple of nights per week [line 252, 253], which is similar to a traditional male position. She was also socially active with work engagements [line 254], while in her first and second relationships; she was completing her studies at university while being committed to her third relationship.

Wilma loved her work position [line 255] and took it very seriously [line 256], however, her second partner did not. He would refuse to accompany her to any work functions and eventually became argumentative [line 278], difficult [line 279], began drinking excessive amounts of alcohol [line 279]. He would say things like "you're happier at work than you are with me" [line 281]. Wilma found such outbursts to be a horrible experience [line 281]. It is my interpretation that Wilma's partner's discourse was stating that she should position him as the master, the most important person in her life, and that there be no intrusion from others. This belief of Wilma's
partner may be seen as being in agreement with the traditional patriarchal male values of society where the male is the dominant person within a couple relationship (FD).

It was both this belief and these behaviours that led Wilma to realise that her partner was selfish [line 307]. He did not show that he cared about anyone else except himself [line 308]. In past generations, the male has been the dominant force within relationships, allowing for individuals to believe that masculinity is more powerful than femininity (Hollway, 1998). The obvious difference between genders, of course, is physical strength. Many males have used this strength to their advantage in many situations, they have successfully overpowered women who have been positioned as the weaker sex. Even though women have been positioned as the weaker sex, men believed women to be a ‘necessary’ possession that enabled the continuation of the human species. Additionally, they were seen as necessary for the patriarchal males’ desire for pleasure, through power over others (Kaufmann, 1968). Thus women were used for their reproductive capabilities and their position as an object (Hollway, 1998). The traditional patriarchal positions that Wilma occupied included attending to her partner’s needs [line 217] by washing, cooking his favourite meals [line 219] and by making a fuss of him [line 222]. However, as her working career advanced, her second partner began to feel insecure [line 274], and they experienced many conflict situations in which she was dominated by him. I argue that had Wilma acted with more creativity when addressing their difficulties a sense of shared power for them both may have been reached. Gordon (1980) argued that creativity his third position was an excellent step in reaching a solution to a conflictual situation and Nietzsche, rejected the belief that conflict through domination and oppression is a condition that has caused self-aware individuals to
feel internally weak or powerless (Denneson, 1999). Thus it could be argued that Wilma’s partner did not feel insecure [line 274] because of their conflict but because of his own lack of awareness of his internal self.

Furthermore, Nietzsche specified that the avoidance, or denial of difference, between individuals and within situations, stems from an individual’s reluctance to acknowledge, and participate in or challenge situations where difference is prominent, therefore avoiding any suffering (Denneson, 1999). Denneson (1999) argues the statement that chaos allows for the subtle combination of order, and irregularity, as well as, provides the ultimate ground for the production of a creative life. While acknowledging that too much order is not good for any individual, he supports Nietzsche’s belief that difference, inequality and creativity are all necessary elements for self-overcoming. It is this creativity that provides the space for co-operation, nurturance, flexibility and the understanding of differences, which enables the sharing of power (Denneson, 1999).

Through my interpretation the actions of a modern, responsible working partner, and a traditionally, responsible housewife, were repeated by Wilma in her third relationship, where she again avoided acting in the caring, creative manner of self-responsibility. During this relationship, conflicting situations occurred, and no matter how Wilma attempted to resolve them, the outcome was the same. Wilma would cook, clean, and do any other task necessary, to make ‘his’ life easier [line 392], even though they were not living together, and he would provide her with flowers, chocolates [line 370.5], weekends together [line 372] and a telephone call each night, or even sometimes during the day [lines 374, 375]. As a modern partner
and mother, she would act responsibly for herself and her children, by working to secure an income. When Wilma’s third partner provided her with a key to his home, she interpreted this action as a very serious demonstration of commitment [line 387]. She also believed this action was giving her the freedom to come and go as she pleased from his home [line 388], similar to a wife in a traditional marriage. Wilma would arrive at his home, at three o’clock on a Friday afternoon [line 393], when he was still three hours away from finishing work [line 394], and would complete all his house duties for him [lines 394, 395]. She enjoyed this position of power over his household. Wilma felt powerful when he walked through the door, and everything was clean, fresh smelling, and she had cooked his dinner [line 397]. Wilma believed she was “giving him a nice treat” [line 398]. However, it was not long after she was given the key to her partner’s home that their relationship ended [lines 406, 408].

Wilma believed the relationship ended as she had been too open [line 410], and honest [line 413.5] with her partner, about her own thoughts and feelings with regard to their relationship. She believed she was being punished for her openness and honesty [line 420]. I argue that Wilma continued to act in an overly responsible manner by doing everything for her partner, thus dominating and restricting her partner’s freedom (PD) and that conflict arose because of their different interpretations of their discourses. I also argue that Wilma dominated him, his home and his children, positioning him as powerless, within these situations. Wilma’s partner, during the relationship, went in search of an alternative situation, possibly to help himself regain his feeling of power. Wilma discovered, whilst working on his computer, that he had been chatting to a women on the Internet [line 434]. He had also been organising a date with one specific women through an Internet dating
service. The desire or internal motivation for the feeling of power Nietzsche argues is what will propel all individuals to perform or continue to commit to a personal relationship or not (Dennison, 1999). If an individual is in a position that does not assist them to increase their feeling of power, they will search for another personal relationship that does. Wilma’s partner thus found an alternative partner who would allow him to increase his feeling of power.

In contrast, the interview with Missy demonstrates male domination (FD) was apparent when she described her family as violent and dominating of her, particularly her father, while she was growing up.

174 There was a lot of pain, a lot of hurt
176 I remember staring at my
177 father’s eyes and I said no you can hit me as much as you want today because
178 I’m not going to cry...

I assert, for Missy the blame her family reflexively projected onto her, as a result of their lack of responsibility, eventuated in her blaming herself. Later in life this became self-blame, made obvious when she explained how she would punish herself by locking herself away in a cupboard. Missy dominated herself through self-blame, to feel more powerful in order to withstand the family fights that she knew would eventuate later, and thus continued the normal sequence of hurtful events, which became her security in life.

190 When I was eight I remember
191 I was used to being the only
192 one in the family that stayed home and the others went out.
...I locked myself in the cupboard many times

I argue that Missy learnt to feel powerful, and to withstand loneliness and fear [line 191], not through the warmth and support of her family, but through the hurt and domination that both she and her family inflicted on her. Furthermore, Missy found it necessary to continuously hold conversations with herself about her situation. These discussions were possibly her way of attempting to reveal creative alternative methods of action. However, as she was only an eight-year-old child when she was attempting to do this [line 190], she may have been unable to find a more creative solution to her situation.

...I remember talking to myself. That probably would have been the other personality most likely. Because I used to go back and forth, back and forth [talking to myself], when I was small.

The fifth position of Gordon’s (1980) six positions of self-overcoming shows a recognition and acceptance of the warmth and support from others, which creates the self as an individual who has obtained the ability to withstand loneliness. Within these positions, it is possible for an individual to have a heightened understanding of knowledge, and courage, and to have the willingness and ability to give of themselves to others continuously and unconditionally (DD). The self may accomplish this by recognising that, at times, other individuals need to express themselves more powerfully than the self within an interaction. This expression may be demonstrated when the self is able to understand the reality of another so well, due to the continual recurrence of experiences, that it is able to interpret an individual’s desire, or dream, for the feeling of power, without transferring any unresolved personal experiences onto the other individual (Gordon, 1980). I argue, this understanding did not occur
within Missy’s family situation, and so her awareness of her own feeling of power, and that of others, was stilted. Gordon (1980) discusses dialogue as one method that has been utilised to increase understanding and self-overcoming. In Missy’s situation, dialogue was unavailable to her from the family or through social interactions, as she was often prevented from experiencing contact with others. This lack of contact laid the foundations for Missy to be unaware of how to behave, or respond, when involved in a heterosexual relationship. Gordon (1980) further stated that it has been through external listening to another, and dialogue with the other, that individuals have become aware of the different creative avenues of resolution, leading to self-overcoming, without actually experiencing the situation.

15  ...I didn’t really know what I had to do, I thought it was just
17    a role thing. Like the women had to stay home, have the kids, cook
19    meals, not allowed to talk to anybody, basically it was I merely
22    existed in the relationship and not really felt anything in the relationship.

In contrast to dialogue, which involves external communication, the sixth position involves internal communion. The sixth position, to which Gordon (1980) and Stambaugh’s (1985) ideas parallel, is that the art of listening to the inner voice of Soul, the self, life’s energy current, and the sensing of Its relation to nature, provides “freedom” in the true sense, and allows Soul recognition and room for recreation, through self-overcoming (Gordon, 1980 and Stambaugh, 1985). It does not include internal communication, as was performed by Missy [line 197]. Internal communication is the act of talking, or dialogue, with one’s self about ongoing past, present or future experiences. This method of talking to one’s self, Gordon (1980) argues, avoids the present, most accurate, and creative internal response available. Such internal actions of talking to one’s self, Nietzsche argued, hinders the progress
of self-overcoming, by preventing the inner voice of Self from providing an individual with a more accurate sense of freedom (Stambaugh, 1985), which increases the feeling of power and leads to an individual being able to overcome the lesser available positions of self (Kaufmann, 1968).

Through my interpretation, as an adult, Missy, who just switched off [line 124], avoided learning to share power or understand the feeling of power in others, however, she did appear to gain the same increased feeling of power over others as her family had over her. Missy’s family inflicted much pain and suffering on her and she is now inflicting similar hurt on others [line 143,144]. Missy talks of continually occurring personality issues and I argue, she uses this at times to avoid responsibility within her relationships. This behaviour is illustrated when Missy states that she does not remember her violent behaviours towards others, and that these actions are a product of a disorder, discursively labelled by medical practitioners as Multiple Personality Disorder [lines 117,118,119].

123 ...if he accused
124 me of something I didn’t do, I just switched off and became this other
125 person, this stronger person.

130 I learnt to identify that but at the time I didn’t know.
131 ...it was just a part of who I was. See unless you identify
133 there’s another personality there and start learning about that personality,
134 you can’t identify with it, because you just go. You blank out, ...you
135 like, wake up and you think how did that pot plant get in the TV.
136 I was watching a movie, what happened? and I was constantly saying
138 what happened, what did I do then, what did I say? I was constantly
139 doing that to people around me all the time and to my husband and other
140 people. ...what did I say, did I say anything wrong? yeah, like that
141 was, that was the other per, that was the other personality, like the
143 stronger one was very destructive, very vicious, ...more like very
144 violent in a lot of ways... And then the weaker personality went when I
146 was left alone, it felt comfortable, that was ok. Any sort of threat I’d
change, but I didn’t understand the changes

Missy confided in me during the interview that she had had nine years of therapy [line 119], and that her doctor, who was always there for her [line 204], would admit her to a private hospital whenever she became bad.

Missy’s behaviours, I argue, may have increased her feeling of power, however, may also have hurt or led to the feeling of power for others being lessened. Nietzsche has viewed this position as one of relative weakness in the understanding of self and thus led to thoughtlessness for others (Patton, 1993). An individual, as in Missy’s case, with little understanding of self and the feeling of power, may often be involved, consciously or unconsciously, in inflicting hurt or injury to another individual (Kaufmann, 1968). Individuals with little self understanding may inspire pity, sympathy and humility within other individuals, making this individual, powerless over self and oppressed, but powerful over other individuals, especially through the power to hurt. Nietzsche argued that any increased power even this exalted state of power gained through sympathy was envied by the so called powerful, and thus has led to changes in ethics codes, values and morals (Kaufmann, 1968). Such changes, Nietzsche also believed, have provided a position where those who appear weaker than others have been provided for through the enforcement of an illusionary state of democracy (Kaufmann, 1968).

Nevertheless, women have desired the feeling of power over others, by being in control of their own life position and desires, and by being in an active position to initiate sexual relations, not just to be positioned as a male play object (Hollway,
1998). This position was accomplished through the support of some men for women, who fought for the rights of women, and believed that both sexes had the "right to express their sexuality in any way they choose so long as nobody is hurt" (Hollway, 1998:234). The power and the status of women within society have increased, and modern women have moved into a position, with similar status to that of men (Permissive Discourse).

The position of the modern women has discursively developed to where she is responsible not only for the traditional housewife duties, but also for numerous responsibilities of employment outside the home, which has provided her with financial independence, and an increased feeling of power. I argue that nevertheless, modern women are still experiencing difficulties within their relationships. Previously they may not have acted responsibly for themselves and wanted a male to be responsible for them and now they may act in an overly responsible manner, by taking full responsibility for both the household, family and work responsibilities (PD). This has not led to the use of the six positions of Gordon (1980) enabling creative problem solving. Men and women even in a modern society continue to fluctuate between the Fear Discourse and the Protective Discourse.

I argue that individuals are not always aware of their internal desire for power and its dual nature, other wise they would look to position themselves where they could make more creative decisions, which provide an increased feeling of shared power for both the self and others. Denneson (1999) argued that this shared position would lead to the most alive feeling of power, freedom, and eventually, further self-awareness and self-overcoming. Gordon (1980) also argues that through acting with
balanced responsibility, courage, creativity, giving, acceptance and through listening
to the inner voice of self all individuals are provided with a multiple of positions from
which to create changes in their lives that increase their awareness of self and others.
Figure 5. Synthesis of epistemology in power sharing in relation to the interpretation of the various demonstrations of themes of commitment.

(Wallace, 2002)
Chapter 11  

Discussion

The focus of this study is the examination of couple relationships to determine how and why power influences an individuals' style of commitment in heterosexual relationships. These issues of power and commitment are explored through personal accounts of the internal feeling of power, as demonstrated through the themes of commitment, by each participant. This study has attempted to argue that the themes or styles of commitment could be understood as positions of responsibility that each individual, due to their present and historical, social, cultural and political environments, consciously or unconsciously selects through their personal interpretation and allocation of meaning within each interaction and influences discourse and discursive practices in the future. I have used Post structuralism to argue that individuals arrive at a description or explanation of, or otherwise account for, the world in which they live. The elements that make up this epistemology are the social and historical influences and the deconstruction of text. The social and historical elements support the finding that all individuals take part in another's experiences, by passing on information through discourse and discursive practices. The deconstruction of text may provide a position to assist in the further understanding of the multiple positions found within discourses in relation to subjectivity (Henriques, et. al., 1998). It is these multiple positions that may assist in creatively finding another alternative discourse in relation to an issue. It was important, in this research, to show that future awareness by individuals to the need to increase their feeling of power and demonstrate Gordon's (1980) six positions of responsibility would assist in determining how creative attention and power sharing could be focused, in order to recreate future realities of self-overcoming. One finding
within this research upheld by Gergen (1991), Burr (1998), Kaufmann (1968) and Gordon (1980) was the belief in, and support for, the outcome that these different positions of reality, within relations of power, means that each individual’s position had eventuated from their interpretation of their experiences, even from within the same historical, social, political or cultural situations.

Hollway (1998) argued that many issues, including e.g. commitment within heterosexual relationships, are taken-for-granted constructions of life’s events. These taken-for-granted assumptions must be challenged and exposed through the feminist research practice of deconstruction, e.g. the process of questioning, thus introducing openness and curiosity to language to reveal further truths, interpretations and meanings, which are all from historically based contexts. I argue that this practice is necessary and important for an individual’s greater understanding of life’s interactions and events, and to increase an individual’s opportunities for increasing the feeling of power and self-overcoming (DD).

Individuals may often demonstrate or speak of the socially acceptable norms of an event rather than their most accurate memory of the event. Consequently, deconstruction of discourse provides a position from which to challenge or use alternative and less oppressive discourses (Hollway, 1998) in order to encourage further understanding. At times participants spoke of alternative or challenging discourses that they had used and had still not experienced a positive outcome. I argue that a positive outcome would be an increased feeling of power for all within the interaction. Even though temporary changes were accomplished only Tom and Margaret spoke of feeling an increase in power within the interaction.
A number of demonstrations of commitment were highlighted within this study. These demonstrations, I argue, often primarily increased the participant’s feeling of power, while they appeared to rarely considering their partner’s feeling of power. I put forward three alternative discursive positions: Fear Discourse (FD), Protective Discourse (PD) and Detached Discourse (DD). It is in my interpretation of this study material that these positions became apparent within the participant’s interviews, on the basis of how the participants increased their feeling of power. The various positions of Gordon (1980) were also unknowingly spoken of by participants at the time of their interview in relation to events within three of their heterosexual relationships. The Fear Discourse was evident when a participant discussed their demonstrations of commitment (responsibility) within their heterosexual relationships through the actions of avoidance, revenge, hurt, pain, blame, control and domination. These actions are conducive to Nietzsche’s negative discourse, where individuals show a lack of responsibility to self and others (Kaufmann, 1968). The Protective Discourse was named as such, due to the participant’s actions of rescuing, smothering, controlling and domination, and taking full responsibility for both self and others. The third discursive position, Detached Discourse, occurred where commitment (responsibility) was demonstrated by two of the twelve participants in a balanced, creative and sharing manner. The actions associated with this discourse were listening to self and others, courage, creativity, open respectful communication, as well as, the giving to others when they needed assistance (Gordon 1980), such as when an individual was unable to accomplish a task on their own.

From the narratives of the six men and six women participants, within this study, it was demonstrated that both men and women would use power over others to
increase their own feeling of power through the Fear or Protective Discourses and therefore, neglect, ignore or forget their partner’s feeling of power. Nietzsche’s theory (Kaufmann, 1968) of the ‘will to power’ argues that the majority of individuals, within society, behave in ways that provide an increased feeling of power for self, and not for others. The implication of this approach, as the majority of individuals perform behaviours within the FD or PD, has and will be further selfish behaviours of conflict or passivity. These behaviours will be demonstrated through control and domination (FD), or passive/rescuing behaviours from their victims of smothering and mothering (PD), with very few individuals using the DD to deconstruct the situation and find a balance.

The fluctuation of a participant from one position to another, e.g. FD to PD and back again, was also observed on numerous occasions, through participant’s stories told within this study. These fluctuations of participants’ actions were highlighted when they spoke of the changes in their demonstrations of commitment while in one relationship, as compared to their demonstrations of commitment (responsibility) whilst in another relationship (changes of commitment between relationships). Additionally, these actions were demonstrated when participants told their stories of a specific interaction, when they were still within a relationship (changes of commitment within relationships), and it became obvious to me, that these fluctuations were numerous with no specific trigger, except when the participant felt a sense of power loss within the situation. This feeling of loss, as previously stated, leads to the struggle of choosing which discourse to use to help the self increase the feeling of power. The most prominent use of discourse in response to these fluctuations was between the discursive positions of Fear and Protection.
Unknowingly the men were most often found to talk about their situations, through the use of the theme or position of fear, which is related to their lack of responsibility to others (FD). In the case of the six women studied, I argued that they often spoke about a position of being overly responsible or protective (PD), to gain their desired result and increase their feeling of power, which therefore encouraged themselves and their partners to continue within their chosen position. Women using the PD, for example, protect and act responsibly over men and their position of FD, while the men, through their demonstrations of the lack of responsibility (FD), fulfil the need of women to be protected.

Both men’s and women’s demonstrations of commitment or responsibility have fluctuated between the two discourses of Fear and Protection and I argue while utilising these discourse of fear and protection were unable to recognise their partner’s demonstrations of commitment. Even though these two positions were consistently the most predominant expressions of commitment throughout the research, it could be argued that the discursive position of detachment (DD) was realised and utilised by two participants, Tom and Margaret. Tom and Margaret, within their different relationships, at various times in their lives, had become aware that power over others was not the most successful method for continuing their relationships in a happy, comforting and sharing way. Consequently, they learned from their past and present experience to be responsible and to use power sharing rather than power over others. Their present relationships, support Nietzsche’s idea of self-overcoming, were very successful for both themselves and their partners, and their relationships to date continue. This position of commitment or responsibility was attained through learning from their life experiences, and developing an
alternative position of self-awareness or self-overcoming through creative problem solving, not one of power over others. These two individuals were able to understand far more about self-awareness, self-reflectivity and greater positions of respect for all individuals from across many social stratifications, as they reflexively deconstructed and interpreted the discourses of others. This position of creative problem solving is a reflection of what Gordon (1980) describes in his six positions of responsibility, strength and courage, creativity, giving, acceptance and inner voice of self.

These findings have therefore supported the original purpose for this research: to identify that power is the driving force of commitment, which is demonstrated through the many themes or styles of commitment, now known to be the three discursive positions within heterosexual relationships. Within this study, two out of twelve participants, demonstrated the detached discursive position of power sharing. There appears, from the participants’ stories, to be little awareness of the internal or external feeling of power of self or others. Both aspects of power, within all generations, have been unconsciously administered within all interactions, and unknowingly taught throughout all social institutions and events. These aspects of power have been ignored, neglected and forgotten as important elements of human history, culture, social and political actions. Political actions have eventuated from the traditional patriarchal methods of domination and control used by many males to increase their feeling of power and their independence and freedom, without demonstrating a balance of responsibility (Kaufmann, 1968 and Gergen & Davis, 1985). The participants’ stories supported this statement of historical eventuation, by revealing that continuously re-experienced historical events were the basis for creative future action to be decided upon or taken.
Within this study it was argued that the increase in the feeling of power, from the use of power over others, learned from past experiences, was only temporary. This power over others was shown on many occasions through participant narratives, for example, when they told of how they felt good about a particular situation, and later of how this feeling of power was believed to be lost. Such a repetition of loss may then lead to struggles which were defined as confusing, frustrating, angering and sometimes to a state of depression. If however, the individual had used Gordon’s (1980) creative power sharing activities to problem solve, the next difficult interaction, if interpreted as difficult, would not have been such a struggle and a reusable creative method for change could increase their previous feeling of power.

Furthermore, it was argued that an individual’s understanding of internal power and external relations of power depended upon past and present struggles. It was through these struggles that my two power-sharing participants, Tom and Margaret, had learned to balance commitment (responsibility) through their demonstrations of power sharing activities. As these participants had relationships where they demonstrated power over others, they had learned, through their life struggles, to recognise when another individual was doing the same. Thus they personally chose to interpret and allocate meaning to the event, interaction or situation, which would then lead them to further demonstrations of power sharing. The actions of commitment, demonstrated by these two participants, had changed and progressed from being external traditional social behaviours, to internal and personal interpretations that they had learned due to their social experiences. It may be possible for individuals to fluctuate from the Detached Discourse to the Fear Discourse or Protective Discourse, however, this fluctuation was not evident in this
research.

Before gaining awareness and understanding of power sharing, these two participants, through their interpretations of previous interactions accepted, the truth of the traditional belief that commitment was demonstrated through arguing with or coercing your partner, or controlling and dominating them, in order to show commitment to them and the relationship. Their interpreted truths concerning commitment, in their third relationship, however, were demonstrated from an internal personal awareness of self-overcoming, therefore leading to improved demonstrations of commitment, through the sharing of power and responsibility. They spoke of this truth as occurring when an individual within the relationship was able to behave in such a way as to increase their and their partner’s feeling of power. They went on to say that this increase in the feeling of power may or may not coincide with the shared values, norms and beliefs of traditional social beliefs (male cultural domination). Hollway (1998) believes that the self is mutually constructed through narratives or stories (experiences), which are a sharing of information that is similar and dissimilar, between all individuals within an interaction. Therefore, this belief allows for new and creative meanings of truth to be allocated to old truths. Instead of the old traditional truths of domination, shared power through shared commitment (responsibility) is now more prominently available. Tom and Margaret also believed that these behaviours continuously provided a position where their and their partner’s feeling of power would increase consistently and not temporarily, thereby increasing the chances of the relationship continuing.

A major component of the theory of Social Constructionism advocates that
social situations or interactions provide environments that are conducive for individuals to learn about self and others (McClelland, 1975, Denneson, 1999, Henriques, et. al., 1998 and Gordon, 1980). Denneson (1999) and Gordon (1980) described these social environments as locations where an individual, through struggle to increase the feeling of power rather than to believe that they feel a loss of power, and so these same individuals struggle to regain their position of power. Nietzsche argued that an individual never loses power because of a situation they are in, they only believe they have (Denneson, 1999).

I have also argued within this study that commitment was another name for responsibility, and I have shown that varying degrees of responsibility were demonstrated through the three discursive positions of Fear, Protection and Detachment. These three positions assist individuals to increase their feeling of power, and thereby attain further independence and freedom for themselves. Both the discursive positions of Fear and Protection provide a temporary increase in the feeling of power (an unbalanced sense of power), thereby encouraging and eventually leading to the feeling of power loss and further difficulties. The Detached discursive position provides a balanced sense of commitment (responsibility), and its use consistently increases an individual's feeling of power. It leads to a more sustainable lifestyle of freedom and independence, while the individual embraces responsibility in relation to self and others.

The outcomes of this study have supported my hypothesis that this feeling of power has a dual nature and occurs from demonstrating power over others, by ruling and dominating others, as well as, from recognising the experiences of power shared
with others within any interaction. Consequently, I argue that the findings of this study may be generalised to any interaction throughout life because of their regularity of occurrence in the stories of most participants when they spoke of how they interacted with their partners and did not speak of knowing other alternative methods of interaction. Further research would need to be undertaken in specific social arenas to demonstrate the applicability and generalisability of the three discourses and discursive practices of commitment, however, I argue that these discourse would be recognisable within all interactions. Areas that would benefit from such research may include child protection, homosexual relationships, employment environments, groups of individuals with mental health issues and their interactions or where ever there are interactions of two or more individuals. For example Vietnam Veterans with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. A major percentage of these Veterans, due to their exposure to previous interactions in their training and in Vietnam, now experience a life of social isolation and could experience outcomes from alternative choices, and a greater understanding of balanced commitment (responsibility) and power sharing, to operate from in their lives. If a veteran from the Vietnam War was depressed and demonstrating behaviours of control over others in order to feel safe, an alternative method for understanding the concept of power sharing could be made available within a number of counselling sessions, therefore assisting him to increase his feeling of power and possibly become aware of the multiple positions of power sharing that are available. Their independence and sense of freedom may also increase and assist in decreasing their present position of fear (social isolation) and protection (control, smothering) of others. Commitment can bring to a heterosexual relationship a sense of freedom through the Detached Discourse of self-overcoming or the belief in a position of powerlessness through the discursive practices of fear or
protection. Commitment (responsibility) is a powerful force in any heterosexual relationship and if individuals could be made aware of its possibilities through creative problem solving, individuals could interact in more harmonious ways.
Chapter 12

Conclusion

Power domination and power sharing in heterosexual relationships can change the style of commitment within that relationship. It can also lead to alterations in discourse and discursive practices that occur outside that heterosexual relationship. At times the individual can be the dominator or the victim. They can take from others, or life, as well as, give. They can use power over others or share that feeling of power. All individuals will find this inside themselves (internal drive to power), ready to be recreated via their exposure to external environments and interactions, thus creating a more balanced position of power sharing.

It has been argued that interactions of power can influence the styles or themes of commitment demonstrated by each individual, within any relationship. There appeared to me to be a gap between an individual’s knowledge of power, commitment and responsibility and their understanding of their demonstrations of power, commitment and responsibility, which impacted on their demonstration of these positions. Many individuals, within society, do not give consideration to the idea that they demonstrate power over others, when that is exactly what they do. These individuals believe they are demonstrating a balanced style of commitment and responsibility to all concerned. Power sharing, being the demonstration of a balanced style of commitment or responsibility, has been a term not often understood or utilised by many individuals or institutions within society. I hypothesised, in accordance with Nietzsche, that the feeling of power temporarily increased from taking power, by ruling and by dominating others (FD/PD). This feeling of power consistently and permanently increased from recognising the experiences of power
shared with others (DD) within any interaction.

This study focused on the examination of heterosexual couple relationships to determine how power influences an individual’s style of commitment in heterosexual relationships. It was based on Gordon’s (1980) six positions of self-overcoming, especially through creativity and sensitivity, and Nietzsche’s concept of an internal desire to increase the feeling of power. My question: “How does an individual’s styles or themes of commitment change within and between three of their previous heterosexual relationships?” was introduced to determine how the feeling of power, unbeknownst to the participant, influenced their demonstrations of commitment within and between their three relationships they chose to speak about. Each participant explored the issues of power and commitment through a questionnaire focusing on the personal discursive accounts of the internal feeling of power, as demonstrated through the themes of commitment.

All twelve participants through their stories demonstrated commitment to be another word for responsibility. Indeed their commitment was highlighted as a very powerful force within their heterosexual relationships, which may be generalised to other interactions for all individuals. The participants’ verbal responses to the research questionnaire revealed that their discourses and discursive practices demonstrated that styles or themes of commitment can change, either temporarily or permanently. These changes depended on environmental circumstances, e.g. the relationship, social learning, family beliefs and the individual’s chosen discourse and discursive position of power through the discourses of fear, protection or detachment. To creatively problem solve and lessen the gap between an individual’s knowledge,
understanding and their demonstrations of power, commitment and responsibility, the three discursive positions of fear, protection and detachment were introduced.

The male participants most often demonstrated the discursive position referred to in this study as the Fear Discourse (FD). This discursive interactive position has been defined as existing when an individual uses the behaviours of avoidance, domination, control over others and the lack of responsibility for self or others. The Protective Discourse (PD) was found to be most often demonstrated by women participants, and involved the behaviours of rescuing, smothering, domination and control, via the behaviours associated with being overly responsible for self and others. Both of these positions were found to be a temporary way to increase the participant's feeling of power. These two discourses usually lead to conflict between the participant and their partner through the use of resistance from either party.

I argue that the Detached Discourse (DD), however, was the only discursive position to have a lasting experience by increasing the feeling of power for all individuals within the interaction. Additionally, it was argued that this Detached Discourse was the least often demonstrated form of commitment utilised by both men and women participants. When commitment was demonstrated by a participant in a balanced manner (DD), the participant provided for the self and others a possible position for personal reconstruction in their life. Such reconstruction created a position of independence and freedom, for the individuals involved in the interaction, by increasing their feeling of power through self-overcoming. Only two participants spoke of their demonstrations of the Detached Discourse through the sharing of the feeling of power within one of their heterosexual relationships. While men often
performed demonstrations conducive to the Fear Discourse and women to the Protective Discourse, the study also revealed that the demonstrations of commitment for both men and women would fluctuate between all three discourses on various occasions. These fluctuations of discourse therefore shows that the democratisation of morals and values for all members of society to be illusionary.

If the Fear and Protective Discourses were most often utilised by participants, and no harmful consequences were experienced by self or another individual, then Nietzsche believed that the learning to be realised within the interaction would be of great benefit to all concerned. If, however, harmful consequences were evident, then it would be necessary for other individuals or even social institutions, e.g. police and health professionals, to intervene in order that the individuals involved would not be harmed. This intervention would interrupt the learning process and the individual, inflicting the harm, may experience the full negative consequential impact of their behaviours, thereby encouraging their learning experience. Should fear occur during any situation then the opportunity for self-overcoming decreases. However, if an individual believes what they are saying and doing to be the truth about a topic and it does not harm others, I argue that their fear of pain and hurt may decrease and self-overcoming may increase. Not only is taking responsibility a necessary starting point in life, so too is courage. Not courage to hurt but courage to give eg: if the action an individual wishes to demonstrate is not harmful to self or others, and they believe it is for the good of all involved, go ahead and do it! Put your dream across, and never mind what others say, if you meet with temporary defeat the challenge will come again. I have also argued that individuals do not know that every failure brings with it the seed of an equivalent success and by accepting the natural consequences of an
action is the best teacher. This may be a painful way to learn, however, Nietzsche argued that it is the most effective. Nietzsche’s work supported this statement, as he believed that every experience, even a painful one, is necessary for further consistent increases of the feeling of power.

It was my aim for this study to show how, through the use of power sharing behaviours, an individual can consistently increase their, and their partner’s, feeling of power, thereby leading them to a greater sense of freedom through balanced demonstrations of responsibility. Rather than reproducing historically learned values that create conflict, the Detached Discourse (DD) of power sharing leads to lessening the gap between knowledge and understanding. This gap between an individual’s knowledge and their demonstrated understanding of their positions of power, and their styles or themes of commitment and responsibility, as well as, their ability to gain freedom in their life, was reduced through the introduction of the deconstruction of the participant’s discourses into the three discursive positions of fear, protection and detachment. Without the introduction of these three positions, a greater understanding of the participants’ positions, through discourses and discursive practices, would have been limited.

With many heterosexual relationships the demonstrated styles or themes of commitment, through the positions of the feeling of power (fear, protection, detachment), have provided structured environments for the various discourses and discursive practices to be understood. These environments have also provided insights into how an individual’s desire to increase their feeling of power, and their demonstration of this need, has dictated the consequential outcomes and experiences
of these participants.

As this study focused on heterosexual relationships only, it would be beneficial for further studies to be accomplished in regard to child protection, homosexual relationships, employment environments, groups of individuals with mental health issues and their interactions, for example Vietnam Veterans, or wherever there are interactions of two or more individuals. This study has highlighted the need for heterosexual couples to utilise creative problem solving skills and values to strengthen their commitment to each other, through the demonstration of power sharing activities. Such activities, involving the Detached Discourse (DD), will consistently increase the feeling of power, which leads to self-overcoming and freedom.
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LOOK

This is not a compulsory research project...

It is not a requirement of the uni. for you to participate in this study...

It is a chance for you to understand your styles of commitment...

It does provide you with the opportunity to gain knowledge and wisdom about yourself...

Topic: “How does an individual’s styles or themes of commitment change within and between three of their previous heterosexual relationships?”

Research interviews will be administered for the purpose of highlighting the many aspects of commitment within heterosexual relationships throughout the life span of individuals within the age bracket of forty to forty nine years. The interviews will be to assist in clarifying the above mentioned topic for my Master of Arts (Honours) Critical Psychology thesis. This thesis topic focuses on the many changes in style of commitment within three different heterosexual relationships.

I would appreciate the assistance of any individuals who would like to participate with me, in my research for further understanding and awareness of ways individuals within society show commitment within relationships.

Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. The beneficial consequences of participating in this research could be the identification, by yourself and other members of society, of positive styles of commitment or styles of commitment that could be changed. If you decide to become a participant and you find yourself distressed due to the nature of the research topic a free personal counselling session will be provided.

It will take approximately one to one and half hours to complete. Your responses will remain completely confidential and anonymous from the public, with all taped interviews being securely stored on completion of the research in November, 2001. Information from this interview will not be used for any purpose other than what has been stated and feedback, a copy of the completed thesis, will be provided to each participant, after completion of the research.

CONTACT CAROL 55376881
Information Sheet

University of Western Sydney Nepean
Centre for Critical Psychology
P.O. Box 10
KINGSWOOD  NSW  2747

Topic: “How does an individual’s styles or themes of commitment change within and between three different heterosexual relationships?”

Research interviews will be administered for the purpose of highlighting the many aspects of commitment within heterosexual relationships throughout the life span of individuals within the age bracket of forty to forty nine years. The individual interviews will be to assist in clarifying the above-mentioned topic for my Master of Arts (Honours) Critical Psychology thesis. This thesis topic focuses on the many changes in style of commitment within three different heterosexual relationships.

I would appreciate the assistance of any individuals who would like to Participate, with me, in my research for further understanding and awareness of ways Individuals, within society show commitment within relationships.

Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. The beneficial consequences of participating in this research could be the identification, by yourself and other members of society, of positive styles of commitment or other styles of commitment that could be changed. If you decide to become a participant and you find yourself distressed due to the nature of the research topic a free personal counselling session will be provided.

It will take approximately one to one and half hours to complete. Your
responses will remain completely confidential and anonymous from the public, with all taped interviews being securely stored on completion of the research in November, 2001.

Information from this interview will not be used for any purpose other than what has been stated and feedback, a copy of the completed thesis, including a summary of findings will be provided to each participant, after completion of the research.

Researcher contact for further details: Carol
55376881 (after 7pm week nights)

NOTE: This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Nepean Human Ethics Review Committee. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Research Ethics Officer (tel: 02 47 360 169). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix C

Participant Consent Form

I.................................................voluntarily consent to being a participant in the study of commitment within heterosexual relationships conducted by Carol Wallace.

The aims of the study have been fully explained. I understand that my identity will be kept confidential and that I can cease participation at any time.

Signed:........................................ Dated:...................................
Participant

Signed:........................................ Dated:...................................
Researcher
Appendix D

Instructions

This interview consists of three questions. There are no right or wrong answers. If you have any difficulty in understanding the meaning of my questions, please do not hesitate to question me for further details.

The research will be asking you to discuss your personal experiences of commitment within three of your heterosexual relationships

* The participant will be told this information at the commencement of the interview.

Demographics

Gender: Male Female

Marital Status: Single Married Defacto Divorced

Are you presently in a heterosexual relationship: Yes No

* The researcher will ask the participant these demographics before the interview commences.
Questionnaire

Please tell me about your experiences of commitment within three different heterosexual relationships.

Questions for Relationship One

1. Could you please tell me about your thoughts concerning commitment within your relationship?
2. How did these aspects of commitment coincide with your partners?
3. How were these aspects of commitment in conflict with your partners?

Questions for Relationship Two

1. Could you please tell me about your thoughts concerning commitment within your relationship?
2. How did these aspects of commitment coincide with your partners?
3. How were these aspects of commitment in conflict with your partners?

Questions for Relationship Three

1. Could you please tell me about your thoughts concerning commitment within your relationship?
2. How did these aspects of commitment coincide with your partners?
3. How were these aspects of commitment in conflict with your partners?

General Questions about Commitment within Relationships

1. What were the similarities of commitment between these three relationships?
2. What were the differences of commitment between these relationships?
3. What meaning does the term commitment hold for you?
4. What qualities of commitment would you look for to determine a relationship as being good or bad?
Verbal Feedback and Debriefing

Did you have any difficulty in answering any of the questions?

Do you have any other problems concerning the research you would like to discuss?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This interview is designed to understand the different styles of commitment within relationships. It is part of my Master of Arts (Honours) Critical Psychology thesis assessment for the University of Western Sydney Nepean.

Your responses will remain completely confidential and anonymous from the public.

Information from these research questions will not be used for any purpose other than what has been stated.

Any questions pertaining to this interview and subsequent study may be directed to the researcher (Carol Wallace).
References


References Cont.


References Cont.


References Cont.


