THE FIELD GUIDE TO RECURRING COUPLE CONFLICT

Aaron Jarrels, MA, LIMHP, LMFT

Copyright © 2026 Aaron Jarrels. All rights reserved.

This field guide is relationship education, not an individual assessment, a diagnosis, psychotherapy, legal advice, or a substitute for specialist safety support. Its four-part Break the Loop sequence is an educational framework informed by related research. The named sequence and associated exercises have not been independently validated as treatments or proven to improve relationship outcomes.

If your situation involves threats, violence, coercive control, stalking, sexual pressure, fear, or retaliation, do not assume a shared conflict exercise is appropriate. Safety, accountability, and individualized professional or specialist support take priority. For immediate danger, contact local emergency services.

CONTENTS

PART I | UNDERSTANDING RECURRENCE

Chapter 1. Why Do We Keep Having the Same Fight?

Chapter 2. The Issue and the Pattern

Chapter 3. What Makes Conflict Become Repetitive?

PART II | INTERACTION AND CONTEXT

Chapter 4. Demand, Withdrawal, and Familiar Positions

Chapter 5. Escalation and Negative Reciprocity

Chapter 6. What We Think Our Partner Means

Chapter 7. What Happens When Capacity Narrows

Chapter 8. Attachment and Recurring Conflict

Chapter 9. Responsiveness, Regulation, and Recovery

Chapter 10. Repair After Difficult Conflict

PART III | MEANING AND INTERPRETATION

Chapter 11. An Organizing Model for Recurring Conflict

Chapter 12. Launch: What Happened?

Chapter 13. Overload: What Started Happening Inside Me?

Chapter 14. Old Story: What Did the Moment Begin to Mean?

Chapter 15. The Three Pillars: Why Some Moments Carry More Weight

Chapter 16. Protection Move: What Did I Do Next?

Chapter 17. How Two Loops Become One Recurring Pattern

Chapter 18. How to Read Interaction Patterns

PART IV | THE ISSUES THAT MATTER

Chapter 19. Money

Chapter 20. Household Labor and Responsibility

Chapter 21. Parenting

Chapter 22. Sex and Intimacy

Chapter 23. Phones, Technology, and Attention

Chapter 24. Work, Time, and Schedules

Chapter 25. Family, Friends, and Outside Loyalties

Chapter 26. Trust, Agreements, and Broken Expectations

PART V | RECOGNIZING THE SEQUENCE

Chapter 27. Recognizing Repetition

Chapter 28. Map the Issue and the Loop Separately

Chapter 29. Map Your Launch
Chapter 30. Notice Overload
Chapter 31. Identify the Old Story
Chapter 32. Identify the Protection Move
Chapter 33. Map the Relational Sequence
Chapter 34. Earlier Recognition Changes the Available Choices

PART VI | INTERRUPTION AND CHOICE

Chapter 35. NAME IT
Chapter 36. SLOW IT
Chapter 37. CHECK IT
Chapter 38. CHOOSE IT
Chapter 39. Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice
Chapter 40. Practice, Not Perfection

PART VII | AFTERMATH AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Chapter 41. When the Loop Has Already Happened
Chapter 42. Repair, Accountability, and Return
Chapter 43. When the Same Harm Keeps Repeating

PART VIII | CASE MAPS

Chapter 44. How to Read a Case Map
Chapter 45. Household Responsibility
Chapter 46. Spending
Chapter 47. Lateness
Chapter 48. Phones
Chapter 49. Sex and Intimacy
Chapter 50. Parenting
Chapter 51. Extended Family
Chapter 52. Work Stress and Availability

PART IX | LIMITS, SAFETY, AND INTEGRATION

Chapter 53. When the Loop Framework Is Not Enough
Chapter 54. What the Evidence Supports, and What Remains Unknown

Conclusion: What You Can Notice, and What You Can Choose

References

Chapter 1. Why Do We Keep Having the Same Fight?

When a different disagreement feels familiar

"We keep having the same fight" can describe more than one experience. An unfinished issue may keep returning: a household responsibility, a bill, an agreement about time together. Or the topic may change while the exchange feels familiar. The question is what, specifically, is repeating.

Consider a fictional couple. One evening, a person asks why the dishes are still in the sink. Their partner explains that work ran late. The first person repeats the agreement about cleaning up; the partner lists the other things they did that day. Soon they are arguing about whether either person recognizes what the other contributes.

Another evening, the person who explained about the dishes asks why their partner arrived late without sending a message. Their partner explains the delay. The question is repeated, the explanation grows longer, and they begin disputing whether the question was fair. A disagreement about an expense follows a similar course: a concern about a missed agreement, an explanation, a repeated concern, and an argument about raising it.

These scenes illustrate a possible resemblance across disagreements, with roles changing. They are not research observations or a claim that all couples follow this sequence. Each concern also remains substantial. The dishes are unfinished, someone was left waiting, and a spending agreement may have been broken. Describing the exchange does not settle those issues or make responsibility equal.

The example gives us two things to notice: what partners are addressing and what happens between them while they address it. In this guide, recurring couple conflict means "Repeated conflict between partners in which recognizable interactional dynamics recur across one or more issues over time." This is the Field Guide's organizing definition, not a single standardized research measure.

Recognizable repetition need not mean a word-for-word replay. In the example, the topics and roles vary, but the movement from raising a concern to disputing whether it should have been raised is similar.

Describing that resemblance is different from deciding that every disagreement has the same cause. To understand what research contributes, we need to keep those questions separate.

A returning issue and a familiar exchange

A recurring issue concerns what remains unresolved. Recurring interaction concerns similarities in how conversations unfold. Partners might describe either or both, but evidence about one does not automatically establish the other.

Research on problems during early marriage illustrates the distinction. In a study of 169 Florida newlywed couples, researchers did not detect significant average change in aggregate reported problem levels across the first four years of marriage (Lavner et al., 2014). Partners repeatedly rated areas of difficulty; researchers were not recording the same argument as it returned.

The finding describes an average across the sample. It does not mean every couple's problems remained unchanged, or that a particular disagreement was permanent or impossible to resolve. It also cannot tell us whether a familiar sequence appeared beneath different topics. Reported problem levels and the order of responses in a conversation are different things to measure.

For the fictional couple, the unfinished dishes identify a concern. The repeated question and lengthening explanation describe part of an exchange. Neither description replaces the other. Here it helps clarify what "the same fight" might mean.

What research can show about familiar interaction

Researchers examine interaction at different scales. They can study the next response within a conversation, compare behavior across separate tasks, or follow couples over time. Each approach answers a different part of the question about repetition.

Responses within a conversation

Negative reciprocity describes negative behavior from one partner followed by negative behavior from the other. The order of those responses can be studied directly. In one laboratory study of 139 heterosexual couples selected for an alcohol study, negative behavior was associated with a negative rather than neutral response on the partner's next turn (Dermody et al., 2025).

This finding concerns responses within one observed conflict discussion. It does not establish that one partner caused the other's behavior or that the sequence returned in another argument. Following what happens turn by turn gives a view of the exchange that an overall rating of the conversation cannot provide by itself.

Correspondence across different conversations

Consistency across tasks is a separate question. In a small study of 38 married couples, measures of negative-affect reciprocity were positively correlated across a low-conflict conversation and a coached conflict task (Gottman, 1980). The measures showed some correspondence across those tasks in that sample.

This historical study involved selected husband-wife couples and an artificial conflict task. Its finding supports a bounded description of cross-task consistency, rather than an account of identical arguments recurring in everyday life. Nor does it establish that topic makes no difference.

Continuity over time

A longer time span adds another distinction. In a study of 324 young married or cohabiting couples, corroborated reports of hostility were associated with observers' ratings of hostility during a structured discussion two years later (Lorenz et al., 2012). Earlier reports and later observations showed some continuity across methods, but the researchers did not track the same sequence of responses repeating throughout those years.

The sample came from a panel with rural Iowa origins, and the measures summarized hostility rather than tracing individual conversational turns. They also included aggression-related content. These findings must not be used to recast all measured behavior as ordinary disagreement or to assign equal responsibility for harm.

Together, these studies show why it matters to ask what has actually been observed: related responses within a discussion, correspondence across tasks, or continuity between earlier reports and later observations. These are relevant pieces of evidence, not interchangeable demonstrations of one fixed cycle. The reviewed evidence does not establish naturalistic repetition of each couple's individual sequence across topics and episodes. That is a limit of this

chapter's evidence base, not a conclusion that such repetition never occurs.

The same precision applies to an everyday description. "In these two conversations, my repeated concern was followed by a longer explanation" identifies a resemblance that can be examined. It leaves room to notice where the conversations differed.

Topics, roles, and context still matter

Another research term, demand-withdraw, describes an interaction in which one partner seeks engagement or change, sometimes through pressure or criticism, while the other disengages or avoids the discussion. It describes behavior in context. A legitimate request is not a character defect, and disengagement is not automatically inappropriate.

Research on this pattern illustrates why topics should remain visible. In a diary study of 116 married couples with children, demand-withdraw was more likely during disagreements concerning the marital relationship (Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009). These were reports of disagreements at home. Topic context mattered in that sample; the study did not establish a fixed sequence recurring across every topic.

Roles can also vary with the discussion. In a study of 182 married couples, demand-withdraw role patterns varied across discussion contexts (Eldridge et al., 2007). The finding came from overall ratings of discussions, rather than a record of an exact sequence recurring over time. It cautions against treating one partner as inherently "the demander" and the other as inherently "the withdrawer."

Demand-withdraw was also observed in the heterosexual, gay, and lesbian couple groups in one study of 63 couples (Holley et al., 2010). This small, predominantly White sample supports the presence of the pattern in all three sampled groups. It does not establish equal prevalence, identical meaning, or equivalent operation across populations.

These findings give context to the guide's distinction between topic and process. Looking at the exchange does not require treating the subjects as interchangeable or the participants as fixed types. The topic of a disagreement and the interaction process are distinguishable aspects of conflict; examining the process does not make the substantive issue irrelevant. This is the guide's synthesis of the reviewed evidence, rather

than a finding that every topic conceals the same problem (Eldridge et al., 2007; Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009).

Why the interaction deserves attention

The subject matters partly because of its association with relationship experience. Demand-withdraw has been associated with relationship dissatisfaction, although findings vary with context, measurement, and study design (Schrodt et al., 2014). The association warrants attention without supplying a single explanation for why a relationship is distressed.

Timing is one reason for caution. In a study following 431 newlywed couples, observed communication and satisfaction were associated at the same assessment points, but links from communication to later satisfaction were not consistently robust (Lavner et al., 2016). Finding communication and satisfaction together did not consistently establish that communication preceded later changes in satisfaction in that study.

The study used broader communication measures than demand-withdraw alone, so it is not a direct refutation of the demand-withdraw finding. It limits the broader claim that poor communication is always the root cause of dissatisfaction without making communication irrelevant. Because it did not test an intervention, it also does not establish that efforts to change communication cannot help.

This leaves the reader with a reason to examine interaction and a limit on what that examination can explain. Identifying a familiar exchange is not a complete account of relationship distress. The underlying concern, the conduct of each person, and the circumstances still require attention.

What repetition does not tell us

Recurrence alone should not be used to conclude that partners are incompatible or that either has a psychological disorder. This is a limit on inference, not reassurance that the relationship is healthy or safe. A description of repeated conflict cannot substitute for an individual assessment.

Repetition also does not establish intention. In the fictional example, an explanation follows a question. More information would be needed to determine whether the explanation was intended to clarify, evade,

defend, or do something else. A person's experience of the response matters without independently proving what their partner meant.

Responsibility remains a separate question. A broken agreement still requires attention, and harmful conduct remains the responsibility of the person who engages in it. One response following another does not make the first person responsible for everything the second person chooses to do. Recognizing a pattern neither divides responsibility equally nor proves that the pattern must continue unchanged.

When safety changes the question

Where fear, coercion, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, or retaliation are present, this guide prioritizes safety and appropriate specialized support over shared-pattern work. Recurring-conflict language must not equalize responsibility for abuse.

Physical injury is not the only concern. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's definition of intimate partner violence includes stalking and psychological aggression, as well as physical and sexual violence (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2026). The World Health Organization's guidance for women subjected to violence includes ongoing safety among the needs addressed in first-line support (World Health Organization, 2014). That guidance concerns women in a clinical support context; the broader boundary stated here is the Field Guide's own safety policy.

If you are afraid of your partner or concerned about retaliation, individual support from a qualified professional or specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than shared conflict work. You do not need to confront your partner or jointly analyze the interaction to establish that safety matters. Relationship education does not replace individualized assessment.

Ending an unsafe conversation, refusing unwanted sexual activity, or seeking outside support should not automatically be classified as withdrawal from a relationship problem. Boundaries and accountability remain essential to interpreting what happened.

A starting point for observation

Where safety is not in question, one way to apply this chapter's distinction is to describe a disagreement without deciding what it says about the whole relationship. Identify the concern being addressed, then a short part of the exchange using words and actions you can

recall. This is an illustration of the distinction, not a tested intervention or a promise of improvement.

"We argued about chores" identifies a topic. "I asked about the dishes, my partner explained about work, and I repeated the agreement" describes an exchange. The unfinished responsibility belongs in the account too. If another disagreement seems similar, specify both the resemblance and the differences without making it fit a predetermined pattern or assigning hidden motives.

Later chapters introduce the Loop as part of Break the Loop's organizing framework. The external studies cited here do not validate the framework or the Loop as a specific construct. This chapter establishes the subject before teaching the model.

"Why do we keep having the same fight?" becomes a more precise question when we ask what is returning: an unresolved concern, a recognizable exchange, or both. Chapter 2, "The Issue and the Pattern," will develop that distinction while keeping both in view.

Chapter 2. The Issue and the Pattern

What are we trying to address?

A bill was due Friday. Jordan had agreed to pay it. On Monday, Taylor sees a late notice and asks what happened. Jordan says they lost track of the date and thought the payment was automatic. Taylor asks how it could have been missed after they had discussed it. Jordan describes a difficult week. Taylor returns to the agreement. Before long, they are debating whether Taylor's question was an accusation and whether Jordan's explanation was an excuse.

The payment still needs attention. So does what happened as they tried to discuss it. These are two descriptions of one conversation, and each can reveal something the other leaves out.

Chapter 1 introduced the difference between a returning concern and a familiar exchange. This chapter develops that distinction. The issue is what the partners are actually trying to address. The pattern describes what happens between them as they try to address it. An issue may concern household labor, money, time, sex, an unmet request, or a broken agreement. A pattern may involve a concern being repeated, an explanation growing longer, and the partners ending up in a dispute about the conversation itself. This broad description of interaction is not itself the full four-part BTL Loop introduced in Chapter 11; repeated behavior alone does not establish recurrence of that framework-specific sequence.

Calling something an issue does not make it minor. A money disagreement might involve a particular purchase, unequal access to funds, or a promise that was broken. Those are materially different concerns. And calling something a pattern does not mean that the partners have a communication defect or that either person has a fixed role. A useful description says what each did and when, with room for disagreement about what it meant.

Jordan's missed payment is the issue in this example. The late notice and any fee have consequences. Depending on what happened, Jordan may need to arrange payment, cover a fee, and take responsibility for the missed commitment. Identifying the exchange does not cancel those obligations. At the same time, resolving this bill would not, by itself, tell us how a later conversation about another missed agreement would unfold.

Taylor asked, Jordan explained, Taylor returned to the agreement, and Jordan explained at greater length. Eventually they argued about the fairness of the question and the explanation. That account identifies an observable turn in the conversation. It does not establish that Taylor meant to shame Jordan or that Jordan meant to evade responsibility. Nor does it make their actions equally consequential.

Table 1. The Issue and the Interaction: Two Questions to Keep in View

Question	What to keep in view	What the answer does not establish
What is the issue?	The concern, conduct, agreement, decision, and consequences.	How the conversation developed.
What happened in the interaction?	Responses and their order, including any resemblance to other exchanges.	Motives, equal responsibility, or resolution of the issue.
Why ask both?	The substantive matter and the way it was discussed may each require attention.	A single cause or a proven solution for either.

Caption: The table separates the substantive concern from the exchange around it and identifies what each description leaves unestablished. Neither description proves motives, equal responsibility, a single cause, or a solution. Field Guide conceptual synthesis, not a test or research instrument.

Table 1 organizes questions. It is not a test or a research instrument. A partner may know facts the other does not, and the two may remember the exchange differently. The distinction makes space to examine those facts without requiring agreement that one level is the real problem.

What research can tell us about topics and interaction

Researchers can measure what couples discuss and aspects of how they behave during a discussion. That lets them examine associations between topic and interaction. It does not establish that a topic caused a response, or that the same couple would behave differently if the topic changed.

In one study, 402 first-married newlywed couples sampled from low-income Los Angeles neighborhoods each had one observed problem-solving conversation. Researchers grouped the chosen topics and rated each partner's positivity and negativity. Topic category was associated

with both partners' observed positivity and negativity after accounting for reported topic difficulty and relationship satisfaction (Williamson, Hanna, et al., 2013).

The topics couples chose were related to observers' broad ratings of the conversations in that sample. But different couples discussed different selected topics. The study did not test what would happen if the same couple discussed several topics. Topic choice and other differences among couples could also matter. Reported difficulty and other behavior ratings did not show uniform associations. The finding supports a bounded association, not a rule that any particular topic produces a predictable response.

Demand-withdraw describes an exchange in which one partner seeks engagement or change, sometimes with pressure, while the other disengages or avoids the discussion. A diary report of these tactics at home gives a different kind of account from an observer's overall rating. Neither account, by itself, reconstructs every conversational turn or establishes that the issue caused the behavior. A request for change is not necessarily unreasonable.

Keeping these measures separate lets us examine topic and interaction without treating them as interchangeable. This is a way of organizing the questions, not experimental evidence for this guide's issue-pattern distinction or a recurring sequence beneath every topic.

Who chose the conversation?

An observed discussion begins with a choice about what the couple will discuss. If one partner is more dissatisfied with that issue, the partner may have a particular reason to seek change in that conversation. An observer who ignores the selected topic can mistake a role in one task for a durable property of a person.

Crenshaw and colleagues (2021) examined this problem through a selected-journal methods review and analyses of couple samples. In their principal behavioral test, 134 distressed married heterosexual couples discussed two selected topics. Conclusions about observed demand-withdraw roles differed when the researchers accounted for which partner was more dissatisfied with each topic. That is a warning about how topic selection affects interpretation in these samples. It does not mean every couple changes roles across topics or that relative dissatisfaction is the only explanation for observed behavior.

An overall rating of a selected discussion does not establish a permanent ‘demander’ or ‘withdrawer’ identity. Nor does it trace an identical sequence through ordinary life.

The practical question is what an observation actually captures. Which issue was selected? Who wanted something changed? Did the researchers rate a whole discussion, record tactics in a diary, or analyze responses turn by turn? A partner raising a concern may have good reason to raise it. A person stepping away might be avoiding an obligation, asking for a pause, or setting a necessary boundary. Behavior in one discussion does not prove which interpretation is correct.

These sources also answer different questions. Associations between topic categories and behavior across different couples cannot be converted into a claim about how one couple changes across topics. The evidence reviewed here establishes neither a universal topic-driven role switch nor a pattern fixed regardless of topic. That uncertainty does not make the substantive issue disappear.

Describe the exchange without turning it into a person

“Taylor pursues; Jordan withdraws” may seem like a compact account of the bill conversation. It can also turn one exchange into a pair of identities. A more precise description is: “When Taylor returned to the missed payment, Jordan gave a longer explanation, and they began arguing about whether the question was fair.” We can ask what was answered, what information Jordan supplied, and when the conversation changed. We cannot derive either person's character or intention from that shorthand.

An explanation can contain useful facts without settling responsibility for an agreement. Taylor's experience of being brushed aside may matter without proving that Jordan intended to brush Taylor aside. If the partners disagree about the account, they can distinguish what each remembers, what can be checked, and what remains an interpretation. That is more informative than insisting on a label.

Context also changes how an action should be described. An explanation following a calm question may not carry the same meaning as one following an insult. A pause taken to avoid saying something hurtful is different from refusing to address a consequential concern. The words “demand” and “withdrawal,” as research codes or everyday descriptions, do not settle those differences by themselves.

Suppose a later disagreement about arriving late takes a similar turn toward debating the fairness of a question. The partners could describe the resemblance, then check where the two exchanges differed. The lateness may have different consequences, and the roles or responses may change. The fictional comparison illustrates a question to ask; it is not evidence that one fixed script operates across topics. Chapter 1 already set out the limits of the research on cross-conversation recurrence.

Sequence and accountability are separate questions. If Jordan broke an agreement, the pattern does not divide that breach equally. If someone insults, threatens, or controls a partner, the fact that the conduct occurs in an exchange does not transfer responsibility for it to the recipient. A pattern describes what happened between people; it is not a personality type, a motive detector, or an excuse.

What each question can leave unfinished

Suppose Jordan pays the bill, covers the fee, and sets a reliable reminder. Those steps address this instance of the issue. It remains possible that a later concern could again turn into an argument about whether a question was fair or an explanation was heard. That is a possibility within the example, not a prediction that solving the bill leaves the interaction unchanged.

Now suppose the partners notice that they have begun debating the question itself and bring this conversation back to the payment. The bill, the fee, and the missed agreement still need an answer. Altering one part of an exchange does not demonstrate that the concern has been resolved. Conversely, resolving a concern does not guarantee that the next conversation will develop differently. The issue and interaction can influence each other; distinguishing them does not make them causally independent.

This is an organizational distinction, not proof that two separate interventions each work. The studies above measured topics, selected discussions, and observed or reported behavior. They did not test the independent benefits of “working on the issue” and “working on the pattern.” And an association between communication and relationship satisfaction cannot establish that the interaction is the universal root cause of distress. As Chapter 1 explained, longitudinal findings do not settle that causal direction (Lavner et al., 2016).

For Jordan and Taylor, one question is “What happened with the bill, and what would address it?” Another is “What happened while we tried to discuss it?” They can attend to both without ranking them in advance. Where the concern involves inequity or repeated broken commitments, examining the exchange should clarify accountability rather than postpone it.

When shared-pattern language is unsafe

These questions assume that examining a disagreement together is appropriate. That assumption fails when a person is afraid to disagree, leave, say no, or seek support because of coercion, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, or retaliation. Safety and appropriate specialized support take priority over shared-pattern work. An interaction does not imply equal power, harm, or responsibility. Chapter 53, “When the Loop Framework Is Not Enough,” will examine these limits in more detail.

Ending a conversation because continuing would be unsafe should not be treated as defective “withdrawal.” Neither a pattern label nor an invitation to discuss both sides should make a harmed person responsible for another's coercion. Where fear or retaliation is present, individual support from a qualified professional or a specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than a joint exercise. A person need not confront a partner or jointly map an exchange to establish that safety matters. Relationship education does not replace individual assessment. This is the Field Guide's safety policy, informed by public-health definitions and guidance, rather than a result tested by the couple studies in this chapter (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2026; World Health Organization, 2014).

Where the Loop fits

Break the Loop, the relationship education framework used later in this guide, names the interactional side more specifically. Within that framework, the issue is what partners are actually trying to address; the Loop is what begins happening between them while they try to address it. The issue and the Loop are two different things. Both can matter.

That is framework language. The Loop in this specific sense is not a standardized research measure, and the studies cited here did not independently validate Break the Loop. Chapter 11, “An Organizing Model for Recurring Conflict,” will introduce the full Loop model. For

now, Jordan and Taylor do not need to be fitted into its parts to recognize the difference between the bill and the exchange around it.

To describe a conversation, first name the concern and the relevant agreement, conduct, or consequence. Then describe a short part of the exchange in words that leave room for correction. “We talked about money” identifies a topic. “I asked about the late notice, Jordan explained the missed date, and I returned to our agreement” describes a sequence. Neither sentence alone proves a recurring pattern or pays the bill. This is an illustration of the distinction, not a tested exercise with a promised outcome.

The question to carry forward is what needs to be addressed and what happened while the partners tried. Chapter 3, “What Makes Conflict Become Repetitive?”, will examine pre-interaction expectations, responsibility interpretations, immediate responses, and the limits of what they explain about repetition. The substantive concern stays in view.

Chapter 3. What Makes Conflict Become Repetitive?

What happens before the next response?

“I knew where this conversation was going.” A familiar argument can leave that impression. Understanding it requires separating what someone expected beforehand from what the partner actually did and how the exchange unfolded.

Chapter 1 introduced recurring conflict and the limits of what familiarity establishes. Chapter 2 distinguished the issue from the interaction around it. Here the question becomes more specific: what can we responsibly say about the expectations, interpretations, and responses involved when conflict seems to return to familiar territory?

Research can examine expectations before contact, interpretations of responsibility, responses within a discussion, and continuity across tasks or time. These findings come from different samples and measures. Considering them together offers a provisional way to understand familiar responses, rather than a demonstrated account of how recurring conflict develops or persists.

Consider a brief hypothetical exchange. One partner asks, “Have you decided about Saturday?” The other replies, “Why are you checking on me?” The first says, “I was asking because we need to make a plan.” We can describe the question and the responses. If the second partner reports having expected criticism, we can also describe that expectation. Neither account establishes that criticism was intended, that the expectation was inaccurate, or that the same exchange has occurred before.

The example gives us distinct things to describe: an expectation, an interpretation, and successive responses. Keeping them separate is the starting point for examining the evidence.

Expectations before an interaction

An expectation concerns what someone anticipates. It differs from an account formed after the conversation, even if the two use the same words. “I expected tension before we met” and “Afterward, I thought the conversation had been tense” describe different information. Research that measures both at different times can examine whether they are related without relying entirely on recollection after the event.

One daily-diary study followed 103 dual-earner couples with children in Switzerland, most of whom were married, over ten workdays. Before reuniting with their partner, participants reported expectations about the partner's mood. Later that evening, they reported closeness and tension. Within the same individuals, days with more positive expectations were associated with more reported closeness and less reported tension that evening (Schoebi et al., 2012).

This was a comparison of days within each person: on days when expectations were more positive than that person's usual level, later reported closeness tended to be higher and tension lower. Average differences between people answered a separate question. Average expectations were associated with closeness, but not tension. The daily association remained after adjustment for the person's earlier emotional state and the partner's emotional state at reunion (Schoebi et al., 2012).

These were reports of reunion evenings, rather than observations of conflict discussions. A person could report less tension without having a disagreement that evening. Expectations and later experience might also reflect circumstances the study did not measure. The study therefore supports a bounded association between pre-interaction expectations and later reported experience. It does not establish that an expectation caused a particular conflict response.

The study also does not show how the expectations were acquired. The evidence reviewed here does not verify a pathway from prior conflict experience to later expectation to later conflict response within the same couples. Calling these expectations learned conflict scripts would add an untested explanation. Pre-interaction expectation is the supported description; its origin and effect on conflict behavior remain separate questions.

Interpretations of responsibility

An expectation asks what might happen. An attribution asks how an event should be explained. In relationship research, responsibility attributions can involve judgments about whether a partner acted intentionally, behaved selfishly, or deserves blame. Such judgments are different from simply reporting that the relationship is unsatisfying.

In the Saturday example, “We need a decision” identifies a practical concern. “My partner is checking on me” interprets the question. If the person adds, “They asked because they do not trust me,” that

introduces a judgment about the partner's intention. The wording can be examined as an interpretation without assuming that it is either accurate or mistaken. Facts about agreements, timing, prior conduct, and the current exchange still matter.

Research following 280 young married couples from an Iowa-origin cohort found that responsibility attributions early in marriage predicted the person's own warmth-and-hostility behavior composite approximately two years later, after accounting for both partners' initial marital quality. More negative responsibility attributions were associated with less constructive later behavior. Participants had judged hypothetical negative partner events; the later behavior measure combined observer ratings and reports of behavior. The study did not trace a particular interpretation to the next response in a disagreement (Durtschi et al., 2011).

This is a prospective association: attribution was measured before the later behavior assessment. It compares people and their later behavior, rather than showing that changes in one person's attribution predicted changes in that person's behavior. The tested model did not control initial behavior or test the reverse pathway from earlier behavior to later attribution. Stable differences between people or shared relationship circumstances could contribute to the association (Durtschi et al., 2011).

The study's direct paths from one person's attribution to the partner's later behavior were not statistically established (Durtschi et al., 2011). Neither the own-behavior association nor those null partner findings establish that attribution caused behavior. They also do not determine whether the judgments accurately described a partner's intentions.

Other findings limit generalization. In a selected study of 52 married couples, responsibility attributions covaried with observed conflict behavior among wives but not husbands after adjustment for distress and depression group (Bradbury et al., 1996). This was a small, single-assessment study with different group characteristics. Its null findings should remain visible, without being turned into a rule about men and women. The result is a sample-specific qualification, rather than a direct refutation of the later prospective study.

A survey of 2,347 adults in romantic relationships in Spain, Taiwan, Turkey, and the United States found that more negative relationship attributions were associated with lower satisfaction in all four samples, with substantially different association strengths (Williamson et al.,

2026). These were individual reports at one time, rather than paired observations of couples' conflict behavior. The samples were not representative national samples, and the study did not determine whether culture caused the differences.

The findings make responsibility interpretations relevant to this chapter's provisional account, with different outcomes and limits. Satisfaction reports do not substitute for observed conflict behavior, and sample differences do not provide permanent categories for partners.

Chapter 6, “What We Think Our Partner Means,” will develop attribution and interpretation in greater detail. Here their role is narrower: responsibility judgments are one research-supported consideration in a provisional account of familiar responses. They are not a means of reading a partner's mind.

Responses within a discussion

Expectations and attributions concern information reported by a person. Observational research can address another question: what tends to follow a partner's behavior during a discussion? Reciprocity describes a relationship between the partners' responses. Negative reciprocity concerns negative behavior or affect being followed by a negative response.

In a laboratory study of 139 heterosexual couples selected for an alcohol study, negative behavior was associated with a negative rather than neutral response on the partner's next turn (Dermody et al., 2025). The result identifies a temporal association within the observed discussion. It does not mean that every negative response was followed by another, or that one partner caused the other's behavior.

Turn-by-turn observation identifies order more directly than an overall hostility rating. It still leaves the explanation of each response uncertain. Because the study analyzed one conflict discussion, it cannot establish recurrence in later disagreements.

The hypothetical Saturday exchange illustrates what a descriptive account can include. A scheduling question was followed by a question about being checked on, then an explanation of the need to plan. If the partners dispute the meaning, the account can retain that dispute rather than decide it for them. It does not require calling the first question criticism or the second response defensiveness. Those labels may introduce interpretations beyond the observable words.

A reciprocal account also leaves accountability intact. The fact that an insult follows a question does not establish that the question justified the insult. A request for information may be reasonable. A refusal may express a legitimate boundary. Neither action can be interpreted responsibly by its position in a sequence alone.

Chapter 5, “Escalation and Negative Reciprocity,” will develop the account of reciprocal responding and how an argument gains momentum. Here the finding supplies evidence about the next response within a discussion, one part of the question about repetition.

Continuity without an identical script

Chapter 1 introduced correspondence across tasks and broader behavioral continuity over time. For this chapter, the question is whether that correspondence supplies a mechanism explaining why a familiar response returns.

In a small historical study of 38 married couples, measures of negative-affect reciprocity were positively correlated across a low-conflict conversation and a coached conflict task (Gottman, 1980). The finding provides limited evidence of cross-task correspondence in that selected sample. It does not show that each couple repeated the same words, roles, or sequence. The tasks differed, the low-conflict conversation came first, and the selected historical sample limits generalization.

A study of 324 young married or cohabiting couples from an Iowa-origin cohort linked corroborated reports of hostility with observers' ratings of hostility during a structured discussion two years later (Lorenz et al., 2012). This is continuity across time and methods, rather than a record of recurring conversational turns or a test of how a conflict consequence affected the next episode.

The hostility measures also included physical aggression and coercive behavior. Those elements cannot be treated as ordinary disagreement simply because they were included in a behavioral measure. The safety boundary discussed later in this chapter applies to interpreting this finding as well as to applying the guide.

The Durtschi attribution study and the Lorenz continuity study draw on the same parent research cohort (Durtschi et al., 2011; Lorenz et al., 2012). They address different questions and should not be counted as independent replications of a complete mechanism.

Context provides another constraint. In research involving 182 married couples, demand-withdraw role patterns varied across discussion contexts (Eldridge et al., 2007). Demand-withdraw concerns one partner seeking engagement or change while the other disengages or avoids discussion. The study used overall behavioral ratings in selected discussions, rather than an exact sequence followed through everyday life. Its relevance here is that visible positions cannot automatically be treated as enduring identities.

Chapter 4, “Demand, Withdrawal, and Familiar Positions,” will develop that research in detail. For this chapter, context variation and continuity belong together. Finding some correspondence across tasks does not establish a pattern that ignores context. Finding contextual variation does not establish that every couple changes roles whenever the topic changes.

The word familiar should therefore leave room for differences. A reported resemblance can be described precisely without forcing two disagreements into one script. Which response resembled another? Which issue, action, or consequence differed? A pattern describes an exchange. It does not tell us who either partner fundamentally is or prove what either intended.

An immediate consequence is not evidence of later reuse

It can be tempting to explain recurrence by saying that a behavior continues because it works. Someone becomes louder and the partner becomes quieter. A difficult conversation ends after someone leaves. The immediate consequence appears to explain why the response will be used again.

That account contains an additional proposition: the consequence increases the likelihood of later reuse. Showing that an action was followed by reduced partner negativity is not enough to establish it. We would need evidence connecting the response, its consequence, and increased use of that response in later episodes, with attention to the person's prior behavior and opportunities to respond.

In Smith Slep and colleagues' analysis of a selected, medically at-risk and distressed couple sample, a measure called sequential negative reinforcement indexes an immediate response contingency: how often a partner's negativity decreases after the other person's negativity increases, compared with after it decreases. The measure does not test whether those consequences increase later reuse across conflict

episodes. The analysis found no support for the measure's convergence with the other coercion measures or its concurrent validity in the sampled periods; observations were brief and the relevant events sparse (Smith Slep et al., 2026).

The research terminology needs care. A measure bearing the name negative reinforcement does not automatically demonstrate consequence-driven learning across disagreements. Likewise, a technical measure of a coercive interaction process is not an assessment of coercive control. Threats, intimidation, and control require a safety account, not a presumption of mutually learned behavior.

The sources verified for this chapter do not establish the response-to-consequence-to-later-reuse pathway. This limits the chapter's explanation; it does not establish that reinforcement never occurs or that relevant evidence is absent from the wider literature.

Considering the processes together

One provisional way to organize the findings is to consider pre-interaction expectations, responsibility interpretations, immediate responses, and the limited continuity observed across tasks or time. This is research-informed synthesis. The studies provide separate empirical anchors; they do not establish that these processes jointly form a causal chain across episodes (Dermody et al., 2025; Durtschi et al., 2011; Gottman, 1980; Lorenz et al., 2012; Schoebi et al., 2012).

The studies examine different parts of an interaction at different scales. The diary finding concerns daily expectation and later reported experience. The prospective attribution finding concerns a person's responsibility judgments and that person's later behavior. The sequential study concerns the partner's next response in one discussion. Cross-task correspondence and broad continuity concern resemblance across settings or time. None of these findings can stand in for the others.

The integration is therefore a set of questions to hold together: what was anticipated, what was interpreted, what followed, and what specifically resembled another exchange? Its value here is organizational. It does not explain the origin of an expectation, establish a universal recurring sequence, or show that an immediate consequence increases later reuse.

There is also no basis for making interaction the universal root cause of relationship difficulties. In research following 431 newlywed couples,

observed communication and satisfaction were associated concurrently, but links from communication to later satisfaction were not consistently robust (Lavner et al., 2016). That finding constrains causal certainty. It does not establish that communication is irrelevant or that changing it cannot help.

The issue remains part of the account, as Chapter 2 explains. A scheduling decision, an unequal responsibility, or a broken agreement does not become irrelevant because expectations and responses are being examined. The topic and the interaction are distinguishable aspects of conflict; this conceptual distinction does not establish that they operate independently.

Chapter 7, “What Happens When Capacity Narrows,” will address arousal and regulation. Chapter 11, “An Organizing Model for Recurring Conflict,” will introduce the full Break the Loop model. The studies discussed here do not validate that model or its specific four-part organization.

Safety changes the task

Reciprocal-process language can obscure responsibility if it suggests that everyone in an exchange contributed equally to harm. Where there is coercion, intimidation, threats, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, fear, or retaliation, safety and appropriate specialized support take priority over shared-pattern work. A person's response to harmful conduct does not make that person equally responsible for the conduct.

This is the Field Guide's safety policy, informed by authoritative guidance and definitions. The World Health Organization's reviewed publication overview concerns support and ongoing safety for women subjected to violence; the CDC definition includes physical and sexual violence, stalking, and psychological aggression. Neither source constitutes a test of this guide's framework or an individualized assessment of a reader's relationship (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2026; World Health Organization, 2014).

A reader who fears a partner or retaliation does not need to confront that partner or conduct joint analysis to establish that safety matters. Individual support from a qualified professional or specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate. Leaving an unsafe exchange, refusing unwanted sexual contact, or seeking help should not automatically be interpreted as a contribution to a shared conflict

pattern. Chapter 53, “When the Loop Framework Is Not Enough,” will examine these limits in more detail.

A more precise account of repetition

Where safety is not in question, the chapter's distinctions can guide description without becoming an intervention claim. Someone reviewing an exchange can separate an expectation from an observed event and an interpretation from a stated intention. A comparison with another discussion can specify the resemblance and the differences. This is an illustrative application of the conceptual account, not a tested method for preventing conflict.

Such an account might retain uncertainty: “I expected criticism. My partner asked about Saturday. I understood the question as checking on me. I asked why they were checking, and they said they needed a plan.” It describes a reported expectation, an interpretation, and successive responses. It leaves the scheduling issue visible and does not decide either person's motive.

A more precise account of repetition specifies what is similar while preserving what differs: the expectation, the interpretation, the next response, or a broader tendency over time. Research supports bounded findings about each, alongside context variation and null results. Considering them together remains a provisional synthesis, not one established learning cycle. The legitimate concern and each person's responsibility stay in view.

Chapter 4 turns to demand-withdraw, a documented interaction pattern that makes the questions of position, context, and interpretation more concrete.

PART II | INTERACTION AND CONTEXT

Chapter 4. Demand, Withdrawal, and Familiar Positions

Recognizing the positions without deciding the cause

Why does one partner sometimes push harder while the other pulls farther away? The words demand and withdrawal give us a way to describe part of that exchange. They do not, by themselves, explain why either person responded that way or settle who was responsible for the problem being discussed.

Demand-withdraw is an established relationship research construct. It describes an interaction in which one partner pressures, pursues, requests change, criticizes, or seeks engagement while the other disengages, avoids, becomes silent, withdraws, or attempts to end the interaction. Those descriptions cover a range of conduct. Asking for a decision and criticizing a partner are different actions, even when both are included under the demanding side of a particular measure.

Likewise, silence, changing the subject, declining a request, and leaving an unsafe conversation should not be treated as interchangeable. A description of the interaction needs enough context to distinguish an unresolved issue from an unwanted demand, a defined pause from avoidance, and ordinary disagreement from conduct that creates fear or danger.

Chapter 3 introduced demand-withdraw as one example of context-sensitive behavior. Here the focus is how researchers measure those positions, how they vary with the discussion, and what their associations with satisfaction establish. The question is not just whether pressure and disengagement occurred, but what the description allows us to conclude about that exchange.

The topic of a disagreement and the interaction process are distinguishable aspects of conflict; examining the process does not make the substantive issue irrelevant. Chapter 2 developed this distinction. It is the guide's research-informed synthesis, rather than a claim that topic and process operate independently (Crenshaw et al., 2021; Eldridge et al., 2007; Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009). If the concern

involves an unkept agreement, that agreement remains part of the account. Calling the exchange demand-withdraw does not determine whether the request was reasonable or the responsibility fairly distributed.

What the research measures

The studies reviewed here assess demanding and withdrawing behavior within disagreements, using different reporting or observation methods (Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009; Rosen et al., 2025). The distinction matters because the same pattern name can refer to a report about a conflict, an observer's overall rating of a discussion, or a score constructed from several behaviors. Each provides particular information.

In a home diary, partners can report what happened during a disagreement after it occurred. In Papp and colleagues' study, each spouse reported conflicts over a 15-day period. Demand-withdraw classifications drew on reported complementary tactics by different partners within the same conflict. Initiating the disagreement was recorded separately from demanding behavior (Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009). A person who brought up the issue was therefore not automatically classified as demanding simply because they spoke first.

These reports place the behavior in everyday settings and preserve information about the subject of the disagreement. They do not provide a recording of each conversational turn. Reporting pressure and withdrawal in the same episode does not, on its own, establish which came first, whether either intensified, or whether one response caused the other. Repeated diary entries also do not automatically show that a couple repeated an identical sequence across episodes.

Observational studies provide another view. Researchers can record a discussion and rate behavior across it. In Eldridge and colleagues' study, observers combined overall ratings of blame and pressure for demand. Their withdrawing score combined avoidance, withdrawal, and engagement scored in reverse, so that less engagement contributed to a higher withdrawing score. The researchers examined both directional configurations: one partner demanding while the other withdrew, and the reverse (Eldridge et al., 2007). A directional configuration identifies whose behavior is represented in each position. It is not necessarily a record of the order of responses.

Other observational scores organize behavior differently. Rosen and colleagues rated demand-withdraw during one sexual-conflict

discussion and averaged the partners' ratings into a couple-level score (Rosen et al., 2025). That score summarizes the pattern in the observed discussion. It does not assign a permanent role to either partner. A couple-level score and a directional score answer different questions, even if both carry the demand-withdraw name.

Some measures also combine behaviors that another study keeps separate. In the long-married sample examined by Holley and colleagues, passive withdrawal and active avoidance were distinct observed behaviors (Holley et al., 2013). In other studies, withdrawing composites included avoidance and reduced engagement (Eldridge et al., 2007; Ross et al., 2019). Consequently, a finding about one score should not be silently translated into a finding about every form of silence or disengagement.

Consider two brief, hypothetical descriptions. "Both partners reported pressure and withdrawal during the disagreement" describes co-occurrence. "After the question, the partner stopped answering" describes an order of actions. The second description contains temporal information that the first does not. Neither description establishes the person's intention, and neither demonstrates that the same exchange returned the following week.

Keeping these levels separate makes the research more useful. An overall rating can identify an association with satisfaction without explaining the next conversational turn. A report of familiar behavior can deserve attention without proving a fixed script. The evidence should be read at the level it actually measured.

The topic remains part of the pattern

Context is not a minor detail added after the interaction has been explained. The reviewed findings connect demand-withdraw with the subjects and tasks in which it was assessed. In a diary study of 116 married couples with children, demand-withdraw was more likely during disagreements concerning the marital relationship (Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009). The finding concerns reports of conflicts at home among US married parents, most of whom were White. It is an association with topic context, not evidence that every relationship disagreement produces the pattern.

Nor does the diary result establish that topics other than the relationship are unimportant. The comparison concerns the likelihood of the reported pattern in that sample. It does not determine the

seriousness of a particular disagreement about money, parenting, or responsibilities. The substantive concern and the interaction around it both remain visible.

Laboratory tasks offer a different contextual comparison. In a study of 182 married couples, demand-withdraw role patterns varied across discussion contexts (Eldridge et al., 2007). The study included couples with differing levels of relationship distress and discussions of relationship problems and personal concerns. Researchers used overall behavioral ratings, rather than following a precise response sequence across everyday disagreements.

This supports a bounded point about role flexibility: the position observed in one discussion cannot automatically be treated as a person's position in every discussion. The result does not mean that every couple switched roles. Distress also qualified the observed flexibility in this sample, with greater distress linked to less role reversal (Eldridge et al., 2007). Context-sensitive behavior and restricted flexibility can therefore coexist; a universal switching rule would misrepresent the finding.

The way a discussion topic is chosen creates another question. A researcher might ask each partner to nominate a problem and assume that the person who selected it wants more change than the other. Those are separate pieces of information. Choosing a topic does not establish the size of the difference between partners' dissatisfaction with it.

In a methods study of selected couples, conclusions about observed demand-withdraw roles differed when researchers accounted for which partner was more dissatisfied with each selected topic (Crenshaw et al., 2021). The principal behavioral test involved 134 distressed heterosexual married couples. It examined partner-specific dissatisfaction with selected topics alongside overall behavior ratings. Its purpose here is methodological: topic nomination cannot stand in for a measured difference between partners.

That study and the Eldridge study also drew partly on the same treatment-trial cohort (Crenshaw et al., 2021; Eldridge et al., 2007). Their contributions differ, but they should not be counted as fully independent evidence from unrelated populations. One helps show contextual role variation; the other examines how topic selection and relative dissatisfaction affect conclusions about roles.

For a reader, the distinction suggests a more precise description. “I raised the issue” identifies initiation. “I wanted more change than my partner did” identifies a reported difference in desired change. “I criticized my partner repeatedly” describes conduct. One statement does not establish the others. Keeping them separate avoids assigning a research role on the basis of who happened to start talking.

Desire for change and gender are separate questions

Demand-withdraw was observed in the heterosexual, gay and lesbian couple groups in one study of 63 couples (Holley et al., 2010). Each group contained 21 couples. These were small, selected Bay Area samples, predominantly White, with data collected in different periods. The finding establishes occurrence in those sampled groups. It does not establish representative prevalence or equivalence across relationship configurations.

The observation also cautions against defining demand-withdraw as necessarily a woman demanding and a man withdrawing. Some reviewed studies use wife-demand/husband-withdraw labels because they studied married mixed-gender couples and tested that directional configuration. Those labels identify a sampled configuration and analysis. They do not turn gender into a permanent behavioral assignment.

Relative desire for change was a separate finding. In a study of 63 heterosexual, gay and lesbian couples, greater relative desire for change in the discussion topic was associated with a more demanding role relative to the partner (Holley et al., 2010). Researchers coded desire for change independently from a discussion with a facilitator before the recorded conflict. They did not infer it from the later demanding behavior.

Here relative means the difference between the partners, not simply whether one person wanted any change. The analysis related differences between partners in desired change to differences in their observed roles across the studied couples. It does not show that wanting change caused demand, that the topic chooser necessarily demanded, or that a person would switch roles in every subsequent discussion.

This finding must also remain distinct from the occurrence result. Observing the pattern in three couple groups answers whether it appeared there. Examining relative desire for change addresses an

association with role differences. Neither finding establishes that gender never matters or that desire for change determines the roles. Both remain bounded by the small, selected sample and the observed discussion.

A pattern describes what happens in an exchange; it does not tell us who either partner fundamentally is or prove what either intended. This is the guide's inference safeguard, informed by context-sensitive behavior research rather than a test of personality or intention (Crenshaw et al., 2021; Eldridge et al., 2007). A measured demanding position does not reveal a hidden need, and a withdrawing position does not establish indifference, punishment, or fear.

Chapter 6, "What We Think Our Partner Means," will address attribution and interpretation. The present chapter leaves those questions open where the evidence does. Describing an action carefully gives us something to examine without pretending that the action has already supplied its explanation.

Associations with satisfaction depend on the question

Demand-withdraw has been associated with relationship dissatisfaction, although findings vary with context, measurement and study design (Schrodt et al., 2014). A meta-analysis, which brings together results across studies, supports this qualitative association. The reviewed studies used different measures and outcomes. The association is a reason to take the interaction seriously, while preserving the distinction between an association and a cause.

An association means that measured behavior and an outcome are related in the studied data. A prospective study measures the behavior before a later outcome. That timing helps distinguish the question being asked, but does not by itself show that changing the behavior would change the outcome.

A sexual discussion and three later outcomes

A newer study illustrates why the outcome must be named. In one community-couple study, greater demand-withdraw during a sexual-conflict discussion predicted lower relationship satisfaction 12 months later, after accounting for baseline satisfaction (Rosen et al., 2025). The study involved 151 cohabiting, monogamous Canadian community couples and one eight-minute recorded sexual-conflict discussion. Its

overall demand-withdraw rating was a couple-level score, not a permanent assignment of who demanded and who withdrew.

The same study did not detect a significant prospective link with sexual satisfaction. The same study did not detect a significant prospective link with sexual distress (Rosen et al., 2025). Those analyses accounted for the relevant baseline outcomes. The positive relationship-satisfaction finding and the two nonsignificant sexual-outcome findings belong together. “Poorer outcomes” would be too broad if it led readers to assume that all three outcomes were predicted.

Nonsignificant findings also need care. They do not prove that an association is absent or that couples with different pattern scores are equivalent. They describe what these models detected in this sample. Conversely, the relationship-satisfaction result does not establish that demand-withdraw caused later dissatisfaction, that a particular partner’s behavior caused the other’s response, or that the observed discussion recurred unchanged.

Because the study observed one sexual discussion, it does not establish how the same couples would interact in a nonsexual discussion. It also does not turn disagreement about sex into a presumption of coercion or make sexual pressure acceptable. Declining sexual activity is a boundary, and consent remains necessary regardless of the interaction label.

Socioeconomic context and different comparisons

Socioeconomic context introduces further qualifications. In one study of parents and expectant couples, the association between wife-demand/husband-withdraw and later wives’ satisfaction depended on socioeconomic circumstances (Ross et al., 2019). The 515 US mixed-gender couples came from the untreated control group of a relationship-education study; 87% were married at enrollment. The analysis examined wives’ satisfaction at 18 months while accounting for its baseline level. This was an observational analysis within that group, not a test of an intervention that changed demand-withdraw.

Ross and colleagues also studied 431 first-marriage newlywed couples recruited from low-income Los Angeles neighborhoods. In one newlywed sample, socioeconomic risk moderated the concurrent association between deviations in wife demand and husband withdrawal from their own usual levels and wives’ satisfaction (Ross et al., 2019). Moderated means that the association differed with

socioeconomic risk. Concurrent means that behavior and satisfaction were assessed at the same wave, rather than one being used to predict a subsequent change.

The phrase “their own usual levels” identifies the comparison: the wife’s demand, the husband’s withdrawal, and the wife’s satisfaction were each compared with that person’s own average across assessments. This within-person comparison differs from asking whether couples who generally show more demand-withdraw are less satisfied than other couples.

The prospective comparison yielded a further limit. In that newlywed sample, socioeconomic risk did not significantly moderate the association between wife demand, husband withdrawal and wives’ baseline-adjusted satisfaction at 27 months (Ross et al., 2019). That model concerned differences between couples and a later outcome. It should remain next to the concurrent finding, rather than being set aside as though it answered the same question unsuccessfully.

Collecting several waves of data does not turn the concurrent finding into a prediction of later change. Nor does the 27-month nonsignificant result establish that socioeconomic circumstances are irrelevant. The two models address different comparisons and time relationships.

The behavior scores add another boundary. Ross and colleagues combined overall ratings across support and problem-solving tasks. Their demanding composite included hostility, dominance, and angry coercion; the withdrawing composite included avoidance and reversed ratings of communication and listener responsiveness (Ross et al., 2019). These aggregate scores are not a turn-by-turn demonstration that demand provoked withdrawal. Conduct involving coercion should not be normalized because it appears inside a research composite.

The practical interpretation stays narrow. Contextual associations complicate a uniform rule about demand-withdraw and satisfaction. They do not establish that withdrawal is beneficial, identify its protective function, or prescribe disengagement for couples facing economic hardship. A possible explanation offered for an association is not the same thing as a measured mechanism or an intervention tested with those couples.

Taken together, the findings preserve an overall association with dissatisfaction alongside sample-specific prospective support, conditional concurrent associations, and model-specific nulls. This is a

research-informed way to organize the reviewed evidence, within its stated limits. These studies differ in their measures, circumstances, outcomes, and analytical levels. Different results across those questions do not establish a contradiction about the same proposition.

Familiar behavior over time is not an unchanged sequence

Research following couples over time can examine whether measured behaviors change on average. That differs from recording how each disagreement unfolds. In one study of long-married couples, average observed blame, pressure and withdrawal did not change significantly over 13 years. In the same long-married sample, average observed avoidance increased over 13 years (Holley et al., 2013).

The study analyzed 127 middle-aged and older opposite-sex couples who participated in at least two of three laboratory waves. Observers rated behavior across a discussion of a mutually selected conflict topic. The sample was selected and largely White and educated; it was not a representative sample of all long-term couples. Topics could differ across waves (Holley et al., 2013).

These are sample-average trajectories. A nonsignificant average change does not demonstrate that every individual couple remained stable. An increase in average avoidance does not show that every couple became more avoidant or establish why the average changed. The distinction between passive withdrawal and active avoidance matters here because the measured behaviors had different trajectories.

Neither finding shows that avoidance improved the relationships. Three observations across 13 years also leave the detailed course of everyday episodes unestablished. They cannot show an identical sequence recurring between those observations.

For the chapter's question, familiarity should remain a description to investigate. A person might recognize silence in two disagreements without knowing whether its duration, context, meaning, or consequences were the same. The evidence does not justify filling in those missing details with a fixed personality role or an inevitable developmental course.

Describing conduct without erasing the issue

The distinctions above offer an educational way to describe an exchange more precisely. They are not a tested treatment protocol. Where it is safe to reflect, the starting point can be the actual words and

actions, the issue being addressed, and the information that remains uncertain.

For example, “I repeated the question three times, and my partner changed the subject” is a brief hypothetical description. It identifies conduct without deciding whether the question was reasonable, the repetition was hostile pressure, or the topic change was deliberate avoidance. Those questions require context. An agreement, a deadline, a stated refusal, or an unsafe condition may materially change the account.

A similarly concrete description can preserve accountability: “I asked about the agreement, and my partner insulted me.” Naming both actions does not distribute responsibility for the insult between the partners. Describing an exchange is compatible with identifying harmful conduct and the legitimate concern that preceded it.

Requests should not be dismissed merely because a demanding position was observed. Disengagement should not be condemned merely because it resembles a withdrawing position. A defined pause differs from leaving an issue indefinitely unaddressed, and ending an unsafe exchange differs from ordinary avoidance. These distinctions guide description; they do not establish the effectiveness of a pause or a particular duration. A person leaving danger does not owe a return to an unsafe conversation.

The research reviewed here does not prescribe which partner should speak less, remain present, allow space, or return first. Those choices involve the issue, consent, safety, and information about the actual exchange. Assigning “demander” and “withdrawer” as identities would obscure the context-sensitive distinctions the studies make available.

Chapter 7, “What Happens When Capacity Narrows,” will address arousal and regulation. This chapter does not infer a particular physiological state from silence or pressure. Difficulty participating also does not remove agency or responsibility for conduct. Recognizing a behavior leaves room for an explanation without supplying one in advance.

When the shared-pattern account is the wrong task

Where fear, coercion, threats or violence are present, prioritize safety and appropriate specialized support over shared-pattern work; a pattern does not imply equal responsibility for harm. This is the Field Guide’s safety guidance, informed by authoritative support guidance

and definitions, rather than an experimentally tested BTL intervention recommendation (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2026; World Health Organization, 2014).

The boundary also applies to intimidation, stalking, sexual coercion, and retaliation. Calling conduct demand-withdraw must not convert it into ordinary negotiation. A person who leaves a threatening discussion, declines unwanted sexual activity, or refuses abusive treatment should not automatically be classified as maintaining a shared problem through withdrawal.

If you are afraid of your partner or concerned about retaliation, individual support from a qualified professional or specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than joint conflict analysis. Where danger is immediate, emergency assistance may be necessary. You do not need to confront the partner or conduct shared mapping to establish that safety deserves attention.

The World Health Organization source concerns support for women subjected to intimate partner or sexual violence. Its official overview supports the attention to safety; the broader policy here belongs to the Field Guide. Relationship education does not replace individualized risk assessment, specialized services, or clinical care when those are needed.

Chapter 53, "When the Loop Framework Is Not Enough," will examine these limits in greater detail. That future discussion does not replace the boundary here: responsibility for harmful conduct remains with the person engaging in it. A response to danger does not justify the danger or make responsibility equal.

Demand-withdraw and the broader Field Guide

Break the Loop calls what partners are addressing the issue and what begins happening between them the Loop. Both can matter. The Loop is part of Break the Loop's organizing framework; the external studies cited in this chapter do not validate the framework or the Loop as a specific construct.

Chapter 11, "An Organizing Model for Recurring Conflict," will introduce the full BTL model. Demand-withdraw can later be examined through that model, while remaining an external research construct with its own measures and history. BTL uses Protection Move for a person's next response as they try to manage what the moment has come to mean. Observed withdrawal alone does not establish that

interpretation, its function, or a particular need. Those would be additional interpretations, not findings established by a demand-withdraw score.

The central contribution of this chapter is a more specific account of familiar positions. The research documents demanding and withdrawing behavior, context-sensitive roles, and associations with outcomes. The explanation of a particular exchange still requires attention to what was measured, what mattered to each partner, the substantive issue, and the limits of inference.

Chapter 5, "Escalation and Negative Reciprocity," will examine how an argument gains momentum and how successive responses can be studied. Here, the distinction remains essential: recognizing a demand-withdraw configuration does not by itself establish an escalating sequence, a fixed identity, or the cause of the next disagreement.

Chapter 5. Escalation and Negative Reciprocity

How an argument gains momentum

Consider this fictional exchange. One partner asks, “Did you change the appointment?” The other replies, “Why do you have to check everything I do?” The first answers, “Because you never tell me anything.” The appointment still needs to be sorted out, but the exchange now contains two accusations that were absent from the opening question. To describe the change, we do not need to decide what either person secretly intended.

An argument can be examined at more than one level. What did each person do after the other spoke? Did the responses become more intense? Did the exchange stay within a narrow range of behavior? Those questions concern related features of an interaction, but they are not interchangeable. This chapter distinguishes responding negatively to negativity from an increase in intensity, and both from the persistence of a particular kind of response.

Negative reciprocity and escalation are different questions

Negative reciprocity describes negative behavior from one partner followed by negative behavior from the other. In ordinary language, it is negativity answered with negativity. Escalation concerns an increase over the course of an interaction. A response can be negative without being more intense than the response before it. The distinction matters when interpreting both an everyday exchange and a research finding.

Imagine a second fictional exchange: “You did not answer my question.” “You did not answer mine.” “You are avoiding the point.” “So are you.” These responses repeat an accusatory form. Without additional information about tone, pressure or behavior, the words alone do not establish a steady climb in intensity. Repetition and intensification require different descriptions.

Now change the example. A complaint becomes an insult, and the response becomes a more personal insult. In that version, the content supplies a reason to describe intensification. The example illustrates the distinction; it does not establish how frequently either sequence occurs or which partner is responsible for the larger conflict.

Research measures also separate these questions. In one laboratory study of 139 heterosexual couples selected for an alcohol study, negative behavior was associated with a negative rather than neutral response on the partner's next turn. That is evidence about the response following a partner's behavior within an observed discussion (Dermody et al., 2025).

It does not show that each response became more negative than the last. The comparison was between response categories, not a demonstration that the whole discussion climbed an intensity ladder. Nor does a next-turn association establish that one person caused the other's response. The partners' behavior was observed, and the finding does not identify a fixed sequence that each couple repeats across separate arguments.

Other research has defined escalation differently. Kim and colleagues used transitions from lower-intensity to higher-intensity coded negative affect during conflict discussions. A transition into a higher category asks a different question from whether any negative response followed another negative response. Evidence of negative responding therefore does not, by itself, show increasing intensity (Dermody et al., 2025; Kim et al., 2007).

"A negative response followed" describes a sequence. "The responses intensified" describes change. "The exchange remained negative" describes persistence. An accurate account should say which of these it means rather than let one stand in for all three.

Mutual influence does not establish a complete causal chain

The point of examining a sequence is to keep the responses in view together. In the appointment example, the first partner's accusation follows the second partner's accusation. We can describe that ordering while remaining uncertain about why either response occurred. Chronological order is useful information; it is not complete knowledge of the exchange.

The same restraint applies to research. An association between successive responses does not tell us that the earlier response compelled the later one. It also does not show that both responses had the same significance, intensity or impact. The term reciprocity describes a relationship between observed behaviors, not a verdict about equal contribution.

A sequence also has a limited time frame. Evidence from a single discussion can help describe what happened during that discussion. It cannot, without further evidence, establish that the same pair of people uses an identical sequence every week. Chapter 3, "What Makes Conflict Become Repetitive?", addresses the distinctions involved in explaining repetition. Here the immediate question is how to describe what happens next within an exchange.

For a reader, this means there is no need to choose between treating responses as unrelated and treating them as an inevitable chain. It is possible to examine one response in relation to the preceding response while preserving uncertainty and individual accountability. "What happened next?" remains a useful question even when "What caused it?" cannot be answered confidently.

Rigidity, persistence and variation

Behavioral rigidity needs similar care. In this chapter, it refers conceptually to a narrow, relatively unchanging range of responses. That description concerns the behavior being examined. It does not mean that a person is fundamentally rigid, and it does not establish that the range of responses narrowed further as the discussion continued.

One way researchers have approached this distinction is by measuring variation across an interaction. In an observational study, coders rated negative-direct behavior in successive 30-second segments, and researchers summarized its average level and variability across the discussion. This describes how much the measured behavior varied. It is not, by itself, a test showing that partners became progressively more rigid as the argument unfolded (Overall, 2020).

Average level and variability also need to be considered separately. As a matter of measurement, a low level that changes little differs from a high level that changes little. Both may show little variation, but only the latter would justify describing a consistently high level of the measured negativity. Low variability alone is not a synonym for entrenched hostility.

Return to the fictional appointment disagreement. Suppose the same accusation is repeated several times without a new explanation or response to the original question. We can describe the repeated wording. If we want to claim that the behavior becomes more rigid over time, we need evidence of that change, rather than simply the fact that repetition occurred.

The narrower language is useful. It permits a description such as "The same accusation appeared in four successive replies," without converting that observation into a personality judgment or a claim about a psychological mechanism. Identifying an interaction pattern describes an exchange; it does not prove either person's intention or identify a fixed kind of person.

Escalation is not only about volume

A fictional argument can intensify without anyone shouting. A speaker might move from a direct complaint to a contemptuous remark delivered quietly. A response might add a sharper accusation while keeping the same volume. In these examples, the reason for describing escalation would be the change in the response, rather than how loudly the words were spoken.

Observational research can include more than verbal content. Kim and colleagues' affect coding used facial expressions, vocal tone, physical movement and verbal content. Their lower-to-higher negative-affect transition was therefore based on a combination of observable cues, rather than a count of louder statements alone (Kim et al., 2007).

That measurement choice does not make every facial movement or change of tone a reliable explanation of someone's inner experience. The observed cues and the meaning assigned to them remain different things. A description can identify a quiet response, a turned head or a sarcastic phrase without claiming to know the intention behind it.

This is a boundary on interpretation, not a request to disregard what was said or done. A hurtful statement remains open to accountability even when the speaker's motive is uncertain. Chapter 6, "What We Think Our Partner Means," will examine attribution and interpretation more fully. This chapter stays with the observable sequence and the changes that the evidence can support.

Does withdrawal escalate the exchange?

Withdrawal raises a difficult version of the same question. If one partner presses and the other disengages, it may be tempting to complete the story automatically: withdrawal produces more pressure, pressure produces more withdrawal, and the sequence intensifies. That is a possible description to investigate. It should not be assumed merely because demand and withdrawal both appear in a discussion.

A small observational study helps show why the direction of the sequence matters. Turgeon and colleagues examined 20 selected French-speaking, middle-class couples. Ten couples were distressed and ten were nondistressed. The discussions were selected so that wives were primarily requesting changes from husbands, which is an important limit on interpreting the roles observed (Turgeon et al., 1998).

The researchers coded five-second intervals and examined what followed what. Wives' pursuit was associated with husbands' withdrawal in the next coded interval. This dependency was not significantly stronger in the distressed couples. Pursuit was a combined category containing requests, complaints and criticism, so it should not be read as a measure of criticism alone (Turgeon et al., 1998).

The reverse sequence did not show the same result: husbands' withdrawal followed by wives' pursuit was not statistically significant in that study. Events were sparse in this small sample, and the analyses pooled transitions across couples. The finding does not establish that withdrawal never precedes pursuit. It does show why a finding in one direction cannot simply be repeated backward as if both directions had been demonstrated (Turgeon et al., 1998).

There is another distinction. A greater likelihood of a response category is not necessarily an increase in that response's intensity over the discussion. Even a demonstrated withdrawal-to-pursuit association would need additional evidence before it could be described as progressively increasing pressure. The two questions should remain separate.

The evidence reviewed here does not establish a general rule that withdrawal is followed by increasingly negative or pressuring responses. This limit does not establish that no relevant study exists or that withdrawal is harmless. The specific intensification claim remains uncertain.

The word withdrawal also cannot decide what a person ought to do. Avoiding a legitimate issue, requesting a defined pause and leaving an unsafe interaction require different consideration. A quiet person is not automatically the calmer person, the more responsible person or the person causing the escalation. A person who leaves is not automatically refusing accountability. Context is necessary, especially where safety is in question.

Chapter 4, “Demand, Withdrawal, and Familiar Positions,” addresses demand-withdraw as an interaction pattern. The narrower task here is to distinguish that pattern from a demonstrated increase in intensity. Chapter 9, “Responsiveness, Regulation, and Recovery,” will address responses that may help an interaction stabilize. Neither cross-reference changes the need to distinguish ordinary avoidance from a legitimate boundary or protective exit.

What can escalation tell us about later outcomes?

An interaction measure and a relationship outcome are different things. Identifying a response sequence does not, on its own, tell us whether the relationship will remain intact or whether the partners will be satisfied later. Those questions require studies that examine the relevant outcomes and retain the limits of their analyses.

Kim and colleagues followed a selected sample of 85 young married or cohabiting couples for approximately two and a half years after observing their conflict discussions. The study used two seven-minute discussions, with each partner selecting an issue. Its sample and laboratory tasks limit how broadly the results can be applied (Kim et al., 2007).

In the models combining the discussions before demographic adjustment, neither partner’s coded escalation significantly predicted separation or later low satisfaction. In the same sample, men’s coded escalation predicted separation after demographic adjustment and in the analysis of women-selected discussion topics. These findings belong together: the results were conditional on the model and discussion context, rather than a uniform finding of either prediction or nonprediction (Kim et al., 2007).

“Before demographic adjustment” does not mean that the analyses ignored how often the coded behaviors occurred. The study accounted for the occurrence rates of the preceding and following affect categories. Demographic controls were a further part of the analysis. Keeping that distinction prevents the simpler account from misdescribing what the researchers tested (Kim et al., 2007).

The different analyses are not independent replications. They concern the same sample examined in different ways. They do not supply a general rule about men, a causal explanation for separation or a forecast for a particular reader’s relationship. A nonsignificant result also does not prove that the process is irrelevant. The useful conclusion

is narrower: in this study, the association depended on the analysis and context.

Reciprocity does not mean equal responsibility

There are two questions that should never be collapsed: how one response relates to another, and who is responsible for harmful behavior. Describing successive negative responses does not determine equal responsibility, equal harm, equal power or equal accountability. These are separate judgments, and the sequence alone cannot settle them.

An explanation of interaction should also leave room for the original issue. In the appointment example, identifying the accusations does not answer whether the appointment was changed or whether someone needed that information. Attending to the exchange does not require abandoning a legitimate request, excusing an insult or giving up a boundary.

Safety places a further limit on shared-pattern analysis. Where fear, coercion, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion or retaliation are present, this guide prioritizes safety and appropriate specialized support over shared conflict work. Abuse should not be treated as an ordinary disagreement that merely became more intense. This boundary applies to threats and coercion as well as physical violence; the presence of a response sequence does not convert them into ordinary shared conflict.

The World Health Organization's handbook for health-care providers supporting women subjected to partner or sexual violence identifies ongoing safety and support needs as part of the response. Its population and clinical purpose should be kept clear; it is not a test of a general relationship-education framework (World Health Organization, 2014). The Field Guide's broader safety boundary is an editorial and educational requirement, not an outcome established by the interaction studies described here.

A harmed partner is not responsible for managing another person's coercion or violence. Leaving, saying no or seeking individual support should not be recast as an error that keeps a mutual pattern going. Chapter 53 provides the Field Guide's fuller safety discussion. That subject cannot be reduced to an analysis of who answered whom negatively.

A more precise way to notice the exchange

For ordinary conflict where safety is intact, a useful descriptive task is to distinguish the observations from the conclusions. “We both made accusations” differs from “The accusations became more personal.” “The same reply was repeated” differs from “Our responses became progressively more rigid.” Each description should fit the information available.

The useful starting point is a description of one’s own participation. A sentence such as “I answered your complaint with an accusation” identifies a response without deciding everything about what came before it. It also leaves the substantive complaint available for consideration. Description does not settle the issue or remove the need for accountability.

Break the Loop later offers its own way of organizing recurring conflict through the Loop. That is part of BTL’s framework; the external studies discussed in this chapter do not validate the framework or the Loop as a specific construct. Chapter 11, “An Organizing Model for Recurring Conflict,” will introduce that organization without treating it as the finding of these studies.

An argument’s momentum needs a precise description: which response followed, what intensified and what persisted? These questions can be asked while preserving the issue and responsibility for harm. The next chapter turns to a related question: what did each person think the partner’s behavior meant?

Chapter 6. What We Think Our Partner Means

The event and the explanation

A question about the time can be a request for information, a reminder about an agreement, or an accusation. Those are different possibilities. Hearing the words does not, by itself, settle which one applies.

Consider a fictional exchange. One partner asks, “What time are you leaving?” The other replies, “I already told you I would handle it.” The question is observable. The conclusion that the speaker doubts the listener's competence is an interpretation. The speaker's intention is not established by those words alone. It may concern a shared car. The question could instead follow several missed commitments, or it may have been meant critically. A responsible account leaves those possibilities open until there is information to distinguish them.

This chapter examines explanations for partner behavior, expectations about what will happen, and beliefs about relationships. Its central distinction is between an event and the meaning assigned to it. The distinction does not make the event unimportant or the interpretation wrong. It identifies what is known, what has been inferred, and what still needs attention.

What attribution adds to an event

An attribution is an explanation for an event. Relationship-attribution research distinguishes questions about causes from judgments about responsibility, including intention, selfishness and blame. Causal explanations also differ in whether a cause is seen as temporary or lasting, and limited to one situation or relevant more broadly across the relationship (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990).

Those distinctions are useful because “Why did that happen?” can contain several questions. Was there a practical obstacle? Was the behavior deliberate? Does it reflect a recurring problem? Who is accountable for the consequence? Answering one question does not automatically answer the others.

In a fictional example, a partner arrives late for an agreed pickup. “The meeting ran over” proposes a circumstance. “You did not leave enough time” concerns planning. “You wanted to make me wait” adds a claim about intention. “I cannot count on you” extends the event into a

broader judgment. These accounts are not interchangeable, even though each could appear in a conversation about the same late arrival.

The practical problem remains: someone waited, an agreement was missed, and a more reliable arrangement may be needed. Understanding the explanation does not require abandoning that problem. A delay can have an understandable cause and still require accountability. Conversely, the inconvenience alone does not establish an intention to cause it.

An intent inference deserves particular care. “You did this on purpose” makes a different claim from “You knew this mattered to me” or “This happened again.” Evidence for recurrence may justify concern about reliability without settling the precise motive behind the latest event. Deliberateness, foreseeable consequences, impact and responsibility should not be compressed into a single verdict.

Appraisal, interpretation and expectation

For clarity, this guide uses interpretation for the meaning assigned to what happened, appraisal for an assessment of what the situation signifies, and expectation for a prediction about what will happen. These are explanatory distinctions, not separate diagnoses or a claim that every conversation follows a fixed mental sequence.

Return to the pickup example. “The pickup was missed” describes the event. “My time did not matter” gives it relational meaning. “This is a serious reliability problem” appraises its significance. “If I raise it, I will be dismissed” anticipates a response. A person could hold some of these judgments without holding all of them.

Keeping the questions separate prevents one answer from doing more work than it can support. A serious issue need not establish malicious intent. An expectation of dismissal is not a record of what the partner has already said in the present conversation. A reassuring response does not, on its own, resolve the missed pickup. Each proposition calls for its own information.

Chapter 3 introduced expectations and attributions as parts of the evidence about repetition. Here they receive fuller treatment. The aim is to examine the meaning involved without constructing an unverified explanation of how that meaning originated or asserting that it determines the next response.

What the research can establish

A landmark review linked marital dissatisfaction with more negative explanations for partner behavior. It also examined alternative explanations, differences among attribution dimensions and the difficulty of determining accuracy. Its findings support taking explanations seriously; they do not justify declaring every dissatisfied partner mistaken (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990).

Prospective research adds information about timing. In a study of 280 young married couples from a predominantly European-descent, Iowa-origin cohort, responsibility attributions early in marriage predicted the person's own later warmth/hostility composite after accounting for both partners' initial marital quality. The behavior measure combined observation and self-report. Direct paths from one person's attributions to the partner's later behavior were nonsignificant (Durtschi et al., 2011).

That result does not establish that the explanations caused a change in behavior. The tested model did not control an earlier measure of the same behavior, and other influences remain possible. It is evidence of a prospective association within that study, rather than proof that changing an explanation would change a couple's conflict (Durtschi et al., 2011).

Results also vary across samples and methods. In a selected study of 52 married couples, responsibility attributions covaried with observed conflict behavior among wives but not husbands after adjustment for distress/depression group. That small, single-assessment finding is a qualification to broad claims, not a rule that attributions matter to one gender alone (Bradbury et al., 1996).

These studies ask about measured judgments and behavior. They do not observe a partner's private intention directly. The distinction between a reported explanation, an observed response and an established motive remains necessary even when an association is statistically reliable.

Negative attribution is not an individual verdict

Terms such as negative attribution or attributional bias can sound like judgments about a person's credibility. In this chapter, a negative attribution means an explanation that places the behavior in an unfavorable light. The word bias raises a further question about a

systematic tendency in judgment. A negative explanation and a demonstrated error are not the same thing.

A research association cannot adjudicate a particular disagreement. Knowing that certain explanations are associated with dissatisfaction does not establish whether a specific concern is mistaken, partly supported or accurate. Studies using hypothetical events and questionnaire responses do not supply an independent determination of what a particular partner intended (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990; Williamson et al., 2026).

Consider another fictional example. One partner checks a phone while the other is explaining a problem. “You are not interested” is one interpretation. An urgent work message is another possible explanation. Neither possibility becomes established simply by being imaginable. Information about the message, what was said, the surrounding interaction and any repeated agreement matters.

Suppose the partner says, “I was answering work.” That statement adds information. It does not automatically establish that the interruption was unavoidable, that its impact was trivial, or that a repeated agreement about phones no longer matters. Examining an interpretation should make the account more precise, rather than make accountability disappear.

There is also no requirement to distribute credibility evenly. Explicit statements, documented events and repeated conduct can provide different levels of support for competing explanations. Preserving uncertainty about one part of an account does not require treating every part as equally uncertain.

Expectations before the interaction

An expectation concerns what is anticipated, rather than only what is concluded afterward. In a daily-diary study of 103 dual-earner Swiss couples with children, most of whom were married, more positive expectations about a partner before reunion were associated with more reported closeness and less reported tension that evening within the same individuals (Schoebi et al., 2012).

The distinction within the same individuals matters. Rather than merely comparing generally optimistic and pessimistic people, the finding concerns day-to-day differences in expectations and later reported experience. How those expectations were acquired was not established, and conflict behavior was not observed directly. Its results

should not become a prescription to expect the best regardless of circumstances (Schoebi et al., 2012).

For a fictional illustration, “I expect this conversation to go badly” reports a prediction. “You are refusing to listen” describes the partner's supposed present conduct. The prediction may have reasons behind it. It still needs to be distinguished from information about this particular conversation.

That distinction makes room for both history and current evidence. A person need not pretend that previous broken agreements never happened. Nor should an anticipated response automatically be reported as something the partner has already done today. The task is to describe the basis and limits of each conclusion.

Beliefs about what relationships should be

Relationship beliefs are broader than an explanation for one event. Research has examined growth beliefs, concerning the possibility of cultivating a relationship through effort, and destiny beliefs, concerning whether partners are meant to be together. These are measured beliefs, not diagnoses or mutually exclusive personality types (Gander et al., 2025).

In a two-year study of 904 German-speaking couples, stronger growth beliefs were associated with a slower decline in reported satisfaction. Higher initial satisfaction also predicted increasing growth beliefs across the two assessments of beliefs. Destiny beliefs were associated with higher initial satisfaction; the simple own-destiny association with change was nonsignificant, although partner-belief configurations also mattered. Effects were small. The observational design, substantial missing-wave participation and differing measurement windows limit interpretation (Gander et al., 2025).

These qualified associations do not establish that teaching a belief causes improvement or justify ranking partners by their beliefs. The study did not test a method for changing recurring conflict.

A fictional contrast shows the conceptual question. One person treats a disagreement as evidence that the relationship should not require effort. Another treats every difficulty as something more effort must solve. These are possible positions to examine, not findings about the people in the study. Neither position answers whether a particular agreement is fair, whether change is occurring, or whether the relationship is safe.

Effort is not a substitute for consent, accountability or a workable response to the actual issue. A belief that relationships can develop should not become an obligation to keep enduring the same harm. Those are boundaries on how the guide uses the concept, rather than an intervention conclusion drawn from the belief study.

Context limits the conclusion

A recent cross-sectional study of 2,347 relationship-involved adults found negative attribution–satisfaction associations in samples from Spain, Taiwan, Turkey and the United States. Their strengths differed substantially. The participants were individuals rather than paired couples, recruitment differed across countries, and measurement equivalence was imperfect. The study therefore cautions against assuming one universal magnitude or mechanism (Williamson et al., 2026).

Country labels do not explain an individual partner's interpretation. Nor do these findings establish that culture caused the differences or that the same associations would appear in observed conflict. They show why population and measurement qualifications belong in the explanation, rather than being treated as optional detail.

Across the evidence considered here, satisfaction ratings, hypothetical explanations, reunion diaries and observed-behavior composites answer related but distinct questions. A finding about one cannot silently stand in for all the others. There is no single measure in this chapter that reveals what every partner means or supplies a complete explanation of recurring conflict.

Uncertainty without minimizing harm

The distinction between interpretation and fact must not become a demand that someone doubt clear evidence of harmful conduct. “I do not know exactly why this happened” can coexist with “This happened, it harmed me, and it needs to stop.” Uncertainty about motive does not remove the event or its consequences.

The Field Guide's safety boundary takes priority where there is fear, coercion, threats, intimidation, stalking, sexual coercion, violence or retaliation. Shared clarification and charitable reinterpretation are not the default response in those circumstances. Safety and appropriate individualized or specialized support take priority over joint pattern

analysis. No reader has to establish a partner's private motive before taking a safety concern seriously.

A boundary is not evidence of faulty interpretation. Declining a conversation, refusing contact or leaving an unsafe interaction should not automatically be classified as avoidance or a dysfunctional response. This chapter offers an educational distinction, not an individualized assessment or a requirement to confront a partner.

In an ordinary situation where clarification is safe, a person might separate “You asked when I was leaving” from “I heard it as doubt that I would follow through.” That wording identifies an experience without claiming direct access to intent. It does not guarantee a useful reply, and it leaves the original agreement available for discussion. Chapter 37, “CHECK IT,” develops the Break the Loop (BTL) practice of examining assumptions and adding information.

Where this fits in the guide

Chapter 14, “Old Story: What Did the Moment Begin to Mean?”, introduces the BTL term for a familiar meaning or prediction becoming influential as the Loop develops. Old Story is BTL-specific organization. The external attribution, appraisal and expectation research discussed here does not validate it as a distinct empirical construct. An Old Story is not automatically false.

The distinction can be expressed through three questions: what happened, what meaning was assigned, and what information supports that meaning? The answer can preserve a legitimate concern while identifying an inference that remains uncertain. Chapter 7, “What Happens When Capacity Narrows,” turns to the evidence about activation and capacity during conflict.

Chapter 7. What Happens When Capacity Narrows

A difficult disagreement can change while its subject stays the same. The question about a missed bill or a change of plans may remain unresolved, but one or both partners begin finding the conversation harder to follow. A question that would have been easy to answer earlier now sounds more demanding. Someone repeats a point, loses track of what was just said, or wants to finish the discussion immediately. Those experiences deserve explanation. They do not prove that either partner has lost control of their behavior.

This chapter examines several related but distinct processes: emotional intensity, physiological activation, attention, and regulation. Research in these areas helps explain why conflict can feel harder to manage as it develops. But the evidence does not support one universal bodily threshold at which a person becomes unable to listen, think, or choose. Nor does it establish that any single physiological pattern explains recurring couple conflict.

The experience of a narrowing conversation

Consider a fictional exchange. Jordan asks Taylor when a household payment was made. Taylor answers but hears Jordan's next question as doubt about the answer. Jordan notices the sharper tone and repeats the request for a date. Taylor starts explaining the circumstances rather than giving the date. A simple exchange is now more difficult for both people to navigate.

Several things may be happening. Taylor may feel criticized. Jordan may feel that an important question is being avoided. Both may have competing priorities in mind. Attention might become more focused on the perceived challenge than on the original practical question. None of these possibilities can be established from the brief dialogue alone. The issue itself, whether the payment was made correctly and what needs to happen next, still matters.

It can be tempting to label this change as a nervous-system takeover. That explanation is too broad. The more defensible approach is to distinguish what people experience, what researchers actually measure, and what those measurements permit us to conclude.

What physiological activation means

Physiological activation refers to measurable changes in bodily systems that may accompany challenge, effort, emotion, or interpersonal exchange. Depending on the study, researchers might record heart rate, variations in the intervals between heartbeats, blood pressure, skin conductance, or hormonal measures. These are not interchangeable instruments. A change in one cannot be assumed to establish the same change in another.

Moreover, an elevated response is not itself a diagnosis of poor communication. A conversation can be demanding because an issue is serious or because a person is making a sustained effort to explain something. The direction and meaning of a bodily measure depend on the task, comparison period, context, individual characteristics, and analytic choices. Physiological activation should be treated as information about a measured response, not a direct window into intentions or character.

A large meta-analytic review by Robles and colleagues (2014) examined links between marital quality and health-related outcomes. In the subset addressing cardiovascular reactivity during marital conflict, higher marital quality was associated with modestly lower reactivity on average. The reported association was small, approximately $r = -.13$. That result is a group-level association. It does not predict what a particular partner's heart rate will do during tonight's disagreement, and it does not show that poorer marital quality caused a heightened response.

The same review found no statistically significant association between marital quality and the measures of conflict-related cortisol reactivity or daily cortisol slope considered in its analyses. These null findings matter. They limit the appeal of a single story in which an unhappy relationship reliably increases every stress marker. Different markers and sampling situations can produce different results, and a nonsignificant average finding is not proof that no individual relationship ever matters physiologically.

A broader lesson follows: couple conflict is not one uniformly measurable stress event. A study's results should be reported in terms of its actual measurements, rather than translated into claims that one partner's body has simply switched into a different mode.

Emotional intensity and the term flooding

The term flooding appears in some couple-conflict literature. It can refer to a person's reported experience of intense emotional overwhelm during an interaction. That subjective report is important, but it is not equivalent to a heart-rate reading or proof that a fixed neurological threshold was crossed.

Malik, Heyman, and Smith Slep (2020) studied self-reported emotional flooding and conflict behavior in a sample of 233 married or cohabiting couples with complete data. Their sample included relationship-distress and intimate-partner-violence comparison groups. Greater reported flooding was associated with anger-related measures. Couples with at least one partner classified as high flooding showed less effective problem solving in the observed discussions. These results describe associations in that sample. They do not demonstrate that flooding causes poorer problem solving, or that a physiological change first occurred and then eliminated the ability to respond differently.

The study also illustrates why careful population description matters. Observations involving groups with intimate partner violence cannot be folded into an ordinary story about two equally responsible participants in a mutual argument. Fear, coercion, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, and retaliation require safety and accountability assessment before shared-pattern interpretation. A person who disengages to protect themselves should not automatically be described as overwhelmed or avoidant.

In this guide, flooding remains an external research-related term. It is not treated as a synonym for the Break the Loop concept of Overload. The constructs differ in definition and measurement, and evidence about one does not validate the other.

Attention and cognitive flexibility

People often report that they have more difficulty considering alternative interpretations or keeping track of a conversation when they are upset. Such reports are plausible, but specific claims about cognitive performance require evidence that actually measured cognition.

A meta-analysis by Shields, Sazma, and Yonelinas (2016) synthesized experiments examining the effects of acute stress on executive functions. On average, acute stress was associated with poorer working-memory and cognitive-flexibility performance in the tasks studied. Results for inhibition were more complicated: different kinds of inhibition showed different directions of association. For cognitive flexibility, the available set was relatively small. The researchers were examining acute-stress manipulations and cognitive tasks, not observing how partners listened to one another in a recurring disagreement.

This distinction is essential. A laboratory task requiring someone to switch rules is not identical to staying curious when a partner speaks. Working memory in a controlled experiment is not the same thing as recalling a partner's sentence in an emotionally important exchange. We can use the findings to explain that stress may affect some cognitive operations, while declining to claim that the effect necessarily occurs in a given couple or produces a specific Protection Move.

It would also be a mistake to interpret an average decline on a task as loss of agency. A measurable disadvantage does not show that every response has become involuntary. The evidence does not establish a single point at which rational thought disappears. The language of 'the brain shutting off' or an 'amygdala hijack' would misrepresent the evidence reviewed for this chapter.

An informative explanation leaves room for variation. Two people may become distressed in the same discussion yet differ in what they notice, how rapidly they respond, whether they remember the original question, or whether a pause helps. One person may remain outwardly composed while struggling internally. Another may express emotion openly while still retaining the capacity to respond thoughtfully. Observable behavior alone cannot reliably reveal a precise internal state.

Emotion regulation is not a single bodily switch

Emotion regulation refers to processes through which people influence their emotional experiences and responses. It includes more than suppressing a feeling. Research sometimes evaluates deliberately instructed approaches, but the results depend on the instructions and outcomes used.

Salo and colleagues (2025) experimentally examined acceptance and cognitive-reappraisal instructions during a ten-minute couple conflict discussion. Compared with a control condition, the instructed partner showed less withdrawal of cardiac vagal activity as indexed by the study's heart-rate-variability measure. This is a measure-specific result, not evidence of an overall change in emotional functioning. It is not evidence that the couple communicated more effectively, that the other partner became calmer, or that the strategy changed later disagreements.

Indeed, the study did not identify a corresponding statistically significant effect for the uninstructed partner's HRV outcome, and it did not establish an effect for the separate conventional heart-rate reactivity measure. The intervention finding and the null findings belong together. Reporting only the favorable marker would create the impression of a broadly demonstrated physiological improvement that the study did not show.

This distinction also prevents a practical overpromise. It would be inappropriate to tell partners that accepting a feeling or reinterpreting an event will reliably reduce bodily arousal, prevent escalation, or make both people better listeners. Those claims are not established by the study.

Regulation is relevant because it directs attention to the possibility of responding differently under some circumstances, not because it guarantees that every person can do so in every difficult exchange. Appropriate safety boundaries remain in force regardless of whether a strategy changes measured physiology.

Why one observation cannot explain an entire recurring pattern

These lines of research describe different levels of a complicated interaction. Cardiovascular measures concern bodily responses. Flooding questionnaires concern reported experiences. Executive-function tasks concern cognitive performance under specified conditions. A brief experimental instruction tests what happened to a particular measured outcome after an assigned procedure. These findings can inform one another, but they are not interchangeable links in a demonstrated causal chain.

For example, it would be an unsupported inference to combine the observed association between flooding and poorer problem solving with

laboratory cognitive-flexibility findings and then conclude that physiological activation caused a partner to stop listening. That conclusion would require measurements and analytic evidence connecting the steps directly. It cannot be assembled by placing separate findings in a plausible order.

This chapter also cannot establish why a given couple repeatedly returns to the same conflict position across separate disagreements. The laboratory studies discussed here generally observe bounded events or tasks. They do not independently demonstrate a recurring sequence that becomes more likely after every argument. Such claims require evidence concerning repetition and temporal continuity, and they belong within the Field Guide's broader treatment of recurring conflict.

A research-informed description may say that difficult interactions can involve emotional intensity and changes in bodily or cognitive responding. It may acknowledge that some people experience a narrowing of attention or a reduced sense of available options. But it should not convert that possibility into a universal mechanism or a definitive explanation for another person's actions.

Capacity, responsibility, and choice

The distinction between difficulty and incapacity is especially important for accountability. Someone may sincerely find an exchange harder to navigate. That difficulty may warrant a pause, clearer wording, or a change in how the conversation is conducted. It does not excuse threats, intimidation, coercion, or injury. Nor does it require the harmed person to continue an unsafe exchange so that the other person can regulate.

In ordinary disagreements, recognizing that a conversation has become harder can sometimes provide a useful description of what needs attention. The observation does not settle whether a complaint is valid, who contributed what, or which request should be honored. A missed payment may still need to be corrected. A hurtful statement may still require accountability. A demand for information may be reasonable or unreasonable depending on context. Neither physiology nor the experience of overwhelm decides these questions.

Consider again Jordan and Taylor. They may notice afterward that the exchange moved away from the payment date into argument about how the question was asked. That observation is more defensible than

assuming either person's brain was no longer functioning. They could also discover that the payment itself was mistaken or that important information was withheld. Understanding the conversation's difficulty does not erase the underlying issue.

A person who says 'I was overwhelmed' may be describing a genuine experience. That description should be heard as an account of experience, not automatically as proof of the cause, an excuse for conduct, or a verdict on the other partner's intention. Likewise, a person who says 'you stopped listening' is describing an interpretation of an observable exchange. It may identify an important problem, but it does not by itself establish an internal cognitive state.

Connection to Break the Loop

Break the Loop uses the term Overload within its sequence Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. In that framework, Overload describes an organizing account of a narrowing sense of capacity during a developing conflict pattern. The present chapter does not establish that Overload is a measured physiological state, that it has a universal threshold, or that it has been independently validated as an empirical construct.

External research provides adjacent knowledge about physiological response, emotional experience, and cognitive performance under stress. It does not demonstrate the complete BTL Loop. The distinction protects readers from treating a useful educational description as a scientific diagnosis.

For a person reflecting on a difficult exchange, the practical question is not whether a particular biomarker has reached a hypothetical cutoff. It is whether the conversation appears to be becoming harder to follow or respond to thoughtfully, and what responsible options remain available. Sometimes the answer may involve stopping a conversation temporarily. Sometimes it may involve attending to an unresolved practical concern. Where fear or retaliation is present, the answer begins with safety rather than shared-pattern work.

What the evidence leaves open

Several questions remain unsettled. How directly does physiological activation during everyday couple conflict affect observable listening? Which changes in attention predict a particular behavioral response, and for whom? When does an individually chosen strategy meaningfully improve an exchange rather than just one laboratory measure? How much do findings from short laboratory discussions generalize to years of recurring arguments? The approved source set does not provide definitive answers.

These unanswered questions are not defects to be concealed. They are part of the distinction between what is known, what is plausible, and what remains untested. A reader can understand the possibility of narrowed capacity without being told that every difficult argument follows the same biological script.

The most useful conclusion is therefore limited but meaningful. Conflict can involve changes in emotional experience and bodily responding; research outside couple settings indicates that acute stress can affect some cognitive operations, with important differences by task. Within couple discussions, reported flooding has been associated with certain interaction difficulties, and a specific regulation experiment found a measure-specific effect accompanied by important null results. None of these findings establishes that agency disappears.

The next part of the Field Guide can build on this distinction without turning activation into an explanation for everything. A difficult moment may feel narrower than a calm one. What matters analytically is to describe the moment accurately, keep the underlying concern visible, and avoid assigning an unverified internal state or motive to either partner.

Chapter 8. Attachment and Recurring Conflict

Attachment offers a way to think about what it means to depend on another person. In a recurring disagreement, the question may involve more than whether a task gets done. Someone may also be asking whether a partner will be available, whether closeness is welcome, or whether relying on that partner feels possible. Attachment research gives those questions a place in our understanding of couple conflict. It does not settle what any particular argument means.

The distinction matters when a label seems to explain everything. Calling one partner anxious and the other avoidant can appear to organize a confusing exchange. Yet the label still leaves essential questions unanswered: what happened, what each person expected, what the actual problem was, and whether either person behaved harmfully. This chapter uses attachment to sharpen those questions while keeping the current relationship and the concrete disagreement in view.

What researchers mean by adult attachment

In adult romantic attachment research, two widely used dimensions describe different concerns. Attachment anxiety concerns uncertainty about a partner's availability and worry about rejection or abandonment. Attachment avoidance concerns discomfort with emotional closeness and dependence. Relatively low anxiety and avoidance are commonly described as greater attachment security (Simpson & Rholes, 2017). These are descriptions of attachment orientations within a research tradition, rather than diagnoses of mental disorders.

A dimension describes variation by degree. Asking how uncomfortable someone feels depending on a particular partner leaves room for more than an either-or answer. It also leaves room to specify which relationship is being described. Throughout this chapter, the terms anxiety and avoidance refer to these attachment dimensions. They should not be read as diagnoses of an anxiety disorder or as explanations for every instance of avoiding a conversation.

Attachment theory also uses the term working models for expectations about oneself and significant others. In plain language, the relevant question is what someone expects when closeness, help, or reassurance

is at stake. A theory of those expectations can help organize an inquiry. It cannot establish, from the outside, that a person secretly fears abandonment or intimacy. The distinction between a theoretical explanation and a verified account of an individual's experience must remain visible (Simpson & Rholes, 2017).

Security should not become a moral ranking. In this guide, a person does not earn authority in an argument by claiming to be secure. Nor does reporting insecurity make someone's complaint less credible. Whether an agreement was broken still requires attention to that agreement. Whether an accusation is supported still requires attention to the evidence. An attachment description cannot do either job for us.

Why context belongs in the explanation

Reviews connect attachment concerns with responses to stressful relationship situations, while emphasizing that those responses depend on context. Greater anxiety does not mean someone is always demanding; greater avoidance does not mean someone is always withdrawn. What threatens the relationship, what support is being sought, and how a partner responds are part of the account. These are tendencies discussed across studies, not a rule that assigns each person a permanent conflict role (Simpson & Rholes, 2017).

Attachment theory describes two broad ways of managing attachment concerns. Hyperactivation involves intensifying attention to the relationship threat and bids for closeness or reassurance. Deactivation involves distancing or relying on oneself while limiting attention to attachment concerns. These are theoretical descriptions of responses associated with attachment anxiety and avoidance, respectively. They do not establish what any particular request or departure is trying to accomplish (Simpson & Rholes, 2017).

The distinction can clarify a question without supplying its answer. In the attachment account, repeated requests might be considered in relation to uncertainty about availability. A person's distance might be considered in relation to discomfort with dependence. Those possibilities still require the context and the person's account. A missed obligation, an unwanted request, or a need for safety cannot be explained away by naming a possible attachment response.

For understanding a particular disagreement, begin closer to the event. Was someone asking for help, raising a legitimate concern, declining a request, or trying to finish a conversation? What did the person say the

moment meant? What did the partner actually do next? Those questions preserve information that would disappear if the entire exchange were summarized as an anxious person pursuing an avoidant person.

An attachment explanation should also remain distinguishable from other explanations. An unanswered message might raise questions about availability. It might also be part of a concrete disagreement about an agreed plan. Identifying a possible attachment concern does not resolve whether the message could reasonably have been answered, whether the expectation was shared, or whether the agreement needs to change. The practical issue remains a separate subject for the couple to address.

Chapter 4 examines demand-withdraw interaction in detail. An attachment orientation and an observed interaction role should not be treated as interchangeable descriptions. Here, the useful question is whether attachment-related expectations help clarify the interaction without replacing what is known about it. We do not need to assign a style to describe a repeated request, an interruption, a refusal to answer, or a stated need for space.

Expectations can differ across relationships

Research on relationship-specific attachment makes an important distinction between expectations about close relationships in general and expectations about particular people. The Experiences in Close Relationships–Relationship Structures questionnaire was developed to assess attachment in relationships with parents, a romantic partner, and a close friend. Its development studies found that attachment scores across those relationships were not interchangeable. A broad orientation does not capture every detail of a particular relationship (Fraley et al., 2011).

That finding changes what an attachment statement needs to specify. “I find it difficult to rely on people” and “I find it difficult to rely on you to keep this agreement” are different statements. The second names a particular relationship and a specific issue. It would be a mistake to translate it immediately into a general personality description. It would be equally mistaken to assume that every relationship-specific concern proves the partner caused it.

The measurement evidence does not decide whose explanation of a disagreement is correct. The studies relied on people's reports, and the

instruments have limitations. They do not independently verify what a partner intended or establish the cause of a person's expectations. Their contribution here is narrower: they give a reason to specify the relationship being discussed rather than treating one general score as a complete account of the relationship (Fraley et al., 2011).

Consider the difference between asking, “What attachment type are you?” and asking, “What have you come to expect from me when you raise this concern?” The latter is an example of a more specific question, not a validated exercise or a required conversation. It leaves room for the person to describe experience without accepting a label. In an unsafe relationship, there is no requirement to ask it jointly or disclose an answer to a partner.

What attachment labels leave out

The scientific question of categories versus dimensions is more complicated than choosing a familiar label. A study using two large online samples found that self-reported attachment was, overall, more consistent with dimensions than distinct categories. It examined both general and relationship-specific orientations. The authors also identified limits: the study used self-report measures, and it did not directly test whether dimensional scores predicted relationship outcomes better than categories (Fraley et al., 2015).

A later study in Spain explored a hybrid approach that allowed dimensions and profiles to coexist. Among 619 adults, the results depended on the questionnaire and the model-selection decision. For the Experiences in Close Relationships measure, adding a second profile did not meet the study's significance criterion. The Adult Attachment Questionnaire–Revised supported additional profiles; the authors selected two for simplicity after a three-profile model had provided the statistical optimum. This was not a confirmation of a universal four-type system (Morales-Vives et al., 2025).

These findings justify care in both directions. They do not support presenting popular labels as settled natural kinds. They also do not justify announcing that every scientific question about attachment categories has been closed. The studies used different instruments and analytical approaches, with selected samples (Fraley et al., 2015; Morales-Vives et al., 2025). For this guide, the appropriate approach is to explain the dimensions, acknowledge the measurement debate, and refrain from using a short label as a verdict about a person.

A label also cannot supply missing observations. If someone leaves a conversation, the fact available is that the person left. An account of what they experienced would add information. Calling the departure avoidance does not, by itself, establish attachment avoidance, the purpose of leaving, or whether leaving was appropriate. The same discipline applies to reassurance: a request for reassurance does not by itself establish an attachment orientation or decide whether the request was reasonable.

This is especially important when a label becomes an argument against a boundary. Declining sex, asking for privacy, refusing insults, and leaving a threatening conversation should not be reclassified as attachment problems simply because another person wants continued access. Consent and safety do not depend on an attachment score. The conduct and circumstances need to be addressed directly.

The current relationship still matters

Attachment theory includes the influence of earlier relationships, but a childhood explanation should not be imposed on a present disagreement. A major review describes experiences across life, including adult romantic relationships, as relevant to attachment expectations and change. Earlier experience is part of the framework; it is not a complete explanation of a particular adult's response. Nor does the possibility of change establish that a particular partner or educational method will produce it (Overall et al., 2022).

For the reader, this sets a limit on retrospective certainty. A person may connect a present concern with an earlier experience in their own account. That is different from a partner declaring, “This is your childhood talking,” as a way to dismiss current evidence. A present broken agreement does not become irrelevant because it resembles an earlier disappointment. Both the reported history and the current conduct can remain subjects of attention without one cancelling the other.

The same review describes partner buffering: responses that can reduce attachment-related distress or defensive responding under studied conditions. It also discusses important limits, including adversity, the difficulty of providing support, and the need to consider people's own efforts and capacities. The reviewed couple and family literature primarily involved nonmarginalized families with two married parents,

which restricts how broadly its findings can be applied (Overall et al., 2022).

Buffering should therefore be presented as a conditional research topic, not an obligation to manage a partner's reactions. This chapter does not prescribe a style-specific reassurance script or promise that the right response will create lasting security. Chapter 9 takes up responsiveness, regulation, and recovery more fully. Here, the point is that attachment accounts need room for the partner and the circumstances without assigning either person responsibility for preventing the other's harmful behavior.

A disagreement described without typing the partners

The following example is fictional. One partner agrees to confirm a weekend visit with relatives by Thursday. Thursday passes without an answer. On Friday morning, the other partner asks again and says, “I cannot make my plans until I know.” The first partner replies, “You have asked me three times. I need a few minutes before we discuss this.”

Several facts are available. There was a Thursday agreement, the confirmation has not happened, a repeated request has been made, and a pause has been requested. The example does not establish either person's attachment orientation. It also does not establish why the confirmation was missed. Those are missing pieces of information, not invitations to fill in a preferred theory.

Suppose the person waiting says, “When you do not answer, I start wondering whether I can count on our plans.” That adds a reported expectation to the account. Suppose the other says, “I am willing to discuss it, but I want to finish breakfast first.” That adds a stated request. Neither statement requires us to decide that the couple consists of an anxious pursuer and an avoidant withdrawer.

The missed confirmation still needs an answer. A pause request can be considered without treating it as a diagnosis or automatically excusing the delay. The person who missed the agreement can acknowledge that conduct; the person waiting can describe its impact. Attachment may suggest questions about reliance or closeness if the people themselves find those questions relevant. It does not replace the practical decision about the visit.

Imagine instead that the exchange includes a threat of punishment for making independent plans. The appropriate analysis changes. We

should not redescribe a threat as a bid for attachment reassurance and ask the other person to respond more soothingly. Fear, coercion, or retaliation requires attention to safety and accountability. A shared account of recurring conflict is insufficient when it blurs responsibility for threatening behavior.

Where attachment and BTL meet

Break the Loop, the educational framework developed by Aaron Jarrels, uses Old Story to name a familiar meaning or prediction that becomes influential during conflict. It uses Protection Move for the person's next response as they try to manage what the moment has come to mean. These are BTL terms. An attachment orientation, a moment's meaning, and an observable response describe different things.

In the fictional example, “I cannot count on our plans” could become relevant to an Old Story if it is a familiar meaning for that person. That does not make Old Story another name for attachment anxiety. Asking for a pause does not establish attachment avoidance, and it should not automatically be labeled a Protection Move. The purpose, context, safety, and the person's own account remain relevant.

Attachment research can inform questions about expectations and responses without validating the BTL Loop. It also provides no basis for sorting people into the Three Pillars, BTL's lenses for relational significance. Attachment anxiety should not be treated as the same thing as Importance, or avoidance as the same thing as Autonomy. The complete BTL model belongs in Chapter 11; the fuller discussion of Old Story belongs in Chapter 14.

Chapter 6's distinction between interpretation and evidence remains useful here. An attachment-based interpretation is still an interpretation when the necessary information is missing. It should not be used to tell someone that a concern is imaginary, that a boundary is pathological, or that a harmful action was inevitable. Understanding a possible influence preserves the need to examine what happened and who is responsible for it.

Using attachment without making it the whole explanation

For a particular recurring disagreement, an appropriately limited account can name the issue, describe the behavior, and include expectations that people actually report. An attachment-based interpretation should be presented as a possibility when the supporting

information is limited. Evidence about groups should not be converted into certainty about an individual. Leave the question open when information is missing.

The research reviewed here does not provide a complete account of every couple. Selected questionnaire samples, differing measures, and review-based synthesis place limits on the conclusions. The 2025 profile study did not observe couples arguing, and the relationship-specific questionnaire studies did not establish what caused a particular expectation (Fraley et al., 2011; Morales-Vives et al., 2025). Those distinctions matter whenever we are tempted to move from a useful research concept to a confident explanation of someone's life.

Safety sets an additional boundary. If there is fear of a partner, threats, coercion, stalking, violence, sexual coercion, or concern about retaliation, prioritize safety. Individual support from a qualified professional or a specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than shared conflict work. Joint attachment discussions, vulnerability disclosure, or mutual pattern mapping may be unsafe or inappropriate. Neither insecurity nor a wish for closeness excuses coercion. A reader does not need to determine a partner's attachment orientation before taking a safety concern seriously.

Attachment can remain part of an accurate understanding of recurring conflict when its explanatory limits stay visible. The next chapter examines responsiveness, regulation, and recovery: processes to consider when asking what may change the course of an interaction, with the same attention to context, evidence, agency, and safety.

Chapter 9. Responsiveness, Regulation, and Recovery

A disagreement can become quieter while the original concern remains unanswered. Someone may feel heard while still disagreeing. A conversation can end for the evening without either person knowing how to resume it. To understand what changes the course of conflict, we need to distinguish these outcomes rather than treat every reduction in intensity as the same kind of progress.

This chapter examines responsiveness, regulation, and recovery as related processes with different jobs. Responsiveness concerns how a partner's response is experienced. Regulation concerns emotional and physiological processes. Recovery concerns what happens as people move out of a difficult interaction. The evidence supports careful distinctions among them, with practical possibilities that remain dependent on context.

The question is what becomes possible next. Can a concern be stated accurately? Can someone acknowledge its impact without conceding a disputed accusation? Is there enough willingness to continue, or is a pause needed? These are useful questions for ordinary disagreement. Where fear, coercion, or retaliation is present, safety takes priority over shared regulation work.

Responsiveness begins with the experience of being understood

Relationship researchers use perceived partner responsiveness for the experience that a partner understands, validates, and cares about what matters to someone. Perceived responsiveness concerns the recipient's experience, which is distinct from the responder's intention. A recent review places it within the broader study of social support and interpersonal emotion regulation (Arican-Dinc & Gable, 2026).

That distinction gives both people something specific to describe. “I was trying to help” reports an intention. “I felt that you skipped the part I was upset about” reports an experience. Neither statement, by itself, settles whether the response addressed the concern. The conversation still needs the actual words, the situation, and the information each person has.

Responsiveness also leaves room for disagreement. Someone can understand why a change of plans caused difficulty and still disagree about whether the change was avoidable. Acknowledging a concern does not require accepting every explanation attached to it. The Field Guide uses responsiveness in this sense, following the distinction between understanding a person and complying with a demand.

Consider a brief fictional exchange. One partner says, “When you changed the appointment time without asking, I had to rearrange my work.” The other replies, “The office only had that opening.” That answer provides information about the scheduling decision. It has not yet acknowledged the work disruption. An alternative response would be, “I understand that this changed your workday. The office only offered that time, and I should have checked before confirming.”

This alternative illustrates acknowledgment of the stated impact while preserving the scheduling constraint. It also identifies an action for which the speaker takes responsibility. The appointment still needs attention. A more responsive answer does not itself change the appointment or establish that the other partner is satisfied.

Validation can acknowledge experience while preserving disagreement

Validation, as used here, means acknowledging a person's reported experience or the understandable concern within it. This is a conceptual explanation, not a claim that a specific validating response reliably reduces conflict. The research definition of responsiveness includes validation (Arican-Dinc & Gable, 2026). The Field Guide keeps validation distinct from agreement and compliance.

A person might acknowledge, “You were waiting for an answer, and I can understand why the delay was frustrating,” while also saying, “I had not agreed to make that decision today.” Both statements can belong in the account. Acknowledgment does not erase the question of what was promised, what was possible, or whether either person acted unfairly.

Precision matters. “I understand that you felt dismissed” names an experience. “You are right that nobody cares about you” endorses a much wider conclusion. “You are upset, so I must do what you want” turns distress into a claim on the other person's choices. The first statement leaves room to examine what happened. The others add conclusions that do not follow simply from the presence of distress.

Validation also need not sound polished. An accurate acknowledgment in ordinary language fits this definition better than an elaborate speech that attributes feelings or motives the person has not expressed. There is room to ask, “Have I understood the concern?” The answer may be no. Acknowledgment remains open to correction rather than becoming a declaration that the listener has completed the task.

These distinctions preserve accountability in both directions. Someone who broke an agreement still needs to address the breach. Someone who feels hurt remains responsible for threats, insults, or other harmful conduct. Understanding an experience does not authorize a harmful response, and refusing a demand does not automatically indicate a lack of care.

Self regulation includes more than becoming quiet

Emotion regulation refers to processes that influence an emotional response, including its intensity, duration, and expression. Self-regulation concerns one's own responding; interpersonal regulation involves another person. A 2026 review emphasizes that strategies differ in their effects across people and situations. It does not offer one universally best method for couple conflict (Arican-Dinc & Gable, 2026).

In educational terms, the purpose of regulation should be specified. Remaining quiet, speaking without insults, deciding whether to continue, and reconsidering an interpretation are different aims. A person might choose to say less because they want to avoid making another accusation. That choice does not require them to stop caring about the issue or to decide that their concern was mistaken.

Research also distinguishes the measures used to study regulation. Bloch and colleagues examined long-married heterosexual couples from the Berkeley area. Faster reduction of wives' observed negative behavior during a conflict discussion was associated with both spouses' concurrent marital satisfaction. Wives' physiological downregulation was not significantly associated with either spouse's concurrent satisfaction. The analyses used different numbers of couples for different measures, including 136 for behavior and 112 for physiology (Bloch et al., 2014).

Those are selected-sample associations. The study did not assign a strategy to show that using it caused greater satisfaction. Its findings do not create a responsibility for women to manage conflict. They illustrate

why a behavioral result should not be restated as a finding about every emotional or bodily process. Chapter 7, “What Happens When Capacity Narrows,” examines arousal in greater detail.

For a reader, the practical distinction is between describing an action and claiming to know an internal state. “I stopped raising my voice” describes behavior. “My body has fully recovered” makes a different assertion. Neither a calm appearance nor a self-description is enough to establish everything that is happening inside the person, and neither settles the underlying disagreement.

Co regulation describes influence without assigning responsibility

The Field Guide uses co-regulation broadly for interpersonal processes through which one person's behavior influences another's emotional or physiological state or regulation. It describes influence without assigning one partner the job of managing the other person's emotions.

The research vocabulary is less uniform. Physiological linkage refers to partners' physiological measures varying together over time. Some researchers use co-regulation more narrowly for processes that move a system toward stability. A review of 24 studies found that the implications of linkage depended on the measure and context. Physiological similarity alone did not establish healthy functioning (Timmons et al., 2015).

This matters when everyday descriptions borrow scientific language. Saying that two people became upset during an exchange does not establish that their nervous systems synchronized. Even measured covariation would leave questions about its meaning and direction. The same words should not be used interchangeably for shared distress, an attempt to help, and demonstrated movement toward stability.

An offer of support also leaves the recipient with choices. “Would you like me to listen, help think through options, or give you some room?” is a fictional illustration of asking rather than deciding for the other person. It is not a tested prescription. The person may decline or describe a concern the offer does not address.

The ethical boundary is clear even when the interaction is complicated. A partner's distress does not transfer responsibility for their conduct. Someone can offer care without accepting threats or giving up privacy, consent, or a necessary boundary. “You have to calm me down before I

can stop" places an obligation on the other person that the Field Guide does not endorse.

Clarification adds information without deciding the issue in advance

Clarification means asking about something uncertain and allowing the answer to change one's understanding. Here it is an educational option for distinguishing what was said from what was inferred. It is not presented as a method proven to de-escalate every disagreement or reveal a partner's true intention.

"When you said you could not discuss it now, did you mean later tonight or another day?" asks for information about timing. "Why do you always avoid responsibility?" includes a conclusion about a recurring motive. The second question may express a real frustration, but it does not ask the same thing. A concern about avoidance can still be raised directly and supported with specific examples.

An answer also needs to be considered alongside conduct. If someone says they intend to return to a discussion, whether they later return remains relevant. Clarification does not require treating a reassurance as proof or disregarding a repeated broken agreement. It allows more information into the account while preserving the legitimate question that prompted it.

There is no requirement to search indefinitely for a more charitable interpretation. A person can understand what a partner says and still judge the explanation insufficient. They can remain uncertain without suspending a boundary. Chapter 6, "What We Think Our Partner Means," examines interpretation more fully; Chapter 37 will develop the later BTL application.

Pauses change timing but research does not supply a universal duration

A laboratory experiment provides a useful, limited example of changing the time between provocation and response. Romantic partners played a competitive game in which a winner selected the loudness of a noise blast delivered to the other person. Researchers randomly assigned immediate responding or forced delays of 5, 10, or 15 seconds. Delays reduced the task's aggression measure, and a follow-on sample reproduced the delayed-versus-immediate comparison (McCurry et al., 2024).

The researchers did not find significant differences among the three tested delay lengths. That result does not establish equivalence or an ideal duration. The samples were mostly young students, and the task required a noise response rather than offering a no-aggression option. It was not a trial of everyday arguments or a treatment for coercive control. Participant-chosen extensions also did not constitute a randomized test of standalone voluntary timeouts (McCurry et al., 2024).

For ordinary disagreement, a defined pause can be explained as an option for changing when a conversation continues. A fictional request might be, “I want to keep talking about this. I need some space before I respond again. Can we choose a time to return?” The request identifies a purpose and opens a question about the next conversation. It is not a research-derived dose or a guarantee that a pause will help.

A return arrangement can identify what remains to be discussed and whether a decision is urgent. It can also leave room to revise the time if circumstances change. A pause can leave the issue unresolved, and an intention to return can later need follow-through. The label alone does not establish that either has happened.

There is a separate safety boundary. Leaving a threatening interaction does not create an obligation to negotiate a return time or resume joint processing. A person does not need a partner's agreement to prioritize safety. Chapter 36 will address defined pauses within the educational framework, while Chapter 53 addresses situations in which shared conflict work is the wrong priority.

Recovery and resolution answer different questions

Conflict recovery has been measured as the ability to move from a disagreement into another interaction. In one study of 73 young heterosexual couples, researchers observed a ten-minute conflict discussion followed by a four-minute task about areas of agreement. Having a partner who recovered better during that task was associated with more positive relationship emotional tone; its association with relationship satisfaction was marginal ($p = .06$). The corresponding association between a person's own recovery and their own satisfaction was not statistically significant (Salvatore et al., 2011).

The task measured a transition, not complete bodily recovery, forgiveness, or resolution of the original issue. Its four-minute length was part of the research procedure, not an established prescription for

couples. The selected sample and observational design also limit causal and broader population conclusions (Salvatore et al., 2011).

The distinction is useful outside the laboratory as a way of describing outcomes carefully. Partners might be able to prepare dinner together while still needing to address a financial disagreement. Someone may stop arguing yet remain hurt by an insult. A decision can be reached while resentment remains. These possibilities show why "we are fine now" may leave several different questions unanswered.

For the Field Guide, recovery does not require pretending that nothing happened. It can be discussed alongside an unresolved issue and a need for accountability. The aim here is to keep these matters visible without assuming that every conversation must settle all of them at once. Chapter 10, "Repair After Difficult Conflict," examines acknowledgment, accountability, and follow-through more fully.

Safety and accountability govern the use of these ideas

Responsiveness and regulation language can be misused if the goal becomes making the harmed person easier to deal with. Someone who reports fear should not be assigned the task of validating a threatening partner into stopping. Refusing unwanted sexual activity, protecting privacy, or leaving danger should not be classified automatically as failed co-regulation or defective communication.

Under the Field Guide's safety rules, fear, threats, coercion, intimidation, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, or fear of retaliation take priority over shared-pattern analysis. Responsibility for harmful conduct remains with the person engaging in it. Individual support from a qualified professional or specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than joint conflict work. Immediate danger may require emergency assistance. These are safety boundaries, not findings that a communication technique treats abuse.

The same principles preserve agency in ordinary disagreement. Care does not require surrendering a legitimate concern. A pause does not excuse a broken agreement. An explanation of emotional processes does not remove responsibility for what someone does next. The substantive issue belongs in the account throughout.

What this evidence contributes to the Field Guide

The evidence reviewed here addresses different questions using different outcomes. A definition of responsiveness, a behavioral

association, a physiological measure, and an experimental delay are not interchangeable demonstrations that one conflict method works. Their value lies partly in making the questions more precise: what changed, for whom, under what conditions, and what remains unresolved?

The examples in this chapter are educational illustrations. They do not establish a validated script, an ideal pause duration, or a guaranteed path from acknowledgment to agreement. The reviewed studies also do not directly validate Break the Loop's Loop or its interrupt sequence. Chapter 11 introduces the organizing model; later chapters explain its applications while retaining that evidence boundary.

Responsiveness concerns whether someone experiences a response as addressing what matters to them. Regulation concerns the course of responding. Recovery concerns moving beyond a difficult interaction, while the issue and any need for accountability may remain. Keeping those distinctions available gives the next chapter a clearer question: what does repair require after the interaction has changed?

Chapter 10. Repair After Difficult Conflict

A difficult conversation can stop while its consequences remain. Voices are quieter. Someone has said, “I’m sorry.” The immediate argument is over, but a hurtful remark, a broken agreement, or the original problem may still need attention. Calling this moment repaired can conceal how much remains unsettled.

Repair is a broad relationship term for efforts to address disconnection, misunderstanding, harm, or the aftermath of conflict. It can involve acknowledging what happened, accepting responsibility, making amends, or changing subsequent conduct. An attempt to repair is an effort toward those ends. Whether the effort addresses the particular harm is a separate question.

This chapter examines those distinctions and the research that informs them. It does not offer a sequence that every couple must complete. Repair also has limits: nobody owes forgiveness, renewed trust, physical affection, or continued contact because another person has made an effort.

An attempt and its outcome

A repair attempt might be a correction during an argument: “That was unfair. Let me say what I mean without insulting you.” It might be an acknowledgment afterward: “You asked me to keep that private, and I told someone.” These fictional statements have different immediate purposes. One addresses the direction of an interaction; the other identifies conduct that has already caused harm. Neither statement tells us what happens next.

An attempt can be evaluated against the problem it claims to address. An apology for raising one’s voice does not answer a question about an unexplained expense. Replacing a damaged possession addresses a tangible loss, but does not by itself establish that the person affected feels safe. A friendly exchange after conflict may coexist with an unresolved disagreement. These are distinctions about what the actions address, rather than judgments about whether warmth or apology has any value.

When someone says, “I tried to repair things,” the effort and its intended outcome need to be specified. Did the person correct a statement, acknowledge an injury, offer restitution, or keep a later commitment? The recipient’s response and the condition of the

underlying issue remain relevant. Intention, conduct, and outcome should not be folded into one verdict.

Recovery does not settle the issue

Chapter 9 describes responsiveness, regulation, and recovery. One illustration of how narrowly recovery can be measured comes from Salvatore and colleagues' study of 73 young heterosexual couples. Observers rated how participants moved from a ten-minute conflict discussion into a four-minute conversation about areas of agreement. That task measured a transition away from conflict. It did not establish that the original issue or any harm had been resolved (Salvatore et al., 2011).

For educational purposes, it is useful to keep emotional recovery and resolution separate. Partners may be ready to eat dinner, go to work, or speak about another subject while still disagreeing about what happened. A less hostile interaction does not erase the concern that preceded it. Conversely, accepting responsibility for a specific action does not require the affected person to feel better immediately.

Keeping an issue visible need not require an immediate return to it. In an ordinary safe interaction, a person might say, "I can stop arguing now, but I still want us to address the missed payment." That statement identifies an unfinished issue. It does not establish an ideal interval for returning to it, and it does not apply a return obligation to someone leaving an unsafe situation.

Accountability identifies the conduct

Accountability concerns what a person did and what remains theirs to address. It should not require partners to divide responsibility equally. If one person disclosed private information, that person's responsibility for the disclosure is not halved because the other person became angry. Each person can be accountable for their own conduct without a requirement for matching admissions.

Acknowledgment makes the object of repair clearer. "I can see you are upset" recognizes a reported state. "I told someone information you had asked me to keep private" identifies an action. "You said that left you feeling exposed" attends to its reported impact. Those statements answer different questions, and none requires a claim to know the other person's entire inner experience.

An explanation can supply context while leaving responsibility intact. “I was distracted” may describe circumstances around a missed commitment. It does not turn the missed commitment into the other person’s fault. Likewise, stress, an attachment-related concern, or a familiar conflict response does not excuse an insult, coercion, or violence. Understanding a behavior’s possible function cannot decide whether the behavior was acceptable.

Accountability also does not require agreement with an inaccurate accusation. A person can acknowledge interrupting without accepting that every disagreement was deliberate humiliation. Where facts or intentions remain uncertain, the distinction can be stated plainly: “I interrupted you several times. I did not intend to embarrass you, and I hear that you felt embarrassed.” The acknowledgment should not be used to dismiss the reported impact, while the report of impact should not automatically be treated as proof of intent.

What apology research contributes

Lewis and colleagues’ review identifies several recurring components across descriptions of apologies: acknowledgment of wrongdoing, acceptance of responsibility, remorse, an offer of compensation, and a stated intention not to repeat the conduct. The authors also describe substantial variation in how apologies are defined. These components are a way to examine what an apology communicates, rather than a validated sequence of necessary and sufficient steps (Lewis et al., 2015).

The review also has important limits. Much of the research used college samples and hypothetical situations or retrospective reports. Designs were predominantly cross-sectional, meaning variables were assessed at one point in time rather than followed across repeated assessments. Different kinds of close relationships were often grouped together. The review therefore does not establish a single best apology for every couple or show that including particular words prevents repeated harm (Lewis et al., 2015).

Consider the fictional contrast between “I’m sorry you took it that way” and “I shared the information after agreeing to keep it private. I’m sorry I did that.” The second statement identifies the speaker’s conduct and accepts responsibility for it. The comparison illustrates an acknowledgment, without establishing its effect on the recipient or the speaker’s later behavior.

An apology can also include an offer to address consequences: correcting information given to someone else, replacing something damaged, or completing an obligation that remains unmet. Whether a proposed action is relevant depends on the harm. A gift does not answer every kind of injury, and an offer does not give its maker authority to decide that the matter is closed. The affected person can disagree with the proposal or decline involvement.

Making amends is broader than saying sorry

Research on amends looks beyond whether an apology was uttered. In one study by Hannon and colleagues, 78 undergraduates in dating relationships recorded hurtful incidents over two weeks. Reported amends was associated with greater perceived resolution of an incident even after the analysis accounted for reported forgiveness. This was an association in diary reports, not a randomized test showing that an amends technique caused resolution (Hannon et al., 2010).

That work examined ongoing relationships, and the diary incidents were comparatively mild. Its findings do not establish that a particular response prevents repeated harm or makes reconciliation appropriate after severe betrayal. The broader research program also distinguished amends from an explicit verbal apology. For this chapter, its contribution is bounded: studying what happens after harm requires attention to more than the presence of the words “I’m sorry” (Hannon et al., 2010).

The practical distinction is between describing regret and addressing what regret concerns. If a partner missed an agreed responsibility, an acknowledgment can identify the missed action. An offer to complete or redistribute the remaining task concerns its consequences. A later commitment concerns future conduct. These actions are related, but treating one as proof of the others makes accountability harder to describe accurately.

Responsiveness includes hearing the response

Responsiveness concerns whether someone experiences a partner as understanding, validating, caring for, or responding to their needs and concerns. Chapter 9 develops that concept. In repair, an educational illustration is allowing the affected person to explain what remains unaddressed instead of declaring the attempt complete on their behalf. Responsiveness does not require agreement with every interpretation or compliance with every request.

Suppose the person who disclosed private information says, “I thought apologizing was what you needed.” The other person replies, “I appreciate the apology. I’m still worried about who knows.” A response that attends to this concern would address the disclosure and its consequences. Insisting that the apology should already have removed the worry asks the recipient to supply an outcome the speaker cannot establish merely by intending it.

The recipient is also entitled to correct an inaccurate account of their experience. “It wasn’t only embarrassing. I had a reason to keep it private.” No one has to infer which need is operating when the person is willing and able to explain it. Equally, an invitation to explain is not a demand for further disclosure, continued discussion, or reassurance for the person who caused the harm.

A promise and follow-through answer different questions

An intention to change describes proposed future conduct. Follow-through concerns what actually occurs. This distinction matters even when the promise is sincere. “I will not share that information again” is a commitment. Whether another disclosure occurs is a subsequent fact. Neither the forcefulness of the promise nor the elegance of the apology can substitute for that fact.

Giacobbi and Lalot’s systematic review of trust repair identified 13 articles, mostly qualitative and focused on fidelity-related trust. Remorse, accountability, and dependable conduct appeared in the review’s thematic treatment. Small, varied samples and a search limited to English-language publications in two databases constrain its conclusions. The themes are not a pooled test of a repair formula, and findings about infidelity should not be generalized automatically to every disagreement (Giacobbi & Lalot, 2025).

An educational example can make a commitment more specific without claiming that specificity guarantees change. After a missed payment, “I will handle it” leaves the proposed action unclear. “I will make the payment tomorrow and tell you whether it went through” identifies a task and a way to report its completion. The example specifies what completion would mean.

The person responsible for the action remains responsible for carrying it out. A commitment does not automatically turn the affected person into its manager. They may choose to discuss an arrangement, ask questions, or decide that a proposal is insufficient. They are not obliged

to supervise another adult's conduct in order to make accountability possible.

Follow-through should also remain tied to the relevant conduct. Keeping an unrelated promise does not establish that a privacy agreement was honored. Providing affection does not show that an unpaid bill was paid. If an agreement is missed again, the new event needs its own accurate account. The earlier apology remains part of the history, but cannot certify what happened afterward.

Returning to the substantive issue

Repairing the way a disagreement unfolded can leave the disagreement itself unfinished. An apology for ridicule during a discussion about household work does not decide how that work should be allocated. Both questions can remain legitimate: what happened during the conversation, and what arrangement the partners are trying to reach.

In a fictional ordinary disagreement, one person might say, "Calling you lazy was wrong. I still need us to discuss how the work is divided." The other might acknowledge the apology while disputing the proposed division. The example permits accountability and continuing disagreement to coexist. It does not make the original complaint automatically correct, or require an equal apology before the issue can be discussed.

A possible return arrangement can identify the issue and a time the people choose to reconsider it. Its purpose is to make the unfinished conversation explicit. The research reviewed here does not establish one required timetable or guarantee that returning will produce agreement. A return arrangement is also different from a demand that someone remain available for interrogation, surrender a boundary, or resume contact after a protective exit.

Forgiveness is not evidence of future safety

Treating forgiveness as proof that repair is complete conflates different questions. Forgiveness, renewed trust, continued contact, and reconciliation are distinguishable decisions or experiences. Accepting an apology need not settle all of them, and choosing any one does not establish that harmful conduct has stopped.

Evidence about later conduct requires a separate caution. In McNulty's study of 72 newlywed couples, a greater reported tendency to express forgiveness at baseline was associated with partner-reported

psychological and physical aggression that remained relatively stable across four years; lower forgiveness tendencies were associated with declines. Forgiveness was assessed with hypothetical scenarios, aggression was reported, and only 37 couples participated in the final analyzed wave. These observational findings do not show that forgiveness causes abuse or that withholding forgiveness prevents it (McNulty, 2011).

The conduct remains the responsibility of the person engaging in it. This study is not an instruction to punish a partner, become hostile, or withhold forgiveness strategically. Nor should the association between amends and perceived resolution in Hannon and colleagues' study become an instruction to forgive (Hannon et al., 2010). Different measures and outcomes cannot be assembled into a rule about what a harmed person must do.

A person can say, "I understand that you are apologizing, and I am not ready to resume contact." That response does not invalidate the acknowledgment or make its recipient responsible for completing the other person's repair effort. Physical affection and sexual activity likewise remain matters of consent, not demonstrations that an apology has been accepted.

When joint repair is the wrong starting point

Fear, threats, coercive control, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, or fear of retaliation change the appropriate response. These situations should not be treated primarily as a mutual failure to repair. An apology does not establish safety, and shared-pattern language must not distribute responsibility for one person's harmful acts across both partners.

If someone is afraid of their partner or concerned about retaliation, individualized support from a qualified professional or a specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than a joint conversation. Immediate danger calls for emergency assistance. Leaving an unsafe interaction, limiting contact, seeking support, or declining intimacy does not require the other person's permission. Chapter 53 addresses safety and boundaries in greater depth.

What the evidence leaves open

The reviewed sources study different parts of the aftermath of conflict: a transition into another task, apology concepts, reported amends,

perceived incident resolution, trust rebuilding, and later reported aggression. They do not evaluate one unified process with one agreed endpoint. Their population and measurement limits matter when translating findings into ordinary language.

The educational examples in this chapter show distinctions a reader can examine. They do not demonstrate the effectiveness of particular wording or predict what another person will do. Evidence that people report resolution of an incident cannot certify durable change, and a useful conceptual distinction should not be advertised as a validated intervention.

Repair also differs from prevention. Addressing an insult already spoken does not replace responsibility for future speech. A plan for future conduct does not remove the need to acknowledge an injury that already occurred. Repair and prevention concern different parts of the situation; neither makes the other unnecessary.

Chapter 11 introduces the full Break the Loop framework. The external research discussed here does not validate that framework, and repair is not a named BTL sequence. Chapters 41–43 return to aftermath and repair in application. The distinction to carry forward is concrete: an effort, the response to that effort, the original issue, and subsequent conduct each require attention on their own terms.

PART III | MEANING AND INTERPRETATION

Chapter 11. An Organizing Model for Recurring Conflict

Knowing the names of several conflict processes does not yet provide a way to describe a particular argument. Someone may recognize pressure, withdrawal, a familiar accusation, or an urge to explain without knowing how those observations fit together. A practical map needs to distinguish what happened, what the moment began to mean, and what the person did next.

Break the Loop, or BTL, is a relationship education framework created by licensed therapist Aaron Jarrels. It is intended to help couples and individuals identify and interrupt recurring conflict patterns. This chapter introduces its organizing model. The framework is educational, not a diagnosis or a substitute for professional assessment and treatment.

At this transition in the Field Guide, the evidence status needs to remain clear. BTL is a BTL-specific organizing framework informed by related research processes. Research discussed in earlier chapters does not independently validate the four-part model. Its definitions provide a vocabulary for description; they do not establish that every disagreement follows one sequence or that using the vocabulary produces a particular outcome.

A map has a different job from a finding

The preceding research chapters examined interaction, interpretation, activation, attachment, responsiveness, and repair through their own research traditions. Those terms retain their identities. Introducing a framework does not turn the earlier chapters into evidence that researchers have been studying BTL under different names.

An example from Chapter 6 makes the distinction concrete. Attribution research examines explanations for events and distinguishes them from judgments about responsibility, including intent, selfishness, and blame (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). BTL's term Old Story, introduced here, organizes familiar meanings and predictions. The two have

conceptual connections, but a study of attribution is not automatically a study of Old Story.

The same restraint applies to the model as a whole. Separate findings about several processes do not demonstrate that the processes form one fixed causal chain. A framework can arrange questions in a useful order for teaching while its proposed organization remains distinct from an empirically tested account of temporal order, mechanism, or effectiveness. In BTL, the order belongs to the framework.

Aaron Jarrels developed BTL and has a professional and potential commercial interest in its use. That interest is a reason to keep the distinction between framework and evidence visible. Readers do not need to adopt BTL to use the research explanations in earlier chapters, and the framework is not presented as superior to other ways of understanding couple conflict.

The issue remains part of the situation

BTL begins with a distinction already developed in Chapter 2. The issue is what the partners are trying to address. Within BTL, the Loop is the recognizable progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move that may recur as people address an issue. It is not merely the repetition of an argument, thought, feeling, or behavior. A disagreement about replying to an invitation includes a practical question about whether a response was sent. It may also include an exchange in which a question becomes an accusation, an explanation becomes an interruption, and the discussion moves away from the original concern.

The issue and the Loop are two different things. Both can matter. Noticing the exchange does not send the response, establish why it was delayed, or decide how responsibility should be allocated. Conversely, sending it does not by itself address a hurtful remark made during the conversation. The two questions call attention to different parts of the same situation.

This distinction prevents the framework from becoming a reason to dismiss substance. A person who says, “We need to look at our Loop,”

has not answered whether an agreement was broken. A legitimate complaint does not become illegitimate because its expression needs attention. Nor does having a legitimate complaint authorize insults, intimidation, or pressure to surrender a boundary.

Four parts of the BTL Loop

BTL uses the following sequence: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. These are the four parts of its organizing model. What may recur is this progression, while the particular Launch, experience of Overload, Old Story, and Protection Move may differ between occasions. The parts are not personality types or diagnoses, and BTL does not claim that every interaction follows this progression. Each part asks a different question. Chapters 12–16 develop the parts and the related meaning lenses in greater depth; the task here is to show how the overview holds together.

Launch: What happened or what did I notice? A Launch is the event as the person experienced it when they began getting pulled into the Loop. It might be a question, silence, a change of plans, something a partner did, or something they did not do. Describing a Launch begins with the event and the person's experience of it.

“You asked whether I had sent our response” identifies an exchange. “You were trying to prove I am incompetent” assigns an intention. Within the framework, those statements should not be treated as interchangeable. The first can orient a description; the second remains an interpretation unless the intention has actually been established. A Launch can also involve conduct that is plainly wrong. The distinction does not require pretending that an insult was merely a neutral cue.

Overload: What started happening inside me? BTL uses Overload for the part of the Loop in which a person's capacity begins to narrow. The person may describe urgency, tension, difficulty listening, or a strong desire to explain or escape. The term organizes experience within the framework. It does not identify one validated biological state or a threshold that can be inferred from someone's appearance.

The person still has choices, even when those choices feel harder to see. “I was overloaded” is therefore not a conclusion that responsibility disappeared. It is also not something a partner can establish simply by deciding that the other person is too emotional. Chapter 7 addresses the related research on activation and its limits; Chapter 13 develops the BTL term.

Old Story: What did the moment begin to mean? An Old Story is the familiar meaning or prediction that becomes influential as the Loop develops. “You do not trust me” and “I will be left to handle everything” are possible examples. The word old refers to familiarity in the framework, not proof of a childhood origin, trauma history, or attachment classification.

An Old Story is not automatically false. It may contain a concern supported by repeated events. It may also include assumptions or a prediction that goes beyond the information available. Calling a meaning an Old Story does not settle its accuracy. In attribution research, an association between negative explanations and dissatisfaction likewise does not establish whether a particular person's interpretation is correct (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990).

Protection Move: What did I do next? A Protection Move is the person's next response as they try to manage what the moment has come to mean. Explaining at length, criticizing, pressing for an answer, becoming quiet, or withdrawing may be examined in this way. The term names a response in context, not a permanent quality of the person.

Possible functions include trying to be understood, preserving dignity, creating space, or obtaining reassurance. Those possibilities are questions about the response, not permission to invent its motive. A person may be able to describe what they were trying to accomplish; an observer may know only what they did. Understanding the function does not excuse the impact. A response can make sense and still hurt another person.

Reading one ordinary exchange

Consider a fictional disagreement about an invitation with a reply deadline. One partner agreed to send the response. The other asks, “Did you send our response?” The person who agreed to reply later describes hearing the question, feeling an immediate urgency to defend themselves and finding it harder to listen, thinking, “You assume I

cannot handle anything," and giving a long explanation about everything else they had done that day.

Within BTL, the question as experienced is the Launch. The reported urgency and difficulty listening can be described under Overload. "You assume I cannot handle anything" is the reported Old Story. The extended explanation is the Protection Move. These labels organize the fictional person's account. They do not prove that the question was intended as criticism or that explaining is inherently a problem.

The other partner hears the explanation without hearing whether the reply was sent. In this illustration, they later report thinking, "I am going to have to chase this again," feeling increasingly urgent, and repeating the question more sharply. Their concern about the reply remains legitimate. The sharper response is still theirs to describe and, where necessary, take responsibility for.

BTL describes a possible relational link here: one person's Protection Move can become the other person's next Launch. The explanation is an action for its speaker and something experienced by its listener. The repeated question is then something the first person experiences. Chapter 17 develops that relational sequence; this overview does not establish a measured causal chain between the two people.

The example also leaves facts unresolved. We have not established whether the reply was sent, whether reminders had been necessary before, or what either person intended by their tone. A responsible account would keep those questions open. Filling them in to make the model look complete would make the story more confident than its information permits.

If the reply deadline was missed, the person who agreed to respond still needs to address that fact. If a hurtful remark followed, its speaker remains responsible for the remark. Neither obligation waits for an agreement that both people contributed equally. Describing an exchange does not produce a moral balance sheet.

What belongs in an account, and what remains unknown

A map should preserve the difference between an observed action and a reported inner experience. "I repeated the question three times" describes conduct. An account of urgency describes experience. "I assumed I would be ignored" identifies meaning. A statement such as "You were trying to punish me" makes a further claim about another

person's intent. BTL's labels should help keep those kinds of statement distinguishable.

Someone may be able to identify a response more readily than the meaning preceding it. Another person may remember the meaning but be unsure when the tension began. A description can leave a part unfilled when information is missing. There is no requirement to invent an Old Story, locate a bodily sensation, or impose a precise order to complete the model.

The canonical sequence gives the explanation its organization. It does not license certainty about the timing of a remembered disagreement. Nor does resemblance between two conversations show that their topics, stakes, histories, or responsibilities were identical. The model needs to remain answerable to the account of the interaction, including information that does not fit neatly.

The pattern is not the person

The Loop is the four-stage pattern, not the person. A familiar behavior or Protection Move alone does not establish that the full progression has recurred. Calling someone “the defensive one” or “the withdrawer” turns a description of conduct into a type. BTL does not require that move. It permits the more limited description that a person explained at length in this conversation, became quiet at another point, or pressed for an answer in a different exchange.

The vocabulary can itself become an accusation. “You are in your Old Story” may claim authority over someone else's meaning while avoiding their concern. “I think I began hearing that as criticism” describes the speaker's experience and leaves room for further information. The difference is not merely politeness. It concerns who is claiming knowledge of whose experience.

A partner is not required to accept a map written about them. They may correct the account, disagree about the event, or decline to describe their private experience. Disagreement with a BTL label is not evidence of denial or resistance. A rejected interpretation needs examination on its merits; rejection cannot become proof that it is correct.

For the same reason, the name Protection Move should not classify every boundary as a defensive response. Refusing an insult, protecting privacy, declining sexual activity, or leaving an unsafe interaction can be legitimate boundaries. The conduct and context require attention before a framework label is applied.

Mutual influence does not divide responsibility equally

The relational link in BTL describes a possibility of influence, not a rule for distributing responsibility. People can affect an exchange without having equal power, causing equal harm, or carrying equal accountability. A response to a broken agreement does not retroactively cause the agreement to have been broken.

Neither does reporting Overload transfer responsibility to the person whose words preceded it. The speaker remains responsible for their own conduct; the other person remains responsible for theirs. Uncertainty about intentions does not erase known actions or require someone to abandon a justified concern. The framework has to preserve those distinctions even when the interaction is complicated.

Fear, threats, coercive control, intimidation, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, or fear of retaliation change the appropriate use of this material. These situations should not be treated primarily as a shared Loop to be mapped together. Describing the harmed person's response as another part of a cycle must not distribute responsibility for someone else's coercive or violent acts.

If you are afraid of your partner or concerned about retaliation, individual support from a qualified professional or specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than shared conflict work. Immediate danger calls for emergency assistance. Leaving an unsafe interaction or seeking support does not require completing a joint discussion first. Chapter 53 develops the guide's safety and boundary considerations.

What this overview prepares for

The four questions separate the event as experienced, narrowing capacity, familiar meaning, and the next response. They can be used to describe an account without deciding who a person fundamentally is or declaring the underlying issue resolved. Their educational purpose should remain distinct from evidence that the sequence improves recognition or changes outcomes. Those are questions for direct evaluation.

Chapters 12–17 explain the components and their relational connection more fully. The Three Pillars in Chapter 15 are BTL lenses for relational significance, not an additional step in the Loop. Later mapping chapters

develop observation in detail, and the interruption chapters introduce the current BTL sequence, NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. Recognizing the overview does not require mastering those later applications now.

The practical discipline begins with an accurate description: what I noticed, what I experienced, what I understood the moment to mean, and what I did. The next chapter begins with Launch. Whatever the map reveals, the original issue, the limits of what is known, and responsibility for conduct remain part of the conversation.

Chapter 12. Launch: What Happened?

A description of a conflict can contain an event and an explanation of that event in the same breath. “You changed the plan because my time does not matter to you” names a change and assigns a reason. The change may be clear. The reason requires its own support. Keeping those statements distinguishable is the central task of this chapter.

Break the Loop (BTL), the relationship education framework created by Aaron Jarrels, calls the event as the person experienced it when they began getting pulled into the Loop a Launch. The question is: “What happened or what did I notice?” It directs attention to a particular moment in an exchange, including what the person encountered, rather than asking for a verdict about the partner.

Launch is one of the four parts of BTL's organizing model: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. These names organize questions for educational use. They are not diagnoses or a fixed sequence that every conflict must follow identically. Related research does not independently validate this four-part organization. Jarrels has a professional and potential commercial interest in the framework; its concepts should be evaluated with that authorship visible.

An event as experienced

A Launch might involve something said, a tone of voice, a question, a silence, or a change of plans. Something a partner did not do can belong in the account too. The defining feature within BTL is the event's place in the person's experience of getting pulled into a familiar pattern. It need not be the most dramatic moment in the argument.

Consider a brief fictional example. Two partners have arranged to attend a neighborhood meeting together. That afternoon, one says, “I told them we'd arrive an hour later.” The other needs to rearrange the afternoon around the change. The other reports, “That was when I started getting pulled into our familiar argument about whose time counts.” This account identifies the announced change as the Launch for that person. It also names a meaning that began to develop.

The announced change and the meaning are distinguishable. “You told them we would arrive an hour later” describes the reported event. “My time does not count” expresses what it came to mean to the speaker. The original plan still matters, including whether changing it required agreement. Chapter 2 develops the distinction between the issue and the pattern. Identifying the Launch has not answered that question or settled why the change occurred.

The phrase “as experienced” keeps the person's perspective visible. Someone may have noticed the announcement, a particular word, or the fact that the decision had already been communicated to others. A useful description can specify that focus: “I heard that you had already changed our arrival time without checking with me.” It does not have to erase the practical consequence to sound impartial.

What happened and what it meant

BTL's distinction is: “What happened?” is different from “What did I decide it meant?” The word decide in this question does not require a slow, deliberate judgment. It asks which meaning entered the person's account. Nor does separating the questions establish that the meaning was mistaken. A concern can be well supported, partly supported, or uncertain.

“You asked the same question twice” and “You think I am incapable” answer different questions. The first identifies a repeated question, assuming that is what occurred. The second attributes a view to the partner. If the partner actually said, “I think you are incapable,” that statement becomes part of what happened. The distinction follows the available information rather than requiring every concern to remain permanently ambiguous.

The same precision applies to impact. “I had to rearrange my afternoon” identifies a consequence of the changed meeting time in the fictional example. “You changed it to inconvenience me” assigns a purpose. A person can describe the inconvenience and object to the decision without first proving a hostile purpose. Accountability for conduct does not depend on agreeing about every motive attached to it.

Relationship attribution research distinguishes explanations for why an event occurred from judgments about responsibility, including intent, selfishness, and blame (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). Chapter 6 examines this external research literature in detail. BTL uses its own term Launch to organize the question about the event as experienced;

the research distinction does not validate Launch as a separate measured construct.

The review also treats the accuracy of marital attributions as a difficult question, rather than something established simply by their association with relationship satisfaction (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). For this chapter, the implication is limited: a research association cannot determine what a particular partner intended. The review is a historical conceptual analysis, not an individual accuracy test or evidence that all interpretations are wrong.

Silence and things that did not happen

Nonbehavior needs a reference point. “You did not call” leaves important information unstated. Had a call been agreed on? By what time? Was the concern the missing call, the absence of an update, or discovering that plans had changed? These questions clarify the description; they do not establish that an agreement existed merely because someone expected one.

In a separate fictional example, one partner says, “We agreed you would call before the repair person arrived. The appointment time passed, and I had not heard from you.” The absent call can be the event as that person experienced it. “You wanted to leave all the work to me” adds an account of intention. The missed agreement and any resulting work remain substantive concerns even if that intention is unknown.

An expectation can also be personal rather than shared. “I expected a call after the interview” differs from “You promised to call after the interview.” Both sentences can describe something important to the speaker, but they make different claims about the partner's obligation. A Launch description should retain that difference instead of quietly turning an unspoken expectation into a broken promise.

Silence likewise needs context. “After I asked whether you wanted to go, you did not answer before leaving the room” gives more information than “You shut me out.” It still leaves questions about whether the person heard, what else was happening, and why they left. Those possibilities should remain possibilities unless the account supplies further information. Listing them is not a finding that any one explanation is true.

Some absences are less ambiguous than others. An agreed task can remain undone, or a promised update can fail to arrive. Naming a missing action precisely does not require inventing a benign

explanation or withdrawing the complaint. The purpose is to keep the event, the expectation, and the proposed explanation available for separate examination.

Tone, cues, and context

Launch has conceptual overlap with terms such as antecedent, cue, or precipitating event. This overlap does not make the terms interchangeable research measures or establish that an event caused a particular response. In this chapter, a cue means something a person notices in the situation. A pause, facial expression, change in volume, or particular word may be named as part of a Launch. Calling something a cue does not establish what it signals. “I noticed you looked away” and “Looking away proved you were lying” carry very different claims.

A tone description should show whose perception it is. “I heard your answer as abrupt” reports an experience. “You answered, ‘Do it yourself’” supplies words, if those words are recalled accurately. Neither sentence needs to do the work of the other. An account can include both without claiming that a remembered tone is a recording or that the quoted words supply every detail of the exchange.

Context belongs in the description when it changes what is being described. A question asked during an agreed planning conversation differs from the same question shouted through a closed bathroom door. This is a distinction between the situations, not a prediction about how every person would respond. The words alone may be an incomplete account of the event.

Previous events can be relevant context without becoming an explanation of a person's entire history. Someone might say, “This was the third change to the plan this week, and I had already explained the effect on my work.” That statement supplies information that can be examined. “I reacted this way because of childhood trauma” is a different kind of claim and is not established by identifying a Launch.

The term therefore does not require a trauma origin, an attachment label, or a conclusion about a nervous system. Nor is trigger an automatic synonym for Launch. BTL's definition concerns an event as experienced in relation to its educational map. A reader can use that definition without claiming a diagnosis or a biological mechanism.

A starting point is not a verdict about cause

Identifying a Launch answers where a person is beginning this account of being pulled into the pattern. It does not necessarily identify the first event in the interaction. In the meeting example, the partner who announced the time change might identify an earlier exchange as their own Launch. That possibility does not disprove the other account or establish what happened earlier.

For teaching purposes, the account can begin with a bounded statement: “When I heard that the arrival time had already changed, I started thinking that my schedule did not count.” This identifies a reported starting point and a reported meaning. It makes no claim that nothing relevant preceded it or that the speaker has reconstructed every step of the conversation.

Different starting points are not an instruction to split responsibility evenly. One person may have broken an agreement; another may have responded with an insult. Each action needs its own consideration. The fact that one event came before a response does not by itself show that the person responsible for the event caused, deserved, or controlled that response.

Within BTL, one person's Protection Move can become the partner's next Launch. This is a possible relational link in the framework, not a rule assigning equal power or harm. Chapter 17 develops that link. Here it is enough to distinguish “this is what I encountered next” from “this explains away what I did next.”

Describing a Launch without completing the whole map

A description can stay close to what is available: the situation, the words or actions noticed, and the part that marked the beginning of the person's account. “When you asked whether I had finished, I heard it as checking up on me” includes both an event and a perception. “You were checking because you do not trust me” adds an explanation that needs separate support.

Unknown details can remain unknown. If the exact words are not remembered, “You asked about the task; I do not remember the wording” is more accurate than supplying a polished quotation. An uncertain time need not become an exact minute. Precision means matching the description to what can be supported, including the limits of recall.

The partner's response may add information, but agreement is not a prerequisite for having an experience. “I did not mean it that way” reports something about the speaker's stated intention. It does not erase what was said or its impact. Conversely, “That is how I experienced it” does not, by itself, prove the other person's purpose. Both distinctions can remain in view while the actual conduct is addressed.

This descriptive task is an educational illustration, not a tested script for reducing conflict. The chapter does not establish that identifying a Launch will produce agreement, improve recognition, or change the next response. Chapters 27–33 address mapping in more detail, and later chapters address interruption. Those applications require their own explanations and evidence boundaries.

Harm and safety remain part of what happened

A Launch need not be harmless or neutral. A direct insult can be described as a direct insult. An explicit threat should not be rewritten as merely a tone the listener interpreted negatively. Keeping intention distinct from experience does not require treating clear conduct as uncertain, finding an innocent explanation, or accepting a partner's denial as the final account.

The same distinction applies to boundaries. Saying no, declining sexual contact, preserving privacy, leaving an interaction, or seeking support should not automatically be classified as a defective response. A partner's distress at a boundary does not establish a right to cross it. Naming the boundary as an event in someone's experience does not make its holder responsible for later intimidation or retaliation.

Where there is fear, coercive control, threats, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, or fear of retaliation, safety and accountability take priority over shared-pattern analysis. These circumstances require attention beyond an ordinary conflict map. The task is not to find a matching contribution from each partner or to ask the harmed person to explain the event more persuasively to the person creating danger.

Individualized professional support or a specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than joint discussion in those circumstances. Immediate danger warrants emergency help. A reader does not need to complete a Launch description, confront a partner, or obtain agreement before seeking support. The Field Guide's detailed

safety chapters, beginning with Chapter 53, address the limits of shared work further.

What follows the event

Launch keeps one question available without asking it to answer everything: what happened or what did I notice? A clear answer can include an action, an absence, an expectation, and relevant context, while identifying which parts are recalled events, personal perceptions, or proposed meanings. It can preserve a legitimate complaint and leave a motive unresolved.

Chapter 13 turns to Overload, asking what started happening inside the person as capacity began to narrow. That is a different part of the BTL account. The changed plan still needs attention, the words still matter, and responsibility for the next response remains with the person who makes it.

Chapter 13. Overload: What Started Happening Inside Me?

You can care about a conversation and still find yourself struggling to take it in. You may be waiting for a chance to correct one detail, rehearsing an explanation while your partner is speaking, or feeling that the question must be settled immediately. Alongside the original concern, there is now a question about how you are experiencing the discussion.

Break the Loop uses Overload to name the part of the Loop in which a person's capacity begins to narrow. Its central question is: What started happening inside me? The term directs attention to the experience of participating in the exchange, including what has become harder to hear, consider, or choose. It does not identify a diagnosis or a measured biological state.

Chapter 12 addressed Launch, the event as a person experienced it when they began getting pulled into the Loop. Overload turns attention toward the developing internal difficulty. In BTL's organization, Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move names four parts of the Loop. That organization does not establish a universal timetable in which every person must pass through four distinct stages.

What narrowing capacity describes

Within BTL, narrowing capacity can include finding it harder to listen, stay curious, maintain perspective, or consider more than one response. A person may experience tension, urgency, or defensiveness. These are possible descriptions of an experience, rather than a checklist for deciding whether someone else is in Overload. There is no score to reach before the concept applies.

The word capacity also needs a clear boundary. Here it concerns what a person experiences as harder to do in an exchange. It does not refer to intelligence or a permanent personal limitation. Saying that the conversation became harder to follow is a more specific account than deciding that someone has become incapable of thinking.

An ordinary disagreement can contain considerable emotion without this description fitting either person. Someone may be angry and still follow the discussion carefully. Someone may speak softly while reporting that they cannot take in another point. Loudness, tears, stillness, and facial expression do not by themselves establish the internal experience being described. The person remains the source of their own account, and that account still has limits as an explanation of events.

Consider a brief fictional example. One partner says, “I could tell you were still talking, but I was rehearsing how to explain the missed appointment.” That statement identifies a particular experience. It does not prove that the question was unfair or that the explanation could not wait. The missed appointment also remains a practical problem. Calling the moment Overload should make the account more precise without settling questions it cannot answer.

When listening and curiosity become harder

Listening in this discussion means trying to take in what the other person is saying, rather than merely remaining silent until a turn to respond. In a possible Overload experience, a person notices that one phrase has become the focus of their attention. They can remember the accusation they heard but cannot recall the clarification that followed. This is an illustration of what BTL means by narrowing, not proof of a particular cognitive mechanism.

Curiosity concerns leaving room to learn something about the present exchange. It does not require treating every account as equally credible, doubting a well-established fact, or overlooking an agreement that was broken. A person can remain interested in an explanation while being clear that an agreed task was not completed. Understanding the circumstances and deciding what accountability requires are separate questions.

In another fictional exchange, a partner hears, “I thought you were handling the reservation,” and starts preparing a history of all the arrangements they have made. They later report, “I was so focused on showing that I do my share that I missed the question about tonight.” The example supplies the internal experience through the person's report. A partner's observation that the answer wandered would not, by itself, establish why that happened.

A description of reduced curiosity should be equally specific. “I had stopped considering that I might be missing information” tells us more than “I wasn't myself.” It leaves open whether additional information would change the person's conclusion. There may be little uncertainty about the broken agreement, even when there is uncertainty about the circumstances or intention behind it. Overload does not make a justified concern unjustified.

Urgency and defensiveness

Urgency is one possible experience within Overload. It may feel necessary to explain immediately, obtain an answer now, or end the uncertainty before the conversation can continue. The relevant distinction is between experiencing that pressure and establishing that immediate action is actually required. A serious practical deadline may exist, and it needs to be assessed on its own terms.

Suppose a fictional couple is discussing a change to a weekend plan. One person reports feeling that the entire disagreement must be resolved before either can leave for work. They may have a real scheduling problem to settle. They may also be asking for more resolution than that morning allows. Naming the urgency does not decide which request is reasonable. It identifies something to examine alongside the timetable and the outstanding obligation.

Defensiveness can similarly describe a felt readiness to protect one's account or correct a perceived accusation. “I wanted to defend every part of what I had done” identifies an urge. It does not tell us whether the person actually interrupted, explained, counterattacked, or remained quiet. BTL distinguishes the developing internal experience from the response a person makes. Chapter 16 gives Protection Move its fuller explanation.

Neither urgency nor defensiveness supplies the other person's intention. Feeling accused does not establish an accusation, although an accusation may have occurred. Feeling pressured does not establish coercion, although pressure can also be real and serious. The actual words, actions, agreements, and surrounding circumstances still need attention. An internal experience is part of the account of a disagreement, not a replacement for those facts.

What the research adds

Chapter 7 examined research on arousal, regulation, cognitive performance, and flooding. Two distinctions from that chapter matter here. Experiments about stress and cognitive tasks provide different evidence from studies observing couples. Neither category becomes a direct test of Overload simply because its findings seem relevant to the description.

A meta-analysis of acute-stress experiments found poorer average performance on working-memory and cognitive-flexibility tasks. Working memory involves holding and using information, while cognitive flexibility involves shifting between task demands. Results differed across executive functions and tasks. The flexibility evidence came from a relatively small set of studies. These were laboratory stress tasks, not tests of listening or curiosity during couple disagreements (Shields et al., 2016). The findings provide indirect context for thinking about difficulty under stress. They do not demonstrate that a particular partner's activation caused a particular listening failure.

Couple research has examined self-reported flooding, a separate construct. In a study of 233 heterosexual married or cohabiting couples in a U.S. sample spanning distress and intimate-partner-violence groups, flooding reports were associated with anger, and couples with at least one high-flooding partner showed less effective observed problem solving. The study assessed a general propensity, rather than a moment-by-moment sequence proving how a particular disagreement unfolded (Malik et al., 2020). The finding concerns observed problem solving, not a direct test of listening loss. It establishes neither causation nor equal responsibility for harm.

These sources inform the surrounding discussion without validating BTL's construct or its four-part organization. Flooding is not an interchangeable name for Overload. A task score, a person's general report of overwhelm, and their account of this evening's conversation describe different things. None supplies a universal threshold at which listening, perspective, or choice disappears.

The useful limit is therefore specific. BTL can offer language for a person who reports that an exchange is becoming harder to navigate. The cited research cannot establish a biological explanation for every part of that account. It also cannot establish that identifying Overload will improve the next conversation. Recognition benefits and the timing of intervention require their own evidence.

Choices can become harder to see

BTL preserves this principle: The person still has choices, but those choices may become harder to see. In BTL, this distinction keeps a felt narrowing of options from becoming a declaration that behavior was inevitable. “I could only see two possibilities” describes what someone perceived. It does not establish that only two possibilities existed.

For example, someone may recall thinking they had to keep explaining or accept an accusation they considered false. Other responses might have included disagreeing briefly, asking which part needed clarification, or acknowledging one mistake without agreeing to everything alleged. These are possible alternatives in a fictional ordinary disagreement. Their availability and appropriateness depend on the situation. They are not promises that a particular phrase will produce understanding or prevent conflict.

Agency does not mean controlling the partner's response or guaranteeing a cooperative exchange. A person can choose how to express a disagreement while having no power to make the other person listen. Recognizing options should not become a demand to find the perfect response that keeps somebody else from behaving harmfully. Responsibility for that conduct remains with the person who does it.

Nor does retained agency mean that difficulty is trivial. A person may sincerely describe the conversation as much harder than it was ten minutes earlier. Taking that report seriously and holding them responsible for their conduct are compatible. The framework does not require proving that a response was easy before asking whether it was harmful or what accountability requires.

The issue remains unresolved

A discussion of capacity can displace the original concern if it becomes the only subject either person is allowed to raise. “I was overwhelmed” may be a relevant account of experience. It does not answer whether an agreement was broken, whether an expense was authorized, or whether something said was threatening. Those questions retain their importance even when the account of overwhelm is sincere.

Return to the fictional missed appointment. A partner who was left waiting may need acknowledgment, an explanation, and a dependable arrangement for the next appointment. The person who missed it may also describe becoming defensive during the discussion. Both matters

can be considered without treating them as equivalent contributions to the original problem. The experience of discussing a mistake and responsibility for making it are different parts of the account.

Likewise, a request for time or space does not automatically reveal Overload, avoidance, or a Protection Move. Someone may be setting a reasonable boundary. They may be ending an exchange that has become unsafe. Context matters before the framework is applied. No one needs to accept another person's interpretation of their internal state as the price of having a boundary respected.

Overload is most precise when used to describe one's own experience rather than settle an argument about a partner. “I was preparing my defense and missed what you said next” leaves room for specific accountability. “You were in Overload, so your complaint doesn't count” uses the term to dismiss the issue. Neither an educational label nor a research citation gives a person authority to decide what their partner was capable of experiencing.

Safety and accountability

An explanation of narrowed capacity must not become an explanation that excuses intimidation, threats, coercion, or violence. A person remains responsible for harmful conduct even when they describe intense distress. The harmed partner is not responsible for becoming calmer, asking more carefully, or identifying the right moment in order to prevent that conduct.

Where fear, coercive control, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, or fear of retaliation is present, safety and appropriate specialized support take priority over shared-pattern analysis. A recurring interaction does not establish equal power, equal harm, or equal responsibility. Chapters 53 through 55 address the limits of shared work further. A person does not need agreement about a Loop before seeking help.

The same boundary applies to interpreting disengagement. Leaving, refusing further discussion, or declining to explain an internal experience may be protective. The existence of strong emotion does not make continued conversation an obligation. This chapter provides educational language, not an assessment of whether a particular relationship or proposed conversation is safe.

What comes after noticing the difficulty

Overload asks for a description of what began happening inside the person. A useful account might identify a change from taking in the question to rehearsing a reply, from tolerating an unfinished answer to demanding immediate resolution, or from considering alternatives to seeing only one defensible response. These are possible descriptions to examine against one's own recollection. They are not stages everyone must report or evidence that an interpretation is mistaken.

The distinction from Old Story is the question being asked. Overload concerns the experience of narrowing capacity. Old Story concerns the familiar meaning or prediction becoming influential. “I was struggling to take in another sentence” and “I began deciding that my judgment never counts” provide different information. The ideas may be difficult to separate in a person's recollection; the framework should not manufacture a precise timeline that the person cannot support.

Chapter 14 turns to Old Story. Later chapters address observing Overload and considering what to do when a conversation has become harder. Here the task is to understand the construct accurately: describe the difficulty without diagnosing the partner, preserve the issue that still needs attention, and keep responsibility for the next response visible. A narrower experience of choice is not the same as an absence of choice.

Chapter 14. Old Story: What Did the Moment Begin to Mean?

The Meaning Added to a Moment

Two people can agree on what was said and disagree sharply about what it meant. A partner asks, “Did you pay the bill?” The question may concern an outstanding payment. It may also be heard as a judgment: *You think I cannot handle this.* The speaker may have intended a reminder, a criticism, a practical check, or something else. The words alone do not settle which interpretation is accurate.

A disagreement can become more difficult when the meaning attached to a moment becomes as important as the immediate topic. Someone who experiences a question as distrust may respond by defending their competence rather than answering it. Someone who hears a delayed reply as disregard may press for reassurance rather than discussing the schedule. These are possibilities, not conclusions about what either person is secretly thinking.

Break the Loop uses the term **Old Story** for the familiar meaning or prediction that becomes influential as a Loop develops. It may sound like “You don't care,” “You think I'm incompetent,” or “Nothing I do is good enough.” This is a term within an educational framework. It is not a diagnosis, a standard research measure, or a claim that every difficult interaction follows the same sequence.

The crucial point is often missed: **An Old Story is not automatically false.** It may name a valid concern. It may reflect something that has happened repeatedly. It may contain an inference that has not been checked, or it may combine sound evidence with an uncertain prediction. The task is to understand the meaning that became influential without declaring it either true or mistaken in advance.

The Event and the Interpretation

It helps to separate three questions that can easily become one. What happened? What did the moment begin to mean? What evidence supports that meaning?

Suppose Jordan says, “You could have told me the plans changed.” Taylor replies, “You always make me feel like I've done something wrong.” The observable exchange includes a complaint about changed

plans and a response about feeling blamed. Taylor's feeling is part of the interaction. Yet that feeling alone does not establish Jordan's intention. Conversely, Jordan's insistence that no blame was intended does not erase the impact or settle whether the complaint was expressed fairly.

The distinction is not a technicality. If the interpretation is treated as an established fact too soon, the exchange can move from “I wanted to know about the schedule” to “You think I am unreliable.” Then the partners may begin arguing over a presumed attitude instead of examining the scheduling issue and what actually occurred between them.

This does not mean people must distrust their own experiences. It means they can be accurate about what they felt while remaining appropriately careful about what they know of another person's reasons. Sometimes additional facts confirm the concern. Sometimes they complicate it. Sometimes there is too little information to decide.

The same caution applies to a partner's denial. “I didn't mean that” is information about reported intent, not an automatic answer to whether a behavior was hurtful, negligent, or part of a documented pattern. Intent, conduct, impact, and responsibility can require separate examination.

What Attribution Research Adds

Psychologists use *attribution* to describe explanations people make about behavior and its causes. In marital-attribution research, an important distinction exists between asking why an event occurred and judging how responsible a partner was for it. Responsibility judgments may include assumptions about intent, selfishness, and blame (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). These are research concepts. Old Story is BTL's broader practical label for a familiar meaning or prediction, not an alternative name for any single attribution scale.

A landmark review identified associations between marital dissatisfaction and more negative explanations of partner behavior, with differences across the dimensions and studies reviewed (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). Such findings support taking interpretation seriously when studying relationships. They do not show that the dissatisfied spouse is necessarily wrong, that the other partner's intention can be reconstructed from a questionnaire, or that one kind of attribution causes every difficult exchange.

A later prospective study offers a more specific observation. Among 280 young married couples from a selected Iowa-origin cohort, early responsibility attributions predicted aspects of each person's own later warmth and hostility behavior composite approximately two years afterward, after adjustment for both partners' initial marital quality (Durtschi et al., 2011). The study provides evidence that such judgments can be associated with subsequent interaction. It does not isolate a direct causal mechanism, establish within-person behavioral change, or show that someone can reliably improve a relationship simply by changing an interpretation.

Other findings restrain broad conclusions. In one selected study of 52 couples, attribution-behavior associations differed between wives and husbands after adjustment for study group (Bradbury et al., 1996). That does not make attribution a process belonging to only one gender. It illustrates why a particular result cannot automatically become a rule about everyone.

A four-country survey of 2,347 adults in romantic relationships found negative associations between attribution measures and relationship satisfaction in samples from Spain, Taiwan, Turkey, and the United States, but the strength of those associations varied across the samples (Williamson et al., 2026). Because the study relied on cross-sectional reports from differently recruited groups, it cannot establish the causes of the differences or determine which specific interpretation was accurate. Its relevance here is modest but important: no single finding should be presented as a culturally universal description of how partners interpret conflict.

Together, these studies support an attentive but limited claim. Interpretations matter enough to examine. Their associations with experience and behavior depend on what is measured, whom researchers study, and when the observations occur. None of these studies directly tests the BTL Old Story construct or validates the complete Loop.

Why a Meaning Can Feel Familiar

The word *old* refers to the meaning's familiarity, not to a verified account of where it began. A person may hear “You don't trust me” in several different conversations. That resemblance can be useful to notice even when it is not possible to identify a single origin.

People may develop expectations through repeated interactions, experiences in a particular relationship, or other aspects of their lives. But the existence of a familiar expectation does not prove that it began in childhood, arose from trauma, reflects an attachment classification, or was learned from a particular earlier argument. Those histories may matter for some people. They are not conclusions we can draw merely from one defensive exchange.

Research on relationship expectations illustrates both relevance and limitation. In a diary study of 103 Swiss dual-earner couples with children, most of whom were married, day-to-day expectations about a partner before reunion were associated with later reports of closeness and tension in bounded within-person analyses (Schoebi et al., 2012). The study did not establish that conflict episodes taught those expectations or that they caused a repeated sequence of observed conflict behavior. It would be misleading to turn such findings into proof that every Old Story is a learned conflict script.

The familiar meaning may also change. An interpretation that once reflected a real pattern may be less accurate in a new situation. An interpretation once dismissed as an overreaction may be supported by repeated later behavior. The Field Guide does not assume that familiarity means truth, nor that familiarity means distortion.

There is a practical difference between recognizing a recurring prediction and tracing its complete history. The first may be possible during ordinary reflection: “When plans change without warning, I start expecting that my needs will be ignored.” The second may require much more evidence and, sometimes, professional support. The BTL framework does not require readers to reconstruct a personal developmental history to recognize what a moment has come to mean.

Prediction Changes the Conversation's Direction

An Old Story can concern something already believed or something expected to happen next. “You don't respect my judgment” is a statement about presumed meaning. “Whatever I say, you're going to criticize it” is also a prediction about the coming exchange.

These predictions may influence how a person approaches the next sentence. If a partner expects criticism, an ordinary question may be experienced as a test. If a partner expects abandonment, a request for space may be experienced as confirmation. Yet the existence of that expectation does not establish that the other person intended to

criticize or leave. Nor does a prediction become invalid just because it is emotionally charged.

The distinction matters because a prediction sometimes changes the question being asked. Instead of “What does my partner need to know?” it becomes “How do I keep from being blamed again?” Instead of “Can we discuss the delayed arrival?” it becomes “How do I make sure I matter?” These are plausible examples of shifts in attention, not claims that the specific motivational sequence has been objectively demonstrated in every couple.

In BTL's organizing language, a person may move from a Launch through Overload into an Old Story before making a Protection Move. That four-part organization is a way to help readers describe an experience, not a proven universal temporal law. The parts can be difficult to distinguish in real time, and the available information may not permit a confident reconstruction. It is better to leave a step uncertain than to invent a complete map.

A Different Look at the Same Exchange

Consider a fictional example involving Jordan and Taylor.

Jordan notices that Taylor has not responded to a message about dinner plans. Later, Jordan says, “You could have let me know.” Taylor answers, “I was busy, and I don't need you checking up on me.” Jordan responds, “I wasn't checking up on you. I was trying to make dinner.”

Both have potentially legitimate concerns. Jordan needed information to plan a meal. Taylor may have needed space to respond after a busy afternoon. The disagreement does not become meaningless merely because the conversation has acquired additional emotional weight.

For Jordan, the unanswered message might begin to mean, “I don't matter enough to get a reply.” For Taylor, the complaint might begin to mean, “You don't trust me to manage my time.” These are possible Old Stories, not facts about what they were actually thinking. Neither partner's experienced meaning proves the other's intention.

The conversation may become more focused on those meanings than on the original plans. Jordan pushes for acknowledgment. Taylor defends autonomy. Jordan experiences the defense as dismissal. The interaction could continue without either person explaining the practical constraint that began it.

Now suppose Taylor had previously ignored agreed-upon updates, leaving Jordan to manage repeated disruptions. Jordan's concern might have a substantial factual basis. Or suppose Jordan had repeatedly used messages to monitor Taylor's movements. Taylor's concern might have a substantial factual basis. These different histories produce materially different interpretations of the same brief dialogue. A short example cannot decide which history is true.

That uncertainty is not a flaw in the example. It is part of the lesson. The reader can identify a possible meaning without declaring a verdict. The legitimate issue still needs attention, and evidence about actual conduct matters. A good analysis does not force both people into equal responsibility simply because each has a perspective.

Information That Remains Unknown

A simple comparison can help make the distinction visible:

Observed event	Possible familiar meaning	Information still unknown
A partner asks whether a bill was paid.	“You don't trust my judgment.”	Was the question a neutral check, a repeated criticism, or prompted by a missed obligation?
A message is not answered for several hours.	“I'm not important.”	What prevented the reply, what agreements existed, and is this part of a larger pattern?
A partner requests a pause in an argument.	“You're leaving me to handle this alone.”	Is the pause a reasonable way to regulate, avoid accountability, or preserve safety?
A plan is changed without discussion.	“My preferences don't count.”	Was there an urgent reason, an agreed practice, or a repeated disregard of input?

The table is an educational illustration, not a validated instrument. Each possible meaning is worth exploring but must not be treated as a diagnosis or proof. In particular, a pause or boundary should not automatically be labeled withdrawal or an unhealthy Protection Move.

There is no obligation to reinterpret clear evidence of wrongdoing as a misunderstanding. If someone repeatedly breaks an agreement, lies about important matters, or dismisses a stated boundary, the relevant issue includes those actions. An Old Story may help describe the experience of such events without replacing accountability for them.

What It Means to Examine an Old Story

Within BTL, noticing an Old Story means identifying the meaning that has become influential. It does not require someone to disprove the meaning, excuse the behavior that preceded it, or adopt a charitable interpretation regardless of evidence.

A person might notice, “I heard that question as a judgment about my competence.” That statement distinguishes experience from the other person's established intention. It may create room to ask, where appropriate, “Were you questioning how I handled this, or were you checking what still needed to be done?” The answer may clarify the issue. It may also reveal a disagreement that remains unresolved.

Sometimes the most responsible conclusion is that more information is needed. Other times the evidence is sufficient to name a broken commitment, set a boundary, or ask for change. The presence of an Old Story does not decide whether to accept, reject, or negotiate any of those responses.

This is also why describing an Old Story is not a diagnosis of a partner. Saying “My Old Story was that you were trying to control me” is different from saying “You are a controlling person.” The former identifies what the moment came to mean. The latter makes a claim about the other person's identity or behavior that must stand on its own evidence.

It is possible to have several interpretations of the same moment. One may be partly right, another incomplete, and a third based on a prediction rather than an observed event. Precision is more useful than forcing a single explanation simply to complete the model.

When Interpretation Is Not the Priority

There are circumstances in which an invitation to reconsider meaning can be unsafe. If a person fears retaliation, is being threatened, monitored, stalked, coerced, sexually pressured, or subjected to violence, the immediate concern is not whether both partners can

clarify their Old Stories. Safety, accountability, and appropriate specialized support take priority.

A person does not need to resolve uncertainty about a partner's motives before responding to threatening or controlling conduct. Nor should educational language about mutual patterns assign equal responsibility to someone who is being intimidated. In such circumstances, joint pattern analysis may obscure the issue rather than illuminate it.

The Field Guide is relationship education, not therapy or a method for assessing violence risk. Readers facing fear or coercion may need individualized professional guidance and specialized safety resources rather than the shared exercises appropriate to ordinary disagreement.

These boundaries apply even when both people have strong feelings, even when a harmful action is followed by an apology, and even when a protective response can be explained psychologically. A behavior's understandable function is not an excuse for its impact.

The Value of a More Accurate Description

The Old Story concept is useful when it helps someone describe the meaning that entered a difficult moment with greater precision. It can help distinguish a practical disagreement from an additional interpretation that may shape the next response. Its usefulness does not depend on treating that interpretation as a cognitive error.

A familiar meaning might be supported by evidence, contradicted by evidence, or still unresolved. It might reflect an important need while telling us little about the speaker's actual intention. It may relate to earlier experience without revealing its origin. It may be noticed only after the argument has ended.

That is enough to make it worth examining. The question is not, “How do I prove my Old Story wrong?” It is, “What did this moment begin to mean, what do I actually know, and what still needs to be addressed?”

The next chapter considers another part of the BTL framework: the Three Pillars, Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance, as lenses for describing why particular moments may carry relational significance. Those lenses, like Old Story, are educational constructs rather than validated personality categories or evidence of another person's motives.

Chapter 15. The Three Pillars: Why Some Moments Carry More Weight

A small comment can land as a much larger message. One partner asks, “Did you remember to call?” The other hears not only a question about a phone call, but a possible judgment: You cannot handle ordinary responsibilities. In another exchange, the same question is received as a practical reminder, with no sting at all. The words alone do not tell us what either person intended or what the question meant to the person who heard it.

This chapter introduces a way of examining the larger meaning someone may attach to an ordinary interaction. Break the Loop calls the approach the Three Pillars: Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance. They are three educational lenses for exploring experiences of agency, capability, and personal significance. They were developed within the Break the Loop framework. They are not a scientific scale, a clinical diagnosis, or three empirically established causes of recurring conflict. Related relationship research can inform the discussion, but has not independently validated this particular classification.

The aim is modest and useful: to ask a better question about your own experience. When an interaction feels larger than its immediate content, what might it have touched? That question should expand inquiry, not produce a verdict about your partner.

What the Three Pillars describe

Autonomy asks, “Do I have agency?” It concerns the experience of having room to make choices, express preferences, and participate in decisions affecting one’s life. Someone may notice Autonomy when a plan seems to have been made for them, or when a request sounds like an order. But an Autonomy concern does not establish that another person was deliberately controlling. It also does not cancel legitimate agreements or responsibilities.

Intelligence asks, “Am I regarded as capable?” The word refers here to being treated as someone able to understand, learn, contribute, and make judgments. It is not an assessment of intelligence-test scores or a ranking of people’s abilities. Someone may feel their competence questioned when advice is repeated, an error is highlighted, or their explanation is interrupted. The actual exchange still matters. A

correction can be accurate and necessary even when it feels difficult to receive.

Importance asks, “Do I matter?” It concerns whether someone experiences their time, concerns, contribution, and presence as having significance. A forgotten appointment, an unanswered message, or a decision made without consultation might bring this question to mind. But feelings of being unimportant do not, on their own, establish indifference or intent. A person can matter deeply and still be overlooked in a particular moment. An oversight can also cause real harm that deserves attention.

The three questions are intentionally ordinary. They are not meant to replace other descriptions of what someone felt. A person might describe embarrassment, worry, loneliness, anger, or exhaustion without needing to choose a Pillar. These lenses are optional. Their value depends on whether they help the person make an experience more precise.

Why a moment can carry more than its immediate topic

Consider a fictional disagreement about weekend plans. Jordan tells Taylor that friends have been invited to dinner on Saturday. Taylor had expected a quiet evening after a demanding week.

The immediate issue is clear: Saturday has been committed without a shared decision. That issue cannot be solved by analyzing feelings alone. It may require changing the plan, setting expectations for invitations, or accepting a genuine disagreement about how often to host.

The interaction might also carry more personal meaning. Taylor could experience the invitation as an Autonomy concern: I was not included in a decision about my time. Taylor might experience it as Importance: My need for rest did not seem to count. Both interpretations might be present, or neither might fit. Jordan may have assumed the evening was open, forgotten the earlier conversation, or known about the expectation but chosen to proceed anyway. The Three Pillars do not determine which explanation is true.

That is why the question is not, “Which Pillar did Jordan violate?” A more careful question is, “When I heard about the invitation, did I experience a loss of choice, a sense that I did not matter, something else, or no larger meaning at all?” The answer describes Taylor’s

experience. It is not an accusation disguised as a psychological assessment.

The distinction between the issue and the Loop remains intact. Saturday's plan is still the issue. The reactions and interpretations around the issue can be explored within a Loop when the person recognizes a recurrence of the full BTL progression: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The specific reactions, interpretations, and responses may differ across occasions. Repeated content, or one intense exchange, does not by itself establish that the four-stage Loop has recurred.

Autonomy: the experience of having room to choose

Autonomy can become salient when one person believes a decision has been made without their participation. The specific action might be mundane: a purchase, a family visit, a schedule change, or an assumption that the other person will handle a task.

Take a fictional exchange. A partner says, "I told my sister we could help her move Sunday." The other asks, "Why would you volunteer me without asking?" The concern may have little to do with helping the sister. It may be about agency over Sunday's time. That does not mean the moving request is unreasonable. It means that a decision process deserves separate attention from the eventual choice.

Autonomy does not require independence from all obligations. Relationships include promises, compromises, dependencies, and shared decisions. "I have agency" does not mean "I never have to account for how my choices affect someone else." Nor does it mean that every request is coercive. Ordinary requests, expectations, and negotiated commitments should not be collapsed into control.

When the person experiencing the exchange chooses to describe it, specificity helps. "I expected to be asked before my time was committed" is more informative than "You always take away my autonomy." The first identifies an observable process and a preference. The second claims a pervasive intent or pattern that might or might not be supported by the facts.

There is also a safety distinction that cannot be softened. Coercive control, intimidation, threats, retaliation, and enforced restrictions on a partner's movement or choices are not simply stronger versions of a normal Autonomy concern. Such circumstances require a safety-oriented response. Shared Loop mapping is not a substitute for assessing danger or assigning responsibility to the person using coercion.

Intelligence: the experience of being regarded as capable

A mistake can be both real and painful to discuss. Imagine a partner who paid a bill twice. The other notices and says, "Did you even check the account first?" The billing error needs correction. The phrasing may also be heard as a larger judgment about competence.

Under the Intelligence lens, the person receiving the question might notice: I felt treated as though I could not manage something basic. This does not make the billing error irrelevant. It also does not prove that the speaker regards the partner as unintelligent. The speaker may be frustrated about money, startled by the mistake, or consciously intending to insult. The available evidence must be examined rather than inferred from the hurt alone.

This distinction matters because a discussion can slide from a correctable action into a broad argument about character. "The bill was paid twice" can be checked. "You think I am incapable" is an interpretation about how the other person sees us. The interpretation may have a history and may warrant serious discussion, but it remains different from the observable payment record.

The word Intelligence is part of BTL's educational language. It is not interchangeable with competence as used in other psychological theories, and it is not a test of cognitive ability. The lens concerns perceived regard for capability in a relational moment.

A partner can also have a legitimate need for information, instruction, or accountability. Treating every correction as an attack on Intelligence would make ordinary cooperation difficult. The more careful inquiry asks whether the response addressed the task, how it was expressed, what the listener experienced, and what evidence there is for any broader conclusion.

Importance: the experience of mattering

Consider two partners who agreed to attend an event together. One arrives late and does not send a message. The waiting partner may be angry about practical consequences: missed transportation, embarrassment, or a lost reservation. They might also experience the delay as meaning, “My time does not count.”

Importance provides a way to name that possible experience. Yet “I felt unimportant while waiting” is different from “You wanted me to feel unimportant.” The first reports impact. The second attributes a motive. The distinction does not erase accountability. Repeated unreliability can require boundaries, change, or difficult decisions even when harmful intent has not been established.

Importance also does not require constant availability, agreement, or emotional reassurance. Another person's choice to rest, work, disagree, or say no does not automatically prove disregard. A demand for uninterrupted access can itself disregard the other person's agency. The lens must therefore be applied with attention to both the actual conduct and the claims being made about it.

One careful use of Importance may be the simplest: identifying the part of an experience that feels overlooked without insisting that the feeling settles every factual question. “When you canceled without telling me, I felt like our time was optional” offers a specific entry into discussion. The canceled plan remains a practical problem requiring an answer.

When more than one lens fits

The Three Pillars are not independent compartments. A decision about shared finances can concern Autonomy because one person was excluded, Intelligence because their judgment was dismissed, and Importance because their stake was ignored. None of these interpretations has to be the single correct one.

Sometimes the Pillars do not fit well. Someone may be distressed because a child is ill, rent is overdue, or a promised change has not occurred. The immediate circumstances may be enough to explain the reaction. The person need not search for hidden meaning whenever an argument becomes difficult.

Related psychological research helps illustrate the caution about overlap, but does not validate the BTL classification. Kluwer and colleagues (2020) examined autonomy and relatedness as defined

within self-determination theory, not BTL's three lenses. In an experimental study involving 220 participants, an interaction involving self-reported constructive Voice responses was not conventionally significant before adjustment for relationship affect ($p = .061$) but was statistically significant in an adjusted analysis ($p = .024$). Corresponding interactions for the other response categories were not significant. These mixed results, together with measurement and sample limitations, are a reason to resist claims that any simple set of meaning dimensions reliably predicts what partners will do.

The finding also should not be reversed into a claim that the Three Pillars have been disproved. That study did not test them. It studied different constructs using different measures. A related finding may suggest useful questions, but the direction and size of an association in that literature do not translate into a validated effect of a BTL Pillar.

The boundary between meaning and motive

There is a difference between what happened, what it meant to someone, and what another person intended.

Suppose one partner is silent after a question. The silence is an event that can be described. The listener may experience the silence as, "My concern does not matter." That is an interpretation that may be worth checking. The quiet partner may be gathering thoughts, refusing to engage, frightened, exhausted, or deliberately dismissive. The Three Pillars cannot determine the cause.

A useful description can hold all three layers apart: "I asked about the bill. You did not answer for a while. I started thinking my concern did not matter. Can you tell me what was happening for you?" This question is not a script whose effectiveness has been proven. It is an illustration of how to report an experience without presenting an interpretation as fact.

The other person's answer might clarify the situation. It might reveal a serious problem. It might be inaccurate. Checking an interpretation does not require accepting an implausible explanation or forgetting a documented pattern. It allows evidence and experience to remain distinguishable while the practical issue is addressed.

Some readers may recognize recurring experiences of being talked over, overlooked, or excluded. Those patterns deserve attention. The Three Pillars should not become a way to declare that a partner has a hidden

defect or an underlying need one can diagnose from the outside. The relevant question begins with one's own account of a moment.

Where the Pillars sit beside the Loop

Break the Loop describes an educational sequence: Launch, Overload, Old Story, and Protection Move. The Three Pillars are not a fifth stage or an alternative order. They can help a person explore why a familiar meaning, which BTL calls an Old Story, may feel consequential. That is a framework relationship, not an independently validated causal chain.

Imagine hearing, “I already took care of it.” For one person, the words simply mean a task is finished. For another, they might raise a question about Autonomy, because the decision was made without consultation. Another person may hear a challenge to Intelligence, as though they were not trusted to handle it. Someone else may connect the same words to Importance, as though their participation was unnecessary. None of these interpretations follows from the words alone.

If the reaction becomes part of a familiar Loop, it can be explored through that structure. But a Pillar is not a diagnosis of Overload, a guaranteed explanation of Old Story, or an excuse for a harmful Protection Move. The external evidence reviewed for this chapter does not independently validate the relationship between Pillars and Loop stages.

Chapter 14 examines Old Story more directly; Chapter 16 takes up Protection Move, including possible function, impact, and responsibility. This chapter's narrower job is to explain what it means to use the three lenses without turning them into assertions about what another person must have intended.

A careful way to use the classification

The most responsible use begins with one's own experience and returns to the actual issue. One might first identify the event: “The plan changed without us discussing it.” Next, one might ask what made the event personally significant. “I felt that I had no choice” identifies a possible Autonomy meaning. “I felt treated as incapable of making the decision” suggests Intelligence. “I felt that my preference did not count” suggests Importance.

Those sentences should remain revisable. A person can conclude that none of the Pillars fits, that two fit, or that the real concern is simply a

broken agreement. This is an educational reflection, not a screening instrument or a required set of statements.

Consider another fictional example. Taylor says, “I thought you would pick up the prescription.” Jordan replies, “I never said I would.” If Taylor had relied on a clear agreement, the central problem may be responsibility for a missed task. If there was no agreement, the conflict may concern an assumption. Either way, jumping to “You think I'm incompetent” or “I clearly don't matter to you” would add a conclusion that needs investigation. A Pillar may help Taylor name a felt significance, but cannot decide what was promised.

Conversely, it would also be wrong to use the framework to dismiss a complaint. “That's just your Importance Pillar” is not a response to a missed responsibility. It relocates the problem inside the person affected and may avoid the original obligation. An educational classification should help someone describe their experience, not permit someone else to overrule it.

What the evidence does and does not establish

The Three Pillars are BTL's original educational classification. At present, the reviewed research does not establish that these are three independent factors, that they exhaust the ways people experience relational significance, or that identifying them improves outcomes. No direct validation of the three-lens model was established in the bounded research review for this chapter. That statement describes the limits of the review, not proof that no future or unpublished study exists.

Adjacent studies investigate autonomy, relatedness, regard, competence, and relationship functioning. Their findings may be relevant background, but differences in constructs, samples, measures, and designs matter. Correlation is not causation. An experimental manipulation of an external construct is not an experiment on the Three Pillars. A reader should not leave this chapter believing the classification has a validated factor structure or a demonstrated treatment effect.

As an educational distinction, this guide separates an event from the personal significance someone attaches to it. A person can describe an interpretation without claiming proof of another person's mind. These are careful distinctions in the guide, not claims that a particular conversation formula reliably prevents recurrence.

When safety changes the task

Some interactions cannot responsibly be approached as ordinary shared-pattern questions. Where one person faces threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, intimidation, coercive control, fear, or retaliation, safety takes priority. Using Autonomy, Intelligence, or Importance to find an apparently mutual explanation can conceal unequal power and responsibility.

A person who is being controlled does not need to demonstrate a “Pillar trigger” to justify concern. A person engaging in harmful conduct is responsible for that conduct regardless of what they felt beforehand. Neither overload nor personal significance removes agency. The guide is relationship education, not a substitute for individualized risk assessment, therapy, legal advice, or specialized safety assistance.

The same boundary applies to the everyday use of the classification. “You hurt my Importance” cannot justify threats, surveillance, or retaliation. “I was protecting my Autonomy” cannot excuse controlling another person's access to money, movement, or support. The terms help describe experience only where doing so is safe and appropriate; they do not change standards of responsibility.

Returning to the issue

Return to Jordan and Taylor's Saturday invitation. The conversation may eventually become clearer: Taylor wanted consultation before a shared evening was promised, and also felt their need for rest had been overlooked. Jordan may acknowledge the decision without agreeing with every interpretation Taylor formed. The friends' invitation still requires a practical choice. The couple may need a better process for future plans.

A Three Pillars lens does not settle the invitation, tell us what Jordan intended, or guarantee that the next conversation will go better. It offers a way to notice why the exchange may have felt personally consequential. If the question improves precision, it has served its educational purpose. If it adds blame or obscures the issue, it is being used poorly.

The issue matters. The meaning someone attaches to it may matter too. The most useful account preserves both without mistaking an interpretation for evidence or turning a person into a category.

Chapter 16. Protection Move: What Did I Do Next?

A person can leave a disagreement believing they did everything possible to be understood. Their partner can leave the same exchange feeling that the person would not listen. Both reports may describe something important about the experience. Neither, by itself, tells us exactly what the other person intended.

Imagine being told, “You did not check with me before making that decision.” You may hear a reasonable objection. You may also hear a judgment about your competence or respect for the other person. Perhaps you begin listing every consideration that went into your choice. You explain the schedule, the cost, the alternatives, and the reasons your decision seemed reasonable. Your explanation becomes more detailed as the conversation becomes more strained.

What did you do next? You explained. Then you explained more. You might later say that you were trying to give context. The other person might say you were avoiding responsibility. Either interpretation could contain something worth examining. Neither should be treated as proof of the other's private intention.

This chapter concerns that next response: the action, words, silence, distance, or insistence that appears when a difficult moment takes on personal meaning. In Break the Loop (BTL), that response is called a **Protection Move**.

The response after the meaning

BTL organizes an educational Loop as **Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move**. The sequence is a way to examine an experience, not an independently validated account of how every conflict unfolds. Earlier chapters consider what began the moment, how capacity may have narrowed, and what familiar meaning came into view. Here the question is simpler: *What did I do next?*

The canonical definition is precise: **A Protection Move is the person’s next response as they try to manage what the moment has come to mean.** The response may be rapid, familiar, or partly outside deliberate awareness. Calling it a Protection Move does not mean that every action was planned, healthy, or justified. It

does not turn a behavior into a personality type. Nor does it establish that the person's conscious motive was self-protection.

The name invites an inquiry into possible function. People sometimes defend, explain, overexplain, correct, criticize, pursue, withdraw, shut down, fix, appease, control, try to prove a point, speak more loudly, become colder, leave, or push harder to be understood. These are examples from the BTL framework, not a scientifically validated checklist. The same visible action may have different meanings across people and situations.

Consider a person who becomes quiet. Silence might mean they are gathering their thoughts. It might reflect feeling overwhelmed, fear of saying something harmful, disengagement, deliberate punishment, or a decision to protect their own safety. A listener cannot distinguish those possibilities from silence alone. Similarly, continued questioning might be an attempt to understand a decision, a request for reassurance, pressure for an answer, or part of a coercive pattern. Calling either behavior a Protection Move does not settle which account is correct.

The distinction between **behavior and interpretation** matters. “I raised my voice” describes an action. “I raised my voice because you were disrespecting me” includes an interpretation. “I was trying to make you feel small” assigns an intention. These are different kinds of statements, and they call for different kinds of evidence.

Why a response might feel necessary

One useful question is what the response seemed to be accomplishing for the person using it. An explanation may appear to protect competence. A request for reassurance may be an attempt to regain a sense of connection. Withdrawal may create distance from an upsetting interaction. Correction may preserve a sense of accuracy or control. None of these proposed functions can be inferred reliably from the behavior by itself.

Relationship research offers useful comparisons without establishing BTL as a tested model. In an integrative review, Murray and Pascuzzi (2024) describe a risk-regulation perspective in which cues of safety, trust, and responsiveness influence movement toward connection or self-protection. The review brings together theoretical and empirical work across relational contexts. It does not show that a specific criticism, silence, or demand has one particular motive. It also does not test the BTL Protection Move construct.

The value of that comparison is modest but important: concern about safety in a relationship and concern about connection need not be opposites. People may want to remain connected while also trying to avoid an experience they anticipate as painful or diminishing. How they respond may depend on circumstances, history, available choices, and what is happening with the other person. This is a theoretical way to approach the question, not a diagnosis of a conflict participant.

Some familiar responses may also differ in whether they move *toward* another person or *away* from them. Attachment theory, for example, describes hyperactivating responses that intensify attention to relational threat and bids for closeness, as well as deactivating responses involving distance and self-reliance. These are broader theoretical patterns described in the attachment literature (Simpson & Rholes, 2017). They are not a method for identifying somebody's attachment orientation or motives from one argument, and they are not interchangeable with BTL's Protection Move.

A person who pursues an answer may be seeking reassurance, trying to resolve a practical question, or exerting pressure. Someone who withdraws may be setting a limit, avoiding a conversation they ought to address, or responding to danger. The function is a question to explore, not a verdict to impose.

That distinction also protects the ordinary legitimacy of disagreement. If someone asks where shared money went, the question itself is not necessarily hostile pursuit. If someone asks to end a conversation that has become threatening, the boundary is not necessarily unhealthy withdrawal. The context changes what the behavior means and what response is appropriate.

What the research can and cannot tell us

The research on demand–withdraw communication is relevant because it examines recognizable behaviors during conflict. A meta-analytic review by Schrodt, Witt, and Shimkowski (2014) reported associations between demand–withdraw patterns and individual, relational, and communication outcomes across a substantial body of studies. This supports discussing the pattern as a consequential interaction topic. It does not show that every demand is illegitimate, that every withdrawal is harmful, or that an observed pattern reveals the person's motive. The association should not be converted into a universal causal claim.

Smaller observational studies help illustrate why the exact direction and measurement matter. Turgeon, Julien, and Dion (1998) examined 20 selected heterosexual couples in conversations structured around wives' requests for change. In their coded interactions, wives' pursuit was followed by husbands' withdrawal at the measured lag. The reverse sequence, husbands' withdrawal followed by wives' pursuit, did not show a significant dependency in that analysis. The study therefore cannot support a statement that both directions occurred equally or that each partner inevitably escalated the other. Its sample, coding, and observational design limit how broadly the result can be used.

Research also distinguishes what happens during a conflict from how people recover afterward. In a 21-day diary study of 115 heterosexual cohabiting couples, Prager and colleagues (2019) examined reported post-conflict withdrawal and recovery. The withdrawal items concerned behavior participants described as being sulking or withdrawn; punitive intention was assessed separately. Reported withdrawal was associated with less favorable recovery on several measures. Some results differed according to perceptions of a partner's punitive behavior, and the findings about attachment anxiety were not uniformly supportive of the initial expectations. The study does not show that withdrawing caused poorer recovery or that a planned pause would have the same effect.

These studies are not measuring exactly the same thing. One examines a broad communication pattern across many studies, another tracks sequences of coded behavior in a small selected sample, and another uses daily reports after conflicts. Their measures, time frames, and populations differ. Taken together, they justify care when describing conflict behaviors and their possible consequences. They do not establish a single universal function for pursuit or withdrawal. They also do not validate BTL's four-part sequence.

The distinction matters when a response feels reasonable to the person using it. An explanation could be an attempt to clear up a misunderstanding, but the person listening may experience it as an endless defense. Distance could help someone avoid saying something regrettable, but unexplained withdrawal may leave an issue unresolved. Pressure for an answer could express urgency, yet it may also leave the other person feeling cornered. These are possible experiences, not outcomes that must occur whenever the behavior appears.

Function and impact are separate questions

BTL's central principle here is **Understanding the function does not excuse the impact.** A response can make sense to the person who uses it and still hurt someone else. An impact can be real even when the intention was different. Conversely, a person's experience of an impact does not automatically establish that the other person meant to produce it.

Return to the person who kept explaining the decision. They may have been attempting to show they were competent and thoughtful. Their partner may have experienced the explanation as a refusal to acknowledge the original concern. Both statements can be examined without treating the proposed motive as proven.

The conversation might have contained a legitimate issue: a shared decision was made without consultation. That issue remains worth addressing even if the person who made the decision felt criticized. A Protection Move explanation should not redirect attention so completely toward the speaker's discomfort that the original problem disappears.

A useful separation is:

- **What I did:** "I listed my reasons and kept talking after you asked me to stop."

- **What I may have been trying to do:** "I wanted you to understand that I had not acted carelessly."

- **What you experienced:** "You felt that I was arguing against the concern instead of hearing it."

- **What remains my responsibility:** "I can acknowledge the decision and consider what needs to change."

The second line is a first-person account, not independent proof. The third is an account of experience, not proof of the first person's intention. The fourth is where understanding can become accountability.

Function is not a defense that automatically wins an argument. "I was only trying to protect myself" cannot erase intimidation, cruelty, coercion, or repeated disregard for another person's stated limits. The issue is not whether a response can be described sympathetically. The issue is whether the person can examine its effects, take appropriate

responsibility, and make a different choice when a different choice is available.

The same action can have more than one possible function

A Protection Move is not an inventory of bad habits. It is an invitation to notice a familiar response and investigate what it seemed to be for. The examples below are illustrative BTL possibilities, not validated one-to-one correspondences between behavior, motive, and impact.

Possible Protection Move	Possible function to explore	Possible effect to check, not assume
Defending or overexplaining	Protect competence or be understood	The concern may feel unanswered
Repeated questioning or pursuing	Seek clarity or reassurance	The other person may feel pressured
Withdrawing or becoming quiet	Create space or stop escalation	The issue may remain unaddressed
Correcting details	Preserve accuracy or dignity	The larger concern may be lost
Appeasing or agreeing quickly	End conflict or preserve connection	Genuine disagreement may remain hidden
Criticizing or becoming louder	Make a concern register	The other person may experience hostility

An individual's actual function may be different, mixed, or unclear even to them. Effects depend on the interaction, and some behaviors can be harmful regardless of a sympathetic explanation. A table should not become a way of telling a partner what they were “really” doing.

The distinction between an intentional pause and withdrawal deserves special attention. A person may say, “I cannot think clearly enough to discuss this safely right now. I will come back to it after I have had some time.” Depending on circumstances, that can be a boundary or a way to keep the conversation from worsening. Silence imposed as punishment, an indefinite refusal to address an obligation, and leaving because of threats are not equivalent situations. BTL should not collapse them into one category simply because the behavior includes distance.

Similarly, reassurance-seeking can be a straightforward request for comfort or information. Repeated demands for proof of loyalty may have a different relational effect, especially if a refusal is punished. It would be a mistake to call every request for reassurance excessive; it would also be a mistake to treat repeated controlling demands as harmless because reassurance is the named function.

Possible functions are questions, not permissions. People remain responsible for what they say and do, including when their reactions arise in a difficult moment.

A short example: being right and being heard

Jordan and Taylor are discussing plans for the weekend. Jordan agreed to host relatives without checking whether Taylor had already made arrangements. Taylor says, “I needed you to ask first.”

Jordan replies, “I looked at the calendar. Nothing was written down, and we have hosted them before.” Taylor says, “The point is that I wasn't included.” Jordan continues: “I also checked the timing, and it won't interfere with anything we normally do.”

The additional explanation may matter to Jordan. The reason for the decision may not be entirely unreasonable. But Taylor's concern was about being consulted, not primarily about whether the calendar could accommodate the visit. Jordan's continuing defense shifts the conversation from a decision to a dispute over whether the decision was sensible.

If Jordan later reflects, “I thought I was being accused of being careless,” that is an account of the meaning Jordan experienced. It does not mean Taylor intended to call Jordan careless. If Jordan says, “I was trying to show you I had thought about it,” that may help explain the overexplaining. It does not undo the missed consultation.

Jordan could begin with an acknowledgment of the issue and still retain the right to explain relevant practical details. For instance: “I made that plan without asking. I can see why that matters. I also want to explain what I had considered, but first I need to address the decision itself.” This is an illustration of a possible next choice, not a proven script for improving conflict outcomes.

The essential observation is not that Jordan has a defective personality or that Taylor is always correct. It is that Jordan can identify a response and examine whether it accomplished what Jordan actually wanted.

The original issue remains present. Pattern recognition should make that issue easier to address, not replace it.

What belongs to me

A Protection Move becomes useful as a concept when it directs attention toward one's own conduct. “You always withdraw when I ask for something” may be an accusation about another person. “When I thought you were dismissing me, I asked the question again and again” identifies a possible sequence one can examine. Neither guarantees an accurate explanation of the other's mind.

The working inquiry has four parts in BTL: **Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice**. It begins with a behavior that can be described. It then asks what that behavior may have been trying to accomplish, what mattered underneath it, and what choice could better serve that legitimate concern without repeating the same cost. The sequence is a BTL educational tool; the reviewed research does not establish its efficacy.

The questions can remain concrete:

Protection Move: What did I actually do or say? What might a recording have shown? Where is my report already an interpretation?

Function: What did I hope the response would accomplish, or what problem did it seem to solve for me? Am I describing my own experience, or claiming knowledge of somebody else's intention?

Need: What mattered in that moment? Was I trying to be understood, have a say, maintain dignity, create space, or receive reassurance? Could several concerns have been present at once?

Next Choice: What response could better reflect what I want without dismissing the legitimate issue or the effect of my earlier behavior? What responsibility remains even if my intended function was understandable?

For example, a person who kept correcting details might discover that being viewed as competent mattered greatly. The next choice need not be pretending accuracy is irrelevant. It might be to acknowledge the other's concern before clarifying a fact. Another person might recognize that repeated questioning was connected with wanting reassurance, and decide to ask directly for that reassurance without making the partner prove loyalty. These are illustrative possibilities, not evidence that a prescribed wording will produce a particular outcome.

The inquiry also has a limit. If someone cannot identify the function of a response, they need not invent one. “I am not sure why I did that” is more accurate than an attractive explanation without support. A person can take responsibility for an action even without having a complete theory of its origins.

Agency without pretending every moment is easy

One reason for separating the response from the person is to preserve the possibility of choice. “I withdraw” is a description of something a person may do. “I am the withdrawing one” can make an action sound like a fixed identity. BTL does not use Protection Move as a diagnosis, trait label, or excuse for inaction.

Choices may become harder to recognize when someone feels upset or overwhelmed. That difficulty does not eliminate agency. It also does not make every person equally powerful or equally responsible in a particular interaction. People can be constrained by circumstances while remaining accountable for conduct within their control. Recognizing that a behavior felt urgent is not a declaration that it was inevitable.

A next choice need not be dramatic. It may involve stopping a repeated correction, acknowledging the concern before explaining, asking for space with a clear boundary, or declining to pursue a discussion that has become unsafe. The chapter is not claiming that any one of these choices will reliably improve every couple's relationship. Its narrower purpose is to clarify what a person might be choosing between.

A different response also cannot substitute for addressing a genuine issue. If shared money was spent without agreement, the financial decision still needs attention. If commitments were broken, the breach remains. A discussion of Protection Moves should never be used to shift attention away from the person who created the problem simply because the other person's reaction was imperfect.

When a shared-pattern explanation is not appropriate

This chapter concerns recurring couple conflict, not violence or coercive control. Threats, intimidation, stalking, sexual coercion, retaliation, or fear of a partner require a different safety assessment. In such situations, labeling the affected person's actions as one half of a mutual Loop can obscure responsibility and increase risk. A person leaving or

refusing a conversation for safety should not be described as engaging in an ordinary unhealthy withdrawal pattern.

Nor does naming a possible self-protective function excuse abusive conduct. A person who threatens a partner may claim fear, shame, or a need for control. That claimed function cannot convert threats into normal couple conflict. Accountability, safety, and appropriate professional support take precedence over shared-pattern exercises. Relationship education is not a substitute for individualized assessment or care when safety is at issue.

For ordinary disagreements, two people may both have responses worth examining. That observation does not mean their responsibility, power, or effects are equal. Where a significant imbalance exists, good analysis preserves the imbalance rather than forcing both people into a symmetrical story.

Seeing the response without losing the issue

The most useful question at the end of a difficult exchange may not be "Why am I like this?" It may be "What did I do next, and what was I hoping that response would accomplish?" A person may discover that the answer includes a reasonable wish and an ineffective or harmful behavior. Those do not cancel each other out.

The purpose of Protection Move is to make that distinction visible. The behavior can be named without making it an identity. Its possible function can be considered without being treated as proven. Its impact can be taken seriously without assuming the person intended that impact. And the original issue can remain on the table.

Chapter 17 considers what happens when two people's responses are experienced in relation to one another. That relational question is important, but it begins with a more limited responsibility: being able to describe one's own response accurately, consider what it may have been for, and remain answerable for what it did.

Understanding the function does not excuse the impact.

Chapter 17. How Two Loops Become One Recurring Pattern

When my response becomes your next moment

Two people can walk away from a disagreement with different accounts of what happened. One remembers asking an ordinary question. The other remembers the sharpness of the question. One recalls trying to clarify a decision. The other recalls being talked over. Neither account necessarily captures the whole exchange, and neither person can reliably infer the other's private intention from the exchange alone.

The question in this chapter is how those experiences connect. In the Break the Loop (BTL) framework, each partner can describe a sequence of Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The sequence is an educational way of organizing an experience, not a test that independently establishes what was happening inside someone else's mind. What one person does near the end of a sequence can enter the other person's experience at the beginning of theirs. One person's Protection Move can become the other person's next Launch.

That principle helps distinguish an individual response from an interaction. It also has limits. It does not imply that both partners intended harm, contributed equally, or share responsibility for conduct that belongs to one of them. Nor does it mean that recurring conflict indicates an unhappy relationship. Couples can value their relationship and still return to a familiar argument. A pattern is something to examine, not a diagnosis of the people in it.

Two people, two experiences

Imagine that Taylor and Jordan are discussing a weekend plan. Jordan has agreed to host friends without first checking Taylor's schedule. Taylor says, "I wish you'd asked me before deciding." Jordan replies, "I checked the calendar. Nothing was there." Taylor repeats, "That's not the point. I wanted to be included." Jordan lists more reasons why the invitation was reasonable. Taylor becomes quieter. Jordan notices the silence and asks, "Why are you shutting down?"

There is an actual issue here: Jordan made a shared plan without consulting Taylor. The issue does not evaporate when the couple's responses become difficult. This matters because a relational pattern map can otherwise distract from the decision or responsibility that started the exchange.

Now consider the experiences they might report afterward. Jordan might say, "I heard the complaint as 'You never think things through.' I kept explaining because I wanted Taylor to understand that I had considered the practical details." Taylor might say, "Every additional explanation made me feel that my wish to be consulted wasn't being heard. I stopped talking because I didn't know how to say it again."

These reports are possible, not facts we can derive from the dialogue. We can observe explanations, repetition, and silence. Whether Jordan felt accused of incompetence, or Taylor felt unimportant, would need to come from their own accounts and remain open to correction. Jordan's explanation cannot establish what Taylor intended by the original request. Taylor's experience of being ignored cannot by itself prove Jordan meant to dismiss them.

Under BTL, each partner may be able to describe a separate Loop. Jordan's possible Launch is hearing the concern about the decision. Overload is the reported sense of urgency or narrowing capacity to hear it fully. An Old Story might be "You think I can't make a good decision." Jordan's Protection Move is repeated defense or overexplanation. Taylor may then experience that explanation as a new Launch. Taylor's own Overload and Old Story, if present, may lead to withdrawing, repeating the complaint, criticizing, or another Protection Move.

This is a provisional map of an illustrative interaction. The point is not to assign one correct inner sequence to each partner. It is to show where inquiry could begin. A person can recognize their observable response without knowing exactly what it meant to the other person.

The connection between the Loops

A Loop is not located in one partner as a trait. It is a description of an experience and response. In a continuing conversation, responses are not isolated events. Each person hears or observes something that the other says or does. What one partner meant to accomplish and what the other experiences may differ.

The proposed relational connection can be drawn simply:

Partner A: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move

Partner B: [A's Protection Move may be experienced as a new Launch]

→ Overload → Old Story → Protection Move

Partner A again: [B's Protection Move may become the next Launch]

The bracketed transitions are possibilities, not inevitable causal links. Nothing in this figure means that a partner must complete all four steps, that the sequence always runs in the same order in lived experience, or that a second Loop can be diagnosed by watching the first. The figure shows a way of asking about connection, not a measurement result.

A person might think, "I was only explaining," while the other thinks, "I am being argued with." Someone may ask a question to obtain clarity, while the other experiences it as pressure. Silence may be an attempt to collect thoughts, a deliberate refusal to engage, or a necessary departure from an unsafe interaction. The same outward category cannot tell us which account is true. Function must be explored; it must not be assigned from a distance.

What matters is the transition from an action to an experience. An explanation becomes something the other person has to interpret. A repeated request may become something the other person must respond to. An interruption, a pause, a correction, or a refusal can change what is happening next. BTL offers language for noticing that transition without assuming a partner's mind can be read.

What research can actually observe

Researchers can study parts of couple interaction without studying the complete BTL sequence. In one laboratory study, Dermody and colleagues (2025) examined a 15-minute conflict discussion involving 139 heterosexual couples selected from an alcohol-related research sample. Coded negative behavior was associated with the partner's next response being negative rather than neutral. That is evidence of a within-discussion association in a particular sample; it does not show that one partner's action caused the other's response, or that the same pair repeated an identical sequence in later arguments (Dermody et al., 2025).

The findings were not simply a story of negative behavior feeding negative behavior. The researchers also examined positive responses and changes over the course of the conversation. Observed interactions may involve more than one direction of response. That is important when a diagram appears to portray a permanent downward spiral. A drawing of possible influence is not a prediction that the conversation must deteriorate.

Other research makes context relevant. In a study of 182 married couples, demand-withdraw positions differed across discussion contexts. A partner's role in an exchange therefore should not be treated as a fixed identity or a position that is necessarily the same regardless of the topic or situation (Eldridge et al., 2007).

A recent pooled analysis adds another qualification. Wojda-Burlij and colleagues (2026) examined coded discussions from 1,957 mixed-gender couples across 13 studies. One communication profile combined high negative reciprocity with substantial positive behavior and relatively high reported relationship satisfaction. The finding challenges the assumption that observing negative reciprocity alone identifies an unhappy relationship. It does not mean recurring conflict is harmless, nor does it tell us whether these couples repeated the same sequences over time. A profile derived from one selected discussion per couple is not a stable personality or relationship type (Wojda-Burlij et al., 2026).

These studies measure different things from a BTL Loop. Observers can code speech or behavior. Researchers can compare response transitions, communication profiles, and self-reported satisfaction. Such measures do not establish the privately experienced Old Story of either partner. They also do not validate BTL's four-part structure, its full relational diagram, or the effectiveness of BTL instruction.

The strongest bounded conclusion is that partners' behavior is interdependent in observed interactions, and that the form and meaning of those interactions vary with context. BTL then offers a separate educational vocabulary for asking how each person experienced and responded to an exchange.

Recurring does not mean identical

When couples describe "the same fight," they may mean that a recognizable difficulty keeps returning, not that every sentence and response occur in precisely the same order. In BTL, the proposed

recurring Loop is the progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. One argument may concern household decisions and another an invitation to family members. The particular emotions, meanings, beliefs, and Protection Moves may differ between them. Recognizing a familiar feeling or repeated urge can help someone investigate a possible Loop, but neither detail by itself establishes recurrence of the four-stage progression. The correspondence remains a hypothesis to examine, not something that can be asserted from a single exchange.

The distinction matters for evidence. Sequential observations within one conversation tell us something about how responses follow one another during that observation. They do not automatically show that a specific couple repeats the same full sequence across days, topics, and settings. The project's research review retains that missing direct demonstration as a limitation. It would be inaccurate to say that research has established every couple's recurring four-stage BTL sequence.

It would also be inaccurate to dismiss what partners report because the exact sequence has not been independently documented. People can notice a familiar experience and investigate it. The responsible wording is that a similar pattern may be recognizable to them, and that examining it might help them describe what happens. Whether a proposed map fits a couple's experiences is a question they can test against their own accounts, not an outcome guaranteed by the framework.

The pattern can change. A partner may ask differently on one occasion, react differently on another, or recognize that a particular topic carries distinct obligations. Context matters. So do fatigue, misunderstanding, priorities, and what has actually occurred before the exchange. There is no need to force every conflict into one permanent script.

The issue remains real

The two-Loop diagram risks becoming too tidy if it treats all disagreements as equivalent cycles of misperception. Some conflicts begin with a consequential decision, an unmet commitment, or a

behavior that requires direct accountability. Taylor's concern in the weekend example is not merely a Launch to be managed; it is also a substantive request for inclusion in shared decisions.

Jordan might genuinely feel misunderstood. Jordan might also be responsible for making the plan without consultation. These can both be true. An explanation of Jordan's defensive response cannot erase the underlying issue. Likewise, Taylor might find that withdrawing prevented further explanation, but that does not make Taylor equally responsible for the original decision.

The distinction Issue ≠ Loop helps here. The issue asks what the partners must address. The Loop asks whether familiar responses are making that discussion harder to navigate. Neither question substitutes for the other. Someone can change a Protection Move while still needing to correct a decision, honor an agreement, or acknowledge harm. And someone can legitimately insist on the issue without agreeing to treat every reaction as their contribution to a mutual problem.

This is also why Pattern ≠ Person matters. Saying "you are the defensive one" converts an observed response into an identity. Saying "I kept defending the decision after you said you wanted to be consulted" identifies something observable and potentially changeable. That shift preserves responsibility without making the person synonymous with a behavior.

Influence does not divide responsibility equally

Reciprocity describes possible influence between responses. It is not a formula for dividing blame. Two people can affect what happens next while carrying different responsibilities for what they did, what they controlled, and what consequences followed. One partner's remark may be careless; another's subsequent threat is a separate act for which the person making the threat remains responsible. The fact that the acts

occurred in sequence does not make them equally harmful or equally chosen.

This distinction becomes an overriding safety boundary in situations involving coercive control, violence, stalking, threats, intimidation, sexual coercion, fear, or retaliation. BTL's shared-pattern explanation is not appropriate for turning those situations into symmetrical accounts of "our Loop." Protective withdrawal or leaving an unsafe interaction is not an unhealthy Protection Move to correct for a partner's comfort. Relationship education cannot replace assessment, safety planning, or specialized support where these concerns are present.

Even outside situations of abuse, an account of influence is not an excuse. "I felt criticized" does not authorize cruelty. "I wanted to be heard" does not authorize intimidation. "I was overwhelmed" does not remove agency. A person may explain what made a choice difficult while remaining answerable for what they did. Understanding a function does not excuse an impact.

The safer and more accurate approach is to ask what belongs to each person rather than presuming a fifty-fifty division. Where the interaction is safe to examine, each partner may describe their experience. Where power, threat, or retaliation makes that unsafe, mutual mapping should not be the default activity.

Mapping without mind reading

The practical value of the two-Loop idea lies in what it asks a person to notice about their own behavior. It is tempting to begin with a diagnosis of the other person's response: "You got defensive because you can't stand being wrong," or "You went silent because you wanted to punish me." Those are interpretations presented as facts. They may be mistaken, and they often close the space for the other person to describe an experience accurately.

A person can instead begin with a bounded account: "When you said I should have asked first, I felt an urgent need to explain my decision. I listed reasons instead of responding to the request." That statement identifies an observed Protection Move and a reported experience without claiming to know the partner's intention. It also leaves the original issue available for discussion.

The person may then explore the BTL inquiry Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice. What did I actually do? What did I

hope that action would accomplish? What mattered to me? What could I choose differently while still addressing the issue and its consequences? These questions are educational prompts, not validated tests of underlying motivation or a guarantee that one selected next choice will resolve a dispute.

For Jordan, a next choice might involve acknowledging the consultation issue before explaining the calendar. For Taylor, if it is safe and useful, it might involve saying directly that the additional reasons do not answer the concern. Neither action is prescribed as the correct response in all couples or contexts. Both are examples of ways someone might identify a choice that belongs to them.

BTL's interruption sequence, NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT, can support that inquiry. Naming identifies a possible pattern without making an accusation. Slowing creates room to notice a response before adding to the interaction. Checking distinguishes the person's experience from a proven fact about the partner. Choosing asks what action is available, including accountability for the issue. This is the framework's educational sequence; the cited observational studies did not test its effectiveness.

A partner's account may not match the other partner's account. That is not automatically proof that one person is deceptive. People attend to different moments and make different interpretations. At the same time, accuracy does not require treating every account as equally supported. Concrete actions, agreements, harm, and safety conditions still matter. A useful map makes room for both subjectivity and evidence rather than collapsing them.

One connected pattern, two accountable people

Return to Taylor and Jordan. If they recognize a familiar exchange, they might describe it as follows: the concern about consultation reaches Jordan as criticism; Jordan explains; Taylor experiences the explanation as dismissal; Taylor grows quiet; Jordan interprets the

quiet as refusal to engage. They might also discover that the description does not fit one partner's actual experience. The point is to check the map, not to win an argument by naming a Loop.

If the pattern does fit, the recognition can make more than one choice visible. Jordan can attend to the consultation issue before defending the logistics. Taylor can decide what to communicate about the experience of not being heard. Both can distinguish an interpretation from a fact. Neither has to accept a fictional symmetry in the original decision, nor is anyone required to continue a harmful or unsafe conversation for the sake of completing an exercise.

Chapter 17's central claim is therefore deliberately limited. In BTL, an individual's Protection Move can become part of what the other person experiences as a Launch. That offers a way to examine how separate accounts become connected. Observational research offers narrower evidence of interaction and variability, not a proof of the framework's full sequence or efficacy. Recurrence does not require relationship dissatisfaction, and mutual influence does not require equal responsibility.

The next chapter examines how to read research-described interaction patterns without mistaking them for the BTL four-part sequence or for fixed labels about partners. Those descriptions remain provisional, context-sensitive, and subordinate to what actually happened.

Chapter 18. How to Read Interaction Patterns

Research on couple conflict describes several forms of interaction. These descriptions can help a reader notice what occurs during disagreement, compare observations with the limits of a studied construct, and ask what remains unknown. They are not a catalog of kinds of people. They cannot tell a reader who a partner is, what that partner secretly intended, or whether a relationship is healthy or unsafe.

The distinction matters because a pattern name can be useful shorthand and a misleading label. Saying that a conversation contained demanding and withdrawing behavior directs attention to an interaction. Saying that one partner is “the demander” and the other is “the withdrawer” can make temporary positions sound like permanent identities. Use research terms to describe observable possibilities, not to assign fixed roles that people must occupy.

What an interaction description can tell you

Begin with a recognizable interaction form. Ask what the exchange looked like, how one response may have followed another, what each person reports experiencing, and what meanings they assigned to it. Then identify the limits of that description. An observable silence is not proof of indifference. A repeated question is not, by itself, proof of controlling intent. An explanation can be an attempt to clarify, defend, avoid responsibility, or simply supply information. The context and the person’s account matter.

Research on couple interaction can describe behaviors that occur together or in sequence, but a research measure may capture only part of an encounter. A laboratory discussion, daily report, and questionnaire do not necessarily describe the same phenomenon. In reading any research-described interaction, distinguish what was observed or reported from a possible interpretation. Consult the relevant research rather than treating a fictional example as evidence.

Consider a disagreement over a household expense. One person asks several questions about a purchase. The other begins defending the decision, then stops speaking. Someone observing the exchange might identify questioning, explanation, and disengagement. The observer cannot conclude from those behaviors alone that the first partner

wanted control or that the second wanted to punish them. The original financial question may be legitimate. The interaction pattern and the underlying issue remain separate, and both may need attention.

Patterns are not personalities

Pattern names describe positions in exchanges. They do not establish psychological types, diagnoses, or enduring character traits. Even familiar terms from relationship research should be read this way. In a study of 182 married couples, observed demand-withdraw roles differed across discussion contexts (Eldridge et al., 2007). That does not mean every couple reverses roles or that context explains every role change. It does demonstrate why a single exchange should not be turned into a permanent portrait of either partner.

People may respond differently when a topic matters more to one partner, when the timing changes, or when their capacity to participate differs. One person may seek discussion about money and need distance during a discussion about relatives. The other may show the reverse. A research description identifies a possible interaction, not a rule that determines what either individual will do next.

Recognizing a pattern can improve the accuracy of a description. It should not become a new accusation. “I noticed that I kept pressing after you said you needed a break” is more informative than “You are always the avoidant one.” The first statement describes a potentially examinable event. The second turns a contested interpretation into an identity claim.

Patterns can overlap

Separately named research descriptions can help distinguish behaviors, but real exchanges do not have to fit neatly into those divisions. A conversation may include questions followed by defensiveness, criticism followed by countercriticism, and pressure followed by silence. These may be different views of one exchange rather than three independent patterns.

Overlap is especially important when one named interaction resembles another. Distinct terms do not automatically mean that two descriptions are scientifically distinct. Some labels refer to studied research constructs. Others are provisional educational groupings used to organize observations. The fact that an interaction is easy to recognize does not establish that it forms a separate, validated category.

A reader can consider several descriptions provisionally without choosing one "correct" diagnosis. What matters is whether a description helps identify actual behavior and clarify what remains uncertain. If no label fits, nothing is wrong with the observation. Research terminology is a limited aid to understanding, not an exhaustive map of every possible exchange.

The same issue is not always the same pattern

It is possible to revisit one issue through different interaction processes. A couple might discuss money calmly on one occasion, become stuck in repeated explanations on another, and withdraw from the conversation on a third. Conversely, a similar form of interaction may appear while discussing money, family obligations, or a change of plans.

These are distinctions to investigate, not guarantees of cross-topic consistency. The current research record does not establish that every couple repeats an identical sequence across topics or conflict episodes. Evidence about overall behavior, behavior during a single discussion, and recurrence across separate discussions must not be treated as interchangeable. Comparing encounters may be useful without claiming a universal recurring script.

When looking for repetition, record specific moments instead of relying only on a strong feeling of familiarity. What happened first? What did each person actually say or do? Did the conversation change direction? Was the same pattern present last time, or did the experiences merely feel similar? Answers may be incomplete. An accurate "I do not know" is more useful than supplying a motive or sequence that was never observed.

How to distinguish the evidence behind a description

The evidence basis matters as much as the label. A documented research pattern refers to an interaction form examined in external research, within the limits of its measurement, methods, and samples. Demand-withdraw is one example of a research tradition that has studied particular complementary behaviors. A named pattern is not necessarily universal, harmful in every context, or evidence that either participant has a fixed identity.

A research-informed synthesis combines findings or concepts to make an interaction easier to understand. The synthesis may be useful without having been evaluated as a distinct pattern. A BTL-specific

construct is a term or organization belonging to Break the Loop, rather than a standardized scientific category. A provisional candidate is a proposed grouping whose conceptual distinctness or evidentiary basis still needs review.

These distinctions should not be collapsed. A research-described interaction pattern such as demand-withdraw identifies complementary behaviors or patterns of responding; it is not itself a BTL Loop. Within BTL, the proposed recurring pattern is the progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move, even when the topic, emotion, particular Old Story, or Protection Move differs between occasions. Evidence of criticism, withdrawal, emotional arousal, or attribution does not independently validate that full sequence. This is an educational organization, not a research finding that all couples follow four identical stages. When applying BTL, identify only the stages responsibly supported by the person's account; leave unknown stages unknown.

The distinction also applies to statistical classifications. In a pooled observational analysis of 1,957 mixed-gender couples, researchers identified multiple communication profiles from coded laboratory discussions. One profile with relatively high negative reciprocity also had relatively high reported relationship satisfaction (Wojda-Burlij et al., 2026). This is a limited descriptive finding, not evidence that negativity is desirable. More importantly, profiles derived from one ten-minute discussion are not permanent couple identities or demonstrations of repeated sequences across daily life.

What a description cannot establish

A disciplined account can ask about the observable form, possible ordering of responses, each person's reported experience, relevant meanings, research constructs, and what not to assume. Those questions are prompts for inquiry, not a validated classification method. Even when one response appears to follow another, the

description does not establish that a specific sequence is causally reinforced across later conflicts.

Consider common responses, contexts in which an exchange occurred, related research constructs, and places where a different choice might be available. Within BTL, some responses may be examined as Protection Moves, but an apparent function is a question to investigate, not a justification for harm. A person who withdraws may be overwhelmed, disengaged, attempting to punish, setting a legitimate boundary, or taking a needed pause. The same visible movement can have different meanings and consequences.

The question "What should I not assume?" is central. A description cannot establish motive, personality, causation, or equal responsibility where that evidence is absent. References should identify research relevant to the specific claim. Fictional examples illustrate how the ideas might appear; they are not proof that a described sequence is common or inevitable.

A brief way to examine an interaction

Begin with a disagreement you can describe without inventing anyone's motives. Write down the issue and then the interaction: what was said, what changed, and what followed. If a research-described form seems relevant, compare the observation with the construct's actual definition, methods, and limitations. A resemblance alone does not establish a diagnosis or the recurrence of a full BTL Loop.

Next, consider differences as carefully as similarities. Did one person set a clear boundary rather than simply withdraw? Did the same person occupy a different position on another occasion? Is the original concern still unresolved? If you have only one person's account, acknowledge that the other person's experience remains unknown. The goal is to make observation more precise and assumptions less automatic.

If BTL language is useful, map only what can responsibly be identified: a possible Launch, signs of Overload, a familiar Old Story, and a Protection Move. Do not force all four positions into every exchange. The broader educational goal is to recognize a response with enough clarity to consider another choice, not to produce a perfect diagram of the relationship.

Safety and responsibility come first

Describing interaction patterns is not the primary approach for understanding coercive control, intimidation, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, fear of retaliation, or related abuse. In those circumstances, shared-pattern language can obscure power differences and wrongly suggest equal responsibility. Safety, accountability, and appropriately specialized support take priority. The person experiencing harm should not be asked to make an unsafe conversation work by finding a better response in the Loop.

Even outside those situations, a mutual sequence does not imply that each partner contributed equally. One person's behavior can be more harmful, or one partner can have a legitimate boundary or grievance. Recognizing interaction does not erase responsibility for the behavior itself. Nor does choosing to end an unsafe or unproductive conversation automatically amount to an unhealthy pattern.

The purpose of recognition

Research terms and BTL vocabulary can support examination of an exchange, not a verdict about a person or relationship. Pattern names should remain revisable descriptions. Explanations should remain distinguishable from observations. Examples should remain examples, and claims about evidence should say exactly what the research supports.

A useful examination ends with more precise questions: What did I observe? What am I inferring? What matters about the underlying issue? What remains unknown? What response, if any, is available to me without minimizing harm or surrendering a boundary? Those questions are more valuable than finding a label that appears to explain everything.

Chapter 19 turns from research-described interaction forms to money as a substantive issue. A specific topic can matter on its own terms even when a BTL Loop may also unfold around it.

PART IV | THE ISSUES THAT MATTER

Chapter 19. Money

When the numbers are real and the argument returns

A couple opens the credit-card statement. One partner asks about a charge. The other hears an accusation. They have discussed the household budget before, and the conversation quickly takes on a familiar shape. One asks for an explanation. The other points to recent sacrifices. The first presses for specifics; the second becomes quieter. By the time they stop talking, the charge has not been explained, the budget remains unsettled, and both believe the other has missed the point.

The charge is not a pretext. It may affect the rent, the next payment, or whether the household can meet a savings goal. The people involved may have genuinely different ideas about what was agreed, what is affordable, and who bears the consequences. Yet those real questions can also become the setting for a possible BTL Loop: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. An expectation, interpretation, or response alone does not establish that the four-stage progression recurred.

The distinction between issue and Loop is developed in Chapter 2. Here it is applied specifically to financial decisions. The **issue** is the financial matter that needs attention. A **Loop**, in Break the Loop (BTL), is the proposed recurring progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move around that matter. The particular financial topic, meaning, and response need not be identical across episodes. Finding a pattern must not become a way to avoid the numbers, excuse broken agreements, or make one partner responsible for circumstances they did not create.

Money disagreements do not all look alike. Couples can dispute everyday expenses, debt, income, uneven contributions, joint decisions,

financial priorities, or actions that occurred without agreement. In two studies of people reporting financial disagreements, the subjects ranged across who contributed what, employment and income, everyday costs, different values, unilateral decisions, and conduct described as irresponsible. The samples were selected rather than representative of all couples, so the findings describe a range of reported disputes, not their universal frequency (Peetz et al., 2023).

Financial disagreement is not a single kind of conflict

Arguments about spending and saving often involve incompatible but understandable priorities. One person may want to preserve a cushion against future uncertainty. Another may regard a purchase or trip as an appropriate use of money after a difficult period. They can understand each other's reasons and still disagree about the decision. Neither explanation, by itself, establishes that one is careless or the other is controlling.

Debt introduces obligations extending beyond the immediate conversation. A payment due next month constrains choices available today. Income changes may narrow those choices further. Disclosing a debt, identifying the terms of repayment, or reviewing an account may be necessary regardless of how calmly the discussion begins. Conflict skills cannot replace accurate records, workable agreements, or professional financial advice when needed.

Some disagreements concern who is expected to track, plan, or remember the family's expenses. Others concern what should count as an equal contribution when earnings, caregiving, disability, employment, or other circumstances differ. A split that looks equal in dollars may not feel fair in time, risk, or access to discretionary funds. Fairness cannot be settled simply by naming each person's emotional reaction. It requires an examination of the arrangement itself.

In a US study of married adults ages 18–45, higher economic pressure was associated with more frequent reported financial conflict. The associations of communication satisfaction and earnings arrangements were more conditional: some were not statistically significant after additional relationship variables were included, and some differed between wives' and husbands' reports. These were observational findings, not tests of what causes disputes or what any particular couple should do (Dew & Stewart, 2012).

Financial conditions therefore belong in the explanation rather than being treated as background noise. A household confronting an income interruption may face genuine constraints even when its members communicate well. A household with substantial resources may disagree over ownership, control, risk, or priorities. The interaction pattern is important, but it is not a substitute for material context.

What makes a money conversation feel familiar?

Consider a fictional couple, Jordan and Taylor. They have an agreement to discuss purchases above a certain amount. Taylor buys something without checking. Jordan notices it and asks why. Jordan's question can be a reasonable request for accountability. Taylor may nevertheless interpret the tone as evidence of being treated like a child. Taylor replies with a list of bills they recently handled. Jordan hears an attempt to change the subject and repeats the question more sharply. Taylor leaves the room.

We cannot know Taylor's intention from that exchange alone, and we should not assume that Jordan's tone was the original cause. The missed agreement remains the concrete issue. If a similar sequence appears on later occasions, the couple can examine how their responses interact with it.

As described in the earlier chapters, BTL represents one possible recurring sequence as **Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move**. In this example, the question about the charge might be the Launch. Overload refers to a narrowing of available attention and response flexibility, not a loss of agency. An Old Story might be the familiar interpretation, “You don't trust me,” or “I am carrying this alone.” Those statements are hypotheses to check, not established facts about what either person believes. A Protection Move might involve counter-arguing, withdrawing, pressing harder, appeasing, or trying to take over the decision. These categories organize reflection; the financial-conflict studies cited in this chapter did not directly test the four-stage BTL sequence.

Notice that one person's Protection Move can become the next event the other person reacts to. Jordan may experience Taylor's withdrawal as avoidance. Taylor may experience Jordan's increasingly urgent questions as interrogation. This possible reciprocity does **not** establish equal responsibility. Taylor still has to account for the purchase if it breached an agreement, and Jordan remains accountable for their own

conduct. One action need not be excused simply because another action followed it.

The previously introduced BTL meaning lenses, **Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance**, can help the couple explore the significance they attach to the exchange. A question about spending might feel like a question about whether someone is free to decide, whether their judgment is respected, or whether their contribution matters. These lenses are part of BTL's educational organization. They are not empirically established dimensions of financial disagreements, and a partner should not assign one to the other as a diagnosis.

Frequency is not the same as importance

Not every frequently discussed subject is especially difficult, and not every difficult financial issue is discussed often. In one 15-day diary study of 100 married parent couples in the United States, money was not the most frequently reported disagreement topic. Yet money disagreements tended to be rated as more important, and husbands were more likely to identify them as recurring. Several proposed differences in emotional expression and resolution were not statistically reliable. The sample was small, mostly White, and limited to established heterosexual marriages with children, so the pattern should not be presented as typical of all relationships (Papp, Cummings, et al., 2009).

This distinction helps explain why two couples can report a similar number of money conversations but have very different experiences. One pair may revisit a budget often because they manage it collaboratively. Another may avoid the subject until a deadline forces it into the open. Conversation frequency alone does not tell us whether either relationship has a recurring Loop.

A more recent observational study followed 136 couples over one month. Greater self-reported quality of financial communication, rather than the sheer frequency of money conversations, was associated with relationship satisfaction at the end of the month after accounting for earlier satisfaction. Frequency did not show the same general association. The study was not preregistered and its volunteer sample was predominantly White, mixed-sex, and based in the United Kingdom; it did not establish that changing communication quality causes greater satisfaction (Peetz & Saxey, 2026).

The practical implication is modest but useful: asking “Have we discussed it enough?” is not the same as asking “Were we able to examine the question accurately, listen, clarify our agreement, and make a decision?” A couple could talk about finances every week and repeatedly miss the substantive issue. They could also discuss finances infrequently because the arrangements are stable and trusted. More conversation is not automatically the goal.

The pressure surrounding the conversation

A household's financial circumstances can affect the interaction before either partner says a word. Worry about housing, an unexpected expense, insecure employment, or debt repayment may leave little room for ambiguity. But the research warrants careful wording here.

In an observational study of 414 newlywed couples from lower-income US communities, a measure that combined financial strain with other recent stressful events was associated with more negative behavior during brief observed discussions, even after researchers accounted for relationship satisfaction. The same measure was not associated with lower positive behavior or with the researchers' measure of communication effectiveness. The study did not isolate financial strain from other stressors and could not determine which variable caused another (Williamson, Karney, et al., 2013).

The findings suggest a reason to consider context when interpreting a tense exchange, without claiming that financial hardship necessarily produces hostility or that stress removes accountability. The same discussion can involve a difficult material decision and an emotionally charged interaction. Both levels deserve attention.

It is also possible that disagreement persists because no workable answer has yet been reached. One partner might be asking for a budget that can survive irregular income. The other might resist committing to amounts they believe are unrealistic. Their dispute could continue because the plan genuinely needs revision. Naming a Loop would be incomplete if the financial plan still does not add up.

Secrecy, trust, and the limits of a shared-pattern account

Some financial disagreements turn on information that one person has and the other lacks. A purchase may have been concealed. A debt may appear suddenly. One partner may discover that a savings goal was abandoned without discussion. These possibilities differ in seriousness,

and none can be resolved by assuming the parties simply misunderstood each other.

The first question is what happened. Was there a clear agreement? What financial information is accurate? Who had access to the relevant account? What was disclosed, and when? What consequences follow for either person? A recurring exchange may complicate the conversation, but it does not erase a breach of trust or the need for disclosure.

A fictional example illustrates the difference. Taylor discovers a substantial unpaid balance. Jordan says, “I didn't tell you because every money conversation turns into a fight.” Jordan's fear of conflict may be important information, and the couple might later examine the interaction that made disclosure difficult. But fear of a difficult conversation does not itself settle responsibility for the balance or the withholding of information. Taylor is entitled to ask for a complete account. If Jordan's answer is evasive or inaccurate, that problem must be addressed directly.

There is an additional and more serious boundary. **Economic abuse is not an ordinary mutual money disagreement.** It can include controlling another person's access to or use of resources, exploiting their finances, or interfering with employment. A scoping review of 35 quantitative studies identified these forms of economic abuse and documented associations with adverse financial, health, and other outcomes. The research has substantial limitations, including heterogeneous measures, predominantly female survivor samples, and relatively few longitudinal studies. Those limitations do not justify treating coercion as a shared communication pattern (Johnson et al., 2022).

When a person restricts access to money, threatens consequences for spending, sabotages employment, uses debt to trap a partner, or retaliates when the other seeks independence, asking both partners to “own their part of the Loop” can obscure power and danger. The priority becomes individual safety, access to domestic-violence or economic-abuse support, and appropriate professional assessment. A person fearing retaliation should not be directed to challenge the controlling partner or jointly disclose private information as a routine exercise. A shared budget exercise, joint disclosure activity, or confrontation is not automatically safe. BTL is relationship education, not therapy or an intervention for abuse. Where coercion, threats, fear,

or retaliation are present, safety takes precedence over joint pattern work.

Seeing the interaction without abandoning the issue

For disagreements that are noncoercive and safe to discuss, the practical task is to hold the financial question and the interaction sequence in view at the same time. The goal is not to replace a hard decision with a more agreeable conversation. It is to keep the conversation usable enough for the decision to be made.

A couple might begin with the facts that can be checked: the amount, the due date, the agreement, the consequences, and the choices that are genuinely available. If a familiar argument begins, either person may identify their own contribution to the sequence rather than labeling the other's personality. “I notice I am repeating the question more loudly instead of clarifying the missing detail” is different from “You are the one who always shuts down.” “I am explaining all the other bills instead of answering what happened with this purchase” identifies an observable response without asserting a hidden motive.

BTL's interrupt sequence, discussed more fully in the application chapters, is **NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT**. A partner can name the pattern they notice in themselves; slow the next response rather than continuing automatically; check whether their interpretation is accurate; and choose a next action that addresses both the relationship and the actual issue. This is an educational practice suggestion, not an experimentally demonstrated treatment for financial conflict. It does not require the other partner to agree that a particular Old Story or Protection Move is present.

For Jordan and Taylor, a next choice might be to pause accusations, identify the precise purchase and the existing threshold, and ask what made the agreement difficult to follow. Taylor could acknowledge the missed consultation without disputing Jordan's right to know. Jordan could ask about the circumstances without announcing what Taylor intended. Then both still have to decide whether the threshold remains workable and what to do about the purchase.

Another BTL reflection tool follows **Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice**. A person might ask themselves, “What was I trying to accomplish when I changed the subject?” A possible answer could be to avoid humiliation; a possible need could be to contribute without being belittled; a next choice could be to acknowledge the

missing information and request a respectful discussion. These are exploratory statements by the actor, not findings about another person's motives. Understanding a function does not excuse the impact of the move or remove the need for accountability.

A couple can also recognize that some disputes require a process separate from the emotional conversation: independent review of account records, a written decision rule, a change in who administers payments, or consultation with a qualified financial professional. Those steps may matter more than another attempt to discuss feelings about money. Neither BTL nor the studies presented here establish that a particular financial arrangement is superior for every couple.

What this chapter can and cannot conclude

The available research supports several limited observations. Money disagreements involve different substantive matters. Economic pressure is associated with financial conflict in some samples. The reported quality of financial conversations can matter more for relationship satisfaction than their number, but the direction of influence remains uncertain. Financial strain alongside other stressors has been linked to more negative observed interaction in one newlywed sample. Economic abuse is a distinct safety concern, not the mutual version of routine disagreement (Peetz et al., 2023; Dew & Stewart, 2012; Peetz & Saxey, 2026; Williamson, Karney, et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2022).

This research does not establish that all money disagreements conceal one kind of unmet need, that recurrent conflict necessarily damages a relationship, or that naming a BTL Loop reliably changes financial outcomes. It does not support diagnosing a partner's intention from their spending or saving preferences. The studies include selected, predominantly married or mixed-sex samples, and most findings are observational. Even an association found over time is not automatically a causal effect.

The central distinction is practical: money may be the genuine problem, and the way the couple handles it may become another problem. A recurring interaction can be examined without minimizing the balance due, the agreement broken, the unfair allocation, or the difference in financial risk. A safer and more useful conversation leaves both levels visible. It asks what must change in the arrangement and what each

person can choose differently in the conversation, while refusing to convert coercion or exploitation into shared responsibility.

Chapter 20. Household Labor and Responsibility

The task still needs doing

A disagreement about dishes may be about dishes. Someone needs a clean pan, the sink is full, and an agreement has not been kept. There may also be a familiar exchange around the task: a reminder, an explanation, a sharper reminder, a complaint about being supervised. Recognizing that exchange does not empty the sink or decide who was responsible for it.

Household responsibility brings concrete work into contact with questions about fairness, competence, consideration, and authority. This chapter examines those questions while keeping the work in view. It does not assume that every chore disagreement conceals a deeper issue, or that all household disputes follow one pattern. A missed task, an unrealistic arrangement, and an insulting conversation are different problems, even when they occur together.

The distinction developed in Chapter 2 remains the starting point: the issue is what needs attention; the Loop is what begins happening while the partners address it. In Break the Loop (BTL), a recurring Loop refers specifically to the progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move across experiences, not necessarily the same chore, belief, emotion, or behavior occurring again. It does not mean that a practical complaint is merely symbolic. If one person repeatedly carries work that another agreed to do, that allocation deserves examination in its own right.

For this chapter, a useful way to organize the discussion is to keep four questions distinct. What work exists? How is responsibility allocated? How is that arrangement judged? What happens when the partners discuss it? This is an educational organization of the subject, not a scientifically tested sequence or a household-management intervention.

Doing a task and managing its completion

Household work includes visible execution, such as preparing a meal or doing laundry. Research also examines the cognitive work of remembering, planning, coordinating, and checking. A systematic review of 31 articles distinguishes this mental labor from both physical execution and emotion work. Definitions and measures vary, so mental labor is used here for the thinking and management involved in household responsibilities, rather than as a name for every burden associated with family life (Reich-Stiebert et al., 2023).

A simple fictional example makes the distinction concrete. One partner collects a prescription. The other notices that the supply is running low, requests the renewal, checks whether it is ready, and works out when someone can reach the pharmacy. Collecting the prescription is a contribution. The preceding arrangements are also work. Saying who made the trip does not describe the whole assignment.

The point is not to turn every task into an elaborate accounting exercise. It is to specify what a complaint concerns. “I picked it up” may answer a question about execution. “I still had to arrange everything” raises a question about management. Both statements could be accurate. If the partners treat them as competing accounts of the same thing, they may miss that they are describing different responsibilities.

Conversely, a claim to manage everything needs particulars too. Who noticed the need? What arrangements were made? What information did the other person have? Which responsibilities were agreed, assumed, or never discussed? Examining these details does not require treating either person as dishonest. It also does not require suspending judgment where an agreement and its breach are already clear.

In the reviewed literature, women generally carried more mental labor, but the samples were largely heterosexual, Western, White, and middle class. Negative relationship findings were not uniform. These limits matter when describing the research and when considering a particular household; a group pattern is not a reliable assignment of either reader's role (Reich-Stiebert et al., 2023).

There is no need to infer an innate ability to notice, plan, or remember from that finding. Nor should gender-neutral examples erase the unequal responsibilities the research describes. The appropriate task is to identify what happens in the household being considered, including work that may be omitted from a list of finished chores.

Equal shares and a fair arrangement

Equal task shares and perceived fairness ask different questions. A count concerns how work is divided. A fairness judgment concerns how someone evaluates the arrangement, including what they believe each person ought to contribute. Neither question can be answered completely by the other. Two tasks with the same name may require different amounts of time, and one person's apparent availability may depend on responsibilities that have not been counted.

A German analysis of 11,012 adults living with different-sex partners linked feeling that one contributed more than a fair share of paid and unpaid work with lower relationship satisfaction. The fairness question covered employment as well as housework. This was a comparison between people at one survey wave, not evidence that reallocating chores would cause a particular couple's satisfaction to improve (Adriaans et al., 2026).

The detailed findings also resist a simple rule that every perceived imbalance has the same association. Reporting that one did much less than a fair share was not significantly associated with lower satisfaction in the overall adjusted model or among men. That null result does not establish that undercontribution is harmless, just as the overcontribution association does not establish causation (Adriaans et al., 2026).

For a fictional household, consider a temporary arrangement during recovery from surgery. One partner has agreed to do most physical chores while the other handles tasks they can manage from a chair. An unequal physical split does not, by itself, tell us whether this arrangement is fair. We would need to know the relevant capacities, what each person agreed, and whether the arrangement is workable. This example is a conceptual distinction, not a finding about disability or recovery.

A different household might divide a list of chores evenly while leaving every deadline, reminder, and supply check with one person. The equal list would answer only part of the question. Neither example establishes a universal formula. They show why evaluating responsibility requires an account of the work and circumstances, rather than a conclusion drawn from task counts alone.

Fairness is also not settled because the person doing less says the arrangement is acceptable. The other person's account matters.

Equally, disagreement about fairness is not proof of deliberate exploitation. Evidence of agreements, conduct, available time, and consequences deserves attention alongside each person's assessment. A framework should make those questions more precise without deciding them in advance.

What the evidence says about conflict

Relationship satisfaction and conflict are related subjects, but they are not interchangeable measures. A person can report dissatisfaction without describing a particular repeated argument. To examine conflict more directly, researchers need information about conflict itself. The distinction protects this chapter from turning every association with satisfaction into a finding about a recurring sequence.

In a longitudinal study of 108 working-class couples becoming parents for the first time, mothers who perceived housework as fair to both partners reported lower conflict at one year after birth. The proposed indirect pathway linking changes in housework to conflict through fairness did not reach statistical significance. The association and the unsuccessful mediation test need to remain together (Newkirk et al., 2017).

The study followed a selected, predominantly White, heterosexual, dual-earner sample in New England, using self-reports across five time points. It did not observe the same chore conversation repeatedly or test a BTL sequence. Its housework and childcare findings also differed. The results support a bounded account of fairness and conflict, not a causal explanation for every household dispute (Newkirk et al., 2017).

These limits do not make the concrete work unimportant. They define what the cited evidence can establish. The following examples therefore illustrate questions a reader might examine. They do not show a tested mechanism, estimate how common a particular exchange is, or demonstrate that a suggested sentence will change an outcome.

Standards can be part of the actual disagreement

“Done” needs a practical meaning. In a fictional laundry disagreement, one partner has washed and dried the clothes; the other expected them to be put away before guests arrive. If that final step was never agreed, the dispute includes an unclear expectation. If it was clearly agreed, the dispute includes a missed responsibility. Those are different accounts and should not be blended into a generic misunderstanding.

A difference in standards does not automatically make the more concerned person controlling or the less concerned person irresponsible. The relevant question is what the standard concerns. A preference for how towels are folded differs from needing clean work clothes by morning. One may be negotiable in a way the other is not. Describing the consequence is more useful than assigning a character label.

The person who notices an unmet standard is not automatically required to perform the task. “If it bothers you, do it yourself” does not settle a shared responsibility or cancel an agreement. At the same time, a private preference does not become a shared agreement simply because it feels obvious. Both the requirement and the basis for assigning it deserve to be stated.

Practical specificity can separate several questions: What must be completed? By when? What result is necessary? Who has agreed to which part? These are examples of information to clarify, not a prescribed checklist with established effectiveness. Their purpose here is to keep the substantive issue visible before interpreting the exchange around it. For example, “clean the kitchen” could mean washing the dishes, clearing food from the counters, or leaving the room ready for breakfast. Asking which result was agreed does not excuse a missed commitment. It identifies the commitment precisely enough to discuss what was and was not completed.

Some constraints will remain even after clarification. The available time may be insufficient, the money for outside help may be unavailable, or a proposed division may ask someone to do work they cannot safely perform. Naming the interaction does not remove those conditions. A workable account must include them without assuming that the difficulty is simply unwillingness.

When a reminder becomes part of a familiar exchange

Consider another brief fictional example. One partner agreed to take the bins out that evening. Near bedtime, the other asks whether it has been done. The answer is, “You don't have to check up on me.” The first replies, “Then stop making me ask.” They begin arguing about supervision while the bins remain inside.

The reminder may be reasonable. The reply may express an experience of being monitored, without establishing that the reminder was improper. Neither statement settles whether the task was completed or

whether the agreement was workable. An account of the interaction should preserve the missed responsibility, if there was one, without making it permission for contempt or insults.

BTL's Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move offers one way to examine a familiar exchange, as developed in Chapters 11–17. The question could be a Launch for the person hearing it. That person might report urgency and difficulty listening, then recognize a familiar meaning such as “You think I cannot manage anything.” Their next response could be defensive explanation. These are possible elements to investigate, not facts established by observing a reminder.

The other person might describe a different meaning: “If I stop tracking it, it will become my job again.” That concern may reflect an actual history of missed tasks. Calling it an Old Story does not make it false. It should remain possible to examine both the factual history and the response that follows it. Overload, where someone reports narrowing capacity, also does not remove agency or responsibility.

The Three Pillars discussed in Chapter 15 are optional BTL meaning lenses here. Someone may hear a reminder as questioning capability, or experience unfinished work as evidence that their time receives little consideration. Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance do not identify the partner's intention or establish which person is right. They are not measured dimensions of the household studies cited in this chapter.

The familiar exchange need not be symmetrical. A partner who broke an agreement remains responsible for that conduct. A partner who insults the other remains responsible for the insult. One response can become the next event the other reacts to without distributing responsibility equally. The practical obligation and each person's behavior remain separately examinable.

Follow-through, competence, and recognition

Completion matters independently of the explanation offered for noncompletion. In a fictional grocery arrangement, “I forgot the list” explains something about the event, but it does not supply the missing food. If a partner repeatedly has to recover an agreed task, the account

should include that added work. Describing it as a Loop must not make the recovery work disappear.

There may be uncertainty about why an agreement failed. The person might report forgetting, misunderstanding the deadline, lacking a needed skill, or deciding another obligation came first. Those possibilities call for different information. Intentional avoidance should not be assumed merely because a task was done badly. Equally, uncertainty about intent should not make repeated noncompletion impossible to name.

Competence is therefore a question to specify. Does the person know how to perform the task? Do they have the necessary information and access? Was the responsibility accepted? What actually happened? A concern about capability deserves a concrete answer, rather than a global conclusion that someone is incapable. A claim to capability also does not substitute for follow-through.

Recognition concerns what is acknowledged. In a brief fictional exchange, one partner says, “You saw that dinner was ready, but I also planned the meals and checked what we had.” That statement identifies contribution. “Thank you” could acknowledge it. Neither the statement nor the acknowledgment decides whether the allocation should continue. Appreciation and responsibility remain distinct questions.

The examples here do not establish that appreciation offsets inequity or that clearer agreements prevent repeated conflict. They illustrate what an accurate account can preserve: work completed, work managed, promises made, consequences borne, and responses during discussion. The fuller treatment of agreements belongs in Chapter 26; detailed mapping and interruption belong in later sections.

Conditions for shared inquiry

The guide's safety boundary takes precedence over these examples. Where there is coercion, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, fear, or retaliation, household responsibility should not be treated as an ordinary shared Loop requiring mutual disclosure. Being afraid to refuse a task or raise a concern changes the conditions under which discussion is occurring. Responsibility for coercive or abusive conduct belongs to the person engaging in it.

A reader is not obliged to confront a partner, present a labor inventory, or disclose private reflections where doing so may be unsafe. Appropriate specialized support takes priority over joint pattern work.

A protective refusal, exit, or limit on contact should not automatically be classified as dysfunctional withdrawal. These are the Field Guide's educational safety requirements, not outcomes established by the household studies reviewed here.

Even in an ordinary disagreement, a quieter exchange is not the same as a resolved arrangement. A person can speak calmly and still leave agreed work undone. Another can have a legitimate complaint and express it hurtfully. Examining both questions preserves accountability without requiring either person to surrender the underlying concern.

Household conflict calls for keeping the work in the account. What must be done, who carries it, and what remains unequal or unfinished still matter after the interaction has been named. The next chapter turns to parenting, where responsibilities and disagreements require their own attention rather than being treated as interchangeable with chores.

Chapter 21. Parenting

When the subject is a child

A couple can disagree about bedtime and find themselves arguing about something much larger than bedtime. One person wants a predictable routine. The other wants room to respond to how the child is doing that evening. They may begin with a practical question: What time should the lights go out? A few minutes later they are debating whether one of them takes parenting seriously, whether the other is too rigid, and who has the right to make the final decision.

The practical disagreement has not disappeared. The child still needs an answer. But the conversation has also acquired a second problem: the way the two adults respond to each other when they disagree.

Parenting often places important decisions under conditions of pressure. Adults may be tired, disagree about risk, have different experiences of being parented, or feel accountable for consequences neither can fully control. None of those circumstances proves that a recurring couple-conflict pattern exists. It does help explain why parenting is a topic worth examining closely rather than treating every argument as interchangeable.

The central distinction in this chapter is between the parenting issue and the recurring interaction. The issue asks what decision, responsibility, boundary, or plan needs attention. The Loop asks whether the BTL progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move can be recognized across disagreements, even if interpretations and responses differ. Repeated parenting concerns or behaviors alone do not establish that progression. Both may need to change. Recognizing a Loop is not permission to set aside a legitimate concern about a child.

The issue is still real

Parenting decisions can involve discipline, daily routines, school expectations, sleep, health, activities, screen use, safety, and which adult is responsible for follow-through. Some disagreements are about

values. Others are about logistics, uneven responsibilities, conflicting information, or different assessments of a child's needs.

A framework of coparenting proposed by Feinberg (2003) makes an important conceptual distinction. It considers childrearing agreement alongside other aspects of coparenting, including support or undermining, division of labor, and how adults manage family interactions. Those categories are a way to organize inquiry, not proof that every family fits four separate types. They help distinguish what the adults think should happen from what happens between them when they disagree.

Two parents may hold different views about a consequence yet discuss the choice without humiliation or pressure. Two others may agree about the rule but repeatedly undermine one another in front of the child. The amount of agreement alone cannot explain the quality of the interaction.

This difference matters because an otherwise useful observation about communication can become harmful when it is used to dismiss the substance of a parenting concern. An adult may object to a particular disciplinary practice because of a credible safety concern. Calling the objection a “Protection Move” would not resolve the concern, and could conceal a need for protection or outside assessment. The safety of the child and adults takes precedence over a mutual-pattern exercise.

How a parenting disagreement can carry a Loop

Consider a hypothetical couple discussing homework. One adult asks why an assignment was not checked. The other hears the question as an accusation that they are incompetent. They respond by listing everything they did that day. The first adult hears the list as avoiding the problem and becomes more insistent. The second becomes quieter or sharper. When the same roles recur across evenings, both adults may begin to expect the exchange before the first question is asked.

In Break the Loop, the sequence can be organized as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. A missed assignment or a pointed question might be the Launch. Overload describes the narrowing of flexibility and curiosity as urgency rises. An Old Story is the familiar meaning someone gives the moment, such as “You think I

cannot handle this" or "I am carrying this alone." A Protection Move is what the person does next, such as defending, pursuing, criticizing, withdrawing, controlling, or appeasing.

This is a BTL educational organization, not a sequence established by the coparenting studies cited in this chapter. It is also not an assessment of which adult is right about homework. The same parenting issue may recur without a stable Loop; a similar Loop may appear in conversations about several different issues. An example is a prompt for observation, not evidence of someone's hidden motive.

The framework also distinguishes a Pattern from a Person. Saying "I tend to defend when I hear that question" is different from telling a partner, "You always make me defensive." Describing one's own sequence keeps attention on an observable response rather than assigning blame or certainty about another person's intentions.

Authority, competence, and importance

Parenting disagreements can become especially difficult when the decision seems to carry an additional question: Who is trusted to judge this situation? Who is accountable when a plan fails? Who gets to decide what counts as responsible parenting? These are reasonable questions to ask in a specific relationship. They are not findings that every conflict about parenting is ultimately about authority or competence.

The BTL Three Pillars, Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance, are educational lenses for considering why a situation may feel personally significant. They are not measured dimensions validated by the studies discussed here. One adult may experience a last-minute change of plan as a threat to Autonomy. Another may hear a question about discipline as an attack on Intelligence. Another may interpret a decision made without consultation as evidence that their contribution lacks Importance. The word may is essential: the meaning belongs to the person experiencing it and should be checked rather than presumed.

These lenses cannot establish whether a parenting decision was sound. They can help the person distinguish the decision from the meaning added to it. "I think this rule needs to change" is an issue statement. "You never respect my judgment" is an interpretation of the interaction. Both may feel urgent, but they call for different kinds of conversation.

The division of parenting work is another concrete issue. Who schedules appointments? Who notices supplies are missing? Who follows up on messages from school? Who is expected to know the details? A conflict may persist because the workload is not fairly distributed, regardless of whether either person can identify a Loop. Chapter 20 considered household labor and responsibility in more depth; here the point is narrower: identifying a conversational pattern must not replace a real decision about work and accountability.

What research can and cannot tell us

Research on coparenting gives reasons to take the way adults manage parenting disagreements seriously. It does not justify treating every difference of opinion as dangerous to children.

In one community study involving 203 couples parenting children ages three to seven, O'Leary and Vidair (2005) tested statistical models connecting couple adjustment, childrearing disagreement, overreactive parenting, and parent-reported child behavior. The results supported several modeled pathways, but the data were cross-sectional. The models cannot establish whether parenting disagreements caused later child behavior, whether child behavior contributed to parental conflict, or whether both reflected other circumstances.

Longitudinal work permits a different, though still limited, question. Feinberg, Kan, and Hetherington (2007) examined coparenting conflict and outcomes over three years, using a final analytic sample of 259 families with adolescents. Findings for later parental negativity and adolescent antisocial behavior depended on family and child characteristics. Coparenting conflict did not significantly predict later adolescent depression after the study's controls. The null finding and moderation are essential to interpreting the study; the evidence does not support a universal pathway from coparenting conflict to child difficulties.

Another concern is when children feel caught between parents. Schrodt (2026) reviewed 49 studies involving 23,336 participants and found an overall association between interparental conflict and children feeling caught. That is an association across diverse studies, not a statement that one disagreement creates divided loyalties in one child. Adults should not recruit a child to settle their dispute or require loyalty as a condition of connection. The practical boundary matters independently

of any claim that a particular couple's behavior matches a research category.

Measurement also limits generalization. A systematic review of observational coparenting methods identified 35 studies and highlighted limited evidence about longer-term predictive validity (Lima Guerra et al., 2026). Researchers have not measured every family arrangement and interaction in the same way. Findings from one group of intact heterosexual-parent families should not simply be assigned to separated coparents, same-gender parents, multigenerational arrangements, or families with different cultural expectations. Those families may face similar questions, but this chapter does not claim that the probabilities or mechanisms are identical.

Finally, evidence about interventions should not be confused with evidence validating a particular educational framework. Hopson, Fonagy, and Rosan (2026) reviewed 23 articles covering 25 interparental-conflict interventions. Some programs reported improvements, but findings varied and the review did not support a definitive overall conclusion. None of that evidence tests Break the Loop. The most the present chapter can responsibly offer is a framework for noticing a pattern and deciding what must be addressed next.

Two questions, not one

When a parenting disagreement repeats, the most useful inquiry often has two parts.

The first part asks about the child and the decision. What is the actual disagreement? Is there an urgent risk? What information is missing? Who is responsible? What agreement, boundary, support, or specialized evaluation is needed? A practical issue sometimes requires a practical answer. Uncertainty about the right parenting decision does not mean the adults must first complete a relationship exercise.

The second part asks what happens when the adults try to address it. Does a question repeatedly become an accusation? Does one person's insistence increase another's withdrawal? Does a disagreement about timing become a dispute about competence? Does one adult speak for

the other without checking? If the adults recognize the recurring BTL progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move, that may be the Loop worth mapping. A repeated accusation, defensive response, or withdrawal alone does not establish recurrence of that full sequence.

The two questions can be considered together without collapsing them. A couple could use a different tone and still need to negotiate the rule. They could divide childcare responsibilities more fairly while still getting stuck in a familiar accusation-and-defense exchange. A better conversation does not automatically produce a sound parenting decision. A better plan does not automatically change an entrenched way of speaking to each other.

Where interruption becomes possible

BTL's change architecture is SEE → CATCH → CHANGE → STRENGTHEN. In a parenting conversation, SEE means noticing the difference between the substantive issue and the recurring exchange. CATCH means identifying the moment the familiar response begins. CHANGE means making one deliberate choice that is different from that habitual response. STRENGTHEN means returning to that effort over time and noticing what does, or does not, change. This is an educational sequence, not a claim of experimentally demonstrated effectiveness.

The interrupt sequence is NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. An adult might privately name the familiar urge to defend. They might slow the response enough to listen for the actual question. They might check whether “You think I am an inadequate parent” is an interpretation rather than a fact. They might choose to answer the concrete question, ask for clarification, or request a pause with a

specific plan to return. The other adult is not required to agree with a mistaken account of what happened.

These choices should not become rules for controlling a partner's behavior. The exercise is meant to help someone describe and change their own response, not to pronounce that the other person's safety concern is “only an Old Story.” When a conversation concerns a credible threat, dangerous discipline, intimidation, or retaliation, slowing down is not a substitute for protective action.

One optional translation exercise is Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice. Someone who becomes highly insistent might observe that the insistence was an attempt to secure predictability, recognize the need for a clear plan, and choose to ask directly for an agreed follow-through. That observation does not excuse threatening or coercive conduct. Neither does it prove that the other adult had no responsibility for a legitimate disagreement. Function is not an excuse; reciprocity is not equal responsibility.

When the issue requires more than a Loop conversation

Parenting is not only a couple topic. Children and other caregivers have interests and needs that may require independent attention. Some situations involve immediate or ongoing risk, including physical violence, severe intimidation, coercive control, threats, unsafe disciplinary practices, stalking, or retaliation. They should not be described as a shared Loop in which each adult simply needs to change a move.

In such situations, the priority is safety and appropriate specialist support. A parent or caregiver may need confidential advice from a qualified child-safety professional, relevant local services, or an appropriately trained clinician. Joint exercises may be unsafe when one person's disclosures could trigger punishment or escalating control. Relationship education is not therapy, a custody evaluation, or a substitute for child protection.

For less urgent but persistent concerns, outside help may still be appropriate when parents cannot agree on consequential decisions,

when a child's needs require specialized evaluation, or when conversations repeatedly end without workable decisions. Seeking support does not establish that either adult is the problem. It recognizes that the practical parenting issue and the couple interaction may each need resources beyond a short educational chapter.

What to notice next

Parenting can carry a recurring Loop because the topic matters, the decisions have consequences, and adults may hear more than the words being spoken. But the topic alone does not explain a couple's recurring conflict, and the presence of a Loop does not settle the parenting decision.

The useful first step is modest: identify one parenting issue that needs a real answer, then observe one repeated moment in the conversation about it. What was said or noticed? What meaning did you give it? What did you do next? What remains unresolved about the child, the decision, or the division of responsibility?

Keep the answers separate long enough to see both. The aim is not to win a debate about who is the better parent. It is to notice what happens between the adults without losing sight of what the child needs.

Chapter 22. Sex and Intimacy

Sex and Intimacy

Two partners can care about each other and still want different things from their sexual relationship. One may wish for more frequent sexual contact, while the other does not. An invitation may feel hopeful to one person and difficult to answer to the other. A declined invitation may leave one partner disappointed without making the decision to decline wrong.

These differences are not, by themselves, evidence of a damaged relationship. Nor is a difference in desire automatically a recurring conflict pattern. The issue may be how often partners want sexual contact, how they initiate it, what they want from intimacy, or how they respond when preferences do not coincide. A Loop, in BTL, is something different: a potentially recognizable progression through Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The topics, meanings, and responses within that progression may differ across encounters.

The distinction matters because attempts to solve a difference in frequency may leave the interaction around that difference unchanged. It also matters because two people need not want the same amount of sexual contact to respect each other's autonomy.

Difference, Distress, and Frequency

Desire is not a single quantity that both people bring to a relationship in fixed amounts. In research, couples' differences are measured in more than one way. Some studies examine the distance between partners' reported desire; others examine dissatisfaction, distress, or behavior. Those are related questions but not interchangeable ones.

In a study following 229 couples through daily reports and a later assessment, differences in partners' reported sexual desire statistically predicted sexual distress the following day and at twelve months. The reverse associations tested in that study were not statistically significant (Jodouin et al., 2021). This establishes a temporal

association in that sample, not a universal direction of causation. It does not show that a difference necessarily becomes an argument, or that resolving the difference requires either partner to change how much sexual contact they want.

Another study offers a useful counterweight. Researchers surveyed 94 cohabiting couples repeatedly across ten days and found no significant association between similarity in partners' reported desire and their measured initiation, receptivity, or partnered sexual activity (Pawłowska et al., 2024). The study used particular behavioral definitions and a selected sample. It does not mean differences in desire never matter. It means that the meaning of a discrepancy cannot be read directly from a single measure of similarity.

For a couple, frequency may be the visible issue. The more useful question can be what has actually become distressing: a preferred frequency that cannot be agreed upon, uncertainty about invitations, a sense of distance, disappointment, or the way these differences are discussed. A good explanation need not turn one partner's preference into the cause of the other's feelings.

Initiation and a Declined Invitation

Sexual initiation is not one fixed behavior. Partners may communicate interest through speech, touch, timing, or other context-dependent signals. What one partner intended as an invitation may be understood differently by the other. Some invitations are clear and some are ambiguous; none creates an obligation to participate.

Research on perceived sexual rejection shows why interpretation deserves care. In two diary samples involving 98 and 115 couples, participants showed some ability to track partners' reports of rejection while also overestimating rejection at times (Dobson et al., 2022). The comparison depended on what partners reported. It was not independent access to intention, and it does not establish that a person's disappointment was imagined.

This distinction applies in both directions. Someone may genuinely feel rejected without knowing that rejection was the other person's intention. Someone may decline an invitation without rejecting the partner as a person. Neither experience permits the observer to replace a direct account with an assumption.

A refusal remains a refusal. Understanding a partner's feelings may be valuable in a safe relationship, but the person declining does not owe

participation, reassurance, a promise of future activity, or an explanation to make the boundary legitimate.

Communication Does Not Mean Persuasion

Research generally finds associations between sexual communication and relationship outcomes, but its findings do not support a simple instruction to discuss sex more often. A meta-analysis covering 93 studies and 38,499 partnered participants found that the quality of sexual communication was more strongly associated with relationship and sexual satisfaction than the frequency of such communication (Mallory, 2022). These are associations across heterogeneous studies, not proof that a prescribed conversation produces a better outcome.

For this chapter, quality cannot mean a conversation in which one person becomes more successful at obtaining agreement. A conversation can be clear and respectful even when the answer remains no, or when the partners end it with different preferences.

In a qualitative study of 300 partnered adults reporting differences in sexual or affectionate desire, participants described several responses, including discussion, alternative shared activities, and doing nothing on a particular occasion (Clark et al., 2024). These reports show a range of experiences. They do not establish which approach works best, and no reported strategy should be treated as a prescription to participate in unwanted sexual activity.

One implication is that a conversation may aim for mutual understanding rather than immediate agreement. Partners can describe what an invitation means to them, what the other person understood, and what limits they want respected. The outcome might be a change in how a subject is approached; it need not be a change in anybody's willingness to participate.

Emotional Meaning Without Mind Reading

For some partners, intimacy carries meanings beyond a particular activity. An invitation might be associated with closeness, reassurance, or hope for connection. For another person, the same moment might raise concern about pressure, being misunderstood, or having a boundary questioned. These are possible experiences, not motives that can be assigned from outside.

In Break the Loop, the Three Pillars—Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance—offer lenses for examining what a moment may come to

mean. Those lenses are BTL's organizing constructs. The studies cited in this chapter did not test the Three Pillars as a validated account of sexual conflict.

If one partner interprets a declined invitation as “I do not matter,” and the other interprets the ensuing conversation as “My choice will not be respected,” both interpretations deserve to be distinguished from observable facts. The first person knows their disappointment. The second person knows their own willingness and boundaries. Neither automatically knows the other's intention.

That distinction creates room for a more precise account of the issue. It does not make the two positions equally responsible for what follows.

When a Difference Becomes a Repeating Interaction

Consider a hypothetical couple who have discussed sexual frequency several times. One partner mentions wanting more closeness at bedtime. The other says they are not interested in sexual contact that evening. The first partner becomes quiet, and the second anticipates that the evening will now become tense.

This situation alone cannot establish a Loop. The quiet response may have several meanings, and the anticipation may be mistaken. But if the partners recognize a possible four-stage progression across encounters, even with different invitations, interpretations, or responses, they may be able to examine it without reducing either person to a role.

BTL organizes this kind of recurring experience as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. It is a practical map, not an empirically demonstrated sequence for sexual interactions. A Launch could be a request, tone, silence, or change in plans. Overload refers to a narrowing of capacity to respond deliberately. Old Story names a familiar interpretation, not a verified fact about a partner. A Protection Move is a response intended to manage something difficult.

The refusal itself is not automatically a Protection Move. Nor does this framework excuse criticism, retaliation, repeated pressure, or other harmful conduct. Overload does not erase agency.

A person describing their own experience might notice that disappointment becomes a prediction that they are unwanted, followed

by withdrawal. Another might notice anxiety about the conversation and an urge to explain too much. Those descriptions are hypotheses about a particular interaction, to be checked against the partners' accounts, not diagnoses or facts imposed by the framework.

BTL's NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT sequence can provide a noncoercive way to examine one's own response where both people are safe and free to decline the conversation. The choice may simply be to respect the answer, allow space, and return to a topic at a mutually acceptable time. No BTL step overrides consent.

Different Outcomes Can Move in Different Directions

Studies of couples' daily experiences do not always find uniform associations across sexual satisfaction, distress, and sexual function. A 2025 systematic scoping review of diary research identified different individual, relationship, and partner-related correlates, with substantial variation across measures and samples (Velten et al., 2025). Its 58 studies represented only 32 distinct samples, an important limit on treating the reports as independent confirmation.

This is a reminder not to define success with a single outcome. Someone can report relationship closeness and still experience sexual distress. Partners may differ in what they want from a conversation. Understanding these possibilities requires attending to what was measured and what each person says, not assuming that satisfaction, desire, safety, and willingness always rise together.

The studies in this chapter are largely observational or descriptive. They do not establish that BTL causes changes in intimate relationships. Their samples also differ in age, relationship context, sexual orientation, and clinical characteristics. The patterns described here should not be presented as equally established for every couple.

When the Shared-Pattern Account Is Wrong

A disagreement about desire is not the same thing as sexual coercion. Pressure, threats, fear, retaliation, or consequences imposed for declining activity change what must be addressed first. Repeatedly pressing someone to participate, or using intimidation or punishment in response to a boundary, should not be recast as two partners equally creating a Loop.

In these situations, safety overrides shared-pattern analysis. The appropriate next step may be individualized professional assessment or specialized support rather than a joint exercise or discussion. Relationship education is not therapy, and neither this chapter nor a mapping worksheet can determine whether a situation is safe. A person does not need to remain in a conversation, relationship exercise, or sexual situation to demonstrate willingness to work on a pattern (American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, 2013).

For readers who are uncertain whether their situation involves coercion or retaliation, confidential specialized assistance may be more useful than a framework designed for ordinary recurring conflict. The specific referral and crisis information provided with the published guide must be checked for accuracy and relevance to the reader's jurisdiction.

What the Distinction Makes Possible

The most useful first question is not always “How do we want the same thing?” It may be “What exactly is difficult here?” A difference in desire, distress about that difference, an unclear invitation, a perceived rejection, and a repeating interaction each call for different descriptions. They should not be collapsed into one problem.

Where both partners are safe and acting freely, recognizing the interaction may help them choose a response that respects their differences without promising a particular outcome. Where consent or safety is compromised, recognizing that boundary takes precedence over any shared-pattern exercise.

In Chapter 23, attention shifts from sex and intimacy to phones, technology, and attention, another area in which ordinary differences and questions of autonomy must be distinguished from coercive conduct.

Chapter 23. Phones, Technology, and Attention

A phone can become the visible subject of a disagreement in several different ways. One person checks a notification during dinner. The other has been trying to finish a story. A message remains unanswered until evening. Someone wants a private conversation, while their partner expects access to the device. These situations can look similar from a distance, yet they raise different questions.

Sometimes the issue is whether people are giving one another enough attention. Sometimes it is a practical disagreement about availability, a difference in expectations about how quickly messages should be answered, or a dispute about privacy. And sometimes the technology is being used to monitor, intimidate, or control. That last possibility changes the appropriate response.

This chapter separates the technology issue from the interaction that may develop around it. Neither should be dismissed.

What is the issue?

The phrase “phone conflict” can conceal several kinds of concern. A couple may disagree about what counts as uninterrupted time, whether notifications are appropriate during a conversation, or whether a delayed reply signals that a request was missed. There may be a practical need to coordinate childcare or schedules. One person may value being fully present during meals; the other may not experience a brief glance at a screen as a departure from the conversation.

Privacy raises another question. A person can have a legitimate interest in keeping some communications, accounts, or personal information private. Partners can also have legitimate concerns about agreed expectations of honesty and transparency. The existence of either concern does not settle what the other person intends. A disagreement about privacy is not proof of deception, and a desire for greater reassurance does not automatically justify access to another person’s device.

Before treating these exchanges as one problem, it helps to specify the behavior being discussed. Was a partner looking at a screen while the other was talking? Was a time-sensitive message not answered? Was an agreed plan broken? Or was access to a phone demanded under threat

of consequences? The answer matters because these are not interchangeable issues.

What the research can and cannot establish

Researchers sometimes use "partner phubbing" for situations in which someone perceives being snubbed or ignored while a partner attends to a phone. This is not identical to every instance of phone use in another person's presence.

A meta-analysis of partner-phubbing research found a negative association between perceived phubbing and relationship satisfaction. That finding deserves attention, but the authors also reported substantial variation across studies. The research commonly relies on reported experience and observational associations. It does not establish that every instance of phone use damages a relationship, that phone use alone is the cause of lower satisfaction, or that a particular rule about screens will improve a couple's relationship (Ni et al., 2025).

An important qualification appears when researchers ask about co-present phone use rather than assuming it was experienced as neglect. In a survey of 383 cohabiting adults recruited in Britain, most respondents evaluated their partner's nearby phone use as neutral or positive; about 15 percent evaluated it negatively. This is a result from a selected online sample and from participants' evaluations. It is not a population estimate of how often phone use causes harm. It does, however, make an important distinction visible: being near a phone and feeling ignored are not the same measured experience (Frackowiak et al., 2025).

Two cross-sectional surveys also associated partner phubbing with perceived exclusion, lower responsiveness, and reduced intimacy. In the authors' statistical models, conflict and jealousy did not provide additional significant indirect pathways when the other variables were considered together. Those results help identify what respondents experienced as important. They do not establish which element caused another or prove a specific intervention (Beukeboom & Pollmann, 2021).

Researchers have also examined actual device activity rather than relying only on perceptions. In one study, 247 American parents of infants contributed eight days of smartphone tracking alongside diaries indicating when they were with their partners. The association between phone use during reported partner time and relationship satisfaction

was statistically significant among women, not men, in the reported analysis. The sample was restricted to parents of infants; partner presence was still identified by self-report, and the design was not experimental. This finding cannot be converted into a universal claim about men, women, or every couple (McDaniel et al., 2025).

Taken together, these studies support a careful conclusion. The experience of being disregarded while a partner uses a phone matters and has been associated with relationship satisfaction. The meaning of a device's presence, however, depends partly on what was happening, how it was experienced, and what question researchers asked. A screen is an observable object. Feeling neglected is a meaningful experience, but the experience alone does not establish what a partner intended.

Why attention and availability may carry meaning

Consider a conversation interrupted by a notification. One person might notice only that their partner has looked away. They may then interpret that action as disinterest: "What I am saying matters less." The other person might have checked a message about a pickup time and regard the interruption as brief and practical.

Neither explanation should be supplied as a fact without asking. The first partner's experience of feeling dismissed is real as an experience; it does not prove the other person's intention. The second partner's practical explanation may be accurate; it does not automatically erase the impact of interrupting someone who was speaking.

Differences in availability can create similar ambiguity. "Please answer when I text you" is not the same request as "You must always respond immediately." Some messages concern urgent logistics, while others are bids for connection or ordinary updates. The couple still has to decide what expectations are reasonable in their circumstances. The research reviewed for this chapter does not establish one universally effective reply time or a standard amount of permissible personal privacy.

A recurring problem can develop when the practical request and the interpretation become tangled. If a missed message is treated as deliberate rejection, the discussion may shift away from the missed plan. If the other person hears a request for consideration as an attempt at control, the response may shift away from the question of how the couple should coordinate. These are possible examples of interpretation, not established motives or a scientific classification of people.

The issue and the Loop

Break the Loop distinguishes the Issue from the Loop. The Issue is the concrete matter requiring attention: perhaps meals without interruptions, a dependable way to communicate a change of plans, or a clear agreement about which information remains private. In BTL, the proposed recurring Loop is the progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. A missed message, a familiar interpretation, or a repeated response by itself is not the entire Loop.

Within BTL, that interaction can be organized as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. This is a framework-specific educational map, not a sequence established by the phone-use studies just described.

Imagine two partners at home. Jordan begins describing a difficult exchange at work. Taylor looks at a phone and says, “Just a second.” Jordan becomes tense and says, “You never listen.” Taylor hears an accusation and replies, “I cannot even check one message without getting in trouble.” Both stop discussing the original conversation and begin arguing about whether one person is demanding or the other is inconsiderate.

The observable Launch for Jordan might be the glance at the phone. An Old Story might be the familiar interpretation, “I do not matter enough to get your attention.” Criticism could become Jordan’s Protection Move. Taylor might experience the criticism as a Launch, attach a different Old Story to it, and respond defensively. These are illustrative possibilities, not claims about the characters’ actual internal states. Overload may make it harder to examine alternatives, but it does not remove either person’s agency.

In this example, the legitimate Issue remains. Jordan wanted to finish a conversation without interruption. Taylor may have had a time-sensitive reason to check the message. Identifying a possible Loop does not answer whether Taylor should have waited, whether Jordan’s request was reasonable in that context, or what practical arrangement would work the next time.

The point is not to prove that both people are equally responsible. It is to distinguish what needs to be worked out from the reactions that may be making the discussion harder. A pattern is not a personality diagnosis. A behavior that has a protective function is not therefore excused.

What should not be assumed

A delayed reply is not proof that someone is indifferent. A request to put a phone away is not, by itself, proof that someone wants to control their partner. A wish for personal privacy is not proof of dishonesty. Conversely, a claim that monitoring comes from love or anxiety does not make coercive monitoring acceptable.

Other assumptions are also tempting. The partner who dislikes phone use may be cast as needy or overly sensitive. The partner who checks a device may be labeled addicted or incapable of connection. Neither description follows from the ordinary facts of a single exchange. A disagreement is more clearly defined when the people involved can identify the action, the impact, the circumstances, and the expectation that needs to be negotiated.

Evidence about digital jealousy also requires restraint. In a three-wave study involving 322 young partnered adults, researchers examined attachment anxiety, social-media jealousy, electronic partner surveillance, and relationship satisfaction. Their hypothesized sequence of indirect effects was not supported by the longitudinal analysis. The findings do not establish an inevitable path from insecurity to surveillance or dissatisfaction, and the sample was not a dyadic study of both partners (Métellus et al., 2025).

This matters when familiar psychological explanations sound more complete than the data allow. An explanation may be plausible without having been demonstrated. Readers should not have to accept a story about someone's attachment style, character, or hidden intentions in order to discuss what happened.

When monitoring is not ordinary conflict

A disagreement about whether partners should share a calendar or announce that they arrived safely is different from secretly tracking someone's movements, demanding passwords under threat, inspecting accounts to enforce obedience, or using technology to intimidate and

retaliate. Technology-facilitated stalking and coercive monitoring belong to the safety and abuse domain, not to an ordinary shared Loop.

A person may have good reasons to fear what will happen if they deny access to an account, turn off location sharing, refuse to answer, or seek help. Under those circumstances, an invitation for both partners to "own their part" can distort responsibility and increase danger. Safety, accountability, and specialist assessment take precedence over mutual conflict exercises.

The National Network to End Domestic Violence's Safety Net Project addresses how technology can be misused for monitoring and coercion and why safety planning needs to account for devices and accounts (NNEDV, n.d.-b). This chapter does not recommend secretly changing settings, confronting a suspected monitor, or asking partners to exchange passwords as a trust exercise. Such actions may have consequences that depend on the situation. Someone concerned about surveillance, retaliation, stalking, threats, or fear should seek appropriate confidential, specialized help and consider a safety plan relevant to their circumstances.

This boundary should not turn ordinary privacy differences into an abuse diagnosis. It does mean that ordinary relationship-education exercises are not the appropriate first response when coercion or danger is present.

Where interruption may become possible

When the interaction is safe, the first useful distinction can be simple: "What was the phone-related issue, and what began happening between us while we tried to address it?" That question does not require agreement about anyone's motives.

One partner might say, "I was explaining something important and noticed you looking at your phone. I felt dismissed. Can we finish this conversation without interruptions?" The other might answer, "I checked a message about tomorrow's schedule. I did not realize it interrupted you. I can put the phone down until you finish." These are examples of possible communication, not clinically tested scripts or guaranteed solutions.

If the discussion has already begun to follow a familiar path, BTL's named interrupt sequence is NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT →

CHOOSE IT. Here it may mean noticing that the conversation has shifted from an interruption to accusations, allowing room to respond less urgently, checking what is known versus inferred, and choosing one next response that addresses the real request. The full sequence is explained in the later chapters on interruption; this chapter does not introduce a separate technology-specific method.

Once attention returns to the Issue, a couple may still need to make a decision. Perhaps important conversations call for phones to be set aside unless an expected urgent message arrives. Perhaps coordinating work or children requires a different rule. Perhaps a response expectation needs an agreed exception. Such arrangements are matters for negotiation and judgment in a safe relationship, not empirically validated prescriptions from the studies summarized here.

A useful distinction remains even if the argument becomes calmer: an interrupted conversation can require both a different interaction and a substantive answer. One does not replace the other.

Where the topic leaves us

Technology makes attention visible in small, repeatable ways. A glance, an unanswered message, a request for access, or a notification can become the immediate subject of disagreement. Yet those actions differ in context, meaning, and safety. Research on perceived partner phubbing documents associations with relationship satisfaction but does not justify treating all phone use as neglect or a proven cause of conflict.

When two people can safely discuss the issue, the task is to separate what happened, what it came to mean, how the discussion unfolded, and which practical agreement still needs attention. Where technology is used to monitor, threaten, or control, the task changes. Safety takes priority over mapping a shared pattern.

Chapter 24. Work, Time, and Schedules

When the Clock Becomes an Argument

It is 6:40 p.m. Dinner was supposed to start at six. One partner is at home, dealing with a child who needs help and a meal that is getting cold. The other is still at work, trying to finish a task that cannot easily be abandoned.

A message arrives: "Running late again. Sorry."

The partner at home replies, "You could have told me an hour ago."

The partner at work answers, "I cannot just leave whenever I want."

A few messages later, the disagreement is no longer only about a missed dinner. One partner feels left alone with another responsibility. The other feels that a difficult workday has been turned into an accusation about character.

That exchange is an invented example, not a description of what all couples do. Its purpose is to show why a disagreement about time can contain two different problems. There is a practical question: What happened, what responsibilities went uncovered, and what arrangement could work next time? There is also a possible interaction question: What did each partner begin to make the moment mean, and how did each respond?

The two questions should not be collapsed. Changing how an argument unfolds does not automatically solve a childcare problem, an inflexible shift, or a broken agreement. At the same time, finding a practical solution does not necessarily prevent either person from interpreting the next disruption in the same familiar way.

The Visible Issue

Work and schedules create real demands. Couples may have to coordinate paid work, commuting, childcare, elder care, school events, appointments, meals, rest, community obligations, and time alone. Sometimes the conflict is about a late arrival. Sometimes it concerns how often someone is unavailable, who gets to accept extra work, who adjusts when plans change, or who takes responsibility for noticing a conflict before it becomes urgent.

“Time together” also describes several different experiences. Being in the same building is not the same as having uninterrupted time together. Someone can spend an evening at home while remaining responsible for children, work messages, or household tasks. Another person may have fewer hours available but still make an effort to plan, communicate, and follow through.

Research helps establish why the practical issue matters without converting it into a judgment about either person. Flood and Genadek (2016) studied time-use diaries from 46,883 married U.S. adults. Their analyses found that time spent with a spouse varied with parenting and employment circumstances. In some comparisons, differences between employment arrangements became smaller when the researchers accounted for whether the respondent worked on the diary day. Parents, particularly those with younger children, often had less time with a spouse.

These were individual time diaries, not direct observations of couple conflict. The results describe associations between circumstances and measured time allocation. They do not tell us whether the respondent felt considered, whether a partner was unfair, or why any particular couple argued.

This distinction matters. A late return from work might be one event in a long history of preventable broken promises. It might also reflect a shift that cannot be changed without threatening a job. It could involve both a real constraint and a failure to communicate. The facts have to be examined rather than selected to fit the story either partner already believes.

When Work Is Not Easily Moved

It is tempting to treat time as if partners can simply redistribute it by deciding to care more. Some schedules do permit negotiation. Others are assigned, unpredictable, or shaped by limited income, staffing shortages, caregiving needs, and employment rules.

Leupp, Kornrich, and Brines (2021) examined nonstandard work schedules among 913 U.S. married couples observed over three waves of the National Survey of Families and Households. Among couples exposed to night or rotating schedules at one observation, more than a third were again exposed at the next. There was also substantial movement in and out of these arrangements. The study describes a

selected historical cohort, not today's prevalence or a measure of repeated arguments.

Its relevant lesson is modest: Some scheduling pressures persist beyond a single difficult week. A couple may be trying to make workable decisions inside conditions neither partner fully controls. Recognizing those conditions does not erase responsibility for choices that are available. It helps identify which choices actually exist.

Partners may also have different kinds of control. One person might be able to decline an optional meeting but not a mandatory overnight shift. Another might have flexible paid work but be unable to leave a dependent child without care. The question “Why didn't you just come home?” may therefore have a straightforward answer, a complicated answer, or no answer that makes the missed obligation less consequential.

A practical conversation benefits from naming the difference between a choice, a constraint, and an agreement. Those categories should not be used to excuse a pattern of disregarding responsibilities. Nor should they be used to demand that a partner sacrifice employment, autonomy, or safety to prove consideration.

Why the Same Hour Can Carry Different Meanings

The calendar shows what was planned. It does not show what the plan means to either person.

For one partner, a late arrival may bring the thought, “I cannot rely on you when things get hard.” For another, a request to leave work earlier may bring the thought, “Nothing I do is enough.” A third person might see a calendar change as routine and have no strong emotional interpretation at all.

These are possible experiences, not diagnoses or evidence of hidden intent. A partner's feeling of being unimportant is real as an experience, but it does not prove that the other person intended to communicate disregard. Similarly, feeling controlled does not prove that a request for help was an attempt to control.

In Break the Loop, Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance are called the Three Pillars. They are educational lenses for asking what may feel at stake. A work-and-time disagreement could touch Autonomy when someone experiences a request as restricting choice; Intelligence when someone hears an implication that their judgment is inadequate; or

Importance when someone wonders whether their needs matter. These lenses are part of the BTL framework, not independently validated dimensions of scheduling conflict.

It can be useful to ask, “What did that moment start to mean to me?” An interpretation may be partly or entirely accurate, or may need correction. The answer should remain a description of one's own interpretation until the relevant facts can be checked; it should not become an accusation about what the other person secretly meant.

Work Stress and What Comes Home

Sometimes the tension in an evening conversation began somewhere else entirely. A demanding meeting, a difficult customer, an unresolved task, or conflict with a supervisor can accompany someone home.

Story and Repetti (2006) studied 43 selected dual-earner married couples with children over five consecutive workdays. Participants reported workplace events and marital behavior in daily diaries. Following negative social interactions at work, husbands and wives reported more anger and withdrawal in their interactions at home. Their partners' reports did not consistently show the same associations, and some results differed by workload and spouse.

That lack of consistent partner confirmation matters. The study does not show that every stressful workday causes a hostile evening, and five days of reports from a small, comparatively advantaged sample cannot establish a universal mechanism. Still, it supports a bounded observation: For some participants in that study, how work went was related to how they experienced their behavior at home later that day.

There is a difference between understanding a possible influence and excusing conduct. Work pressure may make patience harder or help explain why someone arrived already tense. It does not make threats, intimidation, insults, or abandoned responsibilities harmless. Nor does it mean the partner at home must absorb the consequences without being allowed to raise a concern.

Possible Patterns Around Time

A recurring disagreement about schedules may involve the same visible issue returning. For example, one partner may regularly arrive after the agreed time and the other may regularly assume that the delay shows indifference. But the repetition of a practical problem is not, by itself, proof that the same interaction sequence has repeated.

In BTL terms, a person can examine an episode using Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. A Launch could be a missed message or an unexpected request to stay late. Overload may appear as urgency, a narrowing ability to listen, or difficulty keeping the other person's circumstances in view. An Old Story is the familiar meaning the person begins to assign to the event. A Protection Move could be criticism, argument, withdrawal, reassurance-seeking, or an attempt to control the next exchange.

This is a BTL educational way of organizing experience, not an empirically verified work-and-schedule sequence. A reader should not diagnose a partner's Old Story or intention from one message or a quiet response. Part VI develops the full practice of mapping one's own Loop.

Some couples may notice that discussions become especially difficult around predictable transitions: the end of a workday, a childcare handoff, a shared weekend, or a change in plans. Others may find that the same practical disagreement produces very different conversations. A schedule problem may remain difficult without forming a recognizable Loop at all.

What Must Not Be Assumed

Several assumptions can obscure what actually needs attention.

Being late does not automatically establish a lack of love or care. Being upset about lateness does not automatically mean a person is controlling. Working long hours does not automatically prove dedication to the relationship, and having more flexible hours does not mean someone has unlimited time or an obligation to accommodate everyone else.

The person with the less flexible job is not always the person carrying more total responsibility. Paid hours are only one part of a household's workload. Care for children, older relatives, disability-related needs, and other duties can limit availability even when they do not appear on a pay statement.

It is also a mistake to assume that two people contribute equally to an ongoing conflict simply because both have reactions. One partner may

repeatedly break agreements or leave the other with unfair burdens. The other partner's frustration does not make those decisions equally shared. Likewise, a person may make an understandable request while expressing it in a way that escalates the exchange. Responsibility for those actions remains distinguishable.

The available research also cannot justify declaring that all night work, long hours, or nonstandard schedules harm relationships in the same way. Different studies examine different populations, measures, and outcomes. Some reported associations are conditional or null. For this chapter, the defensible point is that work and time conditions can shape the context of disagreement, not that a particular schedule guarantees a particular relationship outcome.

Two Problems May Need Two Responses

Return to the late-dinner example. Even if both people understand why the text exchange escalated, dinner was still missed and childcare still needed to happen. Someone may have to change a task, arrange backup coverage, notify earlier, or agree on a different expectation for evenings when work runs long.

A workable agreement is specific about reality. Who needs to know about a delay? How much notice is genuinely possible? Which tasks cannot be left undone? Which partner can make an adjustment on a given day? What happens when neither person can meet the original plan? What changes, if any, are realistically within each person's control?

These are questions, not a prescription that every couple must negotiate in the same way. A solution that looks symmetrical on paper may be unworkable if one person has less financial security, less schedule control, greater care responsibilities, or a health limitation. Practical fairness requires examining actual constraints, not simply dividing every task in half.

The interaction itself can be examined separately. One partner might notice a recurring urge to send a sharp message before getting the facts. Another might notice a tendency to stop communicating when criticized, making the practical problem worse. Either person can take responsibility for their own next action without deciding that the original concern was invalid.

As Chapter 2 explains, the issue and the Loop are two different things. Both can matter. Neither automatically replaces the other.

A Possible Place to Interrupt

For ordinary conflict where both people can speak safely, a small interruption may begin before the next accusation, silence, or defensive reply. BTL calls its educational interruption sequence NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT.

For this particular issue, NAME IT might be noticing the shift from missed plans to a judgment about care. SLOW IT creates a pause; CHECK IT separates known scheduling facts from interpretations; CHOOSE IT returns attention to a feasible next response. The sequence is a BTL educational option, not a proven intervention.

For the partner at home, a different message might be: “I need to know by five whether you can cover dinner. If you cannot, please tell me as soon as you know. I am having trouble when plans change without warning.”

For the partner at work, a different response might be: “I see that this left you handling dinner and childcare alone. I could not leave the meeting, but I did know earlier that I might be delayed. I can send an update as soon as I know next time.”

Those responses are illustrative. They are not a tested script or a guarantee that the problem will improve. In some circumstances they may be incomplete or the agreement may have to change. A partner is free to say that the proposed arrangement does not meet a legitimate need.

An important part of interruption is refusing to confuse an explanation with an excuse. A person can describe a real schedule constraint and still acknowledge the impact of not communicating. Someone else can acknowledge that constraint without agreeing to absorb unlimited unplanned responsibilities.

When Shared Pattern Language Is Not Safe

Some work-and-time disputes are not ordinary disagreements over calendars. A partner may threaten someone for going to work, forbid employment or education, interfere with shifts, sabotage transportation, monitor whereabouts, control access to wages, or retaliate when the person asserts independence. Financial abuse and coercive control can involve precisely these forms of interference. The

National Network to End Domestic Violence identifies restricting or sabotaging work and education among the examples of economic abuse (NNEDV, n.d.-a).

Those conditions are not made safer by describing both partners as jointly creating a Loop. Responsibility for threats, control, and sabotage belongs with the person using them. A person who is afraid of retaliation is not obligated to confront the other person, reveal plans, or participate in joint relationship exercises.

Where there is fear, violence, stalking, economic control, threats, or retaliation, safety planning and confidential specialist support take priority. Depending on the circumstances, a domestic violence service, an appropriate professional, a workplace safety resource, or other individual support may be more suitable than joint relationship education. It is important not to prescribe one universal action, since confronting or documenting abuse can itself carry risk.

Even without coercion, outside help may be appropriate when schedules are shaped by severe burnout, ongoing caregiver demands, employment insecurity, or disputes neither partner can resolve through ordinary conversation. Relationship education can help someone consider their own response. It is not a substitute for clinical treatment, legal guidance, workplace protections, disability accommodation, or practical care resources.

The Question Beneath the Clock

Time is both measurable and meaningful. An hour can be unavailable for ordinary practical reasons, and the absence can still have a painful effect. One person may feel dismissed; the other may feel overwhelmed or unfairly judged. Neither feeling alone tells the complete story.

The useful distinction is not between the person who “cares about time” and the person who “does not.” It is between what actually happened, what responsibilities and limitations are real, what each person believes it means, and what each can choose next.

A couple may need a better schedule. They may also need to change how they talk about the next inevitable disruption. They should not have to pretend that either task makes the other unnecessary.

Chapter 25. Family, Friends, and Outside Loyalties

A dinner invitation arrives from one partner's family. One person sees a straightforward plan: a meal, a few hours, and people they care about. The other is already thinking about the previous visit, a difficult conversation, and how hard it was to leave when they wanted to.

They may disagree about whether to go. They may also disagree about what a yes or no would mean.

One partner might hear reluctance as rejection of their family. The other might hear insistence as a sign that their comfort does not matter. Neither interpretation, by itself, establishes the other person's intention. The invitation still requires an answer, and the concerns behind that answer may be entirely legitimate.

Family and friendships are not simply background characters in a couple's relationship. They involve existing commitments, private histories, cultural expectations, practical demands, and other people who are not part of the couple's immediate conversation. An argument about a holiday, a visit, a family request, or a friendship can therefore contain more than one problem at once.

What Is the Visible Issue?

The outward disagreement may concern a specific decision. Which relatives will be invited? How long will a visit last? Who will provide transportation, money, or caregiving? Is someone expected to attend an event they did not agree to? What happens when plans with friends conflict with a family celebration?

Those are real questions. They involve time, capacity, travel, finances, social obligations, and sometimes the treatment one person has received. An agreement about how to speak more carefully does not settle the schedule, pay for transportation, or make another relative behave differently.

At times the concern is not an invitation but a repeated act. A relative may make comments that are unwanted or demeaning. A friend may disregard an agreement about privacy. A family member may expect immediate help regardless of the couple's other responsibilities. The relevant question is not merely why one partner reacts strongly. It is also what happened, whether the concern can be substantiated, and what response is warranted.

A person can be reasonable about the practical issue and still struggle to communicate about it. They can also communicate with great care and still need a firmer boundary. These are different tasks.

Why the Topic May Carry Particular Meaning

A request to spend Saturday with one family may feel like a question of belonging to one partner and a question of choice to the other. Turning down an invitation may be interpreted as disrespect even when the immediate reason is exhaustion. A partner who wants to leave an event early may be seeking distance from a difficult relative, not distance from the relationship.

These are possibilities to check, not motives to assign.

For some couples, contact with relatives or friends also concerns continuity. Each partner brings longstanding ties into the relationship. Those ties do not cease to matter when a couple makes a shared household. Maintaining them may be important even when the partners differ in closeness, customs, or preferred amounts of contact.

Selected studies illustrate why these relationships cannot be reduced to one simple explanation. One study followed 355 Black and White couples from the Early Years of Marriage project over sixteen years. Specific disagreements between spouses' reports of the husband's closeness to the wife's family were associated with later divorce, while several other forms of reported disagreement did not show the same pattern. The study did not establish that a misunderstanding caused a divorce or observe a recurring BTL sequence (Fiori et al., 2021).

A different analysis from that same cohort examined what spouses reported about each other's friends. Associations between early disapproval and later divorce differed by reporting partner and subgroup, and the proposed explanations were not directly tested (Fiori et al., 2018). These are two analyses of an overlapping historical sample, not two independent demonstrations that friends or in-laws undermine relationships.

A March 2026 analysis returned to that same project, examining family-related tension, family and friend support, and perceived marital instability over four survey waves. Greater family-related tension was associated with more reported instability on average across people, but the overall within-person tension association and the direct associations for family or friend support were not statistically significant. Other associations differed according to marital distress,

responsiveness, and subgroup (Shrout et al., 2026). These reports describe marital perceptions in a selected 1986 cohort; they do not establish that family tension causes divorce or that the studies independently replicate one another.

The limited conclusion matters. People can experience the same social relationship differently, and some differences have been associated with relationship outcomes in selected studies. That does not show which interpretation is correct in a particular couple.

When Obligations Are Uneven

Outside loyalties often involve work rather than invitations. An aging parent may need a ride, financial help, or regular contact. A sibling may be unavailable. One partner may have a long history of providing support, while the other is being asked to change their own schedule without much warning.

Such a disagreement should not be reduced to a competition over which family matters more. The responsibility may be real. So may the pressure it places on shared time, money, and the partner who is not providing the help directly.

In a study of 197 middle-aged couples, the total amount of help given to or received from living parents was not associated with marital satisfaction, while differences in the support spouses exchanged with their own parents were associated with reported satisfaction (Lee et al., 2012). A related analysis of 132 of those couples found that some associations between help for parents and marital satisfaction varied according to what each spouse believed about the obligations and rewards of helping parents (Polenick et al., 2017).

These reports concern selected, predominantly White, middle-aged couples and their aging parents. They were observational, and the smaller analysis uses part of the larger study population. They do not establish that helping relatives causes arguments or that unequal help always damages a marriage.

They do, however, caution against the easy explanation that more family involvement necessarily means more relationship strain. What is required, how partners are involved, and what they believe about those obligations are not interchangeable questions.

Holidays, Friends, and Inclusion

Holidays make several questions visible at once: whose traditions continue, whose relatives are nearby, who can afford to travel, whose time off is available, and whether everyone feels genuinely included. Even a couple who agrees about the meaning of a celebration may not have enough money, energy, or childcare to satisfy every expectation.

A friendship can raise a similar set of questions. One partner may have an established group of friends. The other may feel ignored at gatherings, worry that private disagreements are being discussed, or prefer not to attend. The relationship may need an agreement about privacy, time apart, shared events, or respectful treatment. That does not require either partner to abandon friendships as proof of commitment.

Inclusion and consent also matter. An invitation is not necessarily an obligation. Declining one event is not necessarily rejection of the people involved. Yet a pattern of repeated exclusion, cruel treatment, or broken agreements cannot be dismissed simply because a partner is told that their interpretation is mistaken.

The distinction is between what can be observed, what each person experiences, and what each person concludes it means. All three may deserve attention, but they are not the same kind of information.

A Constructed Example: The Sunday Visit

Consider this fictional couple, Taylor and Jordan. On Thursday, Jordan tells Taylor that Jordan's parents expect them for a visit on Sunday afternoon. Taylor says they cannot agree to another visit without discussing it first. Jordan replies that the parents will think Taylor dislikes them.

Taylor says, “You make plans for both of us and tell me afterward.”

Jordan answers, “You never want to see my family.”

The exchange is now carrying two different claims. Taylor is speaking about an agreement that did not happen. Jordan is speaking about what Taylor's objection might signify. Either claim might be disputed or partly accurate. The reader cannot determine their intentions from these lines.

What is known is narrower. Jordan communicated an expectation about Sunday. Taylor objected to not being consulted. Jordan introduced a prediction about Jordan's parents' reaction. Taylor said they were excluded from the planning.

The concrete issue still needs an answer. Do they go on Sunday? For how long? Are there other commitments? Is the expectation that both attend, or would it be acceptable for one to visit alone? And is the earlier agreement, if one exists, being honored?

The conversation may also contain a familiar sequence. One partner may experience not being consulted as being unimportant. The other may experience a refusal as being forced to choose between people. Those interpretations are not facts until checked. A thoughtful response does not require either partner to pretend the scheduling question is trivial.

The Issue and the Loop Are Different

As Chapter 2, "The Issue and the Pattern," explained, an Issue is the matter being argued about. Within BTL, the proposed recurring Loop is the progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move that may unfold around an issue. The subjects, interpretations, emotions, and particular responses can change between conversations about holidays, visits, or friends. Repeated reactions alone do not establish that the same four-stage progression occurred, and recognizing a possible progression does not prove a hidden mechanism.

Break the Loop organizes a self-described episode as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. In the fictional Sunday example, the Launch could be the announcement of plans; Overload might involve urgency or a narrowing ability to listen; an Old Story could be "I have no say" or "My family will never be accepted"; and a Protection Move might be criticism, withdrawal, or defensive insistence.

This is an educational map, not a diagnosis or an independently validated description of that couple. Old Stories may be accurate,

inaccurate, or partly accurate. Overload does not eliminate responsibility for conduct. A Protection Move may have an understandable function without excusing its effects.

It is also possible that no useful Loop analysis is needed. If two people are discussing a new logistical problem with reasonable disagreement, the better question may simply be what decision works. Naming a Loop should not become a way to win an argument about a real obligation.

What Not to Assume

Family disagreements are particularly vulnerable to broad conclusions. A partner who protects time with a parent is not automatically choosing that parent over their spouse. A partner who sets limits on visits is not automatically trying to separate the other from their family. A relative who expresses concern is not necessarily acting in bad faith, and a partner who reports repeated disrespect should not have to prove their experience by accepting an imposed interpretation.

A disagreement over a boundary is also not the same as a clear boundary being ignored. If someone says they will not stay in a gathering where a relative insults them, that limit deserves to be considered on its merits. The other partner may feel disappointed or caught between obligations. Their discomfort does not make the limit illegitimate.

Conversely, a demand that someone stop seeing all friends or family cannot be justified simply by calling it a relationship boundary. Context matters, especially whether a person can disagree freely and maintain independent support.

The aim is not to declare all perspectives equally correct. It is to separate the evidence of what happened, each person's experience, and each person's interpretation, then address responsibility and practical decisions without inventing a motive.

A Possible Place to Interrupt

In safe, ordinary disagreements, a couple may choose to pause before arguing about loyalty and return to the next observable decision. Break the Loop offers the educational sequence NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT.

For Taylor and Jordan, NAME IT might mean identifying the immediate problem: Sunday was announced before they made a joint plan. SLOW IT could mean noticing that each is starting to defend a larger story about being excluded or rejected. CHECK IT would involve testing the meaning rather than declaring it. Taylor could ask whether Jordan worries the parents will feel unwelcome. Jordan could ask whether Taylor's objection concerns the lack of consultation, the visit itself, or something that happened on an earlier occasion.

CHOOSE IT would still require a decision. They might agree to respond to the invitation together, shorten the visit, alternate certain commitments, or decline this occasion. If a relative has behaved disrespectfully, the choice may need to include a clear limit and a plan for what to do if it is ignored.

None of these options guarantees that the couple will agree or that the relative will respond well. The sequence is a BTL educational practice, not an intervention shown by these in-law studies to improve relationship outcomes.

When Shared-Pattern Language Is Not Safe

There is an essential distinction between ordinary negotiations over time with family and a partner's coercive effort to restrict the other person's support network. Preventing contact with friends or relatives, monitoring communication, intimidating someone for seeking help, or threatening retaliation are not merely competing loyalties. The U.S. Department of Justice identifies forced isolation and other controlling conduct as forms of domestic abuse (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2025).

Where fear, coercion, threats, stalking, violence, or retaliation are present, ordinary mutual Loop work is not the appropriate first response. Safety, accountability, and specialized support take priority. One partner's attempt to protect themselves from controlling conduct must not be treated as equal responsibility for that conduct.

A reader in the United States who needs confidential support can contact the National Domestic Violence Hotline at 800-799-7233 or thehotline.org. Where someone is in immediate danger, emergency services may be necessary. This book is relationship education, not a substitute for individualized safety assessment or clinical care.

When Outside Support May Help

Outside support may also be useful without abuse. Repeated arguments about eldercare, strained family relationships, commitments that one partner cannot decline, or long-running disagreements over boundaries can involve more people and resources than a couple can reasonably manage alone.

Depending on the situation, the useful support might be practical assistance with caregiving, a clearer family arrangement, a neutral planning conversation, or a qualified relationship professional. The choice should fit the actual difficulty. If the concern involves fear or coercive control, seek support appropriate to safety rather than standard joint conflict work.

A recurring family dispute is not solved merely by identifying the emotion beneath it. The visit still needs an answer. The agreement still needs to be honored. A relative's conduct may still require a boundary, and each partner's outside relationships may still deserve respect.

The distinction that matters is whether the couple can address those realities without letting untested conclusions about loyalty decide the conversation for them.

Chapter 26. Trust, Agreements, and Broken Expectations

An agreement can be broken before the argument about it begins. A conversation about that breach can then become another problem. Those two events require separate attention.

If someone promised to complete an important task and did not, the unfinished task remains real. If they also concealed what happened, the concealment requires its own account. Examining the argument does not make either concern disappear. Conversely, when the facts or the agreement itself are uncertain, the intensity of a person's reaction cannot settle what occurred.

This chapter concerns reliability, honesty, privacy, commitments, and the conversations around them. Its central question is how to examine a recurring interaction while preserving the difference between an expectation, an established breach, and an interpretation of what that breach means. Serious betrayal requires more than a communication explanation; coercion, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, and fear require a safety response.

What Is the Trust Question?

“I don't trust you” leaves several questions unspecified. Does the concern involve whether a commitment will be kept, whether an account is truthful, whether private information will remain private, or whether a partner will respond with care? Naming the particular concern gives the conversation a more definite subject.

Trust research has examined predictability, dependability, and confidence about an uncertain future. A 2025 measurement study revisited those ideas in two samples of romantically involved individuals. Its results supported a modified trust measure, while also identifying differences in how some items functioned across newer and longer relationships. These were cross-sectional surveys, not observations of trust recovering after betrayal (Camanto & Campbell, 2025).

The distinction offers vocabulary rather than a prescription to have faith. Familiar behavior can be predictable without being acceptable. A person can also express confidence while lacking information about a particular event. Neither confidence nor uncertainty establishes whether someone is safe or truthful.

For the practical purposes of this guide, the question can be made concrete: “What am I being asked to rely on, and what do I currently know about it?” That question permits attention to both an unmet commitment and information still missing. It does not require the concerned person to prove a hidden motive before addressing observable conduct.

An Expectation Is Not Automatically a Shared Agreement

An expectation might have been stated clearly, discussed only indirectly, or never communicated. An agreement involves an understanding that both people actually accepted. Disagreement about whether that occurred is different from acknowledgment that a promise was made and broken.

These distinctions are an educational way of organizing the issue, not a validated classification of all trust problems. Their purpose is to prevent unlike situations from being treated as identical. “I thought you would call” and “You agreed to call before changing the plan” may require different clarification.

Consider the information needed before making the next decision. What was said? What did each person understand? Did the plan change? Was that change communicated? If an agreement is acknowledged, what was not done? If accounts conflict, what can be established and what remains disputed?

Uncertainty should remain uncertainty. It should not become a verdict that nothing happened. Equally, a partner's certainty about an intention does not make that intention known. A missed commitment may establish a failure to follow through while leaving the reason for that failure unresolved.

An unclear agreement also does not excuse independently harmful conduct. A person does not need to negotiate a special rule against threats or sexual coercion before those behaviors deserve attention. Clarifying expectations is appropriate to ordinary disagreements, not a requirement that a harmed person should have anticipated and prohibited every possible harm.

What the Event Begins to Mean

A disagreement about a missed commitment may contain a specific concern and a larger conclusion. “The task was not done” concerns conduct. “I cannot rely on you for anything” reaches beyond that event.

The larger conclusion may reflect relevant history, an overgeneralization, or a mixture of the two. Its accuracy cannot be decided from the sentence alone.

This is where the distinction between experience and proof of intention matters. Feeling disregarded is an experience someone can describe. Concluding that a partner deliberately disregarded them adds an explanation of motive. The explanation may need checking even when the harm itself is established.

Within Break the Loop, an Old Story is a familiar meaning or prediction becoming influential in the interaction. It is not automatically false. Calling a concern an Old Story cannot disprove documented dishonesty, erase a previous agreement, or make the concerned person responsible for restoring trust. Chapter 14, “Old Story: What Did the Moment Begin to Mean?”, develops that distinction.

There is also a difference between an explanation and an excuse. Being distracted may explain a missed action. Feeling ashamed may be offered as context for avoiding a conversation. Neither statement settles responsibility for the conduct or its consequences. The person affected can understand the explanation and still regard the proposed response as insufficient.

A Fictional Example: The Unsent Form

In this invented, ordinary safe disagreement, one partner agreed to submit a household insurance form by Friday. On Saturday, the other asks whether it was submitted. The answer is, “Not yet. I forgot.” The form remains unsent, and both acknowledge the agreement.

The concerned partner says, “Then I have to check everything.” The other replies, “You talk to me like I can't do anything.” The discussion turns toward whether one person is constantly checking and the other is constantly defending. The original deadline remains unanswered.

Suppose the first partner describes their own experience this way: “When you said it wasn't done, I felt urgency. I started thinking I would always be left responsible. I listed several other missed tasks.” This supplies a possible self-described sequence. It does not establish a diagnosis or a universal explanation of checking behavior.

BTL offers a way to examine that account through Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The acknowledged missed action is the

Launch; urgency and narrowing attention may be described as Overload; the prediction about always being left responsible is the Old Story. If the person identifies listing earlier failures as their familiar defensive response, they might examine it as a Protection Move. A record of earlier missed commitments may also be relevant evidence. Referring to that record is not inherently an unhelpful response. Chapter 11, “An Organizing Model for Recurring Conflict,” explains the model fully.

The partner who missed the deadline could likewise describe their own response. The reader should not invent it on their behalf. Both people can examine their conduct during the exchange without making the original failure equally theirs. A less accusatory question would not retroactively submit the form.

The next practical decision remains specific: whether the form can still be submitted, how the person responsible will address it, and what consequences remain. Discussion of the interaction can accompany that decision. It cannot certify that the task is completed or require the concerned partner to take over responsibility.

What Trust-Repair Research Can and Cannot Supply

A systematic review of thirteen articles identified themes in trust rebuilding, including openness, accountability, and shared activity. Most included articles were qualitative, and the literature concentrated on fidelity-related trust. Small and varied samples limit what can be concluded about other breaches. The themes do not establish a universally effective recovery sequence or timetable (Giacobbi & Lalot, 2025).

More narrowly, a two-week diary study of 78 dating undergraduates found that reported amends was associated with perceived incident resolution, even after accounting for forgiveness. It did not demonstrate that making amends caused renewed trust or prevented repeated harm (Hannon et al., 2010).

There is also reason to resist treating forgiveness as protection against future mistreatment. One observational study of 72 newlywed couples linked greater stated willingness to forgive with more persistent

partner-reported aggression over follow-up. Hypothetical forgiveness measures, a selected sample, and substantial attrition limit that finding. It does not show that forgiveness causes abuse or make harmed people responsible for preventing it (McNulty, 2011).

These findings concern different experiences and outcomes. Perceiving one incident as resolved is not evidence that a person will be reliable later. Forgiveness, continued participation, and renewed trust should not be treated as interchangeable obligations. Chapter 10, "Repair After Difficult Conflict," provides the fuller research discussion; Chapters 41–43 address aftermath and repeated harm in application.

What Accountability Still Requires Attention To

For an acknowledged broken agreement, a useful educational distinction is between what is said now and what happens later. "I will submit it on Monday" states a proposed action. Whether submission occurs is a later fact. The proposal can identify what completion would mean without proving that the commitment will be kept.

The relevant conduct also matters. Keeping a different promise does not establish that the original obligation was met. An affectionate evening does not answer whether private information was shared. In each example, the issue requires an account suited to the actual concern.

Specificity should not make the affected person the automatic supervisor. In the form example, the person who accepted the task could propose how they will confirm completion. The other person may decide that the arrangement is acceptable, ask for a different plan, or decline further responsibility. A promise does not transfer the work of making it true to its recipient.

Where the same harm continues, another description of the conversation may be insufficient. The relevant questions include whether the conduct has changed, whether an agreement remains voluntary and realistic, and whether the person affected can set limits without retaliation. This chapter does not decide whether someone should remain in a relationship. It preserves the information those decisions may require.

A Possible Place to Interrupt

For safe, voluntary disagreements, BTL offers NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. This is an educational practice, not a sequence shown by the cited trust studies to restore trust. Chapters 35–38 teach its parts in detail.

In the fictional example, the partner who missed the deadline might NAME IT by acknowledging both the unfinished task and their defensiveness. SLOW IT could involve asking for enough time to answer carefully rather than arguing about every previous disagreement. A defined pause should not be used to conceal an urgent deadline or leave the practical consequences unaddressed.

CHECK IT can distinguish what is known from what is assumed: "I agreed to do this and didn't. Are you asking when I will finish it, or whether you can rely on this arrangement at all?" The question does not require the other person to doubt an established breach. CHOOSE IT might mean proposing a concrete action, accepting a boundary, or acknowledging that the current arrangement has not worked.

The concerned partner has choices too, including asking for information, declining to take over, or deciding that another promise is not enough. These possibilities do not assign them responsibility for producing the other person's accountability. A calmer exchange is not a certificate of renewed trust.

Privacy, Secrecy, and Safety

Privacy should not automatically be treated as deception. A request to retain private correspondence, seek individual support, or decline account access is not proof of wrongdoing. Conversely, knowingly concealing conduct that breaks an acknowledged agreement should not disappear under the label of privacy. The actual conduct and the nature of the agreement still matter.

Trust language can also be used to justify coercion. Threats, intimidation, forced isolation, and technological monitoring intended to control or stalk someone warrant a safety response. U.S. Department of Justice guidance identifies such conduct as abuse-related concerns, rather than ordinary relationship negotiation (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2025).

This does not mean every request for information is abusive. It means that fear, coercion, and retaliation change the appropriate response. If a person cannot safely decline, disagree, maintain independent support, or protect access to their own resources, joint Loop mapping should not be the starting point. Private support from a qualified professional or specialist domestic violence service may be more appropriate. Immediate danger requires urgent help.

Serious betrayal can also exceed ordinary educational work without involving coercion. A qualified clinician may be useful where the facts, consequences, distress, or decisions require individualized assessment. Neither an apology nor a shared discussion obliges reconciliation, further disclosure, sexual contact, or continued participation.

Keeping the Original Question Visible

In an ordinary trust disagreement, interruption leaves several questions open for direct attention: what happened, what was agreed, what remains uncertain, who is responsible, and what happens next. Those questions need not all receive the same answer.

Understanding a recurring interaction can accompany accountability. It cannot replace evidence of follow-through, establish an unknown intention, or require someone to trust again. The issue and the Loop remain different, and an acknowledged breach remains the responsibility of the person who committed it.

The next part of this guide turns from the issues that couples face to the process of recognizing and mapping a possible Loop. Chapter 27 begins by asking what, if anything, actually recurs across disagreements. This shift does not set the practical issues aside: a map of Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move remains distinct from evidence about promises, decisions, and their consequences.

PART V | RECOGNIZING THE SEQUENCE

Chapter 27. Recognizing Repetition

What, exactly, is happening again?

"We have had this fight before" can refer to several different things. The unpaid bill may be the same. The feeling of being dismissed may be familiar. You may recognize the moment you start defending yourself, or the quiet distance that follows. Before calling these the same pattern, ask what you are comparing.

In this chapter, recognition means developing a specific, provisional account of what happens across disagreements. It does not mean diagnosing the relationship or proving what your partner intends. A useful account is specific enough to compare with other difficult conversations. "We argue about everything" leaves that work unfinished.

The Field Guide uses recurring couple conflict as an umbrella term for repeated conflict in which recognizable interactional dynamics recur across one or more issues over time. Within Break the Loop, the recurring sequence is defined specifically as the progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. Topics, thoughts, feelings, and specific Protection Moves may vary across experiences. BTL is the educational framework created by Aaron Jarrels; its particular organization should be distinguished from the external research discussed here.

The practical guidance in this chapter is an educational synthesis. The observation domains are not a validated test, and there is no established score or minimum number of disagreements offered here for deciding that you have a Loop. You can describe a possible pattern while remaining uncertain about parts of it. You do not have to make every episode fit.

Look for a sequence across episodes

Begin with a disagreement you can describe concretely. What happened before you answered? What did you say or do? What happened next? Then consider another disagreement and ask which parts, if any, resemble the first. The aim is to compare episodes, rather than replay one argument repeatedly and call that recurrence.

For a brief constructed illustration, imagine one person asking when a household task will be done. The other gives a detailed explanation of competing responsibilities. The first repeats the request more forcefully. The second begins disputing the wording instead of answering the practical question. This is a fictional teaching example, not evidence about how couples generally behave.

Now imagine a separate exchange about weekend plans. A question is followed by a detailed defense, a more forceful request, and a dispute about wording. The topics differ, but there is a candidate sequence to compare. The observations do not establish that the question was unreasonable, the explanation was insincere, or responsibility was equal. Each issue still needs attention on its own terms.

Compare the order as well as the presence of behaviors. “I explained, you repeated the request, and I corrected your wording” is more specific than “we both got upset.” Leave gaps where memory is incomplete. If you remember becoming quiet but cannot recall what immediately preceded it, that is the limit of the account for now.

One repeated response is also less specific than a repeated exchange. You might explain yourself during many kinds of disagreement, but the partner's response and the subsequent course may differ. Describe those differences. Keep the proposed pattern limited to the parts you can actually describe.

The topic can vary, and it can matter

Chapter 2, “The Issue and the Pattern,” develops the distinction between the substantive concern and the interaction around it. Recognition requires keeping both in view. A recurring unpaid bill remains a financial problem even if the conversation also becomes repetitive. A change in conversational tone does not establish that the bill has been paid or an agreement kept.

Research gives a reason to be cautious about assuming the same process operates independently of topic. In a home-diary study of 116

married couples with children, demand-withdraw, combining pressure for engagement with disengagement, was more likely during disagreements about the marital relationship (Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009). These were reports of complementary tactics within disagreements, not direct observations proving an identical sequence across episodes.

For your own comparison, ask whether the proposed pattern appears across different topics, only around one issue, or mainly under particular circumstances. An account restricted to decisions about family visits may be more accurate than "this is how we handle everything." Neither account should be chosen simply because it sounds more comprehensive.

The same topic can also be revisited without the same interaction occurring. An unresolved scheduling problem may return because the practical arrangement still does not work. If one conversation includes criticism and withdrawal while another involves direct disagreement and a workable decision, preserve that difference. Repetition of subject matter alone does not establish repetition of sequence.

Notice the familiar emotional experience

A familiar emotional experience is another place to look. You might recognize urgency, embarrassment, resentment, sadness, or the expectation that you will not be heard. Here, "emotional signature" simply means the quality of experience you recognize. It is not a diagnosis or a separate BTL construct.

Use the feeling as a prompt for observation rather than a verdict about the exchange. "I felt the same pressure I remember from Sunday" describes your experience. "Therefore you were doing exactly what you did on Sunday" adds a conclusion that needs its own support. You can take the feeling seriously without treating it as a complete record of another person's behavior.

Try to locate the feeling in the particular episode. Did you notice it before anything was said, after a question, while explaining, or once the conversation ended? If the timing is unclear, say so. You are describing what you can identify, not filling in a required emotional progression.

Within BTL, Overload refers to narrowing capacity, such as finding it harder to listen or consider another interpretation. It is one part of the

framework's sequence, Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. A familiar feeling alone does not establish all four parts, and Overload does not remove agency or responsibility. The detailed mapping work belongs in the chapters that follow.

Separate familiar meanings from established facts

Next, ask whether a familiar interpretation appears. “My judgment does not count,” “I will have to handle this alone,” or “Nothing I do will be enough” are possible meanings someone might report. Within BTL, a familiar meaning or prediction becoming influential is called an Old Story. The term does not mean the concern is false.

Write the interpretation as an interpretation. “I took the question to mean that my judgment was not trusted” preserves what the moment meant to you. It leaves open what the questioner actually intended. If earlier broken agreements support your concern, include those facts too. Examining meaning should not require setting aside documented behavior or accepting a partner's denial as the final account.

Attribution research examines how people explain a partner's behavior. In a study of 280 young married couples, early responsibility attributions predicted a later combined measure of the person's own warmth and hostility after initial marital quality was taken into account (Durtschi et al., 2011). The selected, predominantly European-descent cohort and observational design limit generalization. The study did not establish the accuracy of individual interpretations or show that those interpretations caused a particular repeated fight.

For recognition, keep the question narrower: “Does this meaning recur in my account of these episodes?” That is different from deciding that the meaning caused every response, came from a particular childhood experience, or reveals a hidden motive. If the meaning differs between episodes, record that rather than selecting whichever interpretation makes the proposed pattern look most consistent.

Describe repeated responses without assigning identities

Look at what you actually did. “I repeated the question,” “I listed everything I had already done,” or “I stopped answering” describes behavior. Within BTL, a Protection Move is the next response as a

person tries to manage what the moment has come to mean. The label should not substitute for describing the action.

The same restraint applies to your partner. You can report that they changed the subject or left the room without claiming to know why. Do not automatically classify a request as pressure, an explanation as defensiveness, or disengagement as a harmful withdrawal. Context, stated purpose, impact, and safety still matter. A legitimate boundary does not become a problem merely because it interrupts the conversation.

Compare responses in the context of the exchange. When you asked again, did the partner answer, argue about the request, seek clarification, or disengage? Did you then continue, change approach, or stop? A provisional account can include several recurring features without claiming that every interaction has the same ending or that either person has a fixed role.

One recent pooled observational study of 1,957 mixed-gender couples identified a communication profile with high negative reciprocity, meaning negative responses following a partner's negative behavior, and relatively high reported relationship satisfaction (Wojda-Burlij et al., 2026). The analysis used one selected laboratory discussion per couple. It neither establishes stable couple types nor shows recurring conflict is harmless. It cautions against treating one observed communication feature as a complete assessment of the relationship.

Include what happens afterward

Recognition need not stop at the last spoken sentence. Ask what followed in each episode: Did the original issue receive an answer? Was an agreement made? Was it carried out? Did contact resume? Was there distance, continued arguing, an apology, or no clear ending? Keep practical follow-through separate from whether the atmosphere became calmer.

The aftermath can be described without assuming its cause. "We did not speak about the decision again that evening" is an observation. "You were punishing me" assigns intent. If someone explicitly stated a punitive intention, that is relevant information, but silence alone does not establish it. Nor does a friendly conversation afterward establish that the earlier harm or practical problem was addressed.

In a 21-day diary study of 115 heterosexual cohabiting couples, reported withdrawal after conflict was associated with less favorable recovery on

several measures (Prager et al., 2019). Some associations differed with perceptions of punitive behavior, and predicted effects of attachment anxiety, meaning worry about rejection or a partner's availability, were not consistently supported. The self-report study does not justify treating withdrawal as uniformly harmful or beneficial, or equating it with a planned pause or a safety boundary.

For your comparison, distinguish an announced pause from an unanswered request to return, and distinguish both from leaving because an interaction is unsafe. If the repeated aftermath is that an agreement remains unfulfilled, include that concrete outcome. “We became close again” and “the responsibility was completed” answer different questions. Neither should stand in for the other.

Check the account against differences

Once you have a possible description, look for episodes it does not explain. Consider a discussion of the same issue that went differently, or a similar response that had a different consequence. This is part of the proposed observation approach, not a demand to disprove your concern. Keep exceptions alongside the repeated features.

An exception may narrow the description. Instead of “every request becomes a fight,” your account might be “in the disagreements I can describe about unfinished tasks, I begin explaining before answering the question.” That sentence identifies a context and your own response. It does not assert a universal rule or decide which partner is right about the unfinished work.

If it is safe and useful, brief notes can preserve your account of an episode: the actual issue, the order you remember, your feelings and interpretation, your response, and what followed. Note uncertainty and differences as well. There is no prescribed recording schedule here, and a written account remains your account. The chapter does not establish that taking notes improves conflict outcomes.

A partner may remember the episode differently. Where discussion is safe, you can distinguish the parts you agree happened from the parts reported by only one person. Agreement on a complete explanation is not required to describe your own behavior or take a legitimate concern seriously. The purpose is not to assemble a case that forces the partner to accept a label.

Safety changes the task

Do not use this comparison process to reframe threats, violence, coercive control, stalking, sexual coercion, or fear of retaliation as an ordinary shared Loop. Safety and accountability take precedence over mutual pattern analysis. Official domestic-violence guidance identifies intimidation, coercion, isolation, and controlling behavior as safety concerns, not simply communication difficulties (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2025).

You do not need a count of episodes, your partner's agreement, or a complete map before seeking individualized specialized support. Do not keep or share notes if discovery could expose you to retaliation. You are not required to confront a partner, remain in an unsafe conversation, or take responsibility for preventing their harmful behavior. Recognizing involvement in an interaction does not establish equal responsibility, harm, or power.

A provisional description is enough to begin

For an ordinary, safe disagreement, a provisional description might be: “When I ask about an unfinished agreement, I hear the explanation as dismissal. I repeat the request more sharply, and we begin arguing about how I asked. The agreement is still unresolved afterward.” This is another constructed micro-example. It identifies an issue, reported meaning, observable responses, and an aftermath while leaving motives and unobserved details open.

That description is something to examine, not a diagnosis or a complete explanation. Keep what is supported, leave uncertainty visible, and revise the account when a later episode differs. You do not need to name the pattern perfectly or make your partner's sequence complete before noticing your own part.

Chapter 28, “Map the Issue and the Loop Separately,” develops the next distinction in practical detail: what needs to be addressed, and what begins happening while you address it. Recognizing repetition gives that work a specific starting point without deciding the issue for you.

Chapter 28. Map the Issue and the Loop Separately

Keep the concern in view

"We are getting into our Loop" does not answer whether a responsibility was completed, an agreement was kept, or a boundary was respected. Recognizing an interaction gives you something to examine. It does not settle the matter you were trying to discuss.

Chapter 2, "The Issue and the Pattern," established the distinction. Here the task is practical: describe what needs attention, then describe what starts happening while you try to address it. Keep both accounts specific enough that one cannot quietly replace the other.

In Break the Loop (BTL), the issue is what the partners are actually trying to address. Within BTL, the Loop is the proposed progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move that a person may recognize across different disagreements; it is not simply a repeated topic, belief, or behavior. The issue and the Loop are two different things. Both can matter. These are organizing terms within Aaron Jarrels's relationship education framework, not a diagnosis of the relationship.

The mapping guidance here is an optional educational application of that distinction. The evidence reviewed here does not establish this guidance as a validated assessment or show that it resolves disagreements. Use it to describe an ordinary, safe interaction provisionally. You do not need to produce a complete map, persuade a partner to participate, or fit every exchange into the framework.

Issue: What needs to be addressed?

Begin with the actual concern rather than a verdict about the relationship. In a fictional shared-car example, "The car was returned with too little fuel for the trip I had planned" identifies something that can be examined. "You never consider me" expresses a broader conclusion. The conclusion may reflect a serious concern, but it does not yet specify what happened or what needs attention.

Describe the relevant conduct, arrangement, and consequence. Was there an explicit agreement about refueling? Was one person relying on it? What was the practical effect? If no agreement had been made, that belongs in the account too. An expectation and a shared commitment are different things; neither should be invented afterward to make the account look clearer.

Separate what you know from what you still need to establish. You may know the fuel gauge was close to empty and that you had to stop before an appointment. You may not know whether your partner noticed it. The inconvenience does not disappear because intention is uncertain. Equally, the inconvenience alone does not establish deliberate disregard.

Next, identify what remains outstanding. In this example, that might be an agreement about returning the shared car ready for the next person's use. If a clear commitment was missed, acknowledgment and responsibility for the consequence may also matter. These are possible concerns in a constructed example, not a rule that every couple needs the same arrangement.

An issue description need not end with compromise. A person may need information, a decision, a fulfilled responsibility, or a boundary. “I do not consent to that” is not an incomplete answer simply because it does not offer a middle position. Mapping should not convert a legitimate limit into a problem to negotiate away.

Loop: What starts happening while we address it?

Now describe the interaction without replacing the issue. Begin with the exchange you remember: what was said or done, how you experienced it, what you did next, and what followed. Keep observations and interpretations distinguishable. Where memory is incomplete, leave the uncertainty visible.

For a brief fictional illustration, imagine the car's next user asking, “Why did you leave it almost empty?” The partner replies, “I only drove to the store.” The questioner says, “That doesn't answer what I'm asking.” The partner responds, “You make it sound as if I did this on purpose.” The conversation shifts toward whether the opening question was an accusation.

The issue account concerns the fuel, the reliance on the car, and any relevant agreement. The interaction account concerns the question, the explanation, the repeated request, and the dispute about intention.

Describing that exchange does not establish whether the explanation was evasive or the question intended as criticism. Those claims would need additional information.

From the questioner's perspective, a provisional account might be: “When I heard an explanation without an answer about refueling, I took it to mean that the inconvenience did not matter. I repeated the question more sharply. We then argued about whether I was accusing you.” That account marks a reported meaning and the speaker's own response. It does not fill in the partner's inner experience.

Within BTL, the full sequence is Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The detailed mapping chapters that follow address those parts individually. Here, a useful limit is to record only what you can identify. Do not invent narrowing capacity, a familiar meaning, or a protective function merely to complete the sequence. One described exchange also does not establish recurrence; Chapter 27 explains comparison across episodes.

Keep context and responsibility attached

The subject of a discussion should remain attached to its interaction description. Research on selected conflict discussions illustrates why. In a methods study, conclusions about observed demand-withdraw roles differed when researchers accounted for which partner was more dissatisfied with each selected topic (Crenshaw et al., 2021). Demand-withdraw concerns seeking engagement or change alongside disengagement; it is not another name for the BTL Loop.

The principal behavioral test involved 134 distressed married heterosexual couples discussing selected topics (Crenshaw et al., 2021). It does not establish that every couple switches roles, that one partner's concern is justified, or that this chapter's mapping guidance improves outcomes. Its narrower relevance is that an account of behavior needs its discussion context. Chapter 2 gives the fuller research treatment.

A repeated request may concern something that has repeatedly gone unanswered. An explanation may contain information necessary to understand what happened. A refusal may be a legitimate boundary.

Describe the actual response before assigning a conflict label, and preserve what the request, explanation, or refusal was about.

Responsibility for the issue and responsibility for conduct during the conversation also need separate descriptions. If one person missed an agreed responsibility, the other person's later sharpness does not retroactively cause that omission. If the questioner insults the partner, identifying the missed responsibility does not excuse the insult. Each action can be considered without assuming the contributions or consequences were equal.

The same distinction applies to your own account. You can acknowledge, “I interrupted before hearing the answer,” while retaining, “The arrangement still needs to change.” Or you can acknowledge a missed commitment while asking that the discussion proceed without insults. Neither acknowledgment settles every other question.

Put the two descriptions together without merging them

If it is safe and useful, describe one episode in two short passages. Under Issue, state the specific concern, relevant known facts or agreement, consequence, and what remains to be addressed. Mark a disputed detail as disputed rather than treating it as settled or erasing it. A partner's disagreement does not, by itself, disprove your account.

Under Loop, describe the order of responses you can identify and your own reported experience. Include what you did next, rather than only what your partner did. A phrase such as “I understood that as dismissing the inconvenience” identifies an interpretation. It remains one person's provisional account, not an agreed transcript or proof of intent.

Then read each passage against the other. Does the interaction description still leave the practical concern visible? Does the issue description distinguish the original conduct from what happened during the discussion? If either passage consists mainly of labels such as “selfish” or “defensive,” replace the label with the action or reported experience you can describe.

You may find that one passage is much clearer than the other. The agreement might be documented while the order of the conversation is uncertain. Or you may remember the exchange but discover that the expected arrangement had never been discussed. Keep that difference.

A complete-looking account is less accurate if it fills missing information with assumptions.

These descriptions do not have to become a written record. If you choose to make notes, they remain your account and can be revised. You are not required to record episodes, obtain agreement about every detail, or share notes with a partner. Do not keep or disclose material if discovery could expose you to retaliation.

Distinguish a calmer exchange from an addressed concern

After mapping, ask separately what remains of the issue. Has a decision been made? Has a missed responsibility actually been completed? Is an arrangement still disputed? The answer may remain unfinished even if the conversation is calmer. A change in atmosphere is not evidence that an action occurred.

In the car example, the partners could speak respectfully and still leave the refueling question unanswered. They could also agree on refueling while remaining dissatisfied with how they spoke to each other. These are constructed possibilities, not findings about what mapping produces. Neither description should certify success on behalf of the other.

Avoid using recognition as a condition the other person must meet before a concern can be heard. “We need to talk about the Loop before I answer you” should not become an indefinite exemption from the original responsibility. You can identify a conversation you are unwilling or unable to continue while still being clear about what remains unresolved. This does not require staying in an unsafe interaction or promising further contact where that would be unsafe.

Mapping also does not decide which practical solution to choose. A schedule may need changing, a responsibility may need reallocating, or a boundary may need maintaining. Those decisions require the relevant facts, preferences, obligations, and consent. An interaction description does not supply them automatically.

When safety changes the task

Do not use the two descriptions to turn coercion, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, or fear of retaliation into an ordinary shared Loop. Official domestic-violence guidance identifies intimidation, coercive behavior, and control as safety concerns (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2025). A mutual

conversation map must not replace attention to the conduct and the danger.

If it is unsafe to disagree, decline, seek support, or leave the conversation, prioritize safety and individualized specialized support rather than joint mapping. You do not need a complete account or a partner's agreement before seeking help. Do not confront a partner or disclose a map because this chapter suggests describing an interaction. Chapter 53 develops the safety and referral boundaries more fully.

Carry both questions forward

For an ordinary, safe disagreement, the result may be modest: a clearer statement of the concern and a provisional account of what happened while discussing it. Neither needs to explain the whole relationship. Leave uncertain details open, and keep the practical matter visible as you examine your own responses.

Chapter 29, “Map Your Launch,” narrows the next task to what happened and what you noticed, while distinguishing observation from inference. Carry the issue description with you. Greater detail about the sequence should not cost you sight of what still needs addressing.

Chapter 29. Map Your Launch

Begin with one moment

A recurring disagreement may be described in a single sentence that mixes an event with a conclusion about why it happened: “You changed the plans because you do not respect my time.” Perhaps the plan changed. Perhaps that change had a real cost. The statement about respect is a further interpretation. Mapping a Launch begins by giving those elements separate places.

Chapter 12 introduced Launch as a Break the Loop (BTL) concept. Within BTL, a Launch is the event as the person experienced it when they began getting pulled into the Loop. It can be something said, done, noticed, or missing. The question is not “Who caused this entire argument?” but “What happened or what did I notice at the point where I began getting pulled in?”

That question matters because one sentence can contain several different claims. Some concern events that could be checked. Others concern an individual's experience. Still others attribute an intention or belief to a partner. All may matter, but they are not interchangeable. A description of a Launch does not settle whether an agreement was broken, who is accountable, or what another person meant.

The following mapping process is an optional educational application of the BTL framework, not a validated assessment or a demonstrated method for reducing conflict. It can help organize an account without establishing that the account is complete or that the four-part Loop has been independently validated. You can leave any answer unfinished when the information is insufficient.

Choose a specific exchange

Start with a particular episode rather than a summary of the whole relationship. “Last night, when we were discussing the weekend schedule” gives a setting. “Whenever you disregard me” begins with a general conclusion and leaves the event unclear.

Consider a fictional example. Jordan and Taylor have discussed sharing responsibility for picking up a package before a store closes. In the evening, Jordan asks, “Did you get the package?” Taylor answers, “I had a lot going on today.” Jordan asks again. The discussion moves quickly toward whether Jordan is accusing Taylor of being irresponsible.

For Jordan, the Launch might be hearing an explanation that did not answer the question. For Taylor, it might be hearing the question repeated. These are possible points of entry into their respective experiences, not a ruling that their contributions are equal or that the exchange began there in any objective sense.

The package still matters. Was someone responsible for collecting it? Was the agreement explicit? Can it still be collected? Those questions belong to the issue. Chapter 28 explains how to map the issue and the interaction separately. A Launch description should not displace the practical question, and noticing two perspectives does not erase an unmet commitment.

Pick one moment you can describe without constructing a complete theory about the interaction. If several moments seem important, identify the one you remember first noticing and leave earlier events open for later consideration. You are describing the starting point of your account, not proving a single original cause.

What happened?

The first practical question is what you can say about the event itself. For the fictional package example, Jordan might write, “I asked whether the package had been collected. I heard Taylor say that the day had been busy, without answering yes or no.” That reports an exchange. It is more specific than “Taylor was evading responsibility,” which identifies a possible interpretation rather than the words spoken.

Sometimes the event is straightforward. A partner said, “I am not going.” A mutually agreed bill was unpaid when it was due. Someone raised their voice and used an insulting name. Such conduct does not have to be rendered neutral in order to be described accurately. The task is to identify what occurred, including conduct that may require accountability.

Other details may be uncertain. You may remember that a question was asked but not the exact wording. In that case, “You asked about the package, although I do not recall your words exactly” is better than a quotation invented for clarity. An account can be precise about its limits.

It may help to distinguish a fact supported by an agreement, message, or other record from something recalled from memory. That distinction does not mean a record is always required or that a person's memory is

unimportant. It simply prevents a recollection from being presented as a verbatim transcript when it is not.

What did I notice?

An event may contain several details. One person notices the words. Another notices the timing, silence, volume, a facial expression, or the fact that a decision has already been made. Naming what stood out can clarify the experience without claiming that the same detail had the same meaning for both partners.

Taylor might write, “I noticed that the question came again before I had explained what happened.” Jordan might write, “I noticed I still had not heard whether the package was collected.” Both descriptions can be useful. Neither establishes what the other intended by speaking or not speaking.

Perceived tone belongs here when it is clearly marked as perception. “I heard the question as sharp” reports experience. “You asked sharply because you wanted to humiliate me” adds a theory about purpose. The first statement can be sincere without making the second true.

An absence can be a Launch too, but it needs context. “I did not receive the update we agreed would be sent by noon” differs from “You deliberately ignored me.” It also differs from “I hoped for a message but we had not made an arrangement.” Missing actions, explicit commitments, and private expectations should not be merged.

What is observable, and what am I inferring?

The next distinction is between the event as you can describe it and the meaning you have attached to it. In the research literature on marital attribution, explanations for why a partner acted are distinguished from judgments about responsibility, including intention and blame (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990). This is an external conceptual distinction, not evidence that identifying a BTL Launch improves outcomes or reveals another person's real motive.

Try placing two statements next to each other. In the package example, an event description might be: “I asked whether the package was collected and did not receive a direct answer.” An interpretation might be: “I thought Taylor was trying to avoid admitting a mistake.” The interpretation may turn out to be accurate, partly accurate, or unsupported. Nothing about separating it requires pretending that the original responsibility was unimportant.

A different interpretation is also possible: Taylor might have been preparing to explain a missed errand, attempting to defend a difficult day, or responding to an accusation they thought they heard. Those possibilities are not facts supplied by the example. Do not list alternatives merely to manufacture doubt about your own experience. Their value is to show where information remains absent.

If a partner explicitly says, “I did not bother because your plans do not matter,” those words are themselves part of what happened. You need not classify clear statements as unknowable. You also need not treat every accusation or denial as conclusive proof of someone's inner state. Describe what was said, what was done, and which further conclusions remain inferential.

Similarly, “I felt disregarded” need not be replaced with “I was probably mistaken.” A feeling is a report about your experience. Whether the partner intended disregard is a separate question. The distinction leaves room for both impact and responsibility without making subjective experience a test of intention.

Keep the context attached

A brief description should carry enough context for the reader to understand what the observed moment concerned. If a repeated question followed an unanswered request about an overdue obligation, it may matter that the obligation existed. If a partner refused a request because it crossed a boundary, that context matters too.

A short entry can distinguish the arrangement, event, effect, and uncertainty. In the package example: “We had agreed that Taylor would collect the package. I asked whether it had been collected. I did not hear an answer at first and worried the store would close. I interpreted the explanation as avoiding the question, but I do not know whether that was Taylor's intention.” The missed errand, if verified, remains open for resolution.

The purpose is not to reconstruct everything that happened or to assign a neutral score to both partners. A good description may conclude that one person missed a commitment. It may also identify an insult or threat that occurred during the discussion. Distinguishing these elements makes each visible; it does not average them into shared blame.

There may be important facts you cannot establish. You may not know whether your partner saw a message, heard a remark, knew the

deadline, or intended an implication. State the uncertainty where it exists. Do not introduce an innocent explanation as though it had been confirmed. Do not introduce a hostile explanation as though the felt impact had proven it.

A compact Launch record

You may use four short prompts for one episode. These are optional writing prompts for organizing your own account, not a questionnaire with a score, a clinical measure, or an additional named BTL intervention.

First, identify the event: What happened, as best I can describe it? Include words, actions, or an important absence, and distinguish what you remember from what you can independently check.

Second, identify the noticed detail: What stood out to me at that moment? This might be a phrase, silence, change, tone as heard, or a practical consequence. The answer belongs to your experience even when the other person noticed something different.

Third, separate what is known from what is inferred: What do I know about the conduct, agreement, or consequence? What am I taking it to mean about the other person's beliefs or intentions? If intention is genuinely uncertain, leave it open. If words or behavior clearly establish a violation or threat, name that conduct rather than treating it as an interpretive puzzle.

Fourth, keep the issue visible: What still needs to be addressed, regardless of the interpretation? The answer might be an overdue responsibility, a decision, an explanation, an acknowledgment, or a boundary. The fact that a Loop may be developing does not suspend the issue.

An entry could be only a few sentences. “When I heard the schedule had changed, I noticed that the decision had been announced before we discussed it. I experienced that as being left out. I cannot tell from the announcement alone whether excluding me was intentional. We still need to address how shared plans are changed.” That is a provisional account, not an agreed transcript.

There is no requirement to record the exchange in writing. You may reflect privately without keeping notes. No partner must accept your map, complete a parallel map, or consent to being analyzed. If

recording or sharing details could create a risk of monitoring or retaliation, do not make or share the record.

Common errors in mapping

One common error is choosing a verdict instead of an event. “You are selfish” may express anger, but it does not specify the conduct. A clearer Launch account identifies what was said, done, or missing, and may then state the hurt or anger it brought up.

A second error is moving from perceived meaning to proven intention. “The pause felt dismissive” does not by itself demonstrate that the partner paused in order to dismiss. Conversely, “You were only imagining disrespect” does not refute a report of feeling dismissed or prove that no harm occurred.

A third error is erasing the issue. “We were in our Loop” cannot stand in for answering whether the package was collected, whether money was spent without agreement, or whether a boundary was respected. The practical matter may need a response even if the conversation becomes calmer.

Another error is assuming every Launch is an obvious first event. Partners may identify different moments because they noticed different things or because their accounts begin at different places. That does not automatically establish two equivalent accounts of harm. The sequence is not a device for assigning equal responsibility.

Finally, do not force missing information into a neat four-part sequence. Launch is one part of BTL's educational organization: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. A person may be able to describe an event without knowing whether their attention narrowed or a familiar meaning was influential. Chapters 30–32 address those questions individually.

When mapping is not the right task

A clear threat, intimidation, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, coercive control, or fear of retaliation is not an ordinary misunderstanding to be mapped cooperatively. The U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women (2025) identifies controlling and abusive behavior as domestic violence concerns. In those circumstances, safety,

appropriate specialized support, and accountability take priority over exploring a shared Loop.

The same applies when a partner is monitoring communication, restricting contact, or punishing disclosure. A person does not need to collect evidence, maintain notes, ask a threatening partner what they intended, or share a map to earn permission to seek help. Joint reflection can be unsafe where a person cannot disagree freely.

A legitimate refusal or boundary also need not be classified as a problematic Launch simply because the other person feels upset. A partner may experience "no" as disappointing without acquiring a claim to override it. Do not use BTL to reframe coercive acts as protective expressions that the harmed partner should accommodate.

For immediate danger, contact local emergency services where safe. In the United States, the National Domestic Violence Hotline is available at 800-799-SAFE (7233) and thehotline.org. If accessing these resources might be monitored, prioritize a safer device or private connection when available. The Field Guide's later safety chapters address why shared-pattern methods are inappropriate in coercive circumstances.

What a Launch map can and cannot do

The intended result of this exercise is a more differentiated description of one moment. You may be able to say what you encountered, what stood out, what you inferred, and what practical issue remains. Those are parts of an account, not a finding about whether it is correct or whether a partner will agree.

This chapter does not establish that mapping improves recall, prevents escalation, reliably identifies motives, or produces better relationship outcomes. Its limited use is descriptive. Where evidence is absent, keeping uncertainty visible is more accurate than creating certainty for the sake of a complete-looking map.

If you can identify one event and the meaning you began attaching to it without losing the underlying concern, you have completed the task offered here. Chapter 30 turns to a different question: what happens to your capacity as the exchange becomes more difficult.

Chapter 30. Notice Overload

After identifying what happened at the beginning of an argument, the next question is not necessarily what to do about it. It is what you began noticing in yourself as the exchange continued.

You may have been able to follow the conversation at first, then found yourself concentrating on one sentence and missing what came next. You may remember wanting to explain immediately, or noticing that several reasonable responses no longer seemed available. You may remember a gradual change or have difficulty locating it in memory. You do not have to invent a precise turning point.

Break the Loop calls the part of its sequence in which a person's capacity begins to narrow Overload. Chapter 13 explains the construct and distinguishes it from research terms such as emotional flooding. Here the task is more limited: describe what you actually remember about your own experience, without turning possible signs into a test, a diagnosis, or an explanation of someone else's behavior.

What did you notice in your body?

Start with what you noticed, not what you think your body must have been doing. Some people recall tight shoulders, a changed breathing rhythm, a flushed face, restlessness, or a strong wish to leave the room. Others recall no clear bodily cue. These are examples of what someone might report, not symptoms required for Overload.

A statement such as “I remember gripping the edge of the table” preserves a concrete recollection without turning it into a diagnosis. “My nervous system switched into a state where I could not think” adds a biological explanation that the observation does not establish. You may have felt intense discomfort, but intensity alone does not identify a particular physiological condition or prove that your options disappeared.

If you do not remember a body sensation, leave this part unanswered. Do not add one because a worksheet or a familiar explanation suggests that you should have experienced it. A quiet moment may still have felt difficult. An expressive moment may not have involved the narrowing described here. External appearance is not a reliable substitute for a person's own account.

What happened to your attention?

Think about what you were following in the discussion. Were you still able to take in the other person's full point, or had your attention narrowed to a particular phrase? Did you notice yourself mentally preparing an answer while the other person was speaking? Were you looking for an opportunity to correct one detail instead of hearing the rest?

These questions ask for a description of attention as you remember it. They cannot prove exactly what you heard or why you missed something. The other person may also have been unclear, contradictory, or unfair. Noticing that you stopped listening closely does not make their account accurate, and noticing that they repeated themselves does not establish that they intended to criticize you.

For example, in a fictional disagreement about a missed appointment, one partner says, “I remember hearing ‘you never show up,’ and then I was composing my answer to the word ‘never.’ I don't remember the question that came after it.” That is a bounded report about attention. The missed appointment and the fairness of the accusation remain separate matters to address.

What became harder?

Overload is not defined by having an emotion. The useful question is whether something that was available earlier in the conversation began to feel more difficult. Perhaps you found it harder to stay curious, tolerate an unfinished answer, consider an alternative explanation, or choose between more than two responses.

Compare your experience at two points within the same exchange if you can. Early on, you might have been willing to hear how a scheduling mistake occurred. Later, you may recall that hearing an explanation felt like accepting an excuse. That contrast describes how your choices appeared to you. It does not tell us whether the mistake was trivial, whether the explanation was true, or whether continuing the conversation was necessary.

Some readers will not identify a change. They may have been upset from the first moment or may have remained able to think flexibly throughout. Do not force the experience into the framework. An account that says “I was angry, but I could still listen and decide what I wanted to say” is useful information.

What urges appeared?

An urge is not the same as an action. You might recall wanting to interrupt, prove your point, repeat a question, leave, defend every decision, get reassurance, or settle the issue before either person moves on. You may have acted on the urge, resisted it, or done something else entirely.

Keeping the urge separate from the behavior is especially useful when recalling a conflict. “I wanted to correct everything immediately” describes pressure you experienced. “I interrupted three times” describes conduct. One does not automatically establish the other. The actual response belongs to the later Protection Move part of the BTL map; Chapter 32 addresses identifying that response.

A desire to leave also needs context. It may reflect an impulse to avoid a difficult but safe discussion, a reasonable need for time, a legitimate boundary, or an attempt to get away from danger. It must not automatically be coded as avoidance or Overload. When continued discussion is unsafe, leaving or declining to participate may be protective.

Describing one episode

You can use a few plain sentences rather than a rating scale. Begin with one ordinary, safe disagreement and describe it as closely to your own recollection as possible. You do not need your partner to agree with your account or participate in the exercise.

A short self-observation might read: “The conversation started with a question about our weekend plan. I remember feeling more hurried as we talked. I began watching for the next chance to explain and stopped taking in the whole question. I wanted to settle everything before leaving for work. I do not know exactly when that shift happened.”

The wording matters because it separates the original issue, the remembered internal experience, and the action not yet described. It avoids claiming to know the other person's motive or assigning a mechanism to the feeling. It also leaves room for incomplete memory.

If it helps, use four prompts: What, if anything, did I notice in my body? Where did my attention go? What began to feel harder? What did I want to do next? Answer whichever questions fit, in ordinary language. “I cannot tell” is a valid answer. These prompts are an educational aid for description, not a validated instrument or a promise of more accurate recall.

What the description does not establish

A person's description of Overload is not proof that they were unable to act differently. Within BTL, choices may become harder to see, but the person still has choices. Reporting urgency does not excuse an insult. Reporting fear or agitation does not shift responsibility for threats, intimidation, or violence onto the person who raised an issue.

Nor does the label erase the issue itself. If an agreement was broken, an expense was concealed, or a serious concern was ignored, the fact that a discussion became difficult does not settle the underlying matter. The issue and the Loop are two different things. Both can matter.

This practice also does not diagnose your partner. Their voice, expression, silence, or movement may be noticeable, but it does not prove their internal state. “You were overloaded, so you could not hear me” is an inference about another person. A more defensible account is the specific behavior you observed and the impact it had on the exchange.

In relationships involving coercive control, threats, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, fear, or retaliation, safety takes priority over shared-pattern work. You do not need to continue an unsafe conversation, share these notes, or seek a joint account of the Loop. Appropriate specialized support may be necessary. A shared sequence does not mean shared responsibility for harm.

When the account is incomplete

This exercise is based on recollection rather than a recording of the conversation. You might recall a strong urge but not a clear body sensation. You might remember losing track of one sentence without knowing what made that moment difficult. You might notice the change only after the argument has ended. None of these gaps needs to be filled with a confident interpretation.

The aim here is not to prove that you had Overload or to locate an exact second when it began. It is to distinguish what you noticed from what you later concluded about the exchange. That can leave a clearer account of your own experience without making a factual claim about everything that happened between you.

The next question is different. Chapter 31, “Identify the Old Story,” asks what familiar meaning or prediction began shaping the moment. “I could no longer take in another explanation” describes a possible

narrowing of capacity. “They think my judgment never matters” describes an interpretation that may have developed alongside it. Keeping those questions separate makes the map more precise even when the experiences overlap.

Chapter 31. Identify the Old Story

A familiar meaning can enter a disagreement before either person has finished explaining what happened. A question about a missed errand may begin to mean, “You think I cannot handle anything.” An unexpected change of plans may begin to mean, “My time does not matter.” The words or actions that began the exchange are one part of the account. What those words and actions began to mean is another.

Break the Loop (BTL) calls this familiar meaning or prediction an Old Story. The term is part of BTL's educational framework, not a diagnosis or a validated measure of another person's intentions. Chapter 14 explains the concept and its relationship to external research on interpretation and attribution. Here the task is practical and narrower: identify the meaning you noticed in one particular exchange, without turning that meaning automatically into a fact.

What did the moment begin to mean?

Begin with a single ordinary disagreement that you can describe safely. Chapter 29 asked you to identify a Launch, the event as you experienced it when you began getting pulled into the Loop. Chapter 30 asked what you noticed as your capacity may have narrowed. Now ask what the moment was coming to mean to you.

Try completing the sentence, “When that happened, I began thinking it meant _____.” The answer might concern whether you were respected, trusted, valued, heard, believed, or given a say. It might also concern an expectation that the conversation would become difficult. Such meanings can overlap; you do not need to force one interpretation into a fixed category. You are describing an interpretation as you recall it, not a verified account of the other person's beliefs.

A concrete entry is often easier to examine than a label. “When the question was repeated, I thought, ‘You do not trust me to finish anything’” says more than “My Old Story was activated.” It identifies the moment and the meaning you attached to it. That meaning might be understandable, accurate, partly accurate, or mistaken. Identifying it does not decide which.

Sometimes the meaning is hard to put into words. You might remember feeling dismissed without recalling a sentence in your mind. Do not invent an exact quotation. “I experienced that as dismissive, but I

cannot tell what I was thinking at the time" is a useful and appropriately limited description.

What prediction appeared?

An Old Story may take the form of a prediction rather than a judgment about what is happening now. "This is going to become another argument about my competence" is different from "You think I am incompetent." The first anticipates a development; the second attributes a belief to another person.

Ask whether you began expecting the exchange to follow a familiar direction. Perhaps you expected to be interrupted, blamed, ignored, corrected, or pressed for an answer before you could finish. You may be able to name a prediction only in hindsight. If so, say that you remember expecting a result, not that the result was certain.

An expectation is not proof. It may be informed by previous events, a real repeated concern, or an incomplete understanding of the present moment. Likewise, a prediction that later came true does not by itself establish why the other person acted as they did. Keep the anticipated outcome distinct from the event and from any later evidence.

What did I start assuming?

One way to examine an Old Story is to identify the assumptions that made the interpretation feel compelling. Ask what you began taking for granted about the other person's knowledge, intention, priorities, or future response.

Consider a fictional exchange. Jordan and Taylor agreed that Taylor would confirm whether a package had been collected before the store closed. Jordan asks for an update. Taylor replies, "I had three meetings back to back." Jordan repeats the question. Taylor begins to think, "Jordan believes I am irresponsible and is looking for proof." Jordan, meanwhile, begins to think, "Taylor is avoiding an answer because the task was not done."

The stated event is that a question was repeated and a direct answer was not yet given. Taylor's interpretation involves Jordan's supposed judgment; Jordan's interpretation involves Taylor's supposed intention. Neither explanation is established by the brief dialogue. It is also possible that the package was not collected and that this missed commitment needs to be addressed. A useful Old Story map does not remove the underlying issue.

In this example, either partner might describe a familiar meaning. Neither should use the label as a verdict about the other. “My Old Story was that Jordan thought I was irresponsible” is a report of interpretation. “Jordan's real problem is that they are controlling” changes the task into an unsupported claim about a person.

It can help to notice whether your interpretation contains words such as always, never, again, or obviously. Those words do not automatically make a conclusion false. They can signal a broader conclusion worth checking against what is known about this particular episode and, where relevant, other documented instances. An agreement repeatedly broken may genuinely be a recurring issue. The question is what the current evidence establishes, not whether a general statement sounds emotionally charged.

What information do I have?

Set the remembered meaning beside what you actually know. You might have heard a particular sentence, seen a message, recalled a written agreement, or received a direct acknowledgment. There may be good reason to conclude that someone missed a responsibility, made a hurtful remark, or knowingly crossed a boundary. The Old Story exercise does not ask you to doubt those facts merely because they are uncomfortable.

Try using two separate statements. The first describes the available information: “We had agreed on a pickup, and I did not receive the promised confirmation.” The second describes your interpretation: “I began thinking that my plans did not matter to Taylor.” You can take the first concern seriously while recognizing that the second statement makes an additional claim.

Direct statements matter too. If a partner says, “I chose not to tell you because I knew you would object,” the admission is information, not merely an imagined Old Story. You may still have questions about other motives, but distinguishing experience from intention is not a requirement to dismiss what someone plainly said or did.

What information am I missing?

Now identify what you do not know. Perhaps you do not know whether the person saw the message, understood the agreement, noticed your expression, or intended criticism. Perhaps you know the agreement was broken but not why. Missing information can remain missing. You need

not replace one confident assumption with an equally confident positive explanation.

For the package example, Taylor might write, “I know Jordan asked twice. I interpreted that as a judgment about my ability. I do not know what Jordan believed when asking.” Jordan might write, “The question was not answered initially. I thought Taylor was avoiding responsibility. I do not yet know whether the package was collected.” These are separate accounts; they need not be made symmetrical or combined into one shared version.

You are not required to ask the other person for clarification in every case. A question may be useful in a safe exchange where both people can disagree freely, but a person's refusal to answer, ongoing deception, or repeated harmful behavior may itself be relevant information. An educational prompt is not a reason to override a boundary or demand access to someone's private thoughts.

A compact Old Story record

For one safe episode, write a few sentences in ordinary language. Include what the moment began to mean, what you expected would happen, what you assumed, what you know, and what remains uncertain. There is no score, required number of entries, or correct Old Story category.

One possible entry is: “When my question about the package was answered with an explanation about a busy day, I thought I was being brushed off. I expected that I would have to ask several more times before getting an answer. I assumed Taylor did not want to admit the task was missed. I know I did not hear a direct answer at first. I do not yet know why Taylor responded that way. The pickup still needs to be addressed.”

This is an illustrative educational description, not a research-tested instrument. It does not guarantee more accurate recall, reveal a partner's true intention, or demonstrate that mapping an Old Story reduces future conflict. If your recollection is incomplete, it is better to mark the gap than to make the account look complete.

What the Old Story is not

An Old Story is not automatically false, irrational, rooted in childhood, or evidence of an attachment category. It is not necessarily the only meaning at work. The BTL Three Pillars of Autonomy, Intelligence, and

Importance may offer optional lenses for considering relational significance, but they are not personality types or independently validated tests of what someone meant.

Nor does an Old Story excuse what someone does next. Feeling criticized does not justify intimidation. Feeling unimportant does not erase responsibility for a harmful response. The interpretation is distinct from the conduct that may follow, which Chapter 32 addresses as a possible Protection Move.

Most importantly, do not use ordinary shared-pattern analysis as the primary approach where there are threats, coercion, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, fear, or retaliation. In those circumstances, safety, accountability, and appropriate specialized support take priority. The person experiencing danger does not need to test whether their concern is an Old Story, invite a joint mapping discussion, or share private notes.

The point of this chapter is not to replace certainty with compulsory doubt. It is to make a distinction you can use: here is what happened as far as I know; here is the meaning or prediction that became influential; and here is what remains uncertain. The issue may still need resolution. With that distinction visible, Chapter 32 turns to the next question in the BTL sequence: What did I do in response?

Chapter 32. Identify the Protection Move

A disagreement can be remembered mostly for what the other person said. You may recall the question, the tone, the accusation, or the moment you felt misunderstood. It may take more effort to recall what you actually did in response. Yet that response is the subject of this chapter.

In Break the Loop, the sequence Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move offers an educational way to examine a conflict episode. Chapter 29 asked what began the moment. Chapter 30 asked what happened to your capacity and attention. Chapter 31 asked what familiar meaning or prediction appeared. Now the focus moves to the next observable response: What did I do?

This is a practical identification exercise, not a test that determines your personality or discovers a hidden motive. A difficult exchange need not fit neatly into four stages, and your recollection may be incomplete. Begin with what you can describe.

What did I do next?

A Protection Move is the person's next response as they try to manage what the moment has come to mean. It might involve speaking, staying quiet, moving closer, moving away, pressing for an answer, offering an explanation, correcting a detail, agreeing too quickly, or trying to end the disagreement. The phrase is a Break the Loop construct, not a research-validated behavioral category.

Start with one response, preferably one you could have seen or heard if the interaction had been recorded. “I repeated the question” is more specific than “I got demanding.” “I listed my reasons without answering the concern” is more observable than “I became defensive.” “I stopped responding and went to another room” provides more information than “I shut down.”

These descriptions do not make the behavior good or bad by themselves. Repeating a question can be reasonable when a commitment has not been addressed. Leaving a conversation may be an appropriate boundary or a necessary response to danger. An explanation can provide needed context. You cannot judge an action

fairly without considering the issue, the setting, what was said before it, and whether someone could safely disagree or leave.

The first task is to locate your own response rather than to name your partner's. “Taylor was accusing me” reports your interpretation of another person's conduct. “I replied by describing my entire schedule and did not answer the pickup question” identifies something you did. You may eventually need to describe both, but keep them separate on the page.

You may remember several responses. Perhaps you began by explaining, raised your voice, and then walked away. Write them in the order you remember, without assuming each was a separate Protection Move or forcing a perfect timeline. If you cannot reliably remember the sequence, say so. The purpose is clarity, not a complete reconstruction.

What was I trying to accomplish?

After describing the action, ask what it seemed to be for. This is a different question. Behavior is something you did; function is what you think the behavior might have helped you obtain, avoid, preserve, or express.

You might have been trying to be understood, preserve a sense of competence, keep some control over a decision, obtain reassurance, avoid an escalating exchange, make sure a concern was taken seriously, or gain space to think. These are possibilities, not a list of fixed functions. One action can have more than one possible function, and the function may be uncertain even to the person who acted.

Consider the fictional package disagreement introduced in Chapter 31. Jordan asked whether Taylor had collected a package before the store closed. Taylor responded, “I had three meetings back to back.” Jordan asked again. Taylor took the repeated question to mean that Jordan regarded Taylor as irresponsible.

Suppose Taylor's next response was to describe every meeting, interruption, and scheduling obstacle in detail. The observable response would be the extended explanation. Taylor might later say, “I wanted Jordan to know I had been busy, not careless.” That is Taylor's account of a possible function. It does not establish that Jordan had accused Taylor of carelessness, and it does not establish that Taylor's explanation was the only motive operating.

Taylor might also have wanted to avoid saying whether the package was collected. That possibility cannot be ruled out merely because the

explanation felt sincere. The missed pickup, if it occurred, remains a legitimate issue. Exploring the meaning of a response must not become a substitute for answering the original question.

A first-person explanation deserves attention, but it is not independent proof of what prompted the response. Uncertainty or mixed reasons may remain. “I think I was trying to show I had not been irresponsible” leaves more room for examination than “I was only protecting myself, so I did nothing wrong.”

The same caution applies when you look at a partner's conduct. You can observe that someone raised their voice or stopped replying. You cannot reliably identify their private function from that behavior alone. Do not assign a Protection Move or a motive to the other person as a verdict.

What impact might it have had?

The third question concerns what your response may have changed for the other person, the discussion, or the practical issue. It asks about possible impact, not about whether you intended that impact.

An extended explanation might help someone understand your circumstances. It might also be experienced as a refusal to answer a direct question. Silence might allow a person time to think. It might also leave the other person without a promised answer. Pressing for a decision might clarify urgency, or it might exert unwanted pressure. These possibilities depend on the context; the same response does not produce the same impact in every exchange.

There are different levels of certainty here. You may know that you interrupted three times because you remember doing it or a recording confirms it. You may know that the discussion ended without a decision. You may have heard your partner say afterward, “I felt dismissed.” You may only suspect that they felt dismissed. An observed event, a partner's report, and your inference about their experience should not be written as though they were identical kinds of evidence.

In the package example, Taylor could write: “I spoke at length about my meetings. I still had not said whether the package was collected. Jordan repeated the question.” Taylor may infer that the explanation made Jordan feel ignored, but that is an inference unless Jordan actually reported it. The absence of an answer in the remembered exchange is more directly observable. Taylor can take responsibility for that without claiming to know every feeling Jordan experienced.

Understanding the function does not excuse the impact. Trying to be understood does not justify intimidation, threats, insults, or refusing to address harm. A difficult interpretation may help explain why a response seemed available, but it does not take agency away from the person who acted. Nor does noticing a problematic response mean the other person's original concern was invalid.

It is possible to acknowledge both a legitimate issue and your own conduct. “The pickup was missed, and I avoided answering directly” is one such account. A disagreement about the issue may remain, but it need not be erased in order to examine what happened during the discussion.

A compact Protection Move record

For one ordinary, safe disagreement, try three short statements. First, write the action as plainly as possible: “I repeated my reasons three times and did not answer the question.” Second, write the function as a possibility: “I think I was trying to show that I had not acted carelessly.” Third, write what you know about the impact and what remains uncertain: “The question was still unanswered. Jordan sounded frustrated, but I do not know exactly how Jordan understood my explanation.”

This short record is not a validated questionnaire, a score, or a new named Break the Loop intervention. It is one way to describe your own participation with fewer leaps from observation to interpretation. You do not need to make a partner complete the same record, agree with yours, or disclose private thoughts.

If you notice that several actions occurred, you can record more than one. If you cannot identify a possible function, write “I do not know.” Do not force every response to have a protective purpose, or turn an uncertain function into a sympathetic explanation simply to make the map appear complete.

Function, responsibility, and safety

Sometimes a response is not an ordinary conflict behavior to analyze as part of a mutual Loop. Threatening someone, coercively controlling their actions, stalking them, using sexual coercion, or retaliating against them requires a different safety and accountability response. Fear and danger should not be reframed as both partners contributing equally to a shared cycle.

Equally, leaving an unsafe interaction, declining an invasive demand, withholding private notes from a controlling person, or seeking outside help should not be labeled an unhealthy Protection Move merely because it creates distance. No one is required to stay in a threatening discussion to demonstrate better conflict skills. When coercion, violence, threats, fear, or retaliation are present, prioritize safety and appropriate specialized support rather than shared-pattern mapping.

For safer disagreements, the useful distinction remains modest. You can describe what you did, consider what you may have been trying to accomplish, and examine what is known or uncertain about the impact. None of those steps proves that Break the Loop improves outcomes, detects hidden intentions, or captures every conflict. They help keep separate the action, the proposed function, and the responsibility that remains.

These observations complete a four-part description of one episode without pretending it has been fully explained. The next chapter asks how one person's response may become part of the other person's next experience. That relational account will still require the same care about evidence, uncertainty, power, and unequal responsibility.

Chapter 33. Map the Relational Sequence

By the end of Chapter 32, you may have a clearer account of what you did in one difficult exchange. You can describe your response, consider what you may have been trying to accomplish, and separate what actually happened from what you imagine the other person experienced. But an argument does not usually end at the point where one person responds. The other person hears or sees that response and has a moment of their own.

This is the relational part of the map. In Break the Loop, one person's Protection Move can become the other person's next Launch. The word can matters. It describes a possible connection to examine, not an inevitable event, an established causal chain, or an instruction to find equal contributions from both people.

Chapter 17 explained how responses can follow other responses during conflict, and Chapter 32 focused on identifying one's own Protection Move. Here the task is narrower and more practical: place one person's response beside what the other person actually noticed next. Then, where it is safe and relevant, examine whether the exchange continued in the other direction. The underlying issue must remain visible throughout.

From a response to another person's next moment

Consider an ordinary disagreement about a missed commitment. One person asks, “Were you able to pick up the package?” The other person begins explaining a difficult workday. That explanation may be an attempt to be understood. It may also leave the question unanswered. The person who asked notices the lengthy explanation and asks again. Each person is encountering something different.

Within the BTL model, the first person's explanation can be described as a Protection Move when that person recognizes it as their next response to what the question had come to mean. For the other person, the explanation itself may be the next Launch: the observable or perceived moment to which that person begins responding. The same event occupies different positions in the two descriptions.

That does not mean the explanation caused a specific interpretation or that the other person necessarily became overloaded. Nor does it mean an extended explanation is always a Protection Move. It may simply be relevant context or a direct answer in another situation. The map is

useful only to the extent that it remains faithful to what people actually recall and can reasonably describe.

The arrow is a way of reading the exchange, not a finding about blame. Partner A Protection Move → Partner B Launch means that a response by A may be the event B next notices. Where applicable, the sequence may also be described as Partner B Protection Move → Partner A Launch. Neither direction means that one person controls the other's inner experience, that a response was inevitable, or that the partners bear equal responsibility.

Some observable patterns have been studied without establishing the full BTL sequence. In one laboratory analysis of 139 heterosexual couples selected from a study involving alcohol, negative behavior was associated with a negative rather than neutral response on the partner's next speaking turn (Dermody et al., 2025). The researchers observed one fifteen-minute conflict discussion, not a couple's repeated arguments over months or years. The study does not verify a four-part Loop, determine either partner's intention, or establish that the first response caused the second. The study's reported next-turn association should not be extended into advice about alcohol, everyday conflict, or how a particular person will respond.

This narrower finding is consistent with examining successive responses rather than assuming each utterance stands alone. It does not establish that every exchange is reciprocated, that all relationships follow the same sequence, or that mapping the sequence improves outcomes. The BTL arrows remain an educational way of organizing an episode, not a validated measurement of an interaction.

An observable sequence is not a shared interpretation

Suppose the first person says, “I've been in meetings all day,” and the second repeats, “But did you get the package?” Those spoken words can be recorded without deciding what they mean. The first person might hear the second question as an accusation. The second might hear the long explanation as avoidance. Those meanings may shape what happens next, but they are not direct observations of either partner's private intention.

Separate the kinds of information. “I explained my schedule” describes an action. “Jordan asked the question again” describes a remembered next event. “Jordan thought I was making excuses” is an interpretation unless Jordan reported it. “I felt accused” is a first-person experience. Each may matter, but none can stand in for the others.

The difference becomes especially important when an account contains a claim such as “I withdrew because you attacked me.” The speaker may genuinely have felt attacked. Yet the statement combines a personal response with a disputed explanation of the other person's intention. A more precise account is: “I heard the question as criticism, and I stopped answering.” This identifies what the person experienced and did without declaring the partner's motive a fact.

Neither person needs to agree about every interpretation to describe a sequence. At the same time, disagreement about meaning does not make the practical issue disappear. The package may still be missing. The person who agreed to retrieve it may still owe a clear answer or a plan. Attention to the relational sequence is additional work, not an alternative to ordinary responsibility.

A fictional example in two directions

Return to Jordan and Taylor, whose fictional package disagreement carried through Chapters 31 and 32. Jordan asks whether the package was collected before the store closed. Taylor has had several meetings and hears the question as doubt about Taylor's reliability. Taylor starts describing the day's schedule in detail instead of answering yes or no. Jordan repeats the question.

Taylor's portion of the map might begin with the question as a Launch, followed by a sense of pressure or narrowed attention, an Old Story such as “Jordan thinks I cannot handle one simple responsibility,” and a Protection Move of explaining at length. These are Taylor's possible first-person observations and interpretations within the BTL framework. They are not established measurements, and Taylor might describe a different sequence on reflection.

Now consider what Jordan encounters. Taylor's lengthy explanation has not answered whether the package was collected. Jordan notices this and repeats the question, perhaps in a firmer tone. Taylor's explanation can therefore be placed beside Jordan's next Launch. The observable part is the extended explanation and the repeated question. We still do not know exactly what Jordan felt or intended.

Jordan might later say, “I was worried the store would close, and I needed a clear answer.” Jordan might instead report, “I thought Taylor was avoiding responsibility.” Those are different reported experiences. The first does not prove there was no frustration; the second does not prove Taylor meant to avoid the question. Both can be recorded as what Jordan reports, rather than inferred from the question alone.

If Jordan's repeated question becomes the next thing Taylor notices, the arrow may point back toward Taylor. Taylor might then raise their voice or walk away. An account could show Taylor's explanation → Jordan's repeated question → Taylor's raised voice. This is one possible observed order in a fictional episode, not evidence that every member of the exchange passed through four internally identifiable parts.

Do not turn the example into a contest over whose arrow came first. The original commitment and time-sensitive concern existed before these responses. Jordan's right to request a clear answer and Taylor's responsibility to address the missed task can coexist with Taylor's feeling criticized. Jordan may also need to consider the manner of repeated questioning if it became intimidating or demeaning. Those judgments require context, not automatic symmetry.

One direction may be enough

A relational account does not need to become a closed circle. Sometimes you can reliably identify one response and what followed, but you cannot reconstruct the other person's experience. Sometimes the other person offered no response at all. Sometimes a topic was resolved quickly. The lack of a complete, alternating map does not mean you have failed to find a hidden Loop.

It can also be misleading to turn silence into proof of an Old Story or a Protection Move. A person may be thinking, distracted, exhausted, declining an unreasonable demand, or trying to remain safe. The behavior may be visible while its function remains unknown. A complete map should never be more important than accurate description.

Partner A and Partner B are placeholders, not fixed relational identities. In another episode, either person may ask the opening question, withdraw, pursue clarification, or provide the explanation. Some responses are recurring, and others are not. There is no need to assign permanent roles or infer a personality trait from one argument.

A short record for an ordinary, safe disagreement

For a disagreement in which both people can safely disagree and stop the conversation, begin with one response you can describe without diagnosing either person. Write the specific words or action and the immediate context. Then write what the other person said or did next, if you actually know. Leave a space for any uncertainty about what the other person experienced.

For example: “I gave a long explanation without answering whether I had collected the package. Jordan repeated the question.” This is a sequence of reported actions. A separate note might say, “I thought Jordan believed I was irresponsible.” Another might say, “I do not know whether Jordan felt dismissed by my explanation.” Keeping those sentences separate prevents interpretation from becoming the record itself.

Only when it adds clarity and is safe, look at the other direction. You might record: “Jordan repeated the question. I heard it as another criticism and spoke more sharply.” Your experience of criticism is real as an experience, but it does not prove that criticism was Jordan's intention. If you do not know what came next or how the other person understood the exchange, the honest entry is “unknown.”

Do not ask your partner to supply an Old Story, confirm a Protection Move, or agree with your interpretation as a condition of completing the exercise. This is not a joint diagnostic worksheet, a scored instrument, or a test of which person caused the argument. It is an optional way to organize what you know about one encounter. In particular, do not use the map as a debate tactic: “You launched me,” or “Your Protection Move made me do it.”

The useful question is not who owns the entire conflict. It is whether one person's specific response became something the other person then had to encounter and interpret. An answer may be partial. That partial answer can still help a reader distinguish the practical issue, the actions, and the meanings attached to them.

Safety is not a reciprocal exercise

The relational map has a hard boundary. When one person is using threats, coercive control, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, intimidation, or retaliation, mapping two contributions to a shared Loop can disguise unequal power and responsibility. Fear of what will happen after disagreeing, setting a limit, or leaving is not ordinary disagreement. The safety of the affected person overrides the goal of completing a relational sequence.

A person who leaves to avoid being harmed is not required to examine how that departure might have "launched" the other person's anger. Declining to answer an invasive question, protecting private information, seeking support, or refusing an unsafe conversation should not be recast as a problematic withdrawal merely to balance the arrows. Responsibility for threats or abuse remains with the person who engages in them.

Nor should this chapter encourage anyone experiencing danger to disclose a private map to a partner, confront a controlling partner about their purported Old Story, or continue a discussion in order to demonstrate better communication. In circumstances involving fear, coercion, violence, or retaliation, prioritize safety planning and appropriate specialized support. Relationship education is not a substitute for individual risk assessment or qualified help.

Even in safer disagreements, reciprocity does not imply equal responsibility. One person may have broken a promise; another may have spoken harshly; either may have misunderstood an intention. These are different actions with different consequences. An account can acknowledge both without treating them as equivalent or using mutuality to avoid accountability.

What the map can and cannot establish

Mapping the exchange can produce a more careful description of how one conversation unfolded. It does not prove why each person acted, which interpretation was accurate, that either person's response was inevitable, or that a similar sequence will occur again. The external research on next-turn behavior concerns related observed processes and does not independently validate the complete BTL sequence or the benefit of using this map.

The chapter also does not solve the issue. Taylor may still need to acknowledge the missed package pickup and make an alternative plan.

Jordan may still need to decide how to raise the concern without making an unsupported accusation. Sometimes the issue has a straightforward practical resolution; sometimes it reflects an important continuing disagreement. Identifying the relational sequence should not be used to make a legitimate issue seem trivial.

At most, the relational account places two forms of information side by side: what happened between the partners and what each person believes or reports that event meant. It may show one arrow, both arrows, or a fragment with uncertainty. Accuracy matters more than completing a diagram.

Chapter 34 turns toward the timing of recognition. Rather than assuming that identifying a sequence automatically changes it, the next chapter asks what choices may become available when a person notices a familiar response earlier. The first task remains modest: see what can actually be seen without converting a map into an accusation or an excuse.

Chapter 34. Earlier Recognition Changes the Available Choices

Noticing a familiar argument after it ends can feel frustrating. You can describe what happened, yet the words you wish you had not said are already spoken. Break the Loop treats that recognition as a possible starting point. The question is whether, in another encounter, you might notice one part of your own response while there is still an opportunity to choose what comes next.

Within BTL, earlier recognition means noticing the Loop sooner. The framework describes five possible points: after the argument, during a Protection Move, while an Old Story is forming, during Overload, and possibly at the Launch. These are places to consider, not five measured levels of skill or a sequence everyone must master in order.

BTL proposes that earlier recognition may make another response easier to consider. That proposed benefit remains a working hypothesis, rather than an established finding about the effectiveness of this practice. The practical distinction explored here is narrower: a response you have already made and a response you have not yet made present different questions. Recognizing either one does not guarantee that you will act differently or that your partner will respond constructively.

Chapter 33 focused on describing how an exchange unfolded between people. This chapter turns toward when you notice your own involvement. It does not require a complete map, agreement about the other person's intentions, or a partner who uses BTL language.

What changes when you notice

Suppose you have already said something dismissive. You cannot choose not to have said it. You can consider whether to acknowledge it, stop repeating it, and address its impact. If you notice the urge before speaking, the dismissive sentence has not yet been added to the conversation. You can consider whether to say it, ask a direct question, or express disagreement another way.

That is the concrete sense in which timing matters to this chapter. Some actions have already happened; others remain prospective. It does not follow that noticing earlier gives everyone more capacity, more usable options, or a better outcome. A person can recognize a response

and still struggle to change it. A partner may continue behaving harmfully despite a careful response.

Nor does noticing late mean that choice has disappeared. At any point, the next action still deserves attention. Earlier recognition is an educational emphasis on a possible opportunity, not a biological deadline after which responsibility ends.

The five points also should not be confused with the four parts of the Loop. Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move is BTL's organizing sequence. The recognition points look back through that map, beginning with the most retrospective position. They do not add a fifth part or establish that every conflict unfolds in four separately observable moments.

After the argument

At first, the clearest recognition may be retrospective: "That was the familiar argument again." Perhaps you notice that a question about a task became a long defense of your character. You might remember what you said more clearly than what you felt. An incomplete account is acceptable; you do not have to fill the gaps with a confident explanation.

From this position, the immediate words and actions have already occurred. The relevant choice concerns what to do now. That might include acknowledging a hurtful remark, making good on an overlooked responsibility, or identifying one response you would like to reconsider. The aftermath and accountability work belong more fully to Chapters 41–43.

For a brief fictional example, someone realizes after a disagreement about a household task, "I kept explaining why I was busy, but I never answered whether I had done it." Recognition does not complete the task or excuse the evasive answer. In this example, the person has identified a specific action to take responsibility for, rather than concluding only that the whole conversation was bad.

Retrospective recognition is not proof that the same sequence will occur again. It is also not a requirement to replay every argument or document a partner's behavior. The purpose here is to identify something about your own response that you can describe honestly.

During a Protection Move

Recognition may occur while the response is already underway. You hear yourself repeating an explanation, notice that you have stopped answering, or realize you are trying to win a point that has become separate from the original issue. Within BTL, the question concerns your next response to what the moment has come to mean, not a diagnosis of your personality.

Consider a fictional speaker who is halfway through an extended explanation and says, “I haven't answered your question. No, I haven't done it.” That answer does not erase the preceding exchange. It changes what the speaker says next and leaves the practical responsibility visible. The other person is not required to become reassured or stop being upset.

A different next action might be to stop repeating an accusation or acknowledge that you are speaking harshly. You do not have to finish the familiar response merely because it has begun. At the same time, an intention to stop and an actual change in conduct are different things. The relevant question is what you do next.

Do not classify every refusal, silence, or departure as a Protection Move that needs interruption. A person may be setting a reasonable boundary or leaving to remain safe. The observable action alone does not establish its function.

While an Old Story is forming

An earlier recognition point in the BTL map is the familiar meaning or prediction becoming influential. You might notice, “I'm starting to hear this as you not trusting my judgment.” That is different from stating, “You do not trust me.” The first describes what the moment is beginning to mean to you; the second asserts something about the other person.

In a fictional scheduling disagreement, a person hears a question about arrival time and starts thinking, “Nothing I do is enough.” If they notice that thought before launching into a defense, one possible next action is to answer the scheduling question directly. Another is to ask what information the other person needs. These are hypothetical alternatives, not evidence that naming the thought will make them easy to use.

An Old Story is not automatically mistaken. There may be a real history of criticism, an unreasonable demand, or a broken agreement. Recognizing an interpretation does not require replacing it with a kinder explanation or abandoning a legitimate concern. Chapter 37 develops the work of checking assumptions without turning it into compulsory self-doubt.

The opportunity considered here is to notice the meaning before treating it as the only possible account of the moment. You may still decide that your concern is well founded. The framework does not make agreement the measure of a better choice.

During Overload

Within BTL, Overload describes the part of the Loop in which capacity begins to narrow. You may notice urgency, difficulty listening, or a strong impulse to explain or escape before you can identify a familiar meaning. Such experiences are possible observations, not a diagnostic checklist or a measured threshold.

For example, someone in a fictional disagreement notices, “I am planning my answer while you're still speaking.” That observation may provide a reason to reconsider the pace of the exchange. It does not prove the person has lost the ability to listen, establish a brain mechanism, or make the concern under discussion invalid.

Recognizing Overload does not require completing the rest of the map in real time. You can be uncertain about the Old Story and still consider saying less, allowing the other person to finish, or requesting space. Chapter 36 develops SLOW IT, including a defined pause where appropriate. This chapter does not prescribe a recovery time or assume that every intense conversation needs the same response.

Agency and responsibility remain. “I noticed I was overwhelmed” cannot excuse a threat or erase the impact of cruel words. Equally, another person cannot use the term to dismiss your concern: “You're overloaded, so we do not need to discuss what I did.” Both the conduct during the exchange and the original issue still matter.

Possibly at the Launch

The earliest point in this educational progression is possibly at the Launch: the event as you experienced it when you began getting pulled into the Loop. A question, silence, tone, request, or changed plan may become noticeable before you can describe much else. The word

possibly matters. BTL does not require immediate detection or assume that every person can identify a clear beginning.

In another fictional example, an ordinary question about a bill prompts the thought, “This is a moment where I sometimes start defending myself.” That is a possibility to watch in your own response, not proof that an argument has begun or that the question was intended as criticism. One option is to answer the question without assuming the rest of the conversation in advance.

Noticing a possible Launch does not mean avoiding every difficult subject. Questions about money, reliability, parenting, or household responsibilities may need direct answers. A partner should not have to remove all discomfort before raising a legitimate issue. Catching a possible Loop earlier is not permission to declare the topic closed.

Nor is this an instruction to scan constantly for signs that your partner is about to upset you. The focus remains your experience and choices. Identifying another person's supposed Launch, Old Story, or Protection Move is not a substitute for observing your own response.

A modest way to assess recognition

The canonical idea is: Progress may simply mean noticing one moment earlier. That is a modest description of the framework's aim, not a rule that every later encounter must show improvement. You might notice during a response in one conversation and only afterward in another. Those observations alone cannot establish that the practice is succeeding or failing.

For an ordinary, safe disagreement, you can ask when you first noticed something familiar and what you actually did after noticing. Keep the two answers separate. “I recognized my defensiveness” describes awareness. “I stopped interrupting and answered the question” describes conduct. The first should not be counted as though it necessarily produced the second.

There is no need to compare recognition speed with a partner or turn the five points into a score. A more useful account stays specific: what you noticed, what was already done, what remained open, and what responsibility remained afterward. You can leave uncertainty in that account and decline to make a written record.

Safety is not an earlier-recognition task

Earlier recognition must never become a demand that someone anticipate or prevent another person's abuse. Threats, coercive control, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, intimidation, and fear of retaliation change the task. The affected person does not become responsible for harm because they did not notice a warning sign soon enough or respond with the right words.

In those circumstances, safety and appropriate specialized support take priority over shared Loop analysis. This chapter does not ask anyone to disclose private observations, confront a controlling partner, remain in a dangerous conversation, or make a promise to return to an unsafe exchange. Disengaging for safety is not a failure of recognition or relationship skill.

Even in safer disagreements, an earlier observation does not create equal responsibility for what follows. Each person remains accountable for their own conduct. The framework is relationship education, not individual risk assessment or a substitute for qualified help. Chapter 53 addresses these limits more fully.

From recognition to the next action

Recognition and interruption are related tasks, but they are not the same accomplishment. You may notice and still repeat the response. You may also notice late and take responsibility for what you have already done. Neither case justifies pretending that the issue, impact, or other person's choices have disappeared.

Chapter 35 begins NAME IT, the first part of NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. Here the preparation is to locate the moment you actually noticed, rather than the moment you think you should have noticed. Whether that moment comes after the argument or before your next response, the question remains concrete: what is still yours to choose now?

PART VI | INTERRUPTION AND CHOICE

Chapter 35. NAME IT

Suppose a question about a plan is still waiting for an answer, but you have started explaining why the question should not have been asked. Halfway through, you notice that you are defending yourself. You may not yet know what the question meant to your partner, why it felt so important, or how the entire exchange fits together. You can still identify the response you are making.

In Break the Loop, NAME IT asks: “What is happening?” It is the recognition component of NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. Its purpose is recognition, not analysis. A brief observation such as “I'm starting to get defensive” is enough to express what this part of the framework asks you to notice.

BTL proposes that naming your own response may support a more deliberate next action. That is a working hypothesis, not an established finding that NAME IT calms conflict or improves outcomes. An accurate observation, a change in your conduct, and a change in your partner's conduct are separate matters.

Chapter 34 considered when recognition occurs. This chapter concerns how to describe what you notice without turning the description into a diagnosis, a verdict, or another demand. The task can remain small even when the issue matters a great deal.

Begin with what you can observe

Start with something you can describe about your own experience or conduct. “I'm repeating the same explanation.” “My attention is on what I want to say while you're speaking.” “This is beginning to sound like criticism to me.” These are examples of possible observations, not statements everyone should make during every disagreement. You do not need a formal BTL term to say what you notice.

Keep the observation close to the moment. “I'm repeating myself” describes a response. “I'm repeating myself because you never listen”

adds an explanation about the partner and the relationship. That explanation may contain a concern worth discussing, but it is more than recognition of your own response.

Naming an interpretation calls for a similar distinction. “I'm hearing this as you not trusting my judgment” describes how the exchange is landing for you. It does not establish what your partner intended. Nor does naming it an interpretation establish that it is mistaken. Where there has been prior criticism, a broken agreement, or an unreasonable request, those facts remain relevant.

You can also be uncertain. “Something about this feels familiar, but I cannot describe it yet” is a possible account. Leave what you do not know open. Filling every part of a map with a confident answer is not part of NAME IT.

Recognition does not require a complete explanation

BTL organizes its Loop as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. Those are parts of its educational framework, not four facts you must establish before changing what you are doing. Chapter 11 introduces the full model, and Chapters 27–33 develop the mapping work.

During a tense exchange, NAME IT does not ask you to reconstruct the beginning, identify a deeper meaning, work out the function of every response, and explain your partner. The chapter's instruction is more limited: recognize something happening now. Fuller reflection belongs at a time when it can be approached with enough capacity and appropriate safety.

Within BTL, Overload describes capacity beginning to narrow, with possible experiences such as urgency or difficulty listening. If that fits what you notice, “I'm finding it hard to listen right now” can be a sufficient description. It does not require a diagnosis or a claim about what your brain is doing. You remain responsible for your conduct.

An observation is also not an assignment for the other person. Saying that you are finding listening difficult does not require your partner to reassure you, soften a legitimate complaint, or abandon a question. What you do about your capacity is addressed more fully in Chapter 36, SLOW IT.

Say enough to identify the moment

Consider a brief fictional example. One person asks whether an invitation has been answered. The other begins listing everything they have had to do that week, then notices: “I'm explaining how busy I am instead of answering.” The reply has identified a specific response without deciding whether the question was fair, whether anyone was deliberately criticizing, or who has the harder week.

The person might then answer, “No, I haven't replied.” That answer is a next action, distinct from naming. The invitation still needs attention. The questioner may remain frustrated, and the exchange may still need further discussion. The example illustrates the difference between describing a response and doing something about it; it is not evidence of an intervention effect.

A shorter observation may fit another moment: “I'm raising my voice.” There is no need to attach an account of childhood, personality, or hidden need. If you have already spoken harshly, identifying it does not replace acknowledgment of the impact. Chapters 41–43 take up the aftermath and accountability work in greater depth.

Ordinary language is sufficient. You might recognize a Protection Move within the framework and simply say, “I'm defending myself.” The other person does not have to know the framework for you to describe your conduct. The term is an aid to your observation, rather than something they must learn or endorse before the issue can continue.

Shared language is optional

Where both people want to use it and can do so safely, “I think we're getting into our Loop” is a canonical example of shared recognition. The phrase offers an observation about the exchange. It does not establish agreement about everything that has happened or distribute responsibility equally.

If you both want a shared phrase, you can discuss its intended meaning at a calmer time, provided that conversation is safe and welcome. You might explain that you want to notice your own defensiveness, rather than declare that your partner has caused a problem. Either person can prefer ordinary descriptions, suggest different wording, or decline the shared phrase.

If the other person disagrees with your description, you do not need to win an argument about whether this is “the Loop.” Return to what you

can identify in your own conduct. “I do notice that I'm interrupting” is narrower than insisting that both people accept the same account. It leaves their perspective open without requiring you to surrender your own.

Agreement about the label is not a prerequisite for stopping an insult, answering a question, or respecting a boundary. Equally, declining BTL vocabulary is not evidence of resistance, poor insight, or unwillingness to improve the relationship. Shared language is one possible educational aid, not a test of cooperation.

Do not turn the framework toward your partner

“You're doing your Protection Move again” names the other person's behavior through your interpretation of it. “I'm noticing that I've started correcting every detail” describes your own action. NAME IT should not become a way to make your analysis of a partner authoritative.

The same boundary applies to internal experience. You can report your own urgency or familiar meaning. You cannot establish another person's Overload or Old Story by naming it for them. An observation about their words or actions should remain an observation, rather than becoming a claim that you know why they acted.

First-person wording alone does not settle the problem. “I feel that you're trying to control me” still contains an assertion about intention. A more specific account might separate the conduct and its meaning: “You changed the plan without asking me. I experienced that as having no say.” This does not require treating the changed plan as acceptable or postponing a necessary boundary.

Nor should naming Overload invalidate an issue. A person can be angry about a real broken agreement. “You're overloaded” is not an answer to what happened. Likewise, calling a hurtful response a Protection Move does not excuse its impact. The Loop is the pattern, not the person.

What research on labeling can establish

Research on pattern labeling asks related questions, but the procedure matters. Rice et al. (2026) compared two clinician-guided labeling formats in 49 couples with complete data: nature metaphors and descriptive labels. Both included labeling and discussion. The comparison therefore does not isolate naming alone, and it did not

evaluate BTL NAME IT. The small, predominantly White sample also limits generalization.

That distinction matters when translating research into an instruction. A guided session involving discussion is different from a brief observation during an argument. Evidence concerning another labeling procedure should not be presented as proof that saying “I'm getting defensive” will regulate distress or change a partner's response. The proposed benefit of NAME IT remains provisional.

The educational task here can be stated without an outcome promise: identify what you notice, describe it without pretending to know more than you do, and keep responsibility visible. Success at producing a phrase is not evidence that a conflict has improved. Attend separately to what is actually said and done afterward.

Keep the issue and accountability visible

“We're getting into our Loop” should not close a discussion about something that still needs an answer. If a commitment was missed, recognition does not fulfill it. If an arrangement is unfair, naming the exchange does not make the arrangement fair. The issue and the Loop are two different things. Both can matter.

Another brief fictional example makes the distinction concrete. During a disagreement about a changed plan, a speaker says, “I'm getting defensive,” and then continues interrupting. The observation may be sincere, but it should not be counted as having stopped the interruption. The other person is not obliged to treat the declaration as changed behavior.

If you recognize a response only after the conversation ends, describe that timing honestly. “I noticed afterward that I kept correcting you instead of addressing your question” is different from claiming that you caught it in the moment. Late recognition can still be followed by accountability; it does not rewrite what happened.

Naming also does not make every departure, refusal, or silence a response that needs correction. A person may be setting a boundary, declining an unreasonable demand, or disengaging for safety. The action alone does not establish a protective function, and another person's preferred interpretation does not make continued engagement obligatory.

When shared naming is the wrong task

Where there is fear, coercion, threats, intimidation, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, or fear of retaliation, do not treat the situation as a shared naming exercise. Safety and appropriate specialized support take priority over mutual Loop analysis. A person subjected to harm is not responsible for finding a phrase that prevents someone else's abusive conduct.

You do not have to announce what you notice, disclose an interpretation, keep written notes, or ask a partner to agree to a framework. This chapter does not prescribe confronting a controlling partner or remaining in an unsafe conversation. A quiet recognition of danger does not need to become a shared discussion before you can seek support.

BTL is relationship education, not clinical assessment or crisis care. Severe substance-related instability, acute mental-health crisis, or danger to children or dependents requires attention beyond this exercise. Chapter 53 develops the Field Guide's safety and referral boundaries. Mutual influence never establishes equal responsibility for harm.

Recognize, then consider capacity

For an ordinary, safe disagreement, NAME IT can be as brief as one accurate observation you choose to make privately or aloud. You do not need to identify every part of the Loop, explain its origin, or secure agreement. If a description is uncertain, keep the uncertainty in it.

Recognition leaves the next task open. You may still need to stop a harmful response, address an obligation, or decide whether you have enough capacity to continue well. Chapter 36 turns to SLOW IT and its question: “Do I still have enough capacity to do this well?” Naming what is happening begins the educational sequence; what you do next remains a separate responsibility.

Chapter 36. SLOW IT

A disagreement about a bill has become a disagreement about how the bill was discussed. One person begins answering more quickly. The other has a second objection ready before the first is finished. The original question remains unanswered, and the exchange is moving faster than either has made room to follow.

A similar moment can occur in an ordinary disagreement. You have something legitimate to say, yet each new sentence brings another explanation, correction, or accusation. Knowing that you are becoming defensive does not automatically tell you what to do with the next thirty seconds.

Chapter 35 introduced NAME IT, the recognition step in the Break the Loop sequence NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. SLOW IT takes a different question: “Do I still have enough capacity to do this well?” That question does not ask whether the concern is reasonable, who caused the disagreement, or whether you should stop caring. It asks what kind of participation you can manage now.

The purpose of slowing

Within Break the Loop, SLOW IT is the part of the interruption sequence concerned with the pace and demands of an interaction. You might speak more slowly, say less, lower your intensity, attend to one issue at a time, postpone an attempt at problem solving, or request a defined pause. These are options, not an ordered checklist. A time-out is one possible response; SLOW IT is not another name for taking a time-out.

The word “capacity” deserves care. You may be able to keep talking while finding it harder to listen closely, hold uncertainty, or choose your words. You may also be willing to talk but not willing to agree with a demand. The question is not a test of whether your feelings are acceptable. It is an invitation to assess what you can do responsibly in the present exchange.

Break the Loop describes Overload within its Loop sequence, Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. That framework offers

language for the experience of narrowing capacity. It does not establish a diagnosis, a physiological cutoff, or a loss of agency. Feeling overwhelmed does not excuse threats, insults, coercion, or other harmful conduct. Nor does being calmer make someone else's request legitimate.

Slowing is sometimes misunderstood as surrender. A person may worry that reducing intensity means conceding a point or giving the other person control of the conversation. Those are separate questions. You can hold a position, acknowledge an unanswered concern, and still choose to speak with fewer words or return to the subject later. The issue remains important even when the immediate exchange is interrupted.

What slowing can look like without leaving

A disagreement can be slowed before anyone walks away. One possibility is to let a question finish, then answer only that question. Another is to notice when you are beginning a second argument inside the first. “I have two things I want to respond to, but I'll start with the bill” is an example of narrowing the task. It is not a script that research has established as effective.

Saying less is not the same as withholding relevant information. There is a difference between reducing repetitive explanations and refusing to answer a necessary question. Someone who needs clarity about a shared expense, a broken agreement, or a consequential decision is entitled to treat the substantive issue seriously. SLOW IT does not erase that obligation.

Lowering intensity also need not mean pretending not to feel angry. You might choose a lower speaking volume, avoid a sarcastic aside, or stop repeating the sentence that has already been heard. These are descriptions of possible conduct, not requirements that people hide distress. The goal within this educational exercise is to make your own next response more deliberate, not to control how visibly your partner feels.

Sometimes the useful adjustment is not quieter speech but a smaller scope. A discussion about a late payment may draw in last month's disagreement, an unrelated family decision, and an old comment about

responsibility. All three may deserve attention, but trying to settle them simultaneously can make it harder to identify what requires an answer now. Choosing one issue for the moment is not deciding the others do not matter.

An example: keeping the issue in view

Imagine that Jordan notices a charge on a shared account and asks Taylor whether it was expected. Taylor hears the question as an accusation of carelessness and starts defending several earlier purchases. Jordan then raises the concern that the account balance is too low for the next bill. Both have material to discuss, but Taylor is now answering claims Jordan has not made, and Jordan is responding to the defense rather than receiving an answer.

Taylor could say, “I'm explaining too many things at once. The charge was expected. Can we look at what the balance needs to cover?” That response does not require Taylor to agree with Jordan's tone or interpretation. Jordan could instead say, “I have two concerns. First, can we cover the bill? We can come back to the rest.” Either person may slow a part of the exchange without taking responsibility for the other's behavior.

The example is not evidence of what works for every couple. Jordan may still have spoken unfairly. Taylor may still have avoided a real financial obligation. Neither observation is settled by who manages to sound calmer. SLOW IT concerns the conduct of the conversation; it cannot independently determine the facts or settle accountability.

When a defined pause makes sense

Some conversations cannot be usefully narrowed while they are happening. If you notice that your attention keeps returning to rebuttal, that you cannot follow what is being asked, or that you are close to saying something you should not say, stopping temporarily may be more responsible than continuing without adjustment. That is a possible judgment, not a clinical assessment or proof that everyone must take a break at the same point.

The current BTL terminology describes a useful pause through three elements: an intention to continue, a need for space, and an intention to return. In a safe ordinary disagreement, someone might say, “I want to finish talking about this, but I'm having trouble listening carefully. I need some space. Could we check in later about when to continue?” The

wording is illustrative. It is not a validated formula, and a partner is not required to accept the proposed time.

A defined pause is different from disappearing. In ordinary disagreement, an unexplained departure may leave the other person uncertain whether the subject will ever be addressed. A stated intention to return offers information about what the pause is meant to do. It does not guarantee follow-through. If the people involved can agree on when to check back, they can make the expectation more concrete; if they cannot, the disagreement about availability remains a real issue.

Returning is not identical to resolving. A person can come back at the agreed time and still need more space, more information, or an opportunity to address a different problem first. The original concern deserves to be acknowledged rather than erased by the fact that someone took a break. Where responsibility for a specific decision or harm is clear, postponing the discussion is not the same as completing that responsibility.

How much time is enough?

It is tempting to turn a pause into a rule with a precise number of minutes. The research reviewed for this chapter does not identify a universal duration for ordinary couple disagreements. In one experimental study, McCurry and colleagues (2024) imposed short delays before participants selected a noise blast in a competitive task. Delays reduced the task's aggression measure, but the tested delays of five, ten, and fifteen seconds did not differ significantly from one another. These were imposed response delays in a laboratory game, not partners voluntarily agreeing to pause a household disagreement.

Other couple research makes the outcome distinction important. Salvatore and colleagues (2011) observed young couples move from a conflict discussion to a positive-topic task. An association between the partner's observed recovery and concurrent relationship satisfaction was marginal in the reported analysis; the corresponding actor-recovery association was not statistically significant. That study did not test a return agreement, a recommended length of space, or a procedure for solving the original issue.

An integrative review of interpersonal emotion regulation likewise emphasizes context and differences among strategies rather than one universally best technique (Arican-Dinc & Gable, 2026). Taken together, these findings offer reasons to study pacing and recovery

carefully. They do not show that BTL's SLOW IT procedure is effective, that a particular number of minutes is optimal, or that slowing one person will reliably regulate the other.

How long a pause needs to be is a practical decision that may depend on the people, safety, obligations, and circumstances involved. Some situations call for a brief interruption; others call for postponing a difficult discussion. The educational distinction is between communicating honestly about the need for space and presenting an arbitrary number as if it had been proven to work. Any agreement about returning also depends on safety, willingness, and the realistic demands of the situation.

What a pause is not

Space with an intention to return is different from withdrawing contact to punish, frighten, or control. It is also different from refusing to address an obligation indefinitely. Yet the outward act of leaving a conversation does not, by itself, reveal a person's motive. People can leave because they are overwhelmed, because they want to avoid accountability, because they have another responsibility, or because staying is unsafe. The context matters.

The research on post-conflict withdrawal is not a license to infer intention from appearance. A diary study in the source library found associations between withdrawal and poorer recovery in selected measures, with important variation involving punitive intent and the experience of being treated punitively (Prager et al., 2019). That finding should not be converted into “all withdrawal is harmful” or “any pause with a stated return is healthy.” The purpose, impact, circumstances, and subsequent conduct require separate consideration; the observation alone does not establish what someone intended.

Most importantly, this chapter's return principle applies to safe ordinary disagreement, not to coercion or danger. If there are threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, intimidation, fear of retaliation, or coercive control, a person does not owe an explanation, a negotiated pause, or a promise to resume contact. Leaving or ending the interaction may be protective. Shared Loop analysis and joint conflict exercises are not substitutes for safety planning or specialized support.

Slowing does not mean making one person responsible for keeping the other calm. Each person remains responsible for harmful conduct. If the interaction cannot be made safe by changing its pace, the

appropriate response is not a more skillful version of the same conversation.

The limit of the method

BTL proposes that slowing pace, words, intensity, or the overall demand of a conversation may leave more room to consider a next response. That is a working hypothesis about the SLOW IT practice, not a demonstrated improvement in recurrence, satisfaction, or conflict outcomes. Slowing may not change a partner's behavior. It may not uncover the facts that matter. It may not make a needed decision any easier.

There is also a difference between being unable to continue well right now and being unwilling to hear an unwelcome concern. The same words, “I need a break,” can serve different purposes. Within safe disagreement, responsibility includes considering what the pause postpones and whether the person requesting it takes reasonable steps to address that issue later. The right to set a boundary remains, and so does responsibility for one's own conduct.

SLOW IT is therefore a limited step. NAME IT concerns what you notice. SLOW IT concerns the pace and demands of the next part of the exchange. Chapter 37, CHECK IT, will address a different question: “What am I assuming?” A conversation may be slower and still be built on an untested interpretation. Slowing does not complete the rest of the sequence.

The chapter's practical question remains small: “Do I still have enough capacity to do this well?” If the answer is uncertain or no, you can consider what adjustment is possible and safe. That might mean one less explanation, one issue at a time, or an honest request for space with an intention to return. The point is not to make a disagreement disappear. It is to take responsibility for the part of the interaction you can choose next.

Chapter 37. CHECK IT

A question about a shared expense comes at the end of a difficult day: “Did you already pay that bill?” One person hears a straightforward request for information. The other hears an accusation: “You think I’m irresponsible.” Before either has clarified what was asked, the conversation is about trust, control, and everything that happened the last time a bill was late.

Sometimes an accusation really is being made. Sometimes the question is simply a question. Sometimes the words are neutral but the context supplies good reason to hear criticism. The difficulty is that the first meaning that comes to mind can feel as settled as the words themselves. Feeling sure does not establish intention. But uncertainty does not establish that the concern is misplaced, either.

In Break the Loop, CHECK IT asks: “What am I assuming?” It is the third part of NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. Chapter 35 addressed noticing your own current response. Chapter 36 addressed whether you have enough capacity to participate responsibly. This chapter addresses what you are taking the moment to mean, what you know, and what information, if any, would be useful before you respond.

CHECK IT is an educational part of the Break the Loop framework, not a scientifically validated test of partner intentions. Its purpose is to add present-moment information before responding to an Old Story as though it were established fact. It is not a requirement to doubt your senses or surrender a legitimate complaint.

The difference between an event and its meaning

A useful place to begin is by distinguishing what happened from the explanation forming around it. “My partner asked whether I paid the bill” describes an event. “My partner thinks I am incompetent” is an interpretation of that event. The interpretation could be correct, partly correct, or mistaken. The event alone does not resolve the question.

The distinction is not an argument that tone, history, and context do not matter. A question asked in an accusatory tone after repeated

criticism may reasonably feel different from the same words asked in an ordinary planning conversation. If a partner has said, “I do not trust you with money,” that earlier statement is relevant information. The more that is known, the more specific a person can be about why the question raises concern. What is still uncertain is not necessarily everything.

Research on relationship attributions helps explain why this distinction deserves attention. An attribution is an explanation someone offers for another person’s behavior. A historical review by Bradbury and Fincham (1990) described associations between negative explanations and relationship distress while also emphasizing differences among causal explanations, responsibility judgments, and claims about intent. These are not interchangeable questions. Seeing a connection between an interpretation and dissatisfaction does not tell us whether a particular partner intended what was inferred.

Later observational and cross-national work also cautions against treating any one attribution pattern as a universal rule. In a prospective study of selected newlywed couples, early responsibility attributions were associated with their own later behavior, but the design did not demonstrate accurate knowledge of the partner’s intentions or prove that an interpretation caused the behavior (Durtschi et al., 2011). In a more recent study across four country samples, attribution-satisfaction associations differed in strength across the samples (Williamson et al., 2026). Neither finding is a direct test of CHECK IT.

For the reader, the distinction is modest: a familiar interpretation can be important to your response, but it should not quietly become proof of somebody else’s purpose.

What are you actually trying to check?

The question “What am I assuming?” can be used without holding a lengthy debate inside your head. It might be enough to identify one conclusion that has become important to your next response.

Consider three descriptions:

“The conversation stopped when I started explaining.”

“I experienced the silence as dismissal.”

“I am assuming that my partner stopped talking because my concerns do not matter.”

The first is an account of an observable event as remembered. The second describes an experience. The third proposes a motive or meaning. They can all be worth discussing, but they have different degrees of certainty. One person may be certain they felt dismissed while still being unsure why the other person became silent.

That distinction also preserves accountability. If the silence followed an explicit threat, or if a person repeatedly withdraws contact to punish the other, the relevant facts should not be erased by a request to "check the story." Describing a particular intent as uncertain is not equivalent to declaring all conduct acceptable.

Sometimes the uncertainty concerns an expectation. You may have expected help without asking directly, or expected a partner to recall an earlier agreement. A disputed recollection is different from an unspoken expectation. An acknowledged broken agreement is different from either. As Chapter 26 explained, these cases deserve different conversations. Not every concern becomes an assumption just because the people involved disagree about it.

Checking without asking someone to accept your version

When the situation is safe and both people are willing, clarification may take the form of a short question: "What did you mean by that?" Another option is to make the interpretation visible without announcing it as a fact: "Can I check what I think I'm hearing?"

The current BTL wording also provides this example: "I'm hearing this as you not trusting me. Is that what you mean?" The useful feature of these examples is that they invite additional information without presuming what the answer must be. The speaker identifies a meaning they are considering and leaves space for a correction, a confirmation, or a more complicated answer. These are illustrations, not validated scripts, and nobody is required to use particular words.

A question may receive a clear reply. It may also produce a disagreement about what happened, reveal a different concern, or receive no meaningful answer at all. An explanation of intention is information offered by a person, not independent proof of their intention. You still have to consider observable behavior, past agreements, effects, and subsequent choices.

Clarification can fail when it is really a demand for reassurance. "Tell me you weren't criticizing me" is not the same as asking what was meant. Nor is "You misunderstood me, so you cannot be upset" a fair

resolution of impact. A person may not have intended a hurtful effect and may still need to address that effect. A person may also intend to criticize, and the other person is not obligated to pretend otherwise.

There can be more than one question on the table. “Did you pay the bill?” requires an answer about the bill. “Were you questioning my judgment?” concerns an interpretation of the question. Discussing the second does not eliminate the first. CHECK IT should not become a way to evade a concrete obligation by turning every request into a debate about tone.

Accuracy and bias can coexist

One reason to avoid a blanket instruction to “assume the best” is that people sometimes perceive something real. In a laboratory study of young romantic couples, Venaglia and Lemay (2019) compared how participants perceived a partner’s destructive behavior during a conflict discussion with measures of the partner’s actual behavior in that discussion. Perceptions reflected assessed partner behavior and were also associated with the perceiver’s relationship attitudes. Their results illustrate that accuracy and bias can coexist without establishing anyone's true intention.

The study was limited to a selected, mostly young heterosexual sample and a single laboratory discussion. It was not a test of asking clarification questions, it did not establish true intentions, and it cannot determine what happened in a reader’s relationship. Its importance here is narrower: the idea that all negative perceptions are mere distortions would misstate the evidence. People can respond to real conduct while making additional inferences about it.

This is particularly important when someone has credible reasons for concern. If money has been taken without agreement, a promise repeatedly broken, or an insult plainly spoken, no exercise in interpretation should require someone to ignore those facts. You can check whether the motive you inferred is accurate while still identifying the conduct that requires attention.

A review by Overall and McNulty (2017) also cautioned against one-size-fits-all guidance about couple conflict communication. The implications of direct opposition or cooperative responses depend on the circumstances, including whether a serious problem needs to change. A respectful conversation is not always a conversation in which

concerns are softened or a partner is reassured. Sometimes the appropriate next response is a clear disagreement or a boundary.

A small example: a question about a plan

Imagine Jordan and Taylor are discussing a family visit. Taylor says, "I thought you were going to tell me before making the plan." Jordan immediately hears, "You never make responsible decisions," and begins listing earlier examples of being trusted to organize things. Taylor becomes frustrated that the actual plan has not been addressed.

Jordan could identify the gap: "I'm hearing that as you saying you can't trust my decisions. Is that what you mean?" Taylor might answer, "No. I wanted to be consulted before we committed to a weekend." If that is the answer, the conversation has gained a more specific concern. Jordan may still disagree about whether consultation was promised. Taylor may still be disappointed. The issue has not disappeared merely because one interpretation was corrected.

The answer might instead be, "I do not trust you to make those plans alone anymore." That is important information, too. CHECK IT is not a technique for getting the reassuring answer. It can reveal that the disagreement is more substantial than first understood.

The example is fictional and does not demonstrate that asking the question improves conflict outcomes. Its function is to show the difference between treating an inferred meaning as settled and making room for additional information. The next action, whether listening, acknowledging, disagreeing, or establishing a boundary, belongs more fully to Chapter 38, CHOOSE IT.

When the answer does not resolve the concern

A partner may say, "I didn't mean that," while the words or actions remain consequential. An explanation may clarify what the person intended without making the impact disappear. You may need to name the actual words, ask about a concrete action, or describe what would have to change.

An exchange may also contain incomplete or conflicting accounts. If one person remembers an agreement and the other does not, CHECK IT does not supply an independent record. It may help identify what each person is relying on, but that is different from deciding whose account is true. Some disagreements require checking records,

revisiting commitments, making a practical decision, or acknowledging that the facts remain disputed.

The person asking for clarification retains judgment. So does the person being asked. Nobody can require a partner to accept their explanation as final, and nobody can require a person to apologize for a concern merely because its interpretation remains open.

You may discover that your first reading was unsupported. You may find new information that strengthens it. Or you may be no closer to agreement. CHECK IT should allow all three possibilities. Its purpose is to examine the information available to you, not to engineer a favorable conclusion.

Safety comes before mutual checking

The ordinary examples in this chapter assume that asking a question or offering an interpretation is reasonably safe. They do not apply in the same way where there is coercion, threats, violence, stalking, sexual coercion, intimidation, fear, or likely retaliation. In those circumstances, asking "What did you mean?" can expose someone to additional danger, and efforts to encourage a more generous reading can minimize real risk.

Someone facing threats or coercive control does not owe the other person a charitable interpretation, a joint conversation about the Loop, or a further opportunity to explain away harmful conduct. Protective distance, outside support, or a safety plan may matter more than any shared communication exercise. Responsibility for intimidation or abuse is not shared merely because both people respond to each other.

This is not a special exception to the idea of accountability. It is a governing boundary: recurring disagreement and abuse are not equivalent problems, and BTL's educational framework cannot substitute for specialized safety assessment or intervention.

What the evidence does and does not establish

CHECK IT proposes that briefly testing an assumption rather than reacting to it automatically may leave more room to consider a next response. That is a BTL working hypothesis. Research about attribution, perceived behavior, and communication context provides related concepts, but it does not establish that this particular BTL step makes couples more accurate, de-escalates disagreement, prevents repeated fights, or improves relationship outcomes.

The boundaries matter because “more information” is not always “better information.” A person can misunderstand a question; another can answer evasively. People can disagree about events, remember different details, and have conflicting responsibilities. No single question resolves all of these possibilities.

What remains useful as an educational distinction is the separation between a concern and an unverified explanation of that concern. The concern deserves attention. The explanation can be examined. Neither should be silently substituted for the other.

From checking to choosing

The current BTL sequence is NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. In an actual disagreement, those words are not four mandatory speeches or a checklist another person must complete. NAME IT concerns recognition. SLOW IT concerns capacity and pace. CHECK IT concerns the meaning being inferred and the information still needed. CHOOSE IT will address what you decide to do next.

When you notice a familiar Old Story, the limited question for this chapter is, “What am I assuming?” It may be enough to distinguish an event from the conclusion you drew, identify what remains unknown, or ask one voluntary clarifying question where it is safe to do so. You do not have to pretend there is no problem, and you do not have to decide anyone’s motives before taking responsibility for your next action.

Chapter 38. CHOOSE IT

A conversation about a weekend visit begins with a familiar disagreement. One person says, “I wish you had asked before agreeing to that.” The other starts explaining why the plan made sense, repeating the same defense more forcefully each time. What they want is to be understood. What their partner hears is that the objection does not matter.

There may be an actual disagreement about permission, priorities, or commitments. That issue should not vanish into a discussion of communication style. But the next response still matters. The person defending the plan could keep explaining, stop and listen to the objection, acknowledge the commitment that was made, or say plainly what they disagree about. None of those responses guarantees a better outcome. They lead into different conversations.

In Break the Loop, CHOOSE IT asks: “What do I actually want to do next?” It is the fourth part of NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. Earlier chapters addressed noticing a familiar response, assessing whether there is enough capacity to participate, and checking an interpretation against available information. CHOOSE IT concerns the action that follows.

The canonical principle is straightforward: the goal is choosing instead of automatically reacting. It is not “always be calmer,” “always be agreeable,” or “always stay in the conversation.” Depending on the circumstances, a deliberate response may be a clear request, a boundary, an acknowledgment, or a decision to step away. The person retains responsibility for the choice, and other people retain their own agency.

What a choice is meant to accomplish

A familiar Protection Move can feel like the only available response. Someone who expects criticism may defend before hearing the whole concern. Someone who expects pressure may withdraw as soon as a difficult question begins. Someone who fears being ignored may pursue an answer increasingly urgently. In BTL these are possible Protection Moves, not fixed personality types or established diagnoses.

CHOOSE IT invites a narrower question than “How do I fix the relationship?” The question is what to do next in this particular moment, with this particular concern and these actual limits. A person can notice the response they are already moving toward and consider whether it serves what they want to accomplish.

A person who wants to be understood may be tempted to explain for five more minutes. That explanation could be necessary, especially if a factual mistake needs correcting. But the person might instead want the partner to hear one important point, and a shorter direct request could serve that purpose better. A person who wants room to think may already be moving toward leaving without a word. If the situation is safe, saying that a pause is needed and describing a possible return may communicate the limit more clearly. Neither option should be treated as a proven script.

There are also times when the familiar reaction is a legitimate protective decision. A person may be choosing not to participate in an insulting exchange, or refusing demands that violate a boundary. It would be a mistake to classify all disengagement as a problem, or all persistence as courage. The question is not whether the behavior looks accommodating. It is whether the person can make a responsible decision that fits the real circumstances.

The limits of a communication rule

Research does not support a simple ranking in which one style of couple-conflict communication is always best. In their review of communication during intimate relationship conflict, Overall and McNulty (2017) described how the implications of direct opposition and more cooperative responses depend on the nature of the problem and the context. Where a serious, changeable problem requires action, direct opposition may help make the problem visible. A superficially gentle response can also leave an important concern unaddressed. The same review does not mean forceful confrontation is always beneficial.

That is an external research synthesis, not a study of CHOOSE IT. The review draws together work conducted with different designs and populations; it does not establish a universal formula for an individual couple. It does establish an important constraint on advice: an agreeable response and a useful response are not necessarily the same.

Consider a person who has repeatedly promised to take care of a shared obligation and has not done so. Their partner may need a clear account

of what happened, a new agreement, or a boundary about what can be relied upon. An instruction to “validate first” cannot substitute for taking responsibility. Conversely, a direct request for change does not require insults or intimidation. The substance of the concern and the way it is raised both matter.

Some choices are requests

A direct request identifies something the other person can understand and consider. “I need you to tell me before inviting someone to stay” is more specific than “You never think about me.” It also leaves the underlying question open: perhaps the partners disagree about who may make the decision, what notice is reasonable, or whether prior consent was given.

A request is not a guarantee of compliance. Nor is every need a demand that another person must fulfill. A clear request makes a possible next action available for discussion without disguising it as proof of the other person's character.

When a disagreement has become a debate about intentions, a direct question may bring attention back to the practical issue. “Can we decide who is handling the payment?” concerns the payment. “Do you trust me?” concerns the relationship meaning. Both questions may matter, but they are not interchangeable. CHOOSE IT should not become a way of bypassing either.

Some choices are listening or acknowledgment

Listening can be a substantive action rather than silence while preparing a rebuttal. Someone may choose to ask, “What part of the plan concerns you most?” and then hear the answer before explaining their own position. Acknowledgment might sound like, “I understand that this affected your schedule,” even when the person disagrees that they acted improperly.

Acknowledging an experience is different from certifying every explanation offered for it. It is possible to take the consequences seriously without agreeing to an unverified allegation. It is also possible to acknowledge that a concern is justified and still disagree about the proposed solution.

If the other person identifies concrete harmful conduct, acknowledgment cannot be used to evade accountability. “I hear that you are upset” may describe an emotion while leaving the actual breach

untouched. A better next choice may include naming the conduct and what the person will do about it. That is not a substitute for follow-through.

Some choices are boundaries or pauses

A boundary states a limit on what a person will do or accept. “I will discuss this without insults, but I will not continue while I am being called names” is different from “You must stop disagreeing with me.” The first concerns participation under specified conditions. The second may attempt to control another person's position. Context matters, particularly where power or intimidation is involved.

A person may also choose to request a defined pause. In a safe, voluntary disagreement, this can mean naming the need for space and, if appropriate, proposing when to return to the unresolved issue. Chapter 36 explained that a pause is not a universal time limit or proof that the conflict is solved. CHOOSE IT concerns deciding whether that option is appropriate now. No research reviewed for this chapter establishes that one pause script or duration improves recurring conflict.

A pause should not be used to punish, frighten, or erase a partner's concern. But nobody owes continued contact when doing so is unsafe. A protective exit from threats or intimidation does not need to be reframed as failure to communicate.

Some choices are disagreement and accountability

Choosing a different response is not the same as withdrawing disagreement. “I hear that you wanted me to ask first. I still believe the decision was reasonable, and I want to discuss what we agree to do next time” is a disagreement that identifies the subject. It may be unwelcome, but unwelcome does not automatically mean disrespectful.

In another situation, a person may need to say, “You are right. I agreed to check with you, and I did not.” That acknowledgment is different from accepting responsibility for every feeling or accusation raised during the argument. Accountability requires accuracy about conduct and consequences, not blanket self-blame.

When the exchange is safe, a person can also decide to return to the issue after interrupting a familiar pattern. The argument may have shifted from the missed commitment to whether someone is selfish, controlling, or dismissive. Returning might mean asking: “What are we

going to do about the commitment?" Interrupting the Loop and addressing the issue are connected but not identical tasks. A more deliberate tone does not pay a bill, restore time, or complete an agreement.

Presence and space are not universal instructions

Two familiar positions deserve particular care. Someone who tends to withdraw may decide to stay present for one more question or to say what is happening rather than disappearing. Someone who tends to pursue may decide to allow a partner some voluntarily requested space while recognizing that the other person's need for space does not, by itself, establish rejection.

Those alternatives are not mandates. A withdrawn person may need a genuine break. A pursuing person may be asking for information that has been unreasonably withheld. Staying in the room can be unsafe; granting space can also be misused as a pretext for indefinite avoidance of accountability. What matters is the specific situation, not whether a choice looks like the opposite of a familiar Protection Move.

Research on post-conflict withdrawal and recovery is relevant to understanding why responses can matter, but it cannot determine the correct action in a particular exchange. BTL's CHOOSE IT has not been directly evaluated as an independent technique, and this guide cannot promise that changing a response will end a recurring argument or produce a particular relationship outcome.

An ordinary example: a plan that was already made

Consider a fictional couple, Jordan and Taylor, planning a family visit. Taylor learns that Jordan has already committed them to spending Saturday with relatives.

Taylor says, "I wish you had checked with me first." Jordan hears criticism and starts defending the relatives: "They are your family too. We have not visited in months. I thought you would be happy about it." Taylor repeats the complaint, this time more sharply. Jordan raises their voice and lists all the times they have handled family arrangements.

If the conversation is safe and voluntary, Jordan might notice the familiar defense. Jordan could ask, "Are you upset about seeing them, or about my making the commitment before we talked?" That would be

CHECK IT, an attempt to clarify an interpretation. The reply is information, not proof that either person is unreasonable.

Suppose Taylor answers, “I wanted to decide with you because I already have plans for Saturday.” Jordan now has more of the actual issue. CHOOSE IT asks what response would be responsible next. Jordan could acknowledge that they made a commitment affecting Taylor's time without consulting Taylor. Jordan could ask about the other plans. Jordan could disagree about whether earlier consultation had been promised. Or Jordan could offer to contact the relatives and explain that Saturday is not confirmed.

A response such as “I did agree to Saturday before asking you. I will call and tell them we need to reconsider” may be an appropriate choice if Jordan actually intends to follow through. It does not require Jordan to agree that visiting the relatives is a bad idea. It addresses the concrete action that created the difficulty.

Suppose instead that Taylor says, “I do not want to visit them under any circumstances.” Then the disagreement is more substantial. CHOOSE IT does not transform an actual conflict of priorities into agreement. Jordan can listen and respond directly; Taylor can maintain a boundary; both may have decisions to make. They do not have to share an interpretation of the relationship in order to recognize the real choices.

This example is invented to show possible distinctions, not evidence that any proposed line improves couple outcomes. It is not based on client material or presented as a universal template.

A choice is not proof of a result

The CHOOSE IT step is an educational part of BTL. The framework proposes that noticing a familiar response and considering its purpose may make another action easier to contemplate. That possibility has not been established as an independent intervention effect. The research reviewed for this chapter does not show that CHOOSE IT improves accuracy, reduces escalation, transfers consistently to daily life, or prevents the recurrence of conflict.

A single exchange may improve, deteriorate, or remain unresolved despite a deliberate choice. The other person may refuse a request or respond with an insult. New information may reveal a larger disagreement. A calm response may be inappropriate when a firm boundary or direct confrontation of a serious problem is necessary.

These outcomes are not proof that the person failed to use the framework correctly.

For an educational illustration, the narrower question is whether the person identified a response they could responsibly consider, given what they knew and what was safe. This is not a validated outcome measure. The answer may be no. Capacity, uncertainty, obligations and the other person's behavior can all constrain what is available. Overload can narrow available options without removing agency or excusing harm.

When ordinary conflict guidance is not enough

CHOOSE IT should not be taught as a responsibility to manage another person's coercion or abuse. When someone faces threats, violence, sexual coercion, stalking, monitoring, fear of retaliation or restriction of autonomy, a recommendation to remain present, listen longer, make a direct request or negotiate a pause may increase danger. Reciprocity in an exchange does not imply equal responsibility for harmful conduct.

In these circumstances, safety and individualized specialized support take priority over joint Loop exercises. A person does not need to obtain the other person's agreement, explain a boundary directly to someone dangerous, or remain in contact to demonstrate responsible choice. In situations involving acute crisis, severe substance-related danger, or threats to children or other dependents, appropriate specialist or emergency support may also be needed. The Field Guide's safety standards apply regardless of whether the interaction otherwise resembles a familiar pattern.

U.S. Department of Justice guidance identifies abusive control, threats and isolation as forms of domestic violence and provides routes to specialized assistance (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2025). Such guidance is a safety resource, not an empirical test of CHOOSE IT. A person facing immediate danger should seek emergency help appropriate to their location. Relationship education does not replace assessment or therapy, and this book does not offer an abuse-screening or crisis intervention protocol.

The next response, not a new personality

For a safe everyday disagreement, CHOOSE IT can be practiced as a small decision rather than an instruction to become a different person. A direct request may be useful where a need has not been stated.

Listening may be useful when important information is missing. A boundary may be necessary when conduct is unacceptable. A pause may be sensible when there is too little capacity to continue responsibly. Taking responsibility may matter more than explaining a motive. Returning to the issue may matter when a discussion has drifted into accusations.

There is no requirement to perform all these responses, follow a fixed order, or choose the most pleasant-sounding one. The appropriate next action depends on what is happening, what matters, what is known, what remains unresolved and what is safe.

This chapter completes the named interrupt sequence, NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. It does not complete every conflict. Chapter 39 will examine the formal BTL translation, Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice, as a separate way to explore the possible function of a response without treating function as an excuse. For now, the central question is still the one that gives this chapter its title: “What do I actually want to do next?”

Chapter 39. Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice

From a familiar response to a more deliberate one

Sometimes a person recognizes a familiar response and still does not know what to do instead. They can see that they became defensive, pressed for an answer, grew critical, or went quiet. Naming the behavior is a useful description, but it leaves another question open: What was that response meant to accomplish?

In Break the Loop, a Protection Move is the response a person makes within the familiar sequence Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The term describes a place in the pattern. It does not define the person, excuse conduct, or establish that every response is unnecessary. Some exits, refusals, and boundaries are appropriate and protective.

This chapter introduces a way to examine one's own response without treating an explanation as an excuse. Break the Loop calls it Protection Move Translation:

Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice

The four questions are straightforward. Working through them may be less straightforward. A person may not immediately know why they reacted as they did. They may have several reasons, or a reason they are reluctant to acknowledge. The task is not to produce a perfect hidden explanation. It is to consider a possible function and identify another available response while remaining accountable for what happened.

Protection Move: What did I do?

Begin with conduct that could have been noticed, rather than a label about identity.

“I interrupted three times” is more specific than “I'm controlling.” “I stopped replying and left without saying whether I would return” is more specific than “I shut down.” “I told my partner that their concern was ridiculous” is more specific than “I was just protecting myself.”

Specific descriptions make it possible to distinguish what happened from what someone believes it means. They can also preserve an important difference: choosing to end an unsafe conversation is not the same as disappearing to punish someone. A person should not assume that every firm boundary is a dysfunctional Protection Move merely because it stops an argument.

A useful first question is whether the behavior actually occurred as remembered. Memory and interpretation can differ. If the details are uncertain, say so. The translation does not require a person to claim knowledge they do not have.

Function: What was that response trying to accomplish?

"Function" asks about the possible job a response was doing for the person who made it. Defensiveness might be an attempt to protect a sense of competence. Repeating a question might be an attempt to obtain clarity. Withdrawal might be an attempt to reduce intensity or prevent saying something harmful. Criticism might be an unsuccessful attempt to make a concern impossible to ignore.

These are possibilities, not diagnoses. A similar behavior can have different meanings in different circumstances. The response might have served several purposes at once. Its protective purpose might be mistaken, mixed with frustration, or different from what the person first assumes. A person might discover, after reflection, that the first explanation they gave themselves is incomplete.

It helps to phrase the answer tentatively: "I think I was trying to…" rather than "That was definitely because…." The question is most useful in the first person. Translating a partner's behavior from the outside can quickly become another Old Story: "You did that because you wanted control." An interpretation of another person's intention is not proof of it.

Recognizing an understandable function does not make the behavior harmless. Trying to be heard does not justify intimidation. Wanting space does not excuse a threatening exit. Protecting one's pride does not erase a cutting remark. Function and impact answer different questions.

Need: What did I actually need?

A function is what a response may have been trying to do. A need is what the person was hoping to preserve, receive, or make possible. They are related, but they are not interchangeable.

A person who attacked a partner's wording may have needed to know that their own perspective would be heard. A person who kept asking for a decision may have needed a realistic time to revisit an unresolved plan. A person who withdrew may have needed a pause with enough room to regain the ability to participate. These examples identify possibilities for self-reflection, not a universal set of hidden needs.

One way to test the distinction is to ask, “If I did not use that response, what would I still need addressed?” A need for clarity can remain after an accusation is set aside. A need for respect can remain after a defensive comeback is set aside. A legitimate issue about money, parenting, commitments, privacy, or fairness does not disappear because the way it was raised contributed to conflict.

Naming a need does not establish that the need is unmet because of the partner, or that the partner owes a particular response. A need is not automatically a claim on another person's behavior. “I needed reassurance” does not mean the partner was obligated to provide it immediately or in a particular form. “I needed space” does not authorize indefinite silence as a form of control. “I needed to be understood” does not give permission to demand agreement. The next question concerns what the person can responsibly do with the need.

Next Choice: What else could I do that serves that need?

The final question moves from explanation to an available action. It does not ask for the nicest-sounding sentence or require someone to surrender a boundary. It asks whether there is another response that addresses the need without automatically repeating the same conduct.

A person who wants to be understood might state a concern plainly and stop long enough for a reply. Someone who needs time might request a voluntary pause and, when safe and appropriate, propose when to revisit the issue, without making re-engagement mandatory in unsafe circumstances. Someone who wants an answer might ask for a specific time to make a decision instead of making the request again at increasing volume. Someone who notices a harmful remark might acknowledge it, take responsibility, and return to the actual concern.

These are illustrations, not prescribed scripts. They may not fit every disagreement. A meaningful Next Choice can be a firm no, leaving an unsafe setting, declining an unfair demand, or seeking support beyond the relationship.

Research on communication during couple conflict also cautions against treating any one style as universally best. Overall and McNulty (2017) describe how the implications of direct opposition and cooperative responses can differ with the seriousness of the problem and whether change is possible. This research concerns communication processes; it did not test Protection Move Translation. Its relevance here is a limit on simplistic rules, not proof that the four-question exercise works.

A short example

Consider a fictional, ordinary disagreement between two partners, Taylor and Jordan. They agreed to discuss weekend plans on Thursday, but Friday arrives without a decision. Taylor asks about the schedule again. Jordan replies sharply, "You act as if I never do anything right," and ends the exchange. The plans remain unsettled.

Jordan might translate the moment this way:

Protection Move: "I answered the scheduling question with an accusation and stopped talking."

Function: "I think I was trying to defend myself from feeling criticized."

Need: "I needed room to explain why I had not confirmed the plans, and I needed the conversation to stay focused on what we can do now."

Next Choice: "I can say that I have not confirmed my availability, ask for ten minutes to check, and offer a time when I will have an answer. I can also acknowledge that accusing Taylor was unfair."

That translation does not prove what Jordan felt at the time. It is a provisional first-person account. It does not establish that Taylor's question was unreasonable. It does not erase Jordan's responsibility for the accusation, or settle how the couple will organize the weekend. The issue still needs a practical answer.

Taylor might have a separate response to examine, but there is no requirement that Taylor share equal responsibility or produce an equivalent admission. This example is about how one person can examine their own conduct. It is not a verdict about both partners.

What the translation cannot do

A four-part description may help organize reflection. It cannot establish a person's internal motives with certainty. It cannot decide whether a request is fair, whether harm has been repaired, or whether a partner should forgive. It cannot substitute for the difficult work of correcting conduct and addressing the issue.

Break the Loop proposes that seeing the possible function of a familiar response, then considering the need and an alternative, may make another choice easier to consider. The retained evidence does not establish that this named exercise reduces the recurrence of conflict, accurately identifies hidden needs, or improves relationship outcomes. It is an educational practice, not a validated diagnostic instrument or a demonstrated treatment.

It is also possible to reach an honest answer of “I don't know.” An incomplete translation is preferable to an invented certainty. If a person realizes that the only available choice in that moment was to protect their immediate safety, the task is not to manufacture a more accommodating answer.

When safety changes the question

This framework is intended for ordinary disagreements where people have meaningful freedom to speak, refuse, pause, and seek help. It is not appropriate to use shared Loop language to distribute responsibility evenly when one person is threatened or controlled.

When violence, sexual coercion, stalking, intimidation, monitoring, fear of retaliation, or coercive control is present, safety takes priority over a joint translation exercise. Someone experiencing these conditions does not owe a partner explanations, renewed contact, confrontation, or a more agreeable response. Confidential safety planning, specialized domestic-violence support, clinical assessment, or emergency assistance may be more appropriate depending on the situation. The U.S. Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women provides public information and referral resources (2025).

Where there is acute crisis, serious substance-related instability, or concern for a child or dependent, relationship education should not replace individualized safety and professional support. A protective boundary is not a failure to participate in the exercise.

From understanding to responsibility

The most useful completion of the four questions is not a compassionate explanation of oneself. It is a clearer distinction among what happened, what may have been sought, what remains important, and what action is possible next.

A function can explain without excusing. A need can matter without becoming a demand. An alternative can be considered without abandoning the original issue. And a different response, if chosen, still has to be evaluated by what it actually does.

The next chapter, “Practice, Not Perfection,” turns to the larger question of repeated skill development. This chapter's narrower task is to leave the reader with four questions for examining one familiar response, without confusing self-understanding with exemption from responsibility.

Chapter 40. Practice, Not Perfection

A different response is an attempt, not a verdict

A couple can understand a familiar argument and still find themselves having another version of it. One partner recognizes the shift in tone only after a sharp reply. The other notices that they have stopped listening only when the conversation is over. Each may have understood the pattern clearly earlier that day.

That does not automatically mean the earlier understanding was false. Recognizing a pattern, noticing it while it happens, and choosing a different response are different tasks. People may be able to do one without consistently doing the others. Break the Loop treats this as a reason to approach change as practice rather than as a test that must be passed every time.

The word practice needs a boundary. A person can consider and practice changes to their own responses. They cannot make a partner cooperate, or use a promise of future improvement to avoid responsibility for conduct that has already caused harm. A recurring legitimate issue also remains legitimate even if someone becomes better at noticing their part in the interaction.

A framework for continued practice

Break the Loop organizes its educational change architecture as:

SEE → CATCH → CHANGE → STRENGTHEN

These four terms describe work a reader can return to. They are not experimentally established stages through which everyone progresses in the same order. They do not assign a score, determine readiness, or promise a particular outcome. The sequence is a way of keeping several different questions from collapsing into one.

SEE asks what the pattern is. CATCH asks when it is happening or when it has happened. CHANGE asks what one different response is available. STRENGTHEN asks how to return to that work rather than treating a single attempt as the end of it.

The focus here is modest. The preceding chapters explained ways to map a Loop, recognize it, and choose a different next action. This chapter addresses what to do when those efforts are uneven, partial, or repeated.

SEE: know what you are trying to recognize

SEE begins with description. What is the issue? What is the familiar interaction around it? Which parts can you identify from your own experience, and which parts are uncertain?

In BTL, a Loop is described as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. That map can help organize what someone remembers. It does not prove a partner's intention or erase the actual concern being discussed.

Consider a disagreement about unfinished household tasks. The issue might be an agreement that has not been honored. The pattern might involve one person raising the problem, the other hearing accusation, and an abrupt defensive response. Seeing the pattern does not mean calling the unfinished work unimportant. It means there are two questions to hold at once: what needs to be addressed, and how are we responding while trying to address it?

A useful description can remain incomplete. Someone may notice their own Protection Move without knowing what their partner experienced. Someone may be sure of the words said but uncertain about the meaning assigned to them. Uncertainty belongs in the account rather than being filled in with a confident story.

CATCH: recognize an available moment

CATCH does not mean that every person must detect a Loop before speaking. Recognition might happen during the exchange, in the final moments of an argument, or afterward. Catching it afterward still provides something concrete to examine.

There is an important difference between noticing and acting. A person may notice that they have begun defending themselves and still deliver the next defensive sentence. A person may understand that silence is affecting the conversation without yet knowing whether they can safely remain. Recognition is information, not proof that a particular action was possible or required.

Chapter 34 considered earlier recognition; Chapters 35 through 38 taught NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. Those tools are available for appropriate circumstances, but catching a Loop is not

a requirement to perform every step flawlessly or to announce the pattern to a partner.

If recognition comes late, the question can be simple: What moment did I notice, and what was still possible then? Sometimes the answer is an acknowledgment. Sometimes it is returning to an unresolved practical matter. Sometimes no further conversation is safe or appropriate.

CHANGE: do one thing differently

CHANGE does not require a complete new personality or a perfect exchange. It asks for a specific alternative within a person's own control.

Someone who tends to argue about wording might say, “I disagree with how that was put, but I want to answer the concern.” Someone who usually presses for an immediate decision might request a time to revisit it. Someone who has spoken harshly might take responsibility for the remark rather than defending it. A person who needs to end an unsafe interaction may leave or seek support. The right choice depends on the context and the actual harm at stake.

The alternative should not be confused with surrendering the issue. A clearer request can still be firm. A pause is not a promise to tolerate intimidation. Listening is not agreement. An apology does not automatically settle a broken commitment. Where a boundary is necessary, honoring it may be the responsible action.

Small does not mean trivial. It means the chosen action is specific enough to recognize if it happens. “Never be defensive again” is difficult to observe and impossible to promise. “When I notice I am about to call the question unfair, I will first answer what I know” names an action someone can attempt.

STRENGTHEN: return to the work

The fourth term does not mean that repeating an exercise automatically builds a durable habit. It means keeping the educational practice available beyond one attempt. A person can return to the same question after a disagreement: What did I notice? Did I try a different response? What happened next? What still needs to be addressed?

A changed response may be useful in one exchange and poorly chosen in another. A response may be offered well and still not be received

well. A partner may not cooperate. The original issue may remain unresolved. Those outcomes call for attention to context and consequences, not an automatic judgment that one person practiced too little.

STRENGTHEN also includes asking whether the attempted change respected accountability. If someone stopped shouting but continued to intimidate through threats, a quieter tone does not establish meaningful change. If someone offered an apology but repeated the same broken agreement, the obligation remains. If a boundary was respected, that should not be counted as failure simply because the couple did not return to a joint discussion.

BTL proposes that returning to reflection and another available choice may support continued learning. That is a proposal within this educational framework. The evidence reviewed for this chapter does not directly establish that practicing the named sequence improves relationship satisfaction, prevents recurring arguments, or creates an automatic habit. No fixed number of days or attempts can be promised.

One Loop, one different choice

The Field Guide's practical invitation is deliberately narrow:

“This week, I will try to catch one Loop and do one thing differently.”

It is an invitation, not an assignment another person can enforce. The purpose is to make a possible next action more concrete. You do not have to map every conflict, diagnose your partner's role, or produce an impressive result for the attempt to count as an attempt.

A person might choose one familiar moment: the point when a scheduling question starts to sound like an accusation, or the point when an unanswered text begins to carry an assumed meaning. The plan might be to state the uncertainty rather than announce an intention, or to ask about a practical need without attacking character.

The chosen response can be written in ordinary language: “If I notice myself preparing the same accusation, I will ask what information I am missing.” This is a personal reminder, not an empirical claim about an if-then technique. It can be changed when new information shows that it is unhelpful, unfair, or unsafe.

What if the attempt comes too late?

Suppose Taylor and Jordan repeatedly argue when one of them is late to a planned dinner. On this occasion, Jordan is late again. Taylor

notices the urge to say, “You never care about my time,” but the words come out before Taylor can stop them. Jordan responds defensively, and they argue. Repeated lateness is a recurring issue, but does not by itself show that the same four-stage BTL Loop has recurred.

Afterward, Taylor can identify the point they had meant to catch. Taylor can acknowledge the unfair generalization without pretending the lateness no longer matters. Taylor might say that the missed agreement still needs a practical discussion. Jordan's responsibility for arriving late does not vanish, and Taylor's responsibility for the accusation does not become equal to Jordan's merely because both occurred in the same exchange.

On another occasion, Taylor may notice the phrase earlier and state the concern more specifically. Or they may not. This fictional example illustrates how the practice can be considered; it is not evidence that the method produces a predictable improvement or that both partners share equal responsibility.

The missed moment can still be described honestly. But it should not become a reason to overlook repeated harmful behavior, impose endless patience on a partner, or declare accountability complete because someone intends to try again.

When practice is not the right assignment

Some conflict requires more than an educational reminder. Repeated threats, intimidation, coercive control, stalking, sexual coercion, physical violence, fear of retaliation, or restricted freedom to disagree are not problems that should be reframed as two people failing to catch their Loops.

In those circumstances, the priority is safety and appropriate individualized support. A person does not have to remain in a conversation, disclose private reflections, complete joint exercises, or offer additional chances in the name of practice. A protective boundary is not a failed attempt at change. Relationship education does not replace specialized domestic-violence services, individual clinical assessment, or emergency help when needed. The U.S. Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women (2025) provides public guidance and referral information about domestic violence.

Even in ordinary disagreements, one person may be willing to practice while the other is unwilling to address a serious issue. A new response can be a reasonable effort, but it does not create responsibility for

someone else's choices. An unresolved issue needs to be considered on its own terms.

What counts as progress?

For this exercise, it is more precise to describe what someone did than to announce a global outcome. “I noticed the moment after I interrupted,” “I asked for clarification instead of asserting a motive,” or “I acknowledged my remark and returned to the budget question” are observable descriptions of an attempt.

They are not scores showing that a relationship is healthier. They do not establish that the same conflict will not recur. A person can also discover that an alternative needs revision. The aim is to assess the next choice in context, including whether harm was acknowledged and whether the substantive issue moved toward resolution.

An honest account may be, “I did not catch it until afterward, but I can describe what happened.” Another may be, “I made a different choice, and it did not resolve the issue.” A third may be, “The safest choice was not to continue.” None requires inventing success.

The next chapter turns to what happens when a Loop has already taken place. Interruption is one question. Acknowledgment, responsibility, the unresolved issue, and the aftermath are others. They should not be collapsed into a single promise that practice will eventually make every conflict disappear.

Limits of the evidence

SEE → CATCH → CHANGE → STRENGTHEN and the one-Loop practice statement are BTL-specific educational structures. This chapter does not present them as validated stages, a proven training dose, or an established intervention. The possible benefits of repeated use remain hypotheses requiring direct study. Research on other skills, planning methods, or everyday habit formation cannot be treated as validation of this framework.

PART VII | AFTERMATH AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Chapter 41. When the Loop Has Already Happened

The argument is over. The room has become quiet. You have each moved to something else, but there is a difference between a conversation ending and the consequences of that conversation being addressed.

Perhaps someone said something harsh. Perhaps an agreement was broken. Perhaps the original question is still waiting: Who will handle the bill, what will change about the schedule, or how will the two of you make a decision? The end of the exchange does not answer these questions.

Sometimes the most useful question is not whether you managed to interrupt the Loop while it was happening. It is what remains after it has happened. Looking back cannot undo what someone said or did. It can, however, give each person a more accurate account of what deserves attention now. That is an educational possibility, not a demonstrated result of the Break the Loop framework.

Four questions after conflict

The aftermath does not need a second named sequence. Instead, four separate questions can keep important concerns from being collapsed into a single verdict about whether the argument is 'fixed': What needs acknowledgment? What still needs accountability? What issue remains unresolved? What can be learned about the pattern?

These are questions to consider, not a script for both partners to complete together. Someone may be ready to speak while the other needs time or distance. In some situations, discussing the interaction together is not appropriate or safe. The questions also do not presume that both people behaved in equally harmful ways.

What needs acknowledgment?

An experience may remain important even when the speaker and listener remember the conversation differently. One person remembers a sharp tone; the other remembers the underlying worry and not the

tone at all. Each may be describing something real about their own experience without providing conclusive evidence about the other's intention.

Acknowledgment can be precise. 'I interrupted you before you finished' concerns observable conduct. 'You told me that felt dismissive' concerns the other person's reported experience. Neither statement requires, 'I was trying to make you feel unimportant,' when that intention is not established. Conversely, uncertainty about intention should not be used to brush aside the impact that the other person reports.

The distinction matters because an exchange can become stuck on the accusation behind the experience. 'You wanted to embarrass me' is a claim about motive. 'When you corrected me in front of everyone, I felt embarrassed' identifies an event and an experience. These accounts are not interchangeable. The first may need to remain open to checking; the second can be heard without settling the first.

At times, the person who was hurt does not want to describe the experience again. Acknowledgment is not an entitlement to another explanation. If the relevant conduct is already clear, the person responsible can recognize it without demanding that the other person provide a detailed account on request.

What still needs accountability?

A relationship pattern can describe how an exchange developed. It cannot redistribute responsibility for specific actions. One person's criticism might have been followed by the other's withdrawal, but that sequence does not make each person equally responsible for the criticism. A person's response to feeling cornered may be understandable as an attempt to protect themselves without becoming acceptable conduct.

Accountability begins with identifying what was done and what is still within that person's responsibility. A person who shouted can own the shouting. A person who disclosed private information can own the disclosure. A person who failed to complete an agreed task can acknowledge the unfinished task. These are different matters, and a general apology for 'how things went' may not identify any of them.

Explanation and accountability can coexist. 'I was overwhelmed' may describe the conditions in which the statement was made. It does not turn an insult into a partner's responsibility or remove the need to

address it. The Break the Loop distinction between Overload and agency matters here: narrowed capacity is not the same as having no responsibility for a choice.

Likewise, a Protection Move is a BTL description of a familiar response, not a moral permission slip. Saying 'I withdrew because I felt criticized' does not prove the criticism was intended, settle whether the withdrawal was harmful, or determine what the other partner should do. Describing possible function does not excuse the action.

Acknowledgment may also require specificity about what remains. A promise of change is not the same as change already demonstrated. A person may sincerely intend to handle the next difficult conversation differently while still needing to address what occurred this time. Chapter 42 considers repair and behavioral follow-through in detail. Here the distinction is simpler: a stated intention does not erase an existing responsibility.

What issue remains unresolved?

Some couples finish an argument by agreeing to stop talking. That may be a reasonable limit for the moment. It does not mean the disagreement about the childcare schedule, spending decision, or family visit has been resolved. It can help to name the unfinished issue without reopening every sentence from the argument.

Suppose the original disagreement involved a payment that had not been made. One partner apologizes for an insult. The apology concerns the insult. The payment still needs attention. If the apology is treated as closure for both matters, a concrete obligation disappears inside a judgment about the relationship. If the original question is treated as the only thing that matters, the insult and its effect may disappear instead. Both can remain real.

This is the Issue ≠ Loop distinction applied after the fact. The Issue concerns what the two people were addressing. Within BTL, the proposed recurring Loop is the recognizable progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move, even when the particular issue, belief, or response differs across episodes. Repetition or escalation within one argument does not by itself establish recurrence. The issue can be legitimate even if the discussion of it went badly.

Understanding a pattern does not mean that an unanswered request has become unimportant.

The issue may also remain unresolved because there was no agreement. Some disagreements involve real differences in values, resources, or priorities. A clearer description of the interaction does not manufacture agreement. In an ordinary safe conversation, people may later choose whether, when, and how to return to the substance. No particular return interval or response script is established by this chapter's research.

A quiet ending is not a resolution measure

Research does not treat every postconflict outcome as the same thing. Salvatore and colleagues, for example, studied how 73 young heterosexual couples moved from a ten-minute conflict discussion to a shorter conversation about areas of agreement. That task examined the transition following conflict. It did not establish that the original issue or any harm was resolved (Salvatore et al., 2011).

Similarly, reported amends and perceived resolution are related but distinct from what someone will do later. Hannon and colleagues reported associations between amends and perceived betrayal resolution in selected ongoing relationships. Those reports do not establish that a particular apology prevents repeated harm or that an affected person is obliged to forgive (Hannon et al., 2010).

The practical implication is a limit on inference. Someone becoming calmer, saying sorry, or participating in a pleasant exchange tells us something about that moment. It does not automatically answer the question about a broken agreement, changed conduct, lasting trust, or future safety.

What can be learned about the pattern?

After an ordinary safe disagreement, a person may try to reconstruct their own part of the Loop: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. This is a retrospective use of Break the Loop's educational model. It is not an independently validated method for identifying the causes of a particular interaction, nor does it reveal a partner's hidden thoughts.

The Launch might be a question, a silence, or a change in plans that the person noticed. Overload names their felt narrowing of capacity. The Old Story is the familiar meaning the moment began to carry. The Protection Move names what they did next. A reader can hold each part as a working account, using 'I noticed,' 'I took it to mean,' and 'I responded by' rather than asserting as fact what the other person intended.

For example, a reader might recall: 'When the plan changed, I heard it as another sign my time did not matter. I became tense and started accusing.' That statement identifies a perception and a response. It does not prove that the partner meant to disregard the reader's time. Nor does it settle whether the change of plans violated a real agreement.

Someone else might remember the same event differently. That does not require selecting a winner for the entire account. A pattern can be explored without converting incomplete memory into an exact transcript. If an action is disputed, it may need factual checking. If an issue involves a broken promise, the relevant facts still matter even when the emotional interpretations differ.

Learning is not the same as excusing

Imagine a fictional couple, Taylor and Jordan, arguing about a weekend plan. Jordan changes the departure time without asking. Taylor hears the change as 'my plans don't matter' and responds with a cutting remark. Jordan becomes defensive and walks away. The conversation ends.

Taylor may recognize the meaning they gave the change and take responsibility for the remark. Jordan may recognize their part in changing an agreed plan without consultation and take responsibility for leaving the decision unresolved. Their responsibilities need not be identical: the insult and the unilateral change are different actions. Recognizing a possible Loop helps distinguish their experiences without proving anyone's private intention.

Now imagine Jordan says, 'I didn't mean to exclude you.' That may clarify Jordan's reported intention, but it does not change the fact that the plan was altered without consultation. Taylor can acknowledge not knowing Jordan's intention while still asking that future changes be discussed. Jordan can ask that disagreements not involve insults without making Taylor alone responsible for the practical plan.

This example is fictional and illustrative, not a report of a studied couple or evidence that asking these questions improves outcomes. Its point is not to assign equal shares of blame. It is to preserve each question long enough to see which one is being answered and which one has been left aside.

When a future choice comes into view

Looking back may reveal a response a person would prefer to make next time. 'I want to ask before I assume' or 'I want to own the insult without avoiding the actual issue' are possibilities. They are not evidence that the next interaction will be different. The direct evidence reviewed for this chapter does not establish that BTL's retrospective Loop analysis reduces conflict, improves the accuracy of recollection, or creates durable change.

That limit is important. The value of a retrospective question should not be exaggerated into a claim that it repairs harm. A harmful action may require concrete accountability, changed behavior, outside assistance, or protective distance. Insight alone cannot certify any of those outcomes.

When the shared-pattern lens is not appropriate

Threats, coercive control, stalking, violence, sexual coercion, fear, or retaliation change what comes first. These are not situations in which each person should be assigned an equal part of a mutual Loop. The person using threats or coercion remains responsible for those acts. A person seeking safety need not join a debrief, offer a reciprocal apology, return to the discussion, disclose private reflections, forgive, or restore contact.

Where safety is uncertain, individualized support from an appropriately qualified professional or a specialized domestic violence service may be more suitable than couple education or a shared conflict exercise. In immediate danger, emergency assistance may be necessary. The U.S. Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women provides public information about domestic violence and support resources (Office on Violence Against Women, 2025).

A protective boundary is not a failed attempt to communicate well. The BTL framework is relationship education, not a substitute for individual safety assessment, abuse intervention, or therapy. Chapter 53 addresses these distinctions more fully.

An aftermath that remains honest

It is possible to end the evening without reaching a verdict about every part of the argument. One person may still need acknowledgment. Someone may need to take responsibility for an action. The practical issue may be unsettled. Each person may have only a partial picture of their own response.

The four questions are useful because their answers can remain separate. Acknowledgment does not prove agreement with every interpretation. Accountability does not require symmetrical blame. Ending the fight does not settle the original issue. Recognizing a familiar response does not prove that change has occurred.

Chapter 42 turns to repair, accountability, and return. That discussion begins from the distinction established here: what people tried to do after conflict, what harm remains, what issue is unresolved, and what conduct follows are not one and the same.

Limits of the evidence

The empirical literature cited here concerns selected recovery tasks and reported amends in external relationship studies. It did not directly evaluate Break the Loop or the four aftermath questions in this chapter. The examples illustrate educational distinctions, not validated outcomes.

Chapter 42. Repair, Accountability, and Return

After an argument, the quiet can be a relief. The conversation has stopped, the people involved are no longer raising their voices, and ordinary life can resume. But the end of an argument does not establish that the harm was addressed or that the original problem was settled.

A person might apologize sincerely and still leave their partner wondering what will be different tomorrow. Another might be ready to speak kindly again while remaining unwilling to accept an account of what happened. These possibilities are not contradictions. They concern different questions.

Chapter 10 examined external research about apology, amends, recovery and forgiveness. Here the purpose is practical: to distinguish what someone might acknowledge, what accountability involves, how a proposed repair can respond to its actual impact, and when an unfinished issue may be revisited. The examples that follow illustrate distinctions to consider in ordinary, safe disagreements. They are not a tested repair script, nor a series of steps that everyone must complete.

What needs to be acknowledged?

Imagine that one partner brings up an unpaid household bill. The other responds, “You always find a way to make me look incompetent.” The discussion becomes heated and ends without a decision about the bill.

Later, the second partner says, “I'm sorry we fought.” That may express regret about the evening. Yet it does not identify the accusation, the unpaid bill, or the other person's experience of being blamed.

A more specific acknowledgment, in this fictional example, could be: “When you brought up the bill, I accused you of trying to make me look incompetent. I shouldn't have said that.” The statement names conduct without requiring the speaker to claim knowledge of their partner's intentions. It can be accurate even if the speaker continues to disagree about how the bill should be handled.

The distinction is useful because acknowledgment can mean several things. Someone can acknowledge an observable action, recognize what another person reports feeling, or concede a factual mistake. These are not identical. “I hear that my words felt dismissive” attends to the other person's experience. It does not automatically establish that dismissiveness was the speaker's conscious intention. Equally, saying “I

didn't mean it that way" does not erase the reported experience or the words that were actually spoken.

A reported impact deserves to be heard without being converted automatically into proof of intent. An honest account can make room for both.

Responsibility without a matching confession

Accountability becomes less useful when it is treated as a negotiation over which partner must admit the same amount of fault. In the bill example, the person who made the accusation remains responsible for making it. The other person's tone or timing might be discussed separately, if those concerns are real. Neither concern cancels the first.

For an ordinary disagreement, someone might say, "I interrupted you and called your question an attack. That part is mine." This does not require the other person to agree that the entire discussion was one-sided. It identifies a particular action for which the speaker can take responsibility.

Explanations can help clarify how an action occurred. Feeling criticized may help explain why someone became defensive. It is not an excuse for using an insult. A familiar reaction can be understood without being approved. Within Break the Loop, a person might recognize their own Protection Move while still accepting responsibility for the choice they made.

That distinction matters especially when the conduct was more serious than an unpleasant exchange. Responsibility for threats, intimidation, coercion, sexual pressure or violence cannot be divided equally by appealing to a shared conflict pattern. A person who needs safety is not required to join a mutual accountability exercise.

Apology is a beginning, not a verdict

Apologies can communicate different things. In a review of research on apologies in close relationships, Lewis and colleagues describe recurring conceptual elements such as acknowledging the wrong, accepting responsibility, expressing remorse, offering compensation and stating an intention not to repeat the conduct. Their review does not establish that every apology must contain all these elements or that a fixed wording reliably produces a positive outcome (Lewis et al., 2015).

For a reader, the distinction is between an apology's content and the result the person hopes for. “I'm sorry I said that” identifies regret. “I will correct the misinformation I gave your family” proposes an action. “I won't do it again” concerns future conduct. These statements address related but different parts of the situation.

Research on apologies has limitations. The Lewis review includes substantial college-sample, hypothetical and retrospective evidence, with varied definitions. It cannot establish a single formula that works for every couple or prove that careful wording prevents repeated injury (Lewis et al., 2015).

The person receiving an apology is not responsible for declaring it successful. They may hear it, ask for clarification, decide that something remains unaddressed, or decline further conversation. Their response does not turn the original conduct into their responsibility.

Understanding the particular impact

Suppose a partner apologized for discussing a private concern with a relative. The other partner replies, “The apology matters, but now I'm worried about who else knows.”

At that point, the immediate issue is not only how the disclosure was intended. It includes what happened after the information was shared. One possible response would be to acknowledge the concern and offer an accurate account of what was shared, if the affected person wants that information. Any further contact or correction depends on the circumstances and on the affected person's wishes. An offer is not evidence that the consequences have been resolved.

Responsiveness here is not surrendering every factual disagreement. It means attending to the concern that has actually been expressed rather than insisting that a statement of remorse should already have ended it. The affected person can correct an account of their experience. They need not offer more disclosure, reassurance or access simply because the other person asks.

This example is educational, not an experimentally established technique. Research has not shown that a particular response guarantees renewed confidence. The point is narrower: an attempt to address an injury should not be confused with evidence that the injury has been resolved.

Amends and what they can show

Research also distinguishes saying sorry from making amends. Hannon and colleagues studied how reported amends and forgiveness related to perceived resolution after betrayals. In a two-week diary study of 78 undergraduates in ongoing dating relationships, reported amends was associated with greater perceived incident resolution after the analysis accounted for reported forgiveness (Hannon et al., 2010).

That association is informative but limited. The diary incidents were comparatively mild, the relationships were ongoing, and the study did not randomly assign an amends intervention. It does not show that making amends will prevent renewed harm or that reconciliation is appropriate after severe betrayal.

An offer to correct a concrete consequence may be more relevant than an unrelated gesture. Replacing a lost item addresses a material loss. Correcting inaccurate information addresses a different concern. Neither action automatically resolves the broader effect on trust. Someone can make an offer and still need to hear whether it corresponds to the actual harm.

Making amends is not the same as purchasing acceptance. The recipient can decline a gesture, disagree about its adequacy, or decide that the relationship cannot continue.

The difference between a promise and changed behavior

An apology often turns toward tomorrow: “I won't do that again.” A promise concerns intended future conduct. Follow-through concerns what actually happens. These cannot be exchanged as though the same evidence supports both.

Consider a repeatedly missed household task. “I'll do better” expresses an intention but leaves the next action vague. “I'll pay this bill by Friday and confirm when the payment goes through” identifies a specific responsibility and an observable completion point. That statement remains a proposal. Its usefulness depends on whether the conduct occurs, not on how convincingly it was spoken.

A systematic review of research on repairing trust in couples identified themes including remorse, accountability and dependable behavior. The review covered 13 heterogeneous articles, primarily qualitative and focused on infidelity-related trust. Its findings do not establish a

universal trust-repair sequence or prove that any individual promise will be kept (Giacobbi & Lalot, 2025).

Specific agreements may make later conduct easier to describe. They do not turn the harmed person into a supervisor. The person responsible for the task remains responsible for completing it. Nor is an affected partner obliged to monitor messages, devices or whereabouts to make accountability possible.

One completed promise may matter without settling every concern about the relationship. Likewise, a promise that is broken should be described as a new event. The earlier apology cannot certify subsequent behavior.

A return to the issue is a different task

Repairing how people argued does not automatically resolve what they argued about. The person who accused their partner of trying to make them look incompetent can apologize for the accusation. The bill still needs attention.

In ordinary safe conflict, a return to the issue might sound like this: “I want to take responsibility for what I said. When we're both ready, we still need to decide what to do about the payment.” It keeps accountability and the substantive concern visible without making agreement a condition of the apology.

That return is optional and contextual. People may choose a time, name a concrete question, or decide that a longer conversation is unnecessary. The research reviewed here does not establish an ideal waiting period or a timetable for resolving every disagreement. An invitation to return is not permission to pressure someone into continued contact or a prolonged argument.

Emotional recovery and resolution also require different descriptions. In Salvatore and colleagues' study, observers considered how 73 young heterosexual couples moved from a ten-minute conflict discussion to a four-minute positive-topic discussion. This was an operational measure of a transition after conflict. It did not establish that the original dispute or any harm had been resolved (Salvatore et al., 2011).

It is possible to speak warmly after a difficult discussion and still disagree. It is also possible to acknowledge harm and need time before speaking warmly again. Neither moment alone answers every question about the issue.

Rebuilding responsiveness without demanding it

A partner may want evidence that the other person is listening rather than simply trying to end an uncomfortable conversation. In a safe interaction, listening might involve allowing a correction, asking whether a proposed action addresses the concern, or acknowledging that the other person is not ready to decide.

These are possible educational examples, not steps with demonstrated efficacy. The person who caused harm cannot demand emotional reassurance as payment for taking responsibility. The person affected can set limits on the conversation, refuse affection or decide that trust has not returned.

Responsiveness must also coexist with an accurate account of the facts. Caring about reported impact does not require accepting every accusation about intention. Rejecting an inaccurate intention claim does not justify dismissing the other person's reported experience. Both distinctions protect the possibility of an honest conversation.

Forgiveness, trust and contact remain separate

An apology may be accepted without trust being restored. Forgiveness may occur without renewed contact. A person may choose not to reconcile even when the other person expresses remorse. These are distinct decisions and experiences, not stages anyone is owed.

There is reason to be cautious about treating forgiveness as a universal route to safer future conduct. McNulty studied 72 newlywed couples over four years. A greater baseline self-reported tendency to express forgiveness was associated with partner-reported psychological and physical aggression remaining more stable, whereas lower tendencies were associated with declines. Forgiveness was measured through hypothetical situations, and attrition reduced the final analyzed wave to 37 couples (McNulty, 2011).

These observational findings do not mean forgiveness causes abuse or that withholding forgiveness prevents it. They do undermine a blanket assurance that forgiveness itself establishes safety. The responsibility for aggression remains with the person engaging in it.

An offer of repair never obliges physical intimacy, sexual contact, renewed communication or reconciliation. A boundary may be the appropriate response even when the apology sounds sincere.

When repair is not the priority

Fear, threats, coercive control, stalking, violence, sexual coercion and concern about retaliation require a different starting point. They are not merely examples of partners who have failed to use the right words after conflict. A shared Loop description must not distribute responsibility for harmful conduct or suggest that the person targeted should make a joint repair attempt safer through better communication.

For someone in such circumstances, individualized support from a qualified professional or a specialized domestic violence service may be more appropriate than a shared exercise. A person concerned about retaliation need not tell a partner that they are seeking support. Immediate danger requires emergency help. A person may leave an unsafe situation, limit contact, or seek support without completing a conversation or obtaining the other person's agreement. The later safety chapters address those distinctions more fully.

What repair cannot settle by itself

The research discussed in Chapter 10 and applied here measures different things: apology concepts, reported amends, perceived resolution, observed transitions after conflict, themes in trust-repair studies and reported aggression over time. No single study establishes one necessary sequence connecting them all. The educational examples do not test Break the Loop, and external findings do not validate the BTL Loop as a causal mechanism.

A useful question after a difficult but safe disagreement is not simply, “Did we make up?” More precise questions are possible. What conduct was acknowledged? Was its impact heard? What consequence remains? Which future action belongs to the person responsible? Is the original issue still unresolved? And is another conversation safe and wanted?

These questions do not demand a matching apology, an immediate decision or a particular emotional response. They help keep separate the actions that occurred, the experiences people report, what remains unsettled and what later conduct actually shows.

The following chapter considers what changes when harm repeats without meaningful accountability or follow-through. Here the central distinction is enough: an effort to repair is not proof that repair has occurred, and returning to ordinary conversation is not the same as returning responsibly to the unfinished issue.

Chapter 43. When the Same Harm Keeps Repeating

A repeated apology can eventually raise a different question.

After one difficult exchange, a partner may recognize what happened, take responsibility, and want to respond differently. A later mistake does not automatically erase that effort. People sometimes need practice, and improvement can be uneven.

But another situation deserves a different kind of attention. The same harmful conduct continues, the same assurance follows, and there is little that the affected person can observe as meaningful change. Each new episode may be followed by a convincing conversation. The next episode nevertheless raises a question that the previous conversation did not settle: What has actually changed?

Not every repetition is the same. A recurring disagreement is not necessarily abuse, and one imperfect attempt at change is not proof that someone is unwilling to change. At the same time, repeated harm should not be treated as an ordinary relationship pattern simply because it is familiar.

This chapter is about recognizing that distinction without pretending there is a universal number of incidents, deadline, or test that settles what another person will do next.

The disagreement and the conduct are different questions

Earlier chapters distinguish the issue a couple is arguing about from the Loop that may occur around it. That distinction remains useful when ordinary, safe disagreements repeat. A couple might continue to disagree about spending or scheduling while gradually changing how they speak and listen.

But the difference between issue and Loop does not erase conduct. When someone repeatedly insults, threatens, deceives, intimidates, or violates an agreement, the question is not only how the conversation escalated. It is also what happened, who did it, what impact followed, and what responsibility remains.

Consider an ordinary disagreement about household spending. Two people may become defensive, interrupt each other, and later identify how each contributed to the exchange. That does not require equal responsibility for every sentence or decision. If one partner repeatedly

uses insults, responsibility for those insults remains with the person who used them, regardless of the other partner's contribution to the disagreement.

Likewise, a conflict sequence does not explain away the underlying disagreement. A person may improve the way they raise an issue while still having a legitimate concern about a recurring broken agreement.

Break the Loop offers an educational way to reflect on recurring conflict. It does not establish that two people share equal responsibility for harmful behavior. It is not a method of determining whether abuse has occurred or whether someone is safe.

The difference between difficulty and repeated harm

An imperfect attempt at change can include a lapse followed by specific acknowledgment, a changed response on other occasions, and continued attention to the original concern. None of these elements guarantees success. They do, however, describe something more concrete than repeating a promise.

Repeated harm can look different. The person who acted harmfully may acknowledge the problem immediately after each incident but return to the same conduct. An agreement may be revised several times while the same violation continues. One partner may consistently decline to discuss an important concern, without offering a safe or workable alternative. A betrayal may recur after earlier assurances.

These situations differ in seriousness and context. An avoided conversation is not the same as violence. A missed agreement is not automatically deception. A difficult withdrawal may be a request for space, a limitation in communication, or a protective choice. Its meaning cannot be established from the other partner's interpretation alone.

The point is not to sort every relationship into two categories, trying or not trying. It is to resist an easier but less useful shortcut: assuming that the existence of an explanation or an apology answers the question of what keeps happening.

What words can acknowledge, and what they cannot prove

An apology may communicate acknowledgment, responsibility, remorse, or an intention to act differently. Lewis et al.'s (2015) review describes these as recurring elements in how apologies are understood.

The review does not identify a single combination of words that reliably prevents later harm.

Trust-repair research also points toward accountability and dependable behavior, but the available literature is varied and heavily concerned with betrayal and infidelity. In a systematic review of 13 articles, Giacobbi and Lalot (2025) found recurring themes rather than a proven, universal procedure for restoring trust.

These findings support a careful distinction: saying what one intends to do and later doing it are different events.

An acknowledgment may be sincere without demonstrating that a behavior has stopped. A promise may be specific without being fulfilled. A detailed explanation may help someone understand the circumstances without cancelling the effect of the conduct.

That does not make apologies meaningless. It means they should not carry more evidentiary weight than they can bear. If the concern is repeated behavior, the next relevant information may come from what happens afterward, not from how persuasive the last conversation felt.

A fictional example: an agreement that keeps disappearing

Imagine two partners, Taylor and Jordan, who agree that either will discuss a substantial shared purchase before making it. Jordan makes a purchase without discussing it. Taylor explains the financial impact and the sense of being excluded from a decision they had agreed to make together.

Jordan apologizes and agrees to talk before the next purchase. Some time later, a comparable purchase happens without discussion. The explanation is different. The agreement is repeated. Eventually Taylor says, "We keep agreeing, but the decision still gets made without me."

The example does not prove Jordan is acting maliciously. Nor does it prove that Taylor's preferred financial arrangement is automatically fair. Either person might raise questions about the amount, practicality, or scope of the agreement.

What is observable is narrower: an agreement was made; the behavior did not consistently match it; the underlying decision rule still needs attention. The issue is not resolved merely because the two people understand the emotional meaning of another argument.

In a safe relationship, the partners might reconsider whether the agreement is realistic and mutually acceptable, or decide on a different,

explicit arrangement. They might also recognize the continued mismatch between the agreement and the conduct, without pretending to know the reason for it. An educational framework cannot force willingness or supply the missing follow-through.

When the same verbal harm returns

Verbal harm deserves separate attention because it can be mistaken for a predictable part of any difficult conversation.

A sharp remark, criticism of a specific action, repeated humiliation, and a threat are not interchangeable. Disagreement can be direct without being abusive. An angry response may still be subject to accountability. Repeated degrading language is not made harmless by labeling it an Overload response or a Protection Move.

If an insulting exchange repeatedly ends with an apology, a practical question remains: Has the language changed when the next difficult moment arrived? The answer may be incomplete. A person may make genuine changes in some situations and still repeat behavior that harms the other person.

That is not a reason to invent a score or declare an exact amount of progress sufficient. It is a reason to distinguish statements of regret from the continuing impact of observable conduct.

The responsibility to stop using harmful language rests with the person using it. The recipient does not have to become better at asking, listening, staying calm, or finding the perfect words before that responsibility applies.

Avoidance is not always the same behavior

Someone may stop a conversation because they are overwhelmed and need space. Another person may avoid a discussion because it is painful, embarrassing, or difficult to navigate. Yet another situation may involve using silence, threats, withholding of access, or retaliation to control what can be raised.

These cannot be sorted reliably by appearance alone.

In an ordinary, safe disagreement, a requested pause with a voluntary intention to return may allow the substantive question to remain available. Chronic avoidance without a workable return can leave an important decision unresolved. The person affected may have a

legitimate concern about the lack of engagement even without knowing why it happens.

When silence or disengagement is coupled with intimidation, fear, isolation, punishment, or threats, treating it as a mutual Loop can be dangerous. The safety question comes first. A person who disengages to protect themselves from coercion is not failing at communication.

The same distinction protects against guessing motives. An observable pattern of missed discussions can be named without announcing that the other person is selfish, incapable of intimacy, or deliberately trying to cause pain. Understanding a possible function is not an excuse for harmful conduct, and the absence of an explanation does not make its impact disappear.

Trust can be affected by repeated betrayal

Broken trust can involve many kinds of conduct, from concealed spending and repeated secrecy to violations involving intimacy or access to personal information. These are not interchangeable in seriousness, and their meanings depend on the agreements and circumstances involved.

Research about amends illustrates why outcomes must be kept separate. In Hannon et al.'s (2010) study of 78 undergraduates in ongoing dating relationships who completed two-week incident diaries, reported amends were associated with greater perceived resolution of betrayal incidents, even after adjustment for reported forgiveness. That association does not demonstrate that making amends prevents future betrayals, that trust returned, or that an intervention caused recovery.

An affected person may understand an explanation and still have questions about reliability. They may accept an apology without feeling ready to restore the same level of trust. They may decide that a particular agreement is no longer workable. None of those responses supplies a verdict about what they must do with the relationship.

Restored contact, forgiveness, renewed trust, and future safety are different questions. No one is obliged to provide one as proof that the other has occurred.

What the research cautions about forgiveness

One longitudinal study is especially relevant to the assumption that forgiving more readily must always improve what happens next.

McNulty (2011) followed 72 first-married couples and examined reported tendencies to express forgiveness alongside partners' reports of psychological and physical aggression across four years. In that selected sample, greater reported forgiveness tendency was associated with aggression trajectories that remained more stable, while lower reported tendency was associated with declining aggression.

This was an observational study, not an experiment in which couples were assigned to forgive or not forgive. It measured a reported tendency rather than all forms of private forgiveness. The sample was young and predominantly White, and only 37 couples remained at the final analyzed wave. These limits matter.

The result does not establish that expressing forgiveness causes aggression. It certainly does not make the harmed person responsible for another person's behavior or justify a prescription to withhold forgiveness. It does challenge a simpler claim: that forgiveness can be assumed to prevent continued harm in every relationship.

The more defensible conclusion is also the more limited one. Forgiveness and later conduct must not be treated as the same outcome.

What accountability can and cannot settle

It may help to distinguish several questions instead of folding them into one assessment of whether someone "really means it."

What happened? Describe observable behavior without exaggerating or minimizing it.

Who is responsible for that conduct? Responsibility is not automatically divided equally because two people were present in an argument.

Was the impact acknowledged? Someone can recognize the effect of an action without requiring the harmed person to adopt an explanation for its motive.

What changed afterward? A stated plan and observable follow-through are different information. It may take further encounters to learn more, but no universal waiting period establishes safety.

What remains unresolved? The concrete agreement, damaged trust, protective boundary, or need for outside help may still be present even after a constructive conversation.

These are educational distinctions, not a validated checklist for predicting whether someone will harm another person again. The answers may be uncertain, contested, or unsafe to seek directly.

They also leave room for an important difference: a person can be genuinely attempting change while another person remains affected by earlier harm. Acknowledging effort does not require that person to declare the harm repaired. Recognizing continuing harm does not require a diagnosis of the actor's hidden intentions.

When safety takes priority over pattern analysis

Not all repeated harmful conduct belongs in ordinary couple-conflict education.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2026) identifies intimate partner violence as including physical and sexual violence, stalking, and psychological aggression, including verbal or nonverbal conduct intended to harm or exert control. It can occur as a single episode or across a prolonged pattern. A repeated argument is not automatically intimate partner violence, but the absence of physical injury does not rule it out.

Threats, fear of retaliation, stalking, sexual coercion, intimidation, restricted access to resources, isolation, and other controlling behavior are reasons to stop treating the situation as an ordinary shared Loop. Someone experiencing these conditions does not need to accept reciprocal blame, practice joint interruption, confront the other person, or explain their choices through a Protection Move.

Where there is danger or coercion, individualized assessment and specialized domestic-violence support may be more appropriate than couples exercises. Seeking help may itself carry risk if a partner monitors communications or retaliates, so the safest way to access assistance can depend on the situation. When there is immediate danger, contact local emergency services where it is safe to do so.

This chapter does not determine whether any particular relationship is abusive, provide a risk prediction, or tell a reader to stay or leave. Its responsibility is to make clear that safety and accountability cannot be subordinated to a wish to make the relationship pattern look mutual.

When further support may be appropriate

A repeated concern may also exceed what a self-guided educational exercise can reasonably address without meeting the definition of abuse.

For example, continuing betrayal, repeated violations of consequential agreements, persistent harmful speech, or an inability to discuss important decisions may call for a more individualized assessment of what is happening and what options are available. Qualified professional support can help someone consider their own circumstances. Where coercion, threats, or fear are involved, specialized individual support is the more appropriate starting point than an assumption that joint couple work is safe.

An educational tool cannot substitute for a professional assessment, and professional help is not a guarantee that another person will change. Neither is there a requirement to keep inviting discussion until the other person participates.

A boundary may be about the person's own participation, contact, resources, or next decisions. It does not need to be framed as a technique for producing another person's compliance. Where there is a possibility of retaliation, even stating or enforcing a boundary may require individualized safety consideration rather than a generic communication script.

What Break the Loop can still offer, and where it stops

In ordinary, safe disagreement, a person might recognize the familiar Launch, notice Overload, question an Old Story, and choose a different response instead of a familiar Protection Move. Those are BTL teaching categories, not independently validated findings about any particular couple.

The same educational perspective can help a reader distinguish what they themselves did from what a partner did. A person might choose to speak more clearly, refuse an insult, take appropriate space, or address an agreement directly. None of these choices makes another person's harmful conduct their responsibility. Nor does using NAME IT

→ SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT require giving up an important concern or remaining in an unsafe exchange.

The framework does not measure a partner's sincerity or determine whether repeated conduct will stop. It does not establish why a promise was broken, and it has not been independently shown to stop repeated aggression or betrayal. It cannot replace the need for accountability, observed change, protection, or specialized help.

Sometimes progress is incomplete but real. Sometimes a familiar apology accompanies conduct that continues. Sometimes the most important question is no longer how both people can interrupt an argument, but whether the harmful behavior is stopping and whether the person affected is safe.

Those questions deserve to remain visible, even when a relationship has become practiced at discussing the same incident afterward.

PART VIII | CASE MAPS

Chapter 44. How to Read a Case Map

The preceding chapter examined repeated harm and the limits of shared conflict work. That safety distinction remains in force here. The fictional case maps in the chapters ahead illustrate ordinary, voluntary disagreements in which both people can participate without fear of coercion or retaliation. They are not models for handling abuse, nor do they require a person to return to an unsafe conversation.

A case map is a way to read an interaction without confusing its topic with everything that happened around it. The next chapters use case maps to examine familiar disagreements. Before turning to those examples, it helps to know what each part of the map can tell us and, equally important, what it cannot.

Suppose two people disagree about a task that was left unfinished. The practical question might be who agreed to complete it, whether the agreement was clear, and what needs to happen now. During that conversation, one person might begin explaining at length while the other stops responding. A case map can display both the practical issue and a proposed sequence of reactions. It cannot establish the full truth of an event, prove either person's motives, or settle the disagreement merely by putting it into boxes.

In Break the Loop (BTL), the central sequence is Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. That is the framework's educational organization, not an independently validated measurement of how every argument unfolds. A map is a set of questions and possible connections. It is not a diagnosis or a verdict about either partner.

The eleven parts of a case map

The distinction between the issue and the Loop was introduced in Chapter 2. The maps in this part of the book use eleven reading positions. They are arranged so that the reader can hold onto both the issue and the interaction instead of allowing one to replace the other.

1. Issue. What concrete matter is being discussed? The issue might be a missed agreement, a budget decision, a schedule change, or a difference

in preference. Sometimes the facts are disputed. A map should retain those uncertainties and any practical consequences.

2. Launch. What happened, or what did a person notice, as the interaction began to become difficult? A question, silence, a facial expression, a delayed message, or a statement may be the Launch in that person's account. The Launch is not automatically proof of the other person's intention. A noticed silence may be real; the reason for it may still be unknown.

3. Overload. What difficulty did the person report with listening, staying curious, tolerating uncertainty, or responding deliberately? Within BTL, Overload describes a narrowing of capacity. It does not establish a measured brain state, erase agency, or excuse conduct. A narrator may know that they felt increasingly urgent or unable to hear the rest of a sentence. A reader should not infer an internal state from an illustration alone.

4. Old Story. What familiar meaning or prediction began to carry weight? A person might report, “You think I cannot do anything right,” or, “My needs never count.” These are examples of meanings the person experienced, not confirmed descriptions of what the partner intended. An Old Story is not automatically false. Some concerns may be partly accurate or reflect an actual pattern of broken agreements.

5. Protection Move. What did the person do next? Examples include defending, explaining repeatedly, criticizing, withdrawing, pressing for reassurance, or attempting to control the exchange. This field describes conduct, not a personality type. Asking what a response may have been trying to accomplish is different from treating that possible function as an excuse. Responsibility for harmful conduct remains with the person who chose it.

6. Partner experience. What did the other person observe or report experiencing? The map may contain the partner's own account, a clearly attributed quotation, or a question mark when that account is unavailable. The reader should not assume that one person's reconstruction supplies another person's thoughts.

7. Next Launch. Could the first person's Protection Move have become something the partner noticed next? Within BTL, that is one possible way a Loop becomes relational. The arrow is a teaching possibility, not proof that both people made equal contributions or that each person's

next response was inevitable. Some interactions may stop, shift direction, or contain too little information for a reliable continuation.

8. Recurring pattern. What underlying sequence seems to repeat across different interactions? In BTL, the Loop is the recurring sequence Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The topic, occasion, emotions, interpretations or beliefs, and particular actions can all change from one argument, disagreement, discussion, or conversation to another. What may be recognizable is the underlying sequence, not identical content at each point. Repeating the same topic does not by itself establish a Loop, and one fictional episode cannot demonstrate recurrence. A reader can keep a suspected recurring sequence provisional until there are accounts of more than one interaction.

9. Possible interruption. Where might a different next response have been possible? As described in the earlier interruption chapters, BTL offers NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT as an educational interrupt sequence. A map may show someone noticing the interaction, allowing more space for a deliberate choice, examining an unverified assumption, or responding in another way. This is a possible alternative, not a demonstrated method for preventing harm or guaranteeing resolution.

10. Unresolved issue. What still requires attention even if the exchange becomes calmer? An uncompleted task remains uncompleted. A financial discrepancy still needs clarification. An agreement may need to be renegotiated, or an actual breach may require accountability. Recognizing a Loop does not make those matters disappear.

11. Possible aftermath or repair considerations. After the interaction, people may have separate questions about what happened, whether harm needs acknowledgment, whether a practical decision remains

open, and whether further contact is appropriate. Chapter 42 addresses repair, accountability, and decisions about returning to a conversation in greater detail. Repair here is an ordinary word for attempts to address relational harm, not an additional BTL stage. An apology, a quieter moment, or a proposed next step does not by itself establish that trust or safety has been restored.

These eleven positions are a reading key. They do not require eleven separate events in every disagreement. Some boxes may overlap in a person's telling; some will remain blank. It is more accurate to mark information as unavailable than to fill the page with a plausible but invented explanation.

A short fictional example

Consider the following invented exchange. It is a teaching example, not a research observation or a real clinical case.

Two partners agreed to talk on Sunday about which household tasks each would complete. By Wednesday, the kitchen trash has not been taken out. Taylor asks Jordan, “Did we decide you were taking care of the trash this week?” Jordan says, “Why do you always ask me like I've done something wrong?” Taylor replies, “I just asked a question.” Jordan becomes quiet.

The issue is not complicated by being ordinary. The trash is still there, and the partners may need to check what they actually agreed to do. Their recollections might differ, or the agreement might have been clear. Nothing about a case map pre-decides that question.

In a hypothetical first-person account, Jordan might describe the question as the Launch. Jordan might report increasing urgency to defend themself as Overload, the thought “You believe I can't be trusted” as an Old Story, and the sharp response as a Protection Move. That is a possible account, not a conclusion the reader can draw from the dialogue alone.

From Taylor's reported perspective, the sharp response could become a next Launch. Taylor might say that the accusation felt unfair and that “I just asked a question” was an attempt to correct the record. Jordan's subsequent silence might have several explanations. Without Jordan's account, the map should not label the silence as punishment, avoidance, protection, or indifference. The available evidence is simply that Jordan stopped speaking at that moment.

Notice what remains open. Did they agree who would take out the trash? Was Taylor's wording neutral, pointed, or heard through the history of similar exchanges? Was Jordan's sense of criticism linked to an earlier interaction, the present tone, or an accurate experience of repeated disapproval? The map cannot answer these questions without additional information. It can display them honestly.

A possible interruption could be Taylor saying, “I want to figure out the task, and I can see we're getting tangled up in how I asked.” Alternatively, Jordan might say, “I heard criticism, and I want to check whether you meant it that way.” Neither sentence proves the speaker's account correct, and neither sentence is required. An interruption is a possible next choice, not a performance that automatically earns forgiveness or settles the task.

The unresolved issue is who will do the trash and how the partners want to manage the agreement. If either person spoke harshly, the aftermath may also call for acknowledging that conduct. Changing the conversation about the trash does not substitute for completing the agreed task or correcting an unfair arrangement.

Reading arrows without overreading them

A case map often looks sequential because the labels are arranged from one moment to the next. The arrangement can help a reader follow a story, but it should not be mistaken for a proven causal chain. The order in which someone remembers an interaction may be incomplete, and different participants may notice different turning points.

There is a useful distinction between observing conduct and interpreting it. In a laboratory study of 116 mainly young heterosexual romantic couples, with videos available for 112 couples, Venaglia and Lemay (2019) found that perceptions of a partner's destructive conflict behavior reflected both measured behavior and the perceiver's relationship attitudes. Their design was cross-sectional, involved one laboratory discussion, and did not establish anyone's hidden intention. It did not evaluate BTL or case mapping. The finding offers a bounded reason to avoid either extreme: assuming every perception is the complete objective truth or dismissing every difficult perception as mere bias.

A map can therefore distinguish three kinds of entries: what was observed or reported; what a person says they experienced or inferred; and what remains unknown. The reader should be particularly careful

with claims about why the other person acted. “Jordan stopped talking” is a different kind of statement from “Jordan wanted to punish Taylor.”

The same caution applies to arrows between partners. The arrow from one Protection Move to a possible next Launch shows that an action may be experienced by another person as something that changes the exchange. It does not mean the first move caused every subsequent choice. It does not divide accountability equally, cancel legitimate boundaries, or turn an act of harm into a neutral part of a cycle.

What a map does not ask you to do

A case map is not an instruction to analyze the other person without their participation, pressure them to accept your account, or settle a dispute by deciding whose Old Story is more accurate. For a safe ordinary disagreement, someone can use it privately to organize their own recollection. If both people voluntarily compare accounts, differences may remain. A map should allow those differences to appear.

A different rule applies when safety is at issue. Threats, coercive control, intimidation, violence, sexual coercion, stalking, fear, or retaliation must not be presented as a mutual Loop for both people to interrupt together. In those circumstances, shared-pattern explanation can obscure unequal power and responsibility. Safety and appropriate individualized specialist support take priority over a joint exercise. A case map is not a danger assessment, a substitute for therapy, or a reason to continue an unsafe conversation. Readers are not required to confront, reconcile with, or remain with someone to complete a map.

The reading key has a modest, specific educational purpose: to separate the subject of an argument from a proposed account of its development and leave uncertainty visible. The BTL map has not been independently established as a reliable assessment tool or proven to change future conflict outcomes. Its labels are offered here as an educational way of reading the examples that follow.

How to use the next case maps

When reading a case in the following chapters, begin with the issue. Then read the Launch, Overload, Old Story, and Protection Move as one possible account rather than a finding about the person's character. Pause at the partner experience and the next Launch. Ask whether the map has a direct report or only an inference. Look for the recurring

pattern, if recurrence is actually described, and note where a different choice might be possible.

Finally, return to the unresolved issue and the aftermath. The map is incomplete if it helps name a difficult interaction while erasing the concern that brought the partners into it. It is also misleading if it treats an illustrative sequence as proof of intention, equal responsibility, or a tested intervention.

The case maps ahead cover different everyday subjects in ordinary, noncoercive situations. Their common purpose is not to show that every relationship follows the same script. It is to make the difference between an issue, an experienced sequence, and an uncertain interpretation easier to see.

Chapter 45. Household Responsibility

Completing a household task is not the same as carrying all the work required to make it happen. One partner may see groceries in the refrigerator. The other may remember checking what was missing, thinking through meals, making the list, and sending a reminder. Those are different parts of keeping a home functioning. They can also become the subject of a familiar disagreement.

This chapter uses a fictional household case to demonstrate the eleven-part case map introduced in Chapter 44. The characters and conversations are invented for teaching. They are not drawn from a research participant or a real client, and they do not demonstrate how often any sequence occurs. The practical question of who does the work is as important as what happens when the two people discuss it.

The issue: what counts as the work?

Taylor and Jordan live together and both have jobs. For the past several months, Taylor has typically checked the kitchen supplies, planned meals for workdays, and made grocery lists. Jordan has regularly cooked dinner and cleaned up afterward. Both contribute, but their responsibilities are not identical.

On Sunday, they agree that Jordan will collect the groceries on Tuesday after work. Taylor prepares a list and checks that the usual pantry items have been included. Tuesday passes without a grocery trip. On Wednesday, Taylor begins preparing dinner, discovers several ingredients are missing, and asks Jordan about the errand.

The missed trip is the immediate issue. A broader issue may also be present: who has been carrying the planning, remembering, checking, and follow-up, and whether that distribution is acceptable to both people. In a 2023 systematic review of 31 studies, Reich-Stiebert and colleagues described cognitive household labor as work that includes planning and managing, not merely completing visible chores. The reviewed studies used differing definitions and were drawn predominantly from Western, heterosexual, comparatively advantaged populations. The review cannot determine whether Taylor and Jordan have a fair arrangement. It does make it reasonable to keep cognitive work visible as a distinct part of the fictional issue.

The conversation

The following exchange is invented.

Taylor: “Did you pick up the groceries yesterday?”

Jordan: “No. Work ran late.”

Taylor: “You said you would, and I made the list. Now we don't have what we need for dinner.”

Jordan: “I do plenty around here. You talk like I never help.”

Taylor: “I didn't say you never help. I'm asking about the groceries.”

Jordan: “Whatever I do, it's not enough.”

Jordan leaves the kitchen. The groceries are still missing. Jordan's contribution to cooking and cleaning is real, but it does not establish that the missed commitment or Taylor's planning work should be ignored. Nor does Taylor's frustration, by itself, establish the exact proportion of work each person performs. The case presents a specific breach of an agreement and a potentially wider fairness concern.

1. Issue

The immediate agreement was specific: Jordan would buy the groceries Tuesday. Jordan did not. Taylor prepared the list and expected the errand to be completed. The couple has an immediate practical problem about dinner and a possible longer-term question about whether planning and execution are shared in a workable way.

A case map must not turn “the real issue is our communication” into a reason to overlook the grocery problem. Even a calmer conversation will need to address the supplies, the missed commitment, and future arrangements.

2. Launch

From Jordan's hypothetical first-person account, Taylor's question becomes the Launch. Jordan hears “Did you pick up the groceries yesterday?” after already knowing the trip was missed.

Taylor's question can be both a request for information and a reminder of an uncompleted task. Calling it Jordan's Launch does not make Taylor responsible for Jordan's next response, and it does not prove that Taylor spoke with contempt or intended to belittle Jordan. The

words available to the reader do not establish the tone or every surrounding circumstance.

3. Overload

Jordan might later report feeling a sudden urge to defend their contribution and growing difficulty listening to Taylor's specific concern. Within BTL, Jordan could describe that narrowing of capacity as Overload.

That is a possible self-report within the fictional case, not a clinical assessment, measurement of a brain state, or conclusion that Jordan was unable to choose differently. Taylor might also have been under strain, but the map has no direct account of Taylor's internal state at this point. It should not fill that space by guessing.

4. Old Story

Jordan might identify the thought, “Nothing I do counts.” That would be an Old Story in the BTL vocabulary: a familiar meaning or prediction attached to the current moment.

The thought is not proof that Taylor intended to deny every contribution Jordan has made. It is also not grounds for dismissing Jordan's reported experience automatically. There may be a history of conversations about contributions that deserves separate examination. This example does not supply enough information to settle that history. It does supply an uncompleted errand.

5. Protection Move

Jordan responds, “I do plenty around here. You talk like I never help.” When Taylor returns to the groceries, Jordan says, “Whatever I do, it's not enough,” and leaves.

In this fictional account, Jordan might describe the accusation and departure as attempts to protect against feeling inadequate or unfairly judged. That is a possible function, not a verified motive and not an excuse. Jordan remains responsible for the accusation and for following through on the household agreement. The fact that Jordan cooks and cleans does not erase that responsibility.

6. Partner experience

From Taylor's explicitly fictional perspective, the accusation adds another demand: instead of solving the missed errand, Taylor is now

defending whether the question implied that Jordan does nothing. Taylor might describe feeling unheard and burdened by having to reopen a task that was already assigned.

That account belongs to Taylor. It cannot prove what Jordan meant to achieve by leaving the room. If Jordan does not explain the departure, the case records the visible conduct without assigning an undisclosed intention.

7. Next Launch

Jordan's statement “You talk like I never help” could become Taylor's next Launch. Taylor responds, “I didn't say you never help.” If the exchange continued, Taylor might become more insistent while Jordan defended or withdrew further.

This is a possible continuation, not a mechanical loop in which every response causes the next. Taylor asking for completion and Jordan accusing Taylor of disrespect are not equal actions merely because both occur in the same interaction. Their effects and responsibilities must be considered separately.

8. Recurring pattern

A week later, in a second fictional episode, Taylor asks whether Jordan has scheduled the home-repair visit Jordan agreed to arrange. Jordan says the call has not been made. Instead of arguing about their overall contribution this time, Jordan becomes quiet and changes the subject.

For teaching purposes, suppose Jordan describes a different immediate experience. The Launch is hearing the appointment question. Overload is a reported difficulty staying with the conversation. The Old Story is now “I'm being monitored because I can't be trusted.” The Protection Move is silence and a change of subject rather than an open accusation.

The groceries and the repair appointment are different practical matters. The thoughts and the behaviors also differ. Within BTL, the proposed recurring pattern is the underlying sequence Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move, not repetition of identical subjects, emotions, beliefs, interpretations, or actions. Two deliberately constructed episodes illustrate how a reader might look for such a

sequence; they do not establish that a naturalistic recurring pattern has been measured or that Jordan always responds in this way.

These episodes also share something that is not merely a Loop: Jordan has twice failed to complete a responsibility they accepted. That observable issue deserves attention even if Jordan learns to recognize a defensive response earlier.

9. Possible interruption

An alternative version of the Wednesday exchange could begin with Jordan acknowledging the missed task before explaining the work delay: “I didn't go. I said I would, and I didn't. I can go this evening. I also want to talk about how we're dividing the planning, because I don't want you to have to keep checking.”

Taylor might say, “I need to know whether I can count on an agreed task getting done. I also want us to discuss who keeps the list and notices what's missing.”

Within the BTL interrupt vocabulary, someone might NAME IT, SLOW IT, CHECK IT, and CHOOSE IT. Jordan might name a defensive impulse, allow a moment to listen, check whether the question necessarily means “nothing I do counts,” and choose to answer the actual question. Taylor might choose to state the unmet agreement clearly without taking responsibility for Jordan's defensive choice.

These are possible responses, not proven BTL intervention effects. A new sentence can be helpful to imagine without guaranteeing better household cooperation. Neither person is obligated to set aside legitimate concerns in order to make the interaction appear successful.

10. Unresolved issue

The groceries still need to be purchased. The repair appointment still needs to be scheduled. The partners may need an explicit arrangement for who notices needs, creates lists, makes decisions, completes tasks, and checks what has been done.

Perceived fairness matters to people, but it should not be treated as a simple instruction to split every task exactly in half. In a German cross-sectional analysis of 11,012 individuals living with different-sex partners, Adriaans and colleagues (2026) found that perceived overcontribution to combined paid and unpaid work was associated with lower relationship satisfaction. Some associations involving

perceived undercontribution differed by category and gender or did not reach significance. These results do not establish causation or provide a rule for Taylor and Jordan.

Similarly, a longitudinal study of 108 working-class, dual-earner first-time-parent couples found links between perceived housework fairness and reported conflict, but the proposed indirect pathway from change in household-task division through fairness to conflict was not statistically significant (Newkirk et al., 2017). Its sample and transition-to-parenthood context do not represent every couple. These findings cannot promise that revising a chore list will prevent arguments. They also do not reduce the practical importance of addressing an actual imbalance.

11. Aftermath and repair considerations

If Jordan wants to address the accusation and withdrawal, Jordan can acknowledge the conduct without requiring Taylor first to concede that the grocery reminder was unfair. Taylor can describe the impact without claiming certainty about Jordan's intentions. If Taylor spoke in a hurtful way, that, too, can be considered on its own terms. Reciprocity does not require equal blame.

The couple may decide to review what has been agreed to, identify tasks that are easy to overlook, and check later whether changes actually occurred. Those are possible practical arrangements, not scientifically established BTL outcomes. An apology is not a substitute for a completed errand, a workable workload, or reliable follow-through. A quieter evening does not prove that the concern has been resolved.

What this map shows, and what it does not

The case allows three questions to remain visible at once. What work is being done or missed? What provisional interaction sequence might one person recognize in their own experience? What still has to change, regardless of how well the conversation goes?

The external household-labor research offers context for cognitive work, fairness and conflict. It does not test BTL's four stages, these fictional partners, the proposed interrupt, or the accuracy of retrospective case mapping. The case is an illustration, not evidence of an underlying mechanism. Differences in how household labor is defined, narrow research samples, and null findings are reasons to avoid a universal explanation.

The example concerns an ordinary disagreement where both people can discuss responsibilities without fear. That condition matters. When the situation involves threats, intimidation, coercive control, violence, sexual coercion, stalking, fear or retaliation, it is inappropriate to ask someone to treat the harm as a shared Loop or negotiate safety through a joint mapping exercise. Individualized safety support and responsibility for harmful conduct take priority. The map is not an abuse assessment, therapy, or a reason to remain in an unsafe situation.

A household argument can contain an interaction pattern and a real imbalance at the same time. The useful boundary is not choosing one explanation over the other. It is refusing to let the interaction explanation erase the work, the agreement, or the accountability still required.

Chapter 46. Spending

A purchase can be small enough to fit inside a monthly budget and still raise a question about how decisions are made. A purchase can also create a real financial problem, regardless of how calmly two people discuss it. To understand a spending disagreement, it helps to keep the account balance, the agreement between partners, and the interaction in view at the same time.

This chapter uses an invented couple, Taylor and Jordan, to apply the eleven-part case map from Chapter 44. Neither person represents a research participant or a clinical case. The dialogue and inner experiences are fictional. The map is a way of organizing possible observations and first-person accounts, not a measurement instrument or proof that a BTL sequence occurred.

The issue: an agreed spending limit

Taylor and Jordan share an account for rent, utilities, groceries and savings toward replacing an unreliable car. They each also maintain money for personal use. Their current agreement is to discuss nonessential purchases of more than $200 from the shared account before making them. The agreement does not require either person to seek permission for every personal purchase. They both know the limit, but they have not specified what to do when a needed item seems urgent or when a purchase could reasonably fit more than one category.

On Saturday, Jordan buys $420 of equipment for a hobby using the shared account, without discussing it with Taylor first. The payment clears. Jordan believes some of the equipment might eventually help generate income, but no earnings are assured, and the couple had not agreed to treat hobby expenses as joint investments. On Monday, Taylor notices the transaction while checking whether an upcoming car-repair expense will fit the budget.

The purchase, the account used, and the agreement are observable facts within this fictional example. Whether the equipment can be returned, whether the car repair can still be paid for, and how both people define shared and personal spending remain practical questions. Naming a Loop cannot answer them.

Chapter 19 examines the wider research on financial conflict. Here, the relevant point is narrower: money disagreements involve more than one kind of concern. In two selected samples, Peetz, Meloff, and Royle

(2023) found reported disagreements about expenses, contributions, financial values and unilateral decisions, among other topics. Their selected respondents do not tell us how often those themes occur among couples generally. They do help illustrate why this fictional dispute should not be reduced to a single hidden meaning.

The conversation

Taylor: “What's the $420 charge from Saturday?”

Jordan: “I bought some equipment. I've been looking at it for a while.”

Taylor: “From the shared account? We agreed we'd talk about anything over two hundred.”

Jordan: “I know the number. I thought this was different. I might be able to use it for work.”

Taylor: “But you didn't ask me. I was checking whether we can pay for the car.”

Jordan: “I can't buy one thing without being interrogated?”

Taylor: “I'm asking why you used the joint account.”

Jordan: “Forget it. I'll put the money back somehow.”

Jordan walks into another room. Taylor is left without an explanation of how the funds will be restored. Taylor has asked about a specific transaction and a known agreement. Jordan's sense of being scrutinized may be genuinely felt; it does not by itself establish that Taylor was conducting an interrogation. The case provides no reason to conclude that Taylor routinely controls Jordan's personal spending.

1. Issue

Jordan spent $420 from the shared account on a nonessential purchase, above the agreed $200 discussion threshold, without first talking to Taylor. Taylor has a legitimate question about the account and the car expense. Jordan may have legitimate questions about whether the agreement needs clearer exceptions or how much personal financial autonomy each partner has. Those questions do not cancel the missed agreement.

There is not yet enough information to say that Jordan's purchase has made the car repair impossible. The money has left the shared account; the amount of financial damage, if any, requires checking the actual balance and obligations. The case should not exaggerate the loss to intensify the story.

2. Launch

From Jordan's hypothetical first-person perspective, the Launch is Taylor's question about the $420 charge and the reminder of the spending agreement. The question points toward an action Jordan knows occurred. Calling it a Launch names what Jordan noticed; it does not establish that Taylor was wrong to ask, meant to shame Jordan, or caused Jordan's subsequent choice.

3. Overload

Suppose Jordan later describes a surge of urgency to defend the purchase, difficulty following Taylor's reference to the car, and a narrowing of attention onto the phrase “you didn't ask me.” Within BTL, Jordan might call that experience Overload.

We cannot infer this state simply from the words spoken. It is a hypothetical self-description, not a diagnosis, neurological measurement, or indication that Jordan lost agency. The choice to accuse Taylor of interrogation remains Jordan's responsibility.

4. Old Story

Jordan might describe a familiar meaning: “I have to justify every decision I make.” Within BTL, that is a possible Old Story, a meaning or prediction attached to this particular exchange.

It may reflect earlier disputes the reader has not seen. It may also be an overreading of this one question. The map cannot decide which. Taylor's reminder about a jointly agreed threshold is not, on its own, proof that Taylor wants control over Jordan's independent money. Nor can Jordan's interpretation be dismissed as automatically false just because the transaction breached an agreement.

5. Protection Move

Jordan's visible response shifts from explaining the purchase to accusing Taylor of interrogation, then promising vaguely to replace the money and leaving the room. Jordan might later say the accusation was intended to protect a sense of independence or competence. That

possible function is not evidence of Jordan's actual motive and not an excuse for evading the concrete question.

In the BTL teaching sequence, Jordan could reflect using Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice: accusation and exit; possible wish to avoid feeling controlled; a need for room to make decisions within an agreed arrangement; and a different response that still acknowledges the unauthorized shared-account charge. The last part is a possible choice, not a proven intervention.

6. Partner experience

From Taylor's invented perspective, the accusation changes the conversation. Taylor began with a charge and a spending agreement, then found themself defending whether the question was an interrogation. Taylor might experience Jordan's departure as a refusal to account for the purchase. That experience is Taylor's; it is not proof of Jordan's undisclosed intention.

The effect can be serious even without certainty about motive. Taylor still needs to know whether the car expense is covered, whether the equipment can be returned, and what to expect next time the spending limit is crossed.

7. Next Launch

Jordan's “interrogated” accusation could become Taylor's next Launch. Taylor replies, “I'm asking why you used the joint account.” Jordan might then hear that reply as another demand to defend personal judgment. We can describe these possible successive reactions without assuming that each response had to occur or that the two actions carried equal responsibility.

Taylor is not automatically responsible for repairing Jordan's embarrassment before Jordan can answer a factual question. Jordan's interest in an agreed level of personal spending autonomy also deserves discussion. That interest does not reverse the responsibility for the joint-account transaction. Both substantive subjects may need attention, but they are different subjects.

8. Recurring pattern

Imagine a second fictional episode several weeks later. A $65 automatic renewal for a shared entertainment service appears on the account. The payment is below the $200 discussion threshold and was already scheduled, so there is no equivalent breach of the spending agreement. Taylor asks whether the couple still wants the subscription given the car savings goal.

This time Jordan does not accuse Taylor of interrogation. Suppose Jordan later says the question was a Launch, that attention narrowed and an immediate urge to justify the subscription followed (Overload), that the thought "My choices never make sense to Taylor" came to mind (Old Story), and that Jordan responded with lengthy justifications rather than answering whether to keep the service (Protection Move).

The two issues differ. In the equipment purchase, a specific agreement was broken. In the subscription discussion, the partners may simply disagree about priorities. The reactions and their immediate details also differ. The proposed recurring BTL pattern is the organizing sequence Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move, not the recurrence of identical purchases, emotions, interpretations or actions. Two invented episodes show how someone could look for the sequence. They do not establish naturalistic recurrence, causal inevitability or validation of the framework.

9. Possible interruption

Return to the first conversation. Jordan could recognize the accusation after saying it, rather than before. A possible next sentence would be: "I said you were interrogating me. You were asking about an account we share. I should have talked with you before using it. I need to check whether I can return the equipment." This may be an imperfect, delayed correction rather than a smooth resolution.

Jordan might then name the impulse to defend, slow the response, check whether Taylor's question necessarily means "I have no say," and choose to answer about the transaction. BTL calls those steps

NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. They are offered here as an educational option, not a demonstrated method of improving financial decisions or a guarantee that the conversation will go well.

Taylor might answer: “We can discuss a better way to handle exceptions. But first I need to know the amount available for the car.” The interaction can become clearer without either person surrendering the original issue.

10. Unresolved issue

The equipment has still been purchased. The account balance and car expenses still need checking. Jordan's proposed reimbursement is not a plan until the amount, source, timing and feasibility are clear. The couple may need to decide whether to return the equipment, how to replenish shared savings if necessary, and how to define future exceptions to the threshold.

Research about financial conversation should not be turned into a promise that talking more will solve this. In a one-month observational study of 136 couples, Peetz and Saxey (2026) found that higher self-reported quality of financial communication was associated with later relationship satisfaction after taking initial satisfaction into account, while how frequently couples discussed money did not show the same general association. Satisfaction at the start also predicted later reported communication. The finding does not establish that a BTL interruption causes better financial communication, satisfaction, repayment or trust.

11. Aftermath and repair considerations

Later, Jordan could acknowledge having used shared money outside the agreement and explain what was done to address it. Taylor could describe both the financial and relational impact without asserting certainty about why Jordan made the purchase. If the rule itself proves unworkable, they can renegotiate it prospectively, not retroactively pretend it did not apply on Saturday.

The practical outcome matters more than a polished apology. Jordan returning the equipment or replacing the funds may address one aspect of the problem; rebuilding confidence in shared decisions may require observable follow-through. Taylor and Jordan may also decide that

their arrangements for shared and personal money need a more explicit discussion. None of those results is guaranteed by recognizing a Loop.

What the map shows, and where it stops

A spending argument can involve an actual financial decision, a remembered or disputed agreement, and an interaction that shifts toward defensive meaning. Those three levels should remain visible. Money should not become merely a metaphor for wanting respect, autonomy, intelligence or importance. Within BTL, those may be possible meanings, but they cannot determine the bank balance or erase one person's conduct.

A short home-diary study of 100 married parent couples found that money was not their most frequent conflict topic, but those episodes were often rated as important; greater reported attempts to solve the problem did not establish more compromise or resolution (Papp, Cummings, et al., 2009). This finding concerns a selected U.S. sample and does not demonstrate the BTL case map, the particular spending scenario, or the consequences of any one purchase. It is one reason not to mistake an apparently productive conversation for a settled financial issue.

One boundary is especially important. The case deliberately presents no threats, fear, enforced deprivation, monitoring or retaliation; its shared-pattern mapping depends on that safe, noncoercive premise. A disagreement about an expense is not automatically economic abuse. However, controlling a partner's access to income or necessities, taking or exploiting resources, interfering with work, or using debt and money to dominate can be part of economic abuse. A scoping review of 35 quantitative studies of intimate-partner-violence survivors identified economic control, exploitation and employment sabotage, while documenting substantial study and measurement limitations (Johnson et al., 2022). That literature does not license diagnosing a fictional person from a single transaction.

When spending is connected to threats, coercive control, surveillance, intimidation, violence, fear or retaliation, a shared Loop exercise may be unsafe and may obscure responsibility. There is no obligation to disclose account details to a controlling partner or to negotiate financial safety within a mutual pattern exercise. Appropriate individualized safety support takes priority. This guide is relationship education, not therapy, financial advice or a danger assessment.

What the reader can take from the case is a discipline of separation: check what happened financially; identify only the interaction sequence that the available perspective can support; consider a different next choice without promising results; and return to the agreement and its consequences. An interaction may become easier to discuss while the money problem remains real.

Chapter 47. Lateness

A late arrival can be a practical problem before either partner says a word about it. Someone may have missed an appointment, spent another half hour caring for a child, or been left without the information needed to make a different plan. A case map should preserve those consequences, not transform them into mere misunderstandings.

The following case is fictional. It illustrates one possible way of examining recurring conflict using Break the Loop (BTL). It is not a report of research participants or a clinical case. The thoughts attributed to each person are provisional parts of the illustration, not access to either person's actual private experience.

The situation

Taylor and Jordan live together and share responsibility for collecting Jordan's niece from an after-school activity on certain evenings. On Tuesday, Taylor agreed to arrive home by 5:30 p.m. so Jordan could leave for the pickup. At 5:43, Taylor arrived without having sent a message. Jordan had already made an alternative arrangement with the child's parent. The child was safe because Jordan arranged backup coverage, but Jordan had been left to reorganize a commitment that Taylor had agreed to cover.

The issue is not whether Jordan reacted perfectly to lateness. The stated time was missed, and advance notice did not happen. Those are concrete facts of the invented case. Taylor's explanation might affect what a reasonable future arrangement looks like, but it cannot erase that practical consequence.

1. Issue: What must still be addressed?

Jordan wants to know what happened, whether the 5:30 agreement was realistic, and what should happen next time a delay becomes likely. Taylor may need to account for an unexpected workplace demand or may have misjudged the trip home. The story does not settle which explanation is correct. They still need a workable plan for child pickup, notice, and backup coverage. A changed tone alone cannot arrange transportation.

2. Launch: What was noticed?

Taylor walks through the door. Jordan says, “I needed you here at five-thirty. Why didn't you tell me you were late?” For Taylor, the Launch might be the question, Jordan's raised voice, or the sight of Jordan holding a phone. The Launch names Taylor's experience of what occurred, not proof that Jordan intended an attack. Jordan has a legitimate reason to ask.

For Jordan, a different Launch occurred earlier: the agreed time passed without Taylor or an update. This matters because each person may begin noticing a different part of the same event.

3. Overload: What started narrowing?

Taylor may notice a fast urge to explain everything at once. Listening to Jordan's actual question becomes harder as Taylor thinks through the last hour at work and anticipates criticism. These are possible experiences, not signs that all capacity for choice has disappeared. Taylor can still decide how to respond.

Jordan, having managed the missed pickup plan, may also be impatient and less able to listen slowly. The example does not require that the two people have the same intensity of reaction or the same practical responsibility.

4. Old Story: What familiar meaning becomes influential?

Taylor might begin hearing, “Nothing I do is enough. I'm already in trouble before I can speak.” That familiar prediction may or may not accurately describe what Jordan thinks. It is not established by the question alone.

Jordan might think, “When I need you to follow through, I end up handling it myself.” The case deliberately leaves open whether this is a well-founded account of a longer history, a partially accurate interpretation, or a prediction intensified by the immediate problem. An Old Story is not automatically false, and the real missed commitment should not be denied simply because it carries emotional meaning.

5. Protection Move: What happens next?

Taylor says, “You have no idea how much I had to get done today. I can't control every minute.” Taylor then gives a detailed account of work before answering why no text was sent. The immediate function may be to protect a sense of competence or avoid feeling unfairly judged. That explanation of possible function does not excuse failing to give notice.

Jordan answers, “You always have an excuse.” That statement is a more sweeping accusation than the facts of this single evening can prove. It may also make a useful conversation about timing harder. The map can describe both statements while retaining the initial broken agreement and any unequal responsibility for it.

6. Partner experience: How might the move be received?

Jordan may hear Taylor's detailed defense as an attempt to make the late arrival irrelevant. The observed fact is that Taylor explained work before acknowledging the notice failure. Whether Taylor meant to dismiss Jordan remains uncertain.

Taylor may hear “always” as confirmation that Jordan has already decided Taylor is unreliable. Again, that experience is not proof of Jordan's private intention. Neither interpretation should substitute for asking what each person actually meant or for evaluating the original commitment.

7. Next Launch: How can one response become another starting point?

Taylor's extended defense can become Jordan's next Launch: “You're not even answering the part about texting.” Jordan's global accusation can then become Taylor's next Launch: “So now everything I do is wrong?” The illustration shows how one Protection Move may be experienced as the other person's next Launch. It does not establish a measured causal sequence or divide responsibility equally between them.

8. Recurring pattern: What might repeat when details change?

Two days later, Jordan is late to an agreed dinner because an appointment runs long. Jordan sends a text ten minutes before the reservation, but Taylor feels overlooked and says sharply, “I guess the plan never matters.” Jordan responds by withdrawing and saying very little. This second incident differs from Tuesday in who is late, the seriousness of the practical consequence, whether advance notice was attempted, and the form of the next response.

Within BTL, the recurring Loop is the underlying sequence Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The topics, events, emotions, meanings, beliefs, and actions at each point may vary from one occasion to another. We could tentatively map the dinner exchange as

a noticed delay, growing difficulty staying curious, a familiar prediction about being unimportant, and an accusing or withdrawing response. But these two invented scenes do not demonstrate scientifically that this couple has a recurrent sequence. They show how a reader might examine that possibility. Shared labels alone do not make two separate incidents equivalent.

The practical difference also remains important: a late pickup with no notice and a later dinner with some notice may reasonably require different responses. Pattern recognition should not flatten differences in seriousness.

9. Possible interruption: Where might another choice enter?

Suppose Taylor notices the explanatory rush after the first question. Taylor could say, “You're right that I missed the time, and I should have messaged. I want to explain what delayed me, but I can answer that part first.” This is a possible choice, not a scripted guarantee of a productive response.

Using the BTL educational interrupt sequence, Taylor could NAME IT by recognizing the urge to defend; SLOW IT by pausing rather than immediately giving a long explanation; CHECK IT by separating the thought “I'm being attacked” from what Jordan actually asked; and CHOOSE IT by acknowledging the missed notice and discussing what the evening required. Formally, the sequence is NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT.

The interruption could happen later. Taylor might realize the pattern only after another sharp exchange and return to the specific responsibility. Jordan could also choose to avoid a global “always” claim while still asking directly for follow-through. Neither choice obligates Jordan to stop being concerned about an unmet agreement. The framework has not been independently demonstrated to prevent future late arrivals or improve the outcome of this particular interaction.

10. Unresolved issue: What still needs a practical answer?

The partners still need to know whether the original schedule was feasible, who is responsible for contact when plans change, what counts as sufficiently early notice, and who can provide backup child care without placing that burden automatically on Jordan. A specific agreement might include a message as soon as a delay becomes apparent and a separate contingency plan for a time-sensitive pickup. That is a proposal for their fictional situation, not a universal rule.

Time is not simply a matter of attitude. A U.S. time-diary study found that the amount of time married adults spent with a spouse varied across work and parenting circumstances, and that adjusting for work on the diary day reduced some apparent differences between work-arrangement groups (Flood & Genadek, 2016). That study measured individuals' time use, not these characters, late arrivals, relationship motives, or the BTL sequence. It is a reminder to examine actual constraints before assuming that every missed plan reflects a person's priorities.

11. Aftermath and repair considerations: What would follow?

If Taylor acknowledges the missed obligation but makes no change to the notice process, Jordan may reasonably continue to worry about dependability. A later apology may matter, but it is not the same as a completed pickup plan or reliable follow-through. Chapter 42 discusses acknowledgment, accountability, and return to an issue more fully.

The case also allows an imperfect ending. Jordan may still be irritated. Taylor may be embarrassed. They may need another conversation after the immediate logistics are settled. The educational aim is not a perfectly calm couple or instant forgiveness, but a more careful distinction among what happened, what it began to mean, what happened next, and what remains to be done.

What this map cannot tell us

A map of lateness cannot tell whether Taylor actually had an unavoidable delay, whether Jordan's account of previous missed commitments is correct, or whether either person is intentionally disregarding the other. It cannot establish how common this particular sequence is or predict whether another response would change future behavior. The fictional timing details are teaching details, not research measurements.

Nor should an ordinary case map be imposed where lateness is bound up with coercion. Deliberately preventing a partner from working, withholding access to transportation, using location tracking to threaten, punishing a partner for a delay, or making a person fear retaliation is not merely a reciprocal argument about punctuality. In circumstances involving coercive control, threats, stalking, violence, sexual coercion, or fear, safety and appropriate individualized support take priority over mutual Loop exercises. A person is not required to negotiate a shared pattern with someone who makes disagreement unsafe.

The central distinction

The issue is the missed time, inadequate notice, and concrete impact on another person's responsibilities. A possible Loop concerns how each person experiences the event, assigns meaning, and responds during the disagreement. Either can matter without replacing the other. The reader can use this case to notice a possible repeated sequence while remaining uncertain about motives, making space for accountability, and returning to the real scheduling problem. Chapter 44 explains how to read a case map; Chapter 24 examines work and time constraints in greater depth.

Chapter 48. Phones

A phone on the table can be a practical tool, a distraction, or both. A person might check a message because a child needs a ride, because a colleague is waiting, because they are bored, or because they are avoiding a conversation. Those are very different possibilities. A partner looking across the table usually cannot know which is true simply from the movement of a hand toward a screen.

This case is fictional. Jordan and Taylor appear in other case maps, but neither has a fixed role as the responsible partner or the person who raises a concern. Here, the subject is attention and phone use. As with other maps, the issue deserves attention on its own terms, and the proposed Loop is an educational way to look at the interaction around it. It is not evidence of either partner's unspoken thoughts or an independently validated description of what happened.

1. Issue

Jordan and Taylor are finishing dinner at home. Earlier that day, they had agreed to put aside a short stretch of time after eating to discuss plans for the coming weekend. During Jordan's explanation of a possible visit with relatives, Taylor looks down, opens a phone notification, and types a response. Taylor does not say what the message concerns. Jordan stops speaking.

“What?” Taylor asks.

“You're on your phone,” Jordan says.

“It's one message. I was listening.”

Jordan replies, “Then what did I just say?”

Taylor begins to explain that the message came from work. Jordan says the weekend discussion can wait. Taylor sets the phone down, but the conversation has already shifted.

The actual issue is not imaginary. They had made an agreement about how to use this time, and an interruption occurred without warning. Jordan may reasonably want the conversation to receive attention. Taylor may reasonably need to respond to an urgent message, although the urgency has not been established just by saying the message was from work. Neither the issue nor a possible practical solution can be settled by identifying a Loop.

2. Launch

For Jordan, the observable Launch is Taylor looking away and typing while Jordan is speaking. Jordan notices an interruption during time the partners had set aside.

The Launch is not “Taylor doesn't care.” That is a conclusion about meaning and intention, not the event itself. Nor does the Launch establish that a phone is always inappropriate at dinner. The partners' stated agreement and this particular moment matter.

For Taylor, a later Launch could be Jordan's challenge, “Then what did I just say?” That question occurs after the initial interruption. It does not retroactively erase Taylor's part in what happened.

3. Overload

Suppose Jordan, describing the moment afterward, says that the glance at the phone felt abrupt. Jordan was still trying to finish the thought about the weekend, but now felt pulled toward proving that the conversation mattered. Listening to Taylor's explanation became harder.

That is one possible account of Overload: attention narrows, urgency rises, and the range of responses feels smaller. It is a proposed description of Jordan's experience, not something that can be measured from this fictional dialogue.

Taylor might describe a separate narrowing of capacity when asked to repeat the conversation. Taylor wants to explain the message and begins rehearsing a defense instead of listening to what the interruption was like for Jordan. Neither person's narrowed capacity removes agency or accountability.

4. Old Story

If Jordan were to describe the familiar meaning that came to mind, it might sound like, “I'm not important enough to hold your attention.” The thought would explain why an ordinary-looking gesture carried more weight than the gesture alone.

An Old Story is not automatically false. People can actually be disregarded. The map simply distinguishes the observed movement toward the phone from the meaning Jordan assigned to it, allowing both the concern and the uncertainty to remain visible.

Taylor might later identify a different Old Story: “Any small mistake is going to become proof that I never listen.” This is offered as an

illustrative possibility, not an established belief or a claim that Jordan has no reason to complain.

5. Protection Move

Jordan's immediate Protection Move is to test Taylor: “Then what did I just say?” The question may function, in Jordan's own hypothetical account, as an attempt to establish whether Taylor was paying attention or to protect against feeling unimportant. It also puts Taylor on the defensive.

Taylor responds with a detailed work explanation and the phrase “It's one message.” In Taylor's possible account, minimizing the interruption may function to protect against feeling accused or judged. That function does not excuse failing to announce or negotiate the interruption. The practical agreement still matters.

Neither partner has to be assigned a permanent communication style. A case map concerns possible actions within a particular sequence, not a diagnosis of the people in it.

6. Partner experience

From Taylor's position, Jordan's test may feel like a demand to demonstrate competence at listening. Taylor may hear the question as a verdict before having a chance to explain. From Jordan's position, “It's one message” may make the interruption feel even more dismissive.

Those descriptions are possible experiences, not proof of either person's intention. Taylor's frustration would not mean Jordan had no legitimate complaint. Jordan's hurt would not establish that Taylor deliberately chose a screen over the relationship.

7. Next Launch

After Jordan says the conversation can wait, Taylor might experience the abrupt end as another Launch: “Now nothing I say will matter.” Taylor might respond by withdrawing into silence or adding another explanation. Either response could give Jordan a new moment to interpret.

The arrow from one person's Protection Move to another possible Launch helps a reader see how an interaction can continue. It does not mean that both partners contributed equally to the initial interruption or that either was entitled to the other's attention without limits.

8. Recurring pattern

Consider a separate fictional evening. Taylor is describing a stressful conversation about a shared obligation. Jordan glances at a phone, this time because Jordan is waiting for an update from a family member about transportation. Taylor stops speaking and says, “I guess this isn't a good time.” Jordan replies sharply, “You know I'm waiting for that update.”

This second episode differs in the person holding the phone, the purpose of the message, the stakes and the immediate response. It is not the same act being repeated and it is not automatically the same level of responsibility. Taylor might now report narrowed attention, a familiar prediction that there is never room for Taylor's concerns, and a move toward ending the conversation. Jordan might respond defensively.

Within Break the Loop, the recurring element under consideration is the possible structure Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move, not identical words, phones, emotions or behaviors. Because both episodes have been deliberately invented for teaching, they cannot demonstrate that this four-part sequence occurs in a real couple, that the partners' unspoken states are known, or that using the map will improve outcomes. The reader's task is to consider whether the questions help separate events, meanings and responses.

9. Possible interruption

Return to the first dinner. Taylor could set the phone down and say, “I should have told you I needed to answer something. I interrupted while you were talking.” That statement acknowledges observable conduct without demanding that Jordan immediately feel better.

Jordan could say, “When you turned to it, I started telling myself you weren't interested. I don't actually know whether that was true, but I do want us to protect the time we agreed on.” This preserves the experience while declining to claim proof of motive.

The familiar BTL practice would invite a person to NAME IT, SLOW IT, CHECK IT and CHOOSE IT. For Jordan, that could mean noticing the

urge to test Taylor, pausing before issuing the challenge, checking what the message actually required, and choosing a direct request about attention. Taylor might choose to name the interruption and ask for a defined two-minute pause if the work matter cannot wait.

These are possible choices, not proven solutions. Either partner may still disagree about what counts as a time-sensitive message. Neither has to relinquish ordinary privacy to participate in a respectful discussion.

10. Unresolved issue

The partners still need an explicit agreement. What does “phone-free time” mean? Does it cover the first fifteen minutes after dinner, every weekend-planning conversation, or something else? How will they handle genuine work or family interruptions? What notice is reasonable? If one person has to respond, is there a clear plan to return to the original conversation?

An agreement should fit the actual demands on each person rather than become a standard one partner silently imposes. It also should not disguise a demand to monitor calls, inspect messages, demand passwords or control ordinary contact with other people.

Research offers a useful caution here. A meta-analysis found a negative association between perceived partner phubbing and relationship satisfaction across heterogeneous observational samples, but those associations do not establish causation (Ni et al., 2025). In a separate survey of 383 cohabiting British adults, respondents often characterized a partner's nearby phone use as neutral or positive rather than harmful (Frackowiak et al., 2025). The measures and samples are different, and neither study determines what Jordan or Taylor meant or what this couple should decide. The work of Chapter 23 is to examine these evidence distinctions in more depth. The work of this case map is narrower: keep the phone issue and the possible interaction pattern visible at the same time.

11. Aftermath and repair considerations: acknowledgment and return

If they return to the discussion later, Taylor may want to acknowledge breaking the agreed time without having to agree that every message is disrespectful. Jordan may want to acknowledge that the quiz-like question escalated the exchange without retracting the original

concern. They can still disagree over the interruption, revise their agreement, or decide the same plan will not work for them. A better exchange does not itself establish that a workable agreement has been reached.

A phone can also be used for coercion. This case does not apply when one person is forced to share passwords or locations, monitored or stalked, threatened over messages, isolated from contacts, or afraid of retaliation. In those circumstances, a mutual Loop map can misrepresent responsibility and increase risk. Safety and appropriate individualized specialist support take priority over the shared exercise. Neither the fictional example nor this educational guide can assess danger or substitute for clinical or other specialized help.

The point of the phones map is not that the screen never matters or that every conflict about attention is only a misunderstanding. Sometimes the message is urgent. Sometimes an agreement was broken. Sometimes a partner's concern is justified and an explanation is incomplete. The case leaves those possibilities open while showing how the next response can become part of the argument. Readers can use Chapter 44 for the case-map key, Chapter 23 for the technology evidence, and Chapter 42 for a broader discussion of acknowledgment and return.

Chapter 49. Sex and Intimacy

A disagreement about sex can be difficult to discuss even when neither partner has done anything wrong. One person may want sexual closeness at a moment when the other does not. The difference matters. So does how the partners talk about it. The difference in desire is an issue; an interpretation and response may form part of a proposed BTL Loop, but recurrence concerns the recognizable progression Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move rather than the same interpretation or response repeating. Neither is the whole story.

A case map is useful only if it preserves what is known, what each partner says they experienced, and what remains uncertain. In a sexual disagreement, it must also preserve a nonnegotiable boundary: nobody owes a partner sexual activity. A refusal is sufficient. It does not become a mistake merely because the other person feels disappointed.

Research gives some context, but it does not supply a script for these partners' thoughts. A meta-analysis found that the quality of sexual communication was more strongly associated with relationship and sexual satisfaction than how frequently partners communicated about sex (Mallory, 2022). That is an association across studied samples, not proof that a particular conversation will improve intimacy. In one study of 229 couples, differences in reported sexual desire predicted later sexual distress in the models studied, while reverse temporal associations were nonsignificant (Jodouin et al., 2021). Those findings do not establish that any specific couple is caught in a Loop.

The following case is fiction. Jordan and Taylor are not clients or representative research participants. These scenes extend the fictional Jordan and Taylor examples used elsewhere in the Field Guide. Their genders and private thoughts are not established by these invented moments; earlier episodes do not prove motives or behavior here. The case illustrates how someone might identify a response pattern while treating consent and different needs as real, separate matters.

1. Issue

On Sunday evening, Jordan asks Taylor, “Would you like to have sex tonight?” Taylor replies, “No, I don't want to tonight.”

Jordan nods, then says, “It feels like you never want to be close to me anymore.” Taylor answers, “I should be able to say no without this turning into an argument.” Jordan becomes quiet and leaves the living room.

Two issues are visible. Jordan wants to understand the place of sexual intimacy in the relationship. Taylor wants a refusal to be respected without further pressure. Those concerns cannot be solved by declaring that both partners must contribute equally to a Loop. The refusal itself is not a breach or an obligation to explain. Jordan's disappointment is a feeling, not a claim to Taylor's body. Their broader questions about desire, affection, and compatibility still deserve careful attention, but no agreed sexual frequency can override consent on a particular occasion.

2. Launch

For the first possible map, Jordan identifies the Launch as hearing “No, I don't want to tonight.” That is the event Jordan noticed. It was also Taylor's legitimate choice.

The Launch is not proof of wrongdoing. It identifies where Jordan's experience of the sequence began. Jordan might have noticed a familiar distance, a tired tone, or a pause as well. The scene cannot tell us which mattered most. A map requires Jordan's own report rather than a narrator's guess.

3. Overload

Imagine Jordan later describes becoming tense, embarrassed, and less able to listen after the refusal. That would be a possible report of Overload: narrowing capacity to stay curious and respond deliberately.

It would not mean Jordan lost agency. Jordan remained responsible for what was said next. Nor should we assume that Taylor was overwhelmed simply because Taylor spoke firmly. The available facts are limited to what each partner says and does.

4. Old Story

Suppose Jordan reports that a familiar prediction appeared: “I'm not wanted.” This would be an Old Story in the BTL vocabulary, a meaning Jordan assigns to the moment.

That meaning may be painful and important to understand. It is not proof that Taylor does not want Jordan as a partner, and it is not necessarily false in every conceivable relationship context. The fact that Taylor refused sex on Sunday does not establish a global conclusion about attraction, care, or the future of the relationship.

The distinction matters: experience is not proof of another person's intention, and interpretation is not fact. Checking an interpretation is different from requiring Taylor to dispute it, offer reassurance, or agree to sex.

5. Protection Move

In this possible account, Jordan's Protection Move is the comment “It feels like you never want to be close to me anymore,” followed by leaving without explaining the pause. Jordan may later describe the comment as an attempt to make sense of hurt or obtain a response. That is a proposed function, not a justification.

The move can put pressure on Taylor by turning a particular refusal into a broad accusation. Jordan is responsible for that impact. Taylor's “No” is not the Protection Move. Neither is a clear boundary automatically withdrawal, avoidance, or hostility. A person's right to decline sexual contact remains intact whether the refusal is warm, brief, hesitant, or firm.

6. Partner experience

Taylor describes the comment differently: “When I said no, I felt as if I had to defend my decision. I wanted the answer to be enough.”

That report describes Taylor's experience, not proof that Jordan intended to coerce. But intention is not the only concern. When a refusal is followed by criticism, guilt, bargaining, repeated requests, threats, or fear of consequences, the safety of the interaction matters more than completing a shared pattern map.

Jordan's disappointment can be acknowledged without asking Taylor to absorb responsibility for it. Likewise, Taylor's sense of pressure should not be erased by calling the exchange a misunderstanding.

7. Next Launch

Jordan's accusation may become Taylor's next Launch. Taylor may hear, “Your no is hurting me,” and answer, “You always do this when I

don't want sex." Jordan may then hear that statement as further rejection.

Those arrows describe possibilities, not an observed causal mechanism. The scene provides only one short exchange. A reader cannot conclude that either partner always responds this way or that their responsibilities are equal.

It is also possible for the exchange to end there. Taylor does not have to reenter a discussion in order to make the map complete.

8. Recurring pattern

To show why the issue and the pattern are not identical, consider a different invented moment.

Several days later Taylor suggests sitting close together after dinner, without proposing sex. Jordan asks, "Do you actually want to be near me, or are you just trying to avoid the conversation?" Taylor responds, "I was trying to spend time with you." Jordan answers, "Then tell me what we're supposed to do," and turns toward the television.

In a hypothetical first-person account, Jordan might identify the Launch as Taylor's unexpected invitation. The Overload could be an immediate urge to determine whether the gesture is sincere. The Old Story could sound different from Sunday's: "Any closeness offered to me is just to keep me quiet." The Protection Move could be questioning Taylor's intentions and ending the conversation.

The two moments involve different invitations, meanings, and actions. Their resemblance is an educational possibility: Jordan describes a shift from uncertainty about closeness to a defensive response that makes conversation harder. One invented pair of scenes cannot establish that a real couple has a measured recurring sequence. Nor does it establish that Taylor's invitation was evasive. The familiar form in BTL is Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move; the contents within those positions may vary.

Some couples experience desire differences without arguing about them. In an ecological momentary assessment study of 94 cohabiting couples, similarity in partners' reported sexual desire was not

associated with the measured outcomes of initiation, receptivity, or partnered sexual activity (Pawlowska et al., 2024). The sample and measures were limited, and this null finding does not show that desire differences never matter. It does challenge a simple assumption that a difference automatically determines behavior.

9. Possible interruption

A case map does not prescribe sex, affection, or emotional reassurance. It can suggest where one partner might make a different communication choice.

Jordan might NAME IT privately: “I heard no and started telling myself I'm unwanted.” Jordan could SLOW IT by allowing the answer to stand and taking a pause without punishing silence. Jordan could CHECK IT later, if Taylor freely wishes to talk: “I noticed I made your answer into a larger conclusion about us. I don't know whether that conclusion is accurate.” Jordan could CHOOSE IT by acknowledging the accusation and asking whether there is a mutually acceptable time to discuss what each person wants from intimacy.

Taylor remains free to decline that later discussion or set conditions for it. An apology does not require a shared debrief. No choice within this sequence produces a right to sexual access, a guarantee of a better response, or evidence of BTL effectiveness. A respectful next choice might simply be to accept the refusal and leave it there.

10. Unresolved issue

Even if Jordan changes the accusatory response, the partners still may want different things. They may differ about sexual frequency, the meaning of nonsexual affection, whether physical closeness implies sex, how to initiate without creating pressure, or whether either wants a larger conversation at all.

In a qualitative study of adults who described differences in sexual or affectionate desire, participants reported multiple ways of responding, including communication, alternative shared activities, and doing nothing (Clark et al., 2024). This was a description of reported approaches, not proof that every approach was helpful or safe. In particular, participating in unwanted sex must not be turned into an assignment or a recommended compromise.

For Jordan and Taylor, a voluntary discussion might distinguish “I want to feel connected” from “You must meet my preferred frequency.”

They may identify forms of affection both welcome, or discover that their preferences are genuinely difficult to reconcile. They may seek qualified help voluntarily if they want it. A case map cannot establish that the disagreement will resolve or that either person should remain in the relationship.

11. Aftermath and repair considerations

If Jordan recognizes the accusation as unfair, a meaningful acknowledgment might be: “You said no, and I responded as though you had done something wrong. That was not fair. I am responsible for my words.” Taylor may accept the acknowledgment, decline further discussion, or need time.

A later conversation, if freely chosen, may address the practical question of intimacy separately from the way Sunday unfolded. Follow-through matters more than completing an elegant diagram. The map does not prove changed behavior or remove the possibility of continuing incompatibility.

A safety limit applies throughout. Sexual coercion, threats, intimidation, retaliation, fear, stalking, or violence are not an ordinary reciprocal conflict for joint Loop analysis. Pressure on someone to have unwanted sex, or punishment for refusing, cannot be assigned equally to both partners because they appeared in the same conversation. In those circumstances, prioritize personal safety and individualized specialized support. No one must confront an unsafe partner, document episodes, or carry out a joint exercise.

What the map shows, and what it does not

The map distinguishes an actual difference in desire from possible interpretations and responses that can grow around it. It identifies one hypothetical point where Jordan could communicate differently without erasing Taylor's autonomy. It does not tell us why Taylor declined, determine whether the partners are sexually compatible, or establish that either has a fixed emotional pattern.

The educational aim is modest: notice one possible sequence, distinguish what happened from what was inferred, and consider one responsible next choice. A more skillful conversation does not make consent negotiable, and the absence of an argument does not mean the underlying issue has disappeared.

Chapter 50. Parenting

When the rule changes in the moment

Jordan and Taylor have agreed that their child will put a tablet away at eight on school nights. The arrangement is not merely about a device. It gives the child a predictable end to an evening and leaves time for reading and getting ready for bed. One Thursday, Jordan permits an extra twenty minutes after the child asks to finish a game. Taylor enters the room, sees the screen still on, and asks, “I thought we agreed on eight. Did that change?”

Jordan answers, “It was only twenty minutes. I thought I could make one exception.” Taylor says, “That isn't the point. We made the decision together.” Jordan replies, “So now I need permission for every little thing?” Taylor says, “I need to know whether our agreement means anything.” They continue in the hallway. The child can hear some of the exchange.

This is an invented episode involving the fictional Jordan and Taylor used elsewhere in this book. No detail here establishes how actual parents behave, what either partner intended, or whether a recurring sequence has occurred in their lives. We can, however, use the eleven positions introduced in Chapter 44 to examine the possibilities without losing sight of the child or the parenting decision.

1. Issue: A rule, an exception, and shared responsibility

The immediate issue is specific. Jordan and Taylor had an eight o'clock agreement. Jordan made an exception without discussing it with Taylor first. They still need to decide what exceptions are reasonable, who can authorize them, and how to explain a change to the child. Taylor may reasonably want joint decisions to be respected; Jordan may reasonably want room to respond to a particular evening. Both concerns can exist, even though they do not settle whether this exception was appropriate.

The coparenting framework proposed by Feinberg (2003) distinguishes agreement over childrearing from support, division of labor, and how adults manage family interactions. It is a conceptual framework, not evidence that four fixed types explain all families. In this scene, both the content of the bedtime agreement and the way the adults coordinate are worth attention.

A case map does not declare the decision trivial. The next evening still requires a workable plan, and any uncompleted bedtime task still needs attention. Naming a Loop would not make those obligations disappear.

2. Launch: What each person noticed

For Taylor, the Launch may be the sight of the tablet after eight, followed by Jordan's explanation that an exception was made. That is an observable difference between the agreement and the evening's action. It does not establish that Jordan intended to exclude Taylor or disrespect the agreement.

For Jordan, the Launch may be Taylor's question. The words ask about a rule, but the way Jordan hears them may be different from their literal content. In the constructed scene, neither partner has said what was happening internally at that point. We must not treat an observer's interpretation as a report of either person's mind.

3. Overload: What becomes harder to do

Imagine Jordan later saying, “When Taylor asked, I felt cornered. I stopped listening to the concern about the rule and started preparing my defense.” That would be a first-person description compatible with BTL's term Overload: a moment when listening, curiosity, and deliberate choice seem harder to sustain. It is not proof of a measurable physiological state.

Taylor might describe another experience: “When Jordan called it permission, I was worried we'd never be able to rely on an agreement.” That worry could narrow Taylor's willingness to hear why an exception was made. We cannot know it occurred unless Taylor reports it. Overload never removes either adult's responsibility for what they say or do next.

4. Old Story: Possible meanings, not established intentions

Jordan could describe an Old Story such as, “Taylor thinks I cannot be trusted to parent without supervision.” Taylor could describe a different one: “When we decide something together, I end up carrying the responsibility of making it happen.”

These sentences might be familiar meanings for the fictional adults, but they are not facts about the other's motivation. The second concern might also point to a real history of one-sided follow-through. A map must leave room for that possibility rather than dismiss every painful

interpretation as a misunderstanding. We know only the single invented agreement and exception presented here.

5. Protection Move: What each person does

Jordan's audible move is to turn Taylor's question about the agreement into a question about permission: “So now I need permission for every little thing?” That response may be an attempt to defend decision-making autonomy. Asking what it might protect does not excuse setting aside an agreement or making the other person answer for an accusation they did not make.

Taylor responds by emphasizing whether the agreement means anything. Taylor has a legitimate concern about reliability. Yet the phrasing may also increase the sense that Jordan's competence as a parent is on trial. That is a possible effect of the wording, not proof that Taylor intended to shame Jordan.

One person's understandable concern does not automatically make the next move helpful. Nor does the existence of two moves make both adults equally accountable for the original decision.

6. Partner experience: Two accounts are better than one guess

Taylor may report hearing Jordan's “permission” question as a diversion from the exception. Jordan may report hearing Taylor's statement as a judgment about character. These are possible accounts that would need to be checked with each person. The visible words alone do not certify either interpretation.

There is a third person in the setting: the child. We have only established that the child could hear part of the hallway discussion. We do not know what the child understood or felt. The child should not be asked to decide which adult was right or used to collect evidence for one parent's version.

Research across 49 studies found an association between interparental conflict and children reporting that they felt caught between parents (Schrodt, 2026). The estimate describes a heterogeneous research literature; it does not mean this particular exchange caused that experience or that every disagreement creates it. It gives the adults a reason to attend to the child's position without claiming to know the child's internal response.

7. Next Launch: One response becomes another noticed event

If Taylor hears Jordan's permission question as a refusal to discuss the rule, that question could become Taylor's next Launch. If Jordan then hears “Does our agreement mean anything?” as an accusation of being a bad parent, Taylor's response could become another Launch for Jordan.

These are possible links in a constructed conversation, not observed scientific evidence of a fixed chain. The map draws attention to what each person noticed after the other's move, while withholding any verdict about intent.

8. Recurring pattern: Recognizing a sequence without inventing history

Suppose Jordan and Taylor later notice that other decisions bring a similar progression: a question about a shared plan; difficulty hearing the practical concern; a familiar prediction of being controlled or left with the work; then defensiveness, pressure, or withdrawal. BTL would organize a possible Loop as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move.

The topic, the wording, and even which adult is the first to notice the problem could change across occasions. Recurrence refers to the underlying sequence in this educational framework, not identical incidents. Nothing in this single scene proves that Jordan and Taylor have such a recurring pattern. They would need to compare their own experiences across actual situations to decide whether the map is useful.

9. Possible interruption: A different choice while preserving accountability

Jordan could begin by acknowledging the concrete exception: “I said eight, and I changed it without checking with you. We need to decide how exceptions work.” Taylor could answer with the specific worry rather than a global judgment: “I want us to be able to rely on the plan, especially when the child asks one of us for a different answer.”

These are examples of different next choices, not a script that guarantees agreement. If Jordan notices the urge to defend against a judgment, NAME IT could be recognizing that familiar move. SLOW IT could mean allowing a pause before responding. CHECK IT could mean asking whether Taylor was questioning the rule or Jordan's parenting generally. CHOOSE IT could mean addressing the missed agreement without abandoning Jordan's view that exceptions sometimes make sense. This is the canonical NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT practice, not an empirically established intervention for a child's bedtime routine.

Taylor has choices too, including stating the specific need, postponing a tense conversation until out of the child's hearing, and refusing to make the child a witness or judge. These possibilities do not make Taylor equally responsible for Jordan's earlier decision. If either adult has a credible concern about harmful discipline, neglect, or intimidation, simply slowing a conversation would not replace the needed protective action.

10. Unresolved issue: What the adults still must decide

Even after a calmer exchange, the parenting decision remains unsettled. Is eight a firm school-night limit, or can either adult grant a short exception? If exceptions are allowed, which circumstances qualify? How will they tell each other, and what will they say to the child when the adults disagree?

These questions need practical answers, not merely insight about a communication pattern. Their answers may depend on the child's needs, the family's responsibilities, and what both adults can realistically implement. A shared rule should not become a way to deny a parent reasonable discretion or to obscure one adult's repeated failure to honor agreed responsibilities.

The map cannot determine the best parenting policy, assess development, or decide whether a disciplinary practice is safe. Parents may need appropriate child-development, educational, medical, or

other qualified guidance for the substance of a difficult decision. Relationship education does not substitute for that assessment.

11. Aftermath and repair considerations: What remains after the talk

Later, Jordan could acknowledge changing the agreement without consultation. Taylor could acknowledge that the discussion moved from the specific choice toward broader judgments. Together they could explain a clear next-evening plan to the child without blaming either parent or asking the child to manage adult disagreement. It may also be important to check whether the child heard something frightening or confusing, without prompting the child to take a side.

That possible aftermath is not proof of repair, restored trust, a better bedtime, or fewer future disagreements. A missed commitment may have consequences even after it is acknowledged. An apology and a practical plan are different things, and neither should be assumed from the fact that a couple recognized a sequence.

A safety boundary

This map describes an ordinary, invented disagreement, not coercion or abuse. Threats against a child or adult, dangerous discipline, coercive control, intimidation, violence, retaliation, neglect, or using a child to punish or monitor another adult require a safety-first response. A shared Loop discussion must never be used to divide responsibility for harm equally or pressure someone into unsafe joint work. Where safety is uncertain, individualized support and appropriate child-protection or specialist services take priority.

What this map can and cannot show

The useful distinction is not “the screen-time disagreement was really about communication.” The screen-time disagreement was real. So were the question of who could make an exception and the need for a plan a child could understand. The possible Loop is an additional way to examine why adults might lose access to the very conversation that could address those matters.

In this fictional case, an adult notices an exception, another hears criticism, familiar meanings become available, and responses create more material to react to. The case does not establish a causal sequence, prove intentions, or validate Break the Loop. It shows how to ask better-separated questions: What happened? What meaning did

each adult experience? What did each person actually do? What must still be decided for the child's sake?

Chapter 51. Extended Family

An invitation already answered

Jordan's sister has invited the family for a Sunday holiday meal. The invitation itself is ordinary. The difficulty begins when Taylor learns that Jordan has already said yes for both of them. Taylor had expected to discuss the plan first, especially because a previous visit included comments from a relative that Taylor found demeaning. Jordan knows the comments were upsetting but had not asked whether Taylor was willing to attend this time.

On Thursday evening, Taylor sees a message about what each guest should bring and asks, “Did you tell your sister we're coming?” Jordan says, “Yes. It's just lunch. I didn't think it would be a problem.” Taylor replies, “You decided for me. I told you what happened last time.” Jordan answers, “So I'm supposed to turn down every invitation from my family?” Taylor says, “That isn't what I said. I want a say in whether I go.”

The discussion becomes broader than the Sunday meal. Jordan talks about being asked to choose sides. Taylor talks about not being heard when an uncomfortable family event is treated as insignificant. Neither explains what they would actually do if the same relative made another comment. The invitation remains accepted, but the two people have not agreed on a plan.

Jordan and Taylor are fictional characters used to illustrate possible experiences, not individuals whose intentions or behavior have been measured. A family invitation and a partner's objection cannot, on their own, demonstrate an ongoing Loop. What follows is a case map, with uncertainty left visible.

1. Issue: The decision that still matters

The immediate issue is that Jordan committed both partners to an event without checking with Taylor. A second issue is whether Taylor would be comfortable attending given the previous relative's conduct. There may also be a practical question about transportation and the ability to leave separately. The facts matter: what was promised, what happened at the earlier gathering, how the relative behaved, and what each partner is free to decide now.

Taylor's objection is not automatically resistance to Jordan's family. Jordan's wish to keep a relationship with a sibling is not automatically

disloyalty to Taylor. Family relationships can carry genuine commitments and sources of support, but those commitments do not erase either partner's agency. The meal must be discussed as a real decision, not recast as merely an emotional misunderstanding.

Research on family networks does not supply a verdict about this couple. In a selected longitudinal study of 355 first-married Black and White couples enrolled in Michigan in 1986, certain disagreements between spouses' reports about closeness to in-laws were associated with later divorce, while other measures were not consistently associated (Fiori et al., 2021). The study did not observe Jordan and Taylor, identify motives in a holiday disagreement, or test Break the Loop.

2. Launch: What Jordan noticed

For one possible account from Jordan, the Launch is Taylor's question, “Did you tell your sister we're coming?” That is an observable question about a commitment Jordan made. Jordan could hear it simply as a request for information. Jordan might instead hear criticism or a prediction of another argument about family.

The words do not settle which meaning Jordan actually experienced. A map made from Jordan's perspective would need Jordan's own report, not a narrator's certainty.

3. Overload: What might narrow

If Jordan describes an urgent need to defend the invitation, difficulty hearing the distinction Taylor is making, or an impulse to answer before the question is finished, those could be possible signs of Overload in BTL's educational vocabulary. Overload does not prove a physiological condition or remove responsibility for the reply.

For example, Jordan might say afterward, “Once I heard the question, I was focused on proving I wasn't abandoning my sister. I stopped hearing what Taylor was actually asking.” Without Jordan's report, even that is a proposed line of inquiry rather than a known event.

4. Old Story: The meaning Jordan might give the question

Jordan could report an Old Story such as, “I always have to choose between people I care about,” or, “There is never room for my family.” Those interpretations may feel convincing because they refer to experiences beyond this one evening. They are not proof that Taylor

intends to isolate Jordan from relatives or that any such broader history exists.

An alternative is that Jordan believed a short lunch would be harmless and simply failed to think about the earlier hurt. The map should allow that possibility. Its purpose is to test interpretations, not award a hidden motive.

5. Protection Move: What Jordan actually does

Jordan's answer, “So I'm supposed to turn down every invitation from my family?” changes a narrow question about making a joint commitment into a sweeping claim about family loyalty. In a possible map, that reply functions as a defensive Protection Move. Its possible function is to protect a valued family tie or Jordan's freedom to make plans. Naming that possible function is not an excuse for deciding on Taylor's behalf or misrepresenting Taylor's objection.

The behavior is specific: Jordan expands the question, describes an absolute that Taylor did not state, and does not yet address the unilateral acceptance. It is not evidence that Jordan is generally defensive, controlling, or incapable of listening.

6. Partner experience: What Taylor says and what remains unknown

Taylor can report two distinct concerns: “You decided for me,” and “I told you what happened last time.” Taylor may experience the response as dismissal. But the case cannot infer a private Old Story for Taylor simply because Taylor presses the issue. It matters whether Taylor feels hurt, frightened, angry, frustrated, or simply determined to correct an agreement. Each possibility would call for a different question.

Taylor has a right to decline an invitation or ask what boundaries will be respected. Jordan is accountable for the commitment Jordan made. Those responsibilities do not become equal just because both people are now speaking with frustration.

7. Next Launch: What Taylor notices in Jordan's response

Jordan's sweeping question about “every invitation” could become Taylor's next Launch. Taylor might experience it as another failure to address what happened during the prior visit, or as pressure to justify a personal limit. Taylor's reply, “That isn't what I said,” makes the mismatch explicit.

This is a possible movement between accounts, not evidence of automatic reciprocity. Taylor's insistence on a say in attendance could be a necessary boundary rather than a Protection Move. The map must not transform every refusal, clarification, or request for accountability into a symptom of the Loop.

8. Recurring pattern: What would have to repeat

A single invented argument shows a possible sequence, not recurrence. To examine an actual recurring Loop, both partners would need to identify other occasions and their own first-person accounts. One disagreement might concern a family meal, another a relative's unexpected visit or a request for assistance. The apparent continuity would have to be in a recognizable Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move sequence, even if the topic details, emotions, Old Stories and behaviors differed.

The reported evidence base is narrower than the illustration. In research involving 197 selected midlife couples, the amount of support exchanged with aging parents was not uniformly associated with marital satisfaction, while some differences in that support were associated with satisfaction (Lee et al., 2012). Those reports concern caregiving and association, not the frequency or causal mechanics of holiday disagreements. The research does not establish that family obligations produce a BTL Loop.

9. Possible interruption: A choice without a promised outcome

In BTL, Jordan might try NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT. NAME IT could mean recognizing, “I am answering as if Taylor wants me to reject my family, but Taylor asked why I said yes for both of us.” SLOW IT might mean allowing the question to finish before responding. CHECK IT would involve asking Taylor which concern is primary: the previous comments, the lack of consultation, the inability to

leave, or more than one. CHOOSE IT could mean acknowledging the unilateral response to the invitation and offering to correct it rather than asking Taylor to accept an unmade agreement.

Taylor may also choose how to state a boundary or describe the earlier visit. That does not make Taylor responsible for correcting Jordan's original commitment or for tolerating treatment that is demeaning or unsafe. Neither person must agree to attend in order to demonstrate that an interruption occurred.

This is an educational possibility, not a tested intervention for family loyalty conflicts. The map does not establish that a different phrase would restore confidence, prevent another argument, or change the relative's behavior.

10. Unresolved issue: What the adults still need to decide

Even after a calmer discussion, practical questions remain. Will Jordan tell the sister that the earlier yes did not represent Taylor's decision? Does Jordan want to attend independently? Would Taylor consider a shorter visit if a reliable exit plan exists? If the relative repeats the earlier comments, who will address them, and what limits will each partner set?

The answers cannot be determined by tracing a Loop. They depend on the facts of the prior interaction, the relationship with the extended family, capacity, commitments, cultural context and each partner's consent. There may be no solution in which both people attend the meal. That is not necessarily a failure.

If the invitation is part of intimidation, monitoring, threats, retaliatory pressure, or deliberate isolation from friends or family, this ordinary case-map frame no longer applies. Safety planning and appropriate individualized support take priority over shared-pattern discussion (U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, 2025).

11. Aftermath and repair considerations: What acknowledgment could and could not do

Jordan could acknowledge, “I shouldn't have answered for you. I'll correct that with my sister.” Taylor could explain what happened during the earlier visit and what would make further contact possible or unacceptable. The partners might then communicate their separate

attendance decisions without making either person publicly responsible for the other's choice.

An acknowledgment is not proof that trust has been repaired. It does not guarantee that a relative will change behavior or that another family obligation will be easy. Nor does a boundary become a bargaining chip merely because an invitation causes disappointment. What matters afterward is whether commitments are corrected, choices respected, and practical expectations made clear.

A safety boundary

This scene assumes a fictional ordinary disagreement, not an environment of coercion. Preventing a partner from contacting family or friends through intimidation, surveillance, threats, fear of retaliation, or controlling restrictions is not an equal-responsibility Loop. Nor should a person be told to attend gatherings involving credible threats, harassment, or other serious harms simply to preserve harmony. A safe response may require private individualized assessment and specialist support instead of joint exercises.

What this case can and cannot show

The useful distinction is not that the Sunday invitation was “really” about a Loop. Jordan made a decision affecting Taylor without consultation; Taylor's concern about a relative's comments may have independent merit; and both questions require attention. The optional BTL map adds a way to ask how a person might have moved from a noticed question to a defensive response. It cannot establish either person's intention, identify a recurring mechanism from a single scene, or prove that a particular intervention works.

Extended-family relationships can remain meaningful without making attendance compulsory. A couple may need both a clearer conversation and a substantive decision. Neither replaces the other.

Chapter 52. Work Stress and Availability

The evening that was supposed to be free

Taylor and Jordan had planned to spend twenty minutes after dinner deciding whether to renew a service contract for their apartment. The renewal deadline is the next morning. Jordan has a demanding job and sometimes receives late messages from a supervisor. The plan was to review the options together at seven.

At 6:55 p.m., Jordan receives a message requiring a reply before the next business day. Jordan opens the laptop at the table without telling Taylor whether the planned conversation will happen. Ten minutes later, Taylor asks, “Are we still going to look at this tonight?” Jordan, reading the work message, answers, “I can't do two things at once.” Taylor says, “I know work always comes first.” Jordan moves a hand to the laptop lid but leaves the message open. “I've been dealing with this all day. Can I have one minute without being accused of something?”

They stop talking about the renewal. Taylor opens the contract alone, but neither has agreed on a decision. Jordan later returns to the laptop. Nothing in this invented exchange tells us whether the message could have waited, whether Taylor's account of previous evenings is accurate, or why Jordan did not give an update. Those are questions for the people involved, not conclusions supplied by a narrator.

This is a fictional illustration of the Break the Loop (BTL) educational case map, not a research observation, diagnosis, or proof of a recurring pattern. Chapter 44 explains the eleven positions. Chapter 24 examines work and time constraints; this case stays with one interaction and the practical decisions around it.

1. Issue: What must still be decided?

The partners need to review a contract before a deadline. They had agreed on a time to do it. Jordan became unavailable without clarifying whether the agreement was postponed, shortened, or cancelled. Those are practical matters, not mere interpretations. Jordan may have had a genuine work obligation; Taylor may reasonably need notice and a share of the decision-making. The case does not settle whether Jordan could decline or delay the supervisor's request. The answer matters to any useful next plan.

Work can constrain shared time without indicating what either person values. Flood and Genadek (2016) examined individual time diaries

from 46,883 married U.S. adults. Time spent with a spouse varied across work and parenting circumstances, and some differences across employment arrangements narrowed after accounting for work on the diary day. That observational analysis did not measure the motives of Taylor or Jordan, their particular decision, or repeated BTL sequences.

2. Launch: What happened or was noticed?

For Jordan, a possible Launch is Taylor's question, “Are we still going to look at this tonight?” Jordan might notice its timing, Taylor's expression, or the question while attention is fixed on the supervisor's message. The question itself does not establish an intention to criticize.

For Taylor, the earlier Launch may be the laptop opening just before the agreed time without an explanation. That observation may raise a legitimate question about the plan. Different people can notice different starting points. A case map should record whose account is being considered.

3. Overload: What became harder?

If Jordan later reported being unable to shift attention from the urgent message, hearing a question as another demand, and having difficulty answering calmly, those could be possible descriptions of Overload in BTL's terms. We cannot infer a measurable physiological state from the words spoken. We also cannot assume Jordan had no choice about the tone of the answer.

Taylor may have felt pressed by the approaching deadline and by having to begin the paperwork alone. Pressure might narrow Taylor's patience too. That possibility is not an argument that Jordan and Taylor have equal responsibility for the missed check-in or for the words each chose.

4. Old Story: What familiar meaning might be assigned?

Jordan might report a thought such as, “Even when I'm trying to keep up with work, I am treated as if I am failing at home.” Or Jordan might simply have been distracted without any familiar interpretation. Both remain possible.

Taylor might have the thought, “My concerns are always less important than work.” That experience deserves a hearing, but the sentence is not proof of Jordan's priorities or of the history implied by “always.” If Jordan has repeatedly made and missed commitments, Taylor's concern may also be supported by facts. An Old Story is not

automatically inaccurate; it is a meaning to check rather than a verdict to assume.

5. Protection Move: What did the person do?

Jordan says, “I can't do two things at once,” followed by a challenge about being accused. One possible function of that defensive response is to protect a sense of competence or space under pressure. It may be an attempt to end the immediate demand. The function is a hypothesis, not access to Jordan's intentions, and it does not excuse an unnecessarily sharp reply or the failure to update the plan.

Taylor's “work always comes first” broadens a narrow scheduling question into a global judgment. That may be a way of expressing hurt or trying to gain attention. The map does not convert Taylor's legitimate request for shared responsibility into wrongdoing. It can describe a global statement while preserving what happened to the agreement.

6. Partner experience: What might the response mean to the other person?

Taylor might hear Jordan's words as a refusal to participate and might feel alone with the deadline. Taylor's experience can be described without deciding that Jordan intended dismissal. But Jordan's spoken words do not prove that Jordan intended to leave Taylor with the decision.

Jordan might hear “always” as a verdict on character. That is a possible experience, not evidence that Taylor intended humiliation. Neither partner's interpretation should be put in the other's mouth. Each person's first-person account would require asking and listening.

7. Next Launch: What could become the next starting point?

Jordan's short answer may become Taylor's next Launch, leading to the global accusation. Taylor's accusation may become Jordan's next Launch, leading to the more defensive reply. BTL uses the possibility that a Protection Move becomes the partner's next Launch to help people describe an interaction.

The possibility does not establish an empirically measured causal chain. It does not mean the two actions are equivalent in seriousness, that either one was inevitable, or that the initial unannounced change to the agreed plan no longer matters.

8. Recurring pattern: What might be familiar across different moments?

Consider a second invented moment. A week later, Taylor is absorbed in a difficult work-related call when Jordan asks about a household appointment they had agreed to confirm. Taylor responds, “Do you need an answer this second?” Jordan goes quiet and begins making plans alone. Here the person distracted by work has changed; so have the practical stakes and the visible response. A familiar tension may be present, but resemblance is not proof.

For the reader, a provisional map might ask whether a work interruption becomes a Launch, whether attention and patience narrow as Overload, whether a familiar judgment of neglect or criticism appears as an Old Story, and whether defensiveness or withdrawal follows as a Protection Move. In BTL, the underlying sequence is Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. Its events, emotions, beliefs, interpretations, and actions may change across occasions. Two fictional scenes demonstrate questions to ask, not that a real couple has been measured repeating this sequence.

Research about work stress is narrower than that educational account. Story and Repetti (2006) collected five consecutive workdays of diaries from 43 selected dual-earner married couples with children. Negative work interactions were associated with greater self-reported anger and withdrawal at home, but partner reports did not consistently corroborate those associations. The study does not establish that a stressful day caused this invented exchange, that Jordan was withdrawing for a particular reason, or that BTL stages occurred.

9. Possible interruption: What different action might be available?

Suppose Jordan notices the urge to defend when Taylor asks about the contract. A possible answer is: “I said seven, and I didn't tell you this came up. I need to respond to this message, but let's decide whether we can still review the contract tonight.” This acknowledges the plan and invites discussion without promising that the competing demands will disappear.

In BTL's optional educational sequence, Jordan could NAME IT by noticing the defensive urge; SLOW IT by setting down the laptop or explaining that a brief pause is needed; CHECK IT by distinguishing "I'm being accused of failing" from Taylor's actual question; and CHOOSE IT by offering a realistic time and taking responsibility for the missed update. The canonical sequence is NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT.

Taylor could make another choice too: "We agreed on seven and the deadline is tomorrow. I need to know whether you can do this with me or whether we need another plan." That is a direct request rather than a verdict about priorities. Neither person must abandon a legitimate concern to use the map. A different response might help the discussion, but BTL has not been independently shown to improve outcomes in this type of situation.

10. Unresolved issue: What still needs to happen?

The contract remains undecided. Jordan and Taylor need to establish the actual deadline, who can review which terms, whether both must be present for the decision, and what will happen if another urgent work obligation intervenes. They may also need to reconsider whether seven in the evening is realistically available for this purpose.

If work messages are compulsory, the couple needs to plan around that constraint rather than treat availability as a test of affection. If the messages are optional, that fact may change the accountability discussion. Whether and how responsibilities are shared is a real question, not a requirement to split every task evenly. The goal is not a perfectly symmetrical compromise. Practical responsibility depends on commitments, control over time, and consequences for each person.

11. Aftermath and repair considerations

After the exchange, Jordan might acknowledge the missed update and the sharp reply. Taylor might acknowledge the inaccurate certainty of "always" if the facts do not support it. Either can do so without surrendering the underlying concern. The contract still requires a decision, and an apology does not sign it.

A later conversation could ask whether a protected time can be agreed, how urgent interruptions will be announced, and whether the promised changes happen. The illustration provides no evidence that either partner will follow through, forgive, or feel more secure. Chapter 42 treats accountability and relational repair in greater detail.

Where this map is not appropriate

Work stress never excuses threats, intimidation, stalking, sexual coercion, violence, or retaliation. Deliberately interfering with someone's job, restricting work through fear, controlling access to earnings, or punishing an attempt to maintain employment may constitute economic coercion. Specialist guidance from the National Network to End Domestic Violence recognizes employment sabotage and economic restrictions among forms of financial abuse. That situation must not be described as two equally responsible people caught in a shared Loop. Safety, autonomy, and individualized specialist support take priority. A person is not obliged to negotiate a Loop with someone who makes disagreement unsafe.

What the illustration leaves open

This case cannot tell us whether the supervisor's message was truly urgent, whether Jordan's earlier promises were routinely broken, whether Taylor's experience of neglect is accurate, or whether a single changed sentence would affect future conduct. The case does not resolve the practical disagreement, explain either person's hidden motives, or demonstrate BTL efficacy. The suggested interruption might be useful to the fictional partners, might fail to change the discussion, or might reveal that the practical arrangement itself needs to change. It offers an organized way to keep the concrete issue visible while asking how a particular conversation began to unfold.

PART IX | LIMITS, SAFETY, AND INTEGRATION

Chapter 53. When the Loop Framework Is Not Enough

Some situations look, at first, like the conflicts described elsewhere in this book. A disagreement begins. The partners respond in ways that seem familiar. There is a withdrawal, an accusation, or a difficult silence. Someone may be tempted to ask, “What Loop are we in?”

That question can be useful in an ordinary disagreement where both people are able to participate safely. It is not always the right first question.

Sometimes the immediate concern is not how a conversation developed but whether a person can disagree without retaliation, decline unwanted contact, leave a room, make decisions independently, or reach someone for help. In those circumstances, shared-pattern analysis can obscure rather than clarify what matters most. A person does not have to identify a Loop before treating a threat, a boundary violation, or a dangerous situation as real.

When an educational map reaches its limit

Break the Loop (BTL) is an educational way to consider a potentially recurring progression: Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. The particular topic, emotional experience, meaning, or action at each stage may change from one episode to another. Recognizing such a progression is not a diagnosis, a measurement of danger, or a finding that two people are equally responsible for what occurred.

Many couples encounter ordinary conflict in which this framework may offer a useful way to reflect on their own experience. But even if a person can describe a Launch, an experience of Overload, an Old Story, and a response, that description does not determine whether the relationship is safe. A harmful act may remain harmful regardless of how it is placed on a map. A recurring concern may also require factual

investigation, enforceable boundaries, or outside support without needing any Loop interpretation.

This distinction follows a larger principle in the Field Guide: the issue and the Loop are different things. A missed agreement still needs to be addressed. An injury or threat is not resolved by recognizing what preceded it. Understanding a possible sequence does not turn one person's choices into another person's responsibility.

When fear changes the question

Fear is relevant not only when an argument is loud. It can be present when a conversation appears calm because one person has learned what may happen if they disagree. The practical question may be whether it is possible to say no, ask for clarification, seek privacy, disagree about money, contact friends, or leave without punishment.

Fear during a difficult interaction does not, by itself, allow a reader or this book to determine that abuse is occurring. People may fear rejection, disappointment, or the loss of a relationship without being subject to coercive control. The distinction requires attention to what is happening, including whether there are threats, intimidation, restrictions, monitoring, or consequences for noncompliance. Where a person is concerned about retaliation, the priority should shift toward safety and appropriate individualized support rather than another shared communication exercise.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention describes intimate partner violence as potentially involving physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, and psychological aggression. The U.S. Department of Justice also describes controlling conduct that can be economic, psychological, emotional, or technological. Neither definition reduces the problem to an argument that both people need to learn to manage more skillfully (CDC, 2026; U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women [OVW], 2025).

The presence of coercion matters because ordinary collaborative exercises presume conditions that may not exist. Someone who is monitored, threatened, or punished for disagreement may have little freedom to make a candid Loop map, share an interpretation, or try a new response safely. Their hesitation cannot responsibly be described as simply a failure to communicate.

Behaviors that must not be reduced to a Loop

Violence and credible threats call for attention to immediate safety, not a demand for mutual reflection. Sexual coercion, pressure, or retaliation for refusing sexual contact is not equivalent to a disagreement over desire. A person may decline sexual activity without having to persuade a partner that the refusal is an appropriate Protection Move. Guidance on reproductive and sexual coercion treats coercive conduct as a substantive safety and autonomy concern (American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, 2013).

Stalking and unwanted monitoring also differ from an ordinary request for reassurance. Checking a device, tracking a location, impersonating someone online, repeatedly making unwanted contact, or using technology to restrict another person's decisions may have a coercive or threatening function. The specific conduct and context matter. Specialist technology-safety guidance emphasizes that access to communication and privacy can itself be a safety issue (National Network to End Domestic Violence [NNEDV], n.d.-b).

Money can create legitimate differences about spending, debt, or shared priorities. Restricting another person's access to their earnings, preventing them from working, exploiting their credit, or using resources to trap or punish them raises a different concern. A scoping review of economic abuse research describes economic control, economic exploitation, and employment sabotage as distinct forms of harm. These are not simply stronger versions of ordinary financial disagreements (Johnson et al., 2022).

Threats involving children or dependents, intimidation through property destruction, forced isolation from friends and family, and retaliation for seeking help likewise deserve attention in their own right. These situations cannot be adequately addressed by asking the affected person to identify how their response contributed to the exchange (OVW, 2025).

These descriptions are warning categories, not a checklist that enables a reader to diagnose a partner from a single incident. The guide cannot determine intent, degree of danger, or legal status from an example. Their purpose is to make clear why a safety or accountability question may have priority over a shared-pattern question.

A boundary is not automatically a Protection Move

Protection Move is a BTL term for the response a person may make as a Loop develops. It is an educational description of an individual's possible response, not a label for every act of refusal or disengagement.

A person may end a conversation because it has become threatening. They may decline sex, protect their access to money, request privacy, seek individual advice, or choose not to remain in contact. Such actions are not automatically avoidance, withdrawal, punishment, or evidence that the person needs to practice staying engaged. Their context and purpose matter.

In an ordinary disagreement that is safe for both people, taking a deliberate pause may help someone avoid continuing an unproductive exchange. Where safety is not at issue, repeated refusal to address a necessary shared concern can have consequences that deserve attention. Neither observation justifies demanding that someone stay present while another person threatens, insults, coerces, or intimidates them. A helpful distinction is whether the person is making room for a safer and more workable choice or acting under conditions where remaining involved itself poses a risk.

A boundary can be contested without becoming illegitimate. Someone may dislike a limit that another person sets. That disagreement does not establish that the limit is manipulative. Nor does describing a boundary as a Protection Move make it unreasonable. BTL terms should never be used to override a person's autonomy, consent, or access to support.

Why shared work may not be safe

Loop mapping and interruption exercises sometimes invite people to describe what happened, what it meant to them, and what they might do differently. In ordinary situations, that self-reflection may be useful. In an abusive or coercive relationship, the same disclosure can expose a person's fears, plans, or vulnerabilities to someone who may use them for control.

The National Domestic Violence Hotline advises against couples counseling with an abusive partner, describing concerns about unequal power and retaliation or misuse of disclosures outside the counseling setting. This is specialist survivor-facing guidance. It is not evidence that every form of joint professional work in every distressed

relationship has been experimentally shown to be unsafe (National Domestic Violence Hotline, n.d.-b).

Consequently, this book does not recommend a joint Loop exercise as the default response to fear, threats, coercion, or violence. Nor does it ask someone to explain their concern to an unsafe partner before seeking support. The question of whether a particular therapeutic or educational setting is appropriate belongs with qualified professionals who can assess the actual circumstances, not with a general-purpose worksheet.

It is equally important not to use BTL language to dismiss an account of harm. “That is just your Old Story,” “You are overloaded,” or “My aggression was only a Protection Move” are not ways to establish what occurred. A person's possible motive does not erase the effect of their action. A reasonable concern does not become false because the speaker has emotions about it. The language of recurring sequences should describe one's own experience cautiously, not become a way to define someone else's reality for them.

When the need is larger than relationship education

Not every limitation involves abuse. Sometimes the people involved are facing conditions that require assessment or support beyond an educational account of conflict. Acute psychiatric or behavioral crises, immediate threats of self-harm or harm to others, severe intoxication or dangerous substance-related instability, serious trauma-related complexity, and situations that compromise the safety of children or other dependents may all demand a different first response.

The Field Guide is not an assessment or crisis-management service. It cannot evaluate the urgency of an individual's mental or physical health concern, provide a diagnosis, decide whether a child is safe, or determine which legal obligations apply in a particular jurisdiction. Those judgments require appropriate professional, emergency, child-protection, or legal resources according to the circumstances.

Where there is immediate danger or a medical emergency, emergency assistance may be necessary. Other situations may warrant individualized consultation with a licensed mental health professional, specialized domestic violence advocate, sexual assault service, substance-use treatment professional, or another suitably qualified provider. The relevant support depends on the concern. One kind of professional is not a substitute for every other kind.

World Health Organization guidance on first-line support for women subjected to partner or sexual violence distinguishes immediate emotional and physical needs from ongoing safety and support needs. Its clinical focus and population scope should not be treated as a universal treatment algorithm for every reader, but it illustrates why safety and support cannot be reduced to communication skill alone (World Health Organization [WHO], 2014).

A person also need not decide, from this chapter, whether to stay in or leave a relationship. Those choices may involve safety, housing, finances, care responsibilities, health, and law. Specialist support can assist with considering options without turning the decision into a test of commitment to the relationship or to the BTL framework.

Privacy and the decision to seek support

Accessing help is itself context-sensitive when a person worries that someone is monitoring their calls, devices, accounts, location, or web use. Specialist survivor guidance notes that digital activity may be monitored without the user's knowledge and that private-browsing modes do not ensure that all traces disappear (National Domestic Violence Hotline, n.d.-a; NNEDV, n.d.-b).

For that reason, the Field Guide should not require someone to save a Loop map, share private reflections with a partner, or use a particular online resource on a device that may be monitored. If surveillance or retaliation is a concern, individualized help from a specialized service may be safer than following general digital instructions in a book. No universal set of precautions will fit every circumstance.

Resource information, particularly telephone numbers and service availability, can change. The publication's resource appendix and any maintained online companion should be checked close to publication and updated independently of this chapter. They should distinguish emergency care, crisis support, advocacy, clinical care, and other services rather than suggesting that all offer the same help.

What responsible use of the framework requires

The recurring BTL Loop remains a potentially useful way to examine ordinary conflict where meaningful choice and participation are possible. Its proposed sequence is Launch → Overload → Old Story →

Protection Move. It describes the possibility of a familiar progression, not the inevitability of any behavior, the accuracy of an accusation, or a universal law about relationships.

An unsafe relationship may contain moments that appear to fit that progression. A person affected by coercion may also become frightened, overwhelmed, or defensive. None of those observations makes the coercion mutual or the violence a jointly produced event. The fact that one response follows another is not an assignment of responsibility.

The responsible use of a framework includes knowing when it should not lead. If a person cannot safely disagree, decline contact, preserve privacy, or seek support, the next question is not how well they can NAME IT, SLOW IT, CHECK IT, or CHOOSE IT. It is what they may need to be safer and better supported.

Learning to recognize recurring conflict should increase clarity and choice. It should never require someone to excuse harmful behavior, share private information, abandon a boundary, forgive, reconcile, or remain in danger.

Chapter 54. What the Evidence Supports, and What Remains Unknown

A book about recurring couple conflict has two responsibilities. It should explain what research has learned about how partners disagree, respond to one another, and sometimes remain caught in familiar interactions. It should also say where the evidence ends. Those responsibilities become especially important when a practical framework organizes several areas of research into a new set of terms.

The preceding chapters have examined studies of actual couple behavior, reported experiences, laboratory discussions, diary observations, and longer-term relationships. They have also introduced Break the Loop (BTL) as an educational framework for recognizing and interrupting a possible recurring progression. Those are related bodies of material, but they do not carry the same evidentiary status.

A reader can find a framework useful without assuming it has been scientifically established. A model can describe a recognizable experience without showing that everyone follows the same sequence, that its stages can be measured reliably, or that its exercises improve outcomes. The distinctions are not qualifications to hide at the end of the book. They determine what can responsibly be said throughout it.

What research has documented

Research has found that some relationship problems and disagreements persist across time. In a longitudinal study of newlywed couples, aggregate reports of relationship problems did not show a significant average change across several assessments, even though relationship satisfaction declined on average. That finding concerns the stability of reported problems in a particular sample. It does not prove that every couple repeats an identical argument or that the same sequence unfolds each time (Lavner et al., 2014).

Observational and diary research also identifies patterns in how partners participate in particular disagreements. Demand-withdraw is one well-studied example: one person presses or requests discussion while the other reduces engagement or withdraws. A meta-analysis found associations between demand-withdraw and a range of less favorable relationship outcomes. Yet the studies differed in the ways they defined and measured the pattern, and many were cross-sectional. Findings about demand-withdraw cannot simply be translated into a

causal claim that one partner's behavior produces the other partner's dissatisfaction (Schrodt et al., 2014).

Context matters. In home diaries and structured discussions, the likelihood and roles of demand and withdrawal have varied with the topic, the initiating partner, and the relative importance of the subject to each person. Some prospective findings also differ according to the outcome and the couples studied. What counts as a harmful response in one context cannot always be generalized as a fixed rule about how every couple should communicate (Papp, Kouros, et al., 2009; Eldridge et al., 2007; Ross et al., 2019).

Research on negative reciprocity provides another view. Observational work can examine whether one person's negative response is followed by a negative response from the other. In one laboratory study, negative behavior was associated with a negative response on a subsequent turn. This describes a local sequence within an observed discussion. It does not establish that an identical interaction recurs across weeks or months, or that one response caused the next (Dermody et al., 2025).

Taken together, these findings justify attention to the process of disagreement as well as the issue under discussion. They do not make the substantive issue irrelevant, and they do not establish one universal pattern beneath all recurring arguments.

Meaning, capacity, and relational response

Relationship research has also examined the interpretations people make of their partners' behavior. Attribution research distinguishes explanations about why something happened from judgments involving intent, responsibility, or blame. Such interpretations are associated with relationship quality, but an association does not establish that a particular person's reading of an event is accurate or mistaken. A cross-cultural study reported attribution-satisfaction associations in four national samples, with differences in the strengths of those relationships. That variation cautions against treating one account of meaning as universal (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990; Williamson et al., 2026).

During conflict, emotional and physiological activation can matter too. Studies have examined self-reported flooding, anger, observed problem-solving, and physiological indices under different conditions. Some findings link elevated flooding reports to greater anger and poorer observed problem-solving in studied samples. Other research

distinguishes effects on the person receiving an emotion-regulation instruction from effects on the uninstructed partner. These are particular measures and settings; they do not demonstrate one biological threshold at which a person enters a BTL stage or loses responsibility for what they do (Malik et al., 2020; Salo et al., 2025).

The research on regulation and responsiveness likewise argues against a universal script. Responses that are useful can depend on the seriousness of the problem, whether circumstances can change, the people involved, and what each person needs to address. A direct objection can sometimes be important when a consequential issue is being minimized. A cooperative or validating response is not automatically the best choice in every situation (Arican-Dinc & Gable, 2026; Overall & McNulty, 2017).

After a difficult exchange, the research distinguishes several things that everyday language may merge: reducing hostility, recovering emotionally, making amends, resolving a particular incident, and rebuilding trust. Studies of apologies and amends describe different components and associations, but they do not identify one universal formula that repairs all relationship harm. Forgiveness, continued contact, and reconciliation remain separate decisions. They are not proof that behavior has changed or that a person is safe (Lewis et al., 2015; Hannon et al., 2010; McNulty, 2011).

Why careful evidence has limits

Scientific findings depend on how questions are asked and what is observed. A self-report questionnaire about usual conflict experiences measures something different from an independently coded conversation. A study that records one discussion provides a different basis for inference than a series of everyday observations. A within-conversation association is not the same as repeated episodes of conflict across time.

Time alone does not establish causation. In a longitudinal study of newlywed couples, observed communication and relationship satisfaction were associated at the same assessment, but communication did not consistently predict subsequent satisfaction after accounting for earlier measurements. Such results complicate the familiar claim that changing a communication habit will necessarily cause a particular relationship outcome (Lavner et al., 2016).

Research populations matter as well. Some foundational samples consisted largely of heterosexual newlyweds or couples from narrow socioeconomic and geographic settings. Other studies included different groups or examined distinct subjects, such as financial stress or sexual disagreements. Even when findings are broadly suggestive, differences in sampling, culture, economic constraints, measurement, and relationship context can limit generalization.

Null and mixed findings also belong in the account. For example, a prospective study of demand-withdraw during a sexual-conflict discussion identified an association with later relationship satisfaction but did not detect the corresponding prospective associations with every sexual-outcome measure examined. A qualified account should preserve those differing findings rather than report simply that the pattern predicts all poor outcomes (Rosen et al., 2025).

These cautions do not erase the evidence. They make it more useful. They allow readers to distinguish what has been observed, what researchers infer, and what remains a reasonable but untested explanation.

How Break the Loop uses this research

BTL organizes a possible recurring conflict experience as Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. Launch refers to what happened or was noticed. Overload describes the narrowing of capacity that may make it harder to listen, stay curious, or respond deliberately. Old Story refers to the familiar meaning or prediction that becomes influential. Protection Move refers to what a person does next in response to what the moment has come to mean.

Within this framework, recurrence means recognizing the progression through these four stages across episodes. The particular topic, bodily experience, interpretation, and response may differ every time. Repeating a topic does not, by itself, establish a BTL Loop; nor does the recurrence of a behavior, a particular feeling, or an Old Story. A single incident may be mapped provisionally without proving that the sequence recurs.

Some of the processes addressed by BTL overlap with research on conflict initiation, activation, attribution, coping, communication, and recovery. But overlap is not equivalence. Demand-withdraw is not another name for the BTL Loop. Research on attribution does not independently validate Old Story as a measured stage. Studies of flooding and physiological activation do not validate Overload as a distinct, universally measurable state. Nor does research on autonomy, competence, or connectedness establish the BTL Three Pillars of Autonomy, Intelligence, and Importance as an independently tested three-part structure.

BTL also offers educational practices: NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT; Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice; and SEE → CATCH → CHANGE → STRENGTHEN. Those sequences have an instructional purpose. Related research can inform choices such as pausing or checking an interpretation, but it cannot be used as proof that the named BTL sequences improve recognition, reduce recurring conflict, or produce lasting relationship change.

This is the central evidence distinction in the Field Guide: research about external processes helps explain why a particular educational organization may be plausible or useful to explore. It does not substitute for directly studying that organization.

Seven different kinds of evidence

The project uses seven evidence classes to prevent important categories from being confused. They are editorial classifications, not seven experimentally measured stages of a relationship.

Class A, established external evidence, refers to sufficiently supported findings in the larger field, interpreted at the strength permitted by their methods. Class B, supported external process, refers to credible findings with meaningful variability or unresolved limitations. Those categories concern relationship research, not BTL's success as a program.

Class C, research-informed synthesis, is a reasonable way of bringing related findings into one explanatory account. The synthesis may be intellectually useful without having been directly tested. Class D, BTL-

specific construct, identifies the framework's own terms, distinctions, and instructional sequences. Those labels must not be mistaken for standardized scientific constructs simply because they resemble terms from established research.

Class E, BTL hypothesis or provisional interpretation, covers proposed relationships or outcomes requiring direct study. For example, BTL may propose that learning to notice a Loop earlier could increase opportunities for a different response. The reviewed research does not establish the rate at which this occurs, how consistently people can do it, or what outcome follows.

Class F, BTL program or pilot finding, would contain carefully described observations from a particular BTL workshop or educational program. Such a report should identify the participants, recruitment, measures, timing, comparison conditions if any, and limitations. Participation, satisfaction, or positive feedback would not become proof of effectiveness merely because the experience was meaningful to someone.

Class G, independently validated BTL finding, would require credible direct evaluation of BTL-specific claims with adequate methodological independence. That category cannot be assigned because an outside professional endorses BTL or because a study of a similar but distinct approach finds benefits.

The classes answer different questions. Readers should be able to see whether the claim comes from external science, from a synthesis of that science, from BTL's own language, or from direct evaluation of BTL itself.

BTL was created by this book's author, who has a professional and potential commercial interest in its use. That interest does not determine whether the framework is useful or ineffective. It does make transparent reporting and independent evaluation especially important. The Field Guide does not present workshop experience or informal participant reactions as controlled BTL outcome evidence.

What the current evidence does not establish

The evidence reviewed for this Field Guide does not independently validate BTL's named four-stage Loop or establish that using BTL improves couple outcomes. In the approved project source inventory, no eligible independent study directly tests whether separate observers reliably identify the same four stages, whether the proposed

progression predicts future interaction better than alternative accounts, or whether learning the system changes what happens in later disagreements.

The same limitation applies to the Three Pillars and to the named interruption and practice sequences. The material assembled for this book does not establish that these constructs form empirically distinct categories, that particular practice schedules create durable skill, or that learning them reduces conflict frequency, severity, or harm. The case maps later in the book are educational illustrations, not recorded observations that demonstrate the model in real couples.

This is a statement about the evidence reviewed and approved for this manuscript, not a declaration that no research anywhere could exist or that BTL has been proven ineffective. New data could strengthen, narrow, or challenge the framework's claims. The scientific status should change when the evidence warrants change, rather than when the framework becomes more familiar or widely used.

Practical relevance remains a separate question. A person might find that mapping a disagreement helps them describe their own experience or consider what to do next. That observation can be meaningful without establishing how often such a benefit occurs, whether other approaches would do as well or better, or whether the same result lasts over time. Acknowledging that difference is not a reason to dismiss experience; it is a reason to describe it accurately.

What future research would need to ask

A useful first step would be measurement. Independent researchers could test whether people can apply the four stage descriptions consistently to real, repeated episodes, whether observers agree about the sequence, and where the stages overlap with or differ from established measures. Studies would also need to test occasions when the full sequence does not fit, rather than treating every disagreement as confirmation.

Another step would concern change. A study could compare a clearly specified BTL educational program with an appropriate alternative or comparison condition, measure outcomes before and after participation, and follow participants long enough to examine retention and real-world transfer. Improvements in identifying stages, choosing responses, relationship satisfaction, or reduced distress would each

require measures suited to the actual question. Participant enthusiasm alone would not answer these questions.

Research would need to include different relationship arrangements, cultural contexts, degrees of distress, socioeconomic circumstances, and experiences with disability or chronic stress. It should also record nonbenefit and unintended consequences. A framework that invites self-examination should be studied for possible misuse, including blaming a partner, minimizing legitimate concerns, or misapplying shared-pattern explanations in circumstances involving coercion.

The book's preceding chapter identifies circumstances in which safety and specialized support take priority over relationship education. Research into BTL must preserve that boundary. No proposed educational gain would justify an unsafe joint task or the expectation that a harmed partner should repair the interaction created by someone else's coercive behavior.

Independent evaluation, transparent reporting, and replication could eventually support stronger conclusions, narrower recommendations, or meaningful revisions to the framework. They might also reveal that some parts of the model are more useful than others. That is a legitimate outcome of research, not a failure of the evidence process.

Using the framework responsibly

The reader of this Field Guide need not choose between treating all its observations as scientifically proven and treating them as worthless. A more accurate position is available: some external relationship processes are well documented; many proposed explanations have meaningful limits; and BTL offers an educational map informed by that broader work, without claiming that the entire map has been independently validated.

This book has repeatedly distinguished the issue from the Loop. That distinction remains essential here. A recognizable progression can be considered without neglecting a broken agreement, unfair division of responsibility, coercion, harm, or a need for specialized support. A possible reason for someone's behavior is not evidence that the behavior was acceptable. Recognition is not accountability, and an attempted interruption is not proof that a problem has been resolved.

The research can help people ask better questions. It cannot determine the meaning of every argument for them. BTL provides one way to

organize those questions while leaving room for uncertainty, alternative explanations, and the possibility that a different kind of help is needed.

The most defensible conclusion is also the most useful starting point for continued learning: take the issue seriously, treat the map as provisional, describe your own experience rather than diagnosing your partner, and remain willing to revise what you believe when the evidence or the situation calls for it.

Conclusion

What You Can Notice, and What You Can Choose

“We keep having the same fight” can be a useful place to begin. It is not, by itself, an explanation. Sometimes the same practical problem remains unresolved. Sometimes the topic changes while parts of the exchange feel familiar. Either way, it helps to ask two different questions: What needs to be addressed? And what happens between us as we try to address it?

The issue matters on its own terms. A missed agreement, an unfair division of work, a financial decision, an injury, or an unwanted boundary crossing does not become less real because an argument develops around it. Understanding the interaction cannot settle disputed facts, erase consequences, or transfer responsibility for one person's conduct to the other.

Break the Loop offers one educational way to examine the experience of being drawn into a familiar conflict. Its proposed recurring sequence is Launch → Overload → Old Story → Protection Move. Launch names what happened or what you noticed. Overload names the narrowing of capacity you may experience as the moment becomes difficult. Old Story names a familiar meaning or prediction the moment begins to carry. Protection Move names what you do in response.

The sequence is the proposed recurring pattern. The subject of the argument, the particular meaning attached to it, and the visible response do not have to repeat in exactly the same form. Nor does a repeated topic, behavior, or belief alone establish that the full Loop occurred. One person's Protection Move can become the other person's next Launch, but that possibility never means the partners are equally responsible for harm, power, or choices. You may be able to describe your own experience without knowing every part of your partner's.

The map can also be incomplete. You might know exactly what was said while remaining uncertain about intent. An Old Story may be mistaken, partly accurate, or supported by what happened. A pause may be a useful choice in one interaction and a necessary protective boundary in

another. Describing these possibilities carefully is more important than making every difficult conversation fit the framework.

The practical work in this book has therefore centered on recognition and choice. SEE → CATCH → CHANGE → STRENGTHEN describes a way to return to that work over time. NAME IT → SLOW IT → CHECK IT → CHOOSE IT offers questions for moments when an interruption is possible and appropriate. Protection Move → Function → Need → Next Choice offers another way to examine a response without treating its possible purpose as an excuse.

You do not need to do all of that at once. Recognition may come after an argument rather than during it. A different choice might mean answering the concern before defending your wording, checking an assumption, asking for a pause, taking responsibility for a sharp remark, or returning to an issue that remains unresolved. Sometimes the responsible choice is not to continue the conversation. No worksheet, skill, or statement of good intentions obligates another person to forgive, trust again, or remain involved.

There are situations in which shared Loop work should not lead at all. Threats, violence, coercion, stalking, sexual pressure, retaliation, restrictions on autonomy, and other serious safety concerns require attention to safety, accountability, and appropriate specialized help. A person does not have to explain a dangerous situation through a shared pattern or disclose private reflections to someone who may use them against them. Relationship education is not a substitute for assessment, clinical treatment, advocacy, or emergency support.

The evidence also sets a boundary around what this book can claim. Research has documented important processes in couple conflict, including how people participate in disagreements, how they interpret one another's actions, and how emotion and context can matter. Those findings do not independently validate the four-stage BTL organization or show that its named tools improve couple outcomes. BTL is an educational framework informed by related research, not a universal law of conflict or an independently established treatment. Its usefulness, limits, and possible harms deserve direct and independent

study. A reader's meaningful experience of an exercise should be described as experience, not converted into proof.

That uncertainty does not prevent careful exploration. It asks you to remain accurate about what you know, curious about what you do not, and willing to reconsider an account that does not fit. The aim is not to win an argument by naming a Loop or to explain your partner to themselves. It is to observe your own participation more clearly while continuing to take the issue, the other person's autonomy, and the consequences of behavior seriously.

If you want one place to begin, it is the same modest invitation that has appeared throughout the practical chapters: catch one Loop and do one thing differently. You may notice it afterward. You may see only part of it. You may decide that the real task is to address an agreement, respect a boundary, or seek support rather than change the conversation. All of those observations can matter.

The next difficult moment will have its own facts, stakes, and uncertainties. You do not need to make those facts fit a model. Begin with the issue itself and the conduct that matters. If a Loop description helps, ask what happened, what capacity you had in that moment, what meaning you gave it, and what you chose in response. The goal is not to prove a theory or manage your partner. It is to recognize what you can responsibly know, remain accountable for what you do, and make one different choice when that choice is safe and available.

REFERENCES

Adriaans, J., Bohmeier, M., & Sauer, C. (2026). Perceived fairness of division of labor and relationship satisfaction. Journal of Family Research, 38, 348–362. https://doi.org/10.20377/jfr-1377

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Committee on Health Care for Underserved Women. (2013). Reproductive and sexual coercion. Committee Opinion No. 554. Obstetrics & Gynecology, 121(2 Pt 1), 411-415. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.aog.0000426427.79586.3b

Arican-Dinc, B., & Gable, S. L. (2026). Dyadic emotion regulation. Annual Review of Psychology, 77, 365–391. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-020325-033825

Beukeboom, C. J., & Pollmann, M. (2021). Partner phubbing: Why using your phone during interactions with your partner can be detrimental for your relationship. Computers in Human Behavior, 124, 106932. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106932

Bloch, L., Haase, C. M., & Levenson, R. W. (2014). Emotion regulation predicts marital satisfaction: More than a wives' tale. Emotion, 14(1), 130–144. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034272

Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 107(1), 3–33. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.3

Bradbury, T. N., Beach, S. R. H., Fincham, F. D., & Nelson, G. M. (1996). Attributions and behavior in functional and dysfunctional marriages. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64(3), 569–576. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.64.3.569

Camanto, O. J., & Campbell, L. (2025). Trust in close relationships revisited. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 42(9), 2516–2544. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075251346105

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2026, August 19). About intimate partner violence. https://www.cdc.gov/intimate-partner-violence/about/index.html

Clark, A. N., Walters, T. L., & Lefkowitz, E. S. (2024). It's an ongoing discussion about desire: Adults' strategies for managing sexual and affectionate desire discrepancies in romantic relationships. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 50(3), 669-686. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12709

Crenshaw, A. O., Leo, K., Christensen, A., Hogan, J. N., Baucom, K. J. W., & Baucom, B. R. W. (2021). Relative importance of conflict topics for within-couple tests: The case of demand/withdraw interaction. Journal of Family Psychology, 35(3), 377–387. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000782

Dermody, S. S., Earle, E. A., Fairbairn, C. E., & Testa, M. (2025). Time-varying relational interaction dynamics in couples discussing conflict. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 42(5), 1199–1218. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075251317168

Dew, J. P., & Stewart, R. (2012). A financial issue, a relationship issue, or both? Examining the predictors of marital financial conflict. Journal of Financial Therapy, 3(1), 43–61. https://doi.org/10.4148/jft.v3i1.1605

Dobson, K., Kim, J., & Impett, E. A. (2022). Perceptual accuracy for sexual rejection in romantic relationships. Archives of Sexual Behavior 51(1), 491-503. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02126-1

Durtschi, J. A., Fincham, F. D., Cui, M., Lorenz, F. O., & Conger, R. D. (2011). Dyadic processes in early marriage: Attributions, behavior, and marital quality. Family Relations, 60(4), 421–434. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2011.00655.x

Eldridge, K. A., Sevier, M., Jones, J., Atkins, D. C., & Christensen, A. (2007). Demand-withdraw communication in severely distressed, moderately distressed, and nondistressed couples: Rigidity and polarity during relationship and personal problem discussions. Journal of Family Psychology, 21(2), 218–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.21.2.218

Feinberg, M. E. (2003). The internal structure and ecological context of coparenting: A framework for research and intervention. Parenting: Science and Practice, 3(2), 95–131. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327922par0302_01

Feinberg, M. E., Kan, M. L., & Hetherington, E. M. (2007). The longitudinal influence of coparenting conflict on parental negativity and adolescent maladjustment. Journal of Marriage and Family, 69(3), 687–702. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00400.x

Fiori, K. L., Rauer, A. J., Birditt, K. S., Brown, E., & Orbuch, T. L. (2021). You aren't as close to my family as you think: Discordant perceptions about in-laws and risk of divorce. Research in Human Development, 17(4), 258–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427609.2021.1874792

Fiori, K. L., Rauer, A. J., Birditt, K. S., Marini, C. M., Jager, J., Brown, E., & Orbuch, T. L. (2018). I love you, not your friends: Links between partners' early disapproval of friends and divorce across 16 years. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 35(9), 1230–1250. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517707061

Flood, S. M., & Genadek, K. R. (2016). Time for each other: Work and family constraints among couples. Journal of Marriage and Family, 78(1), 142–164. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12255

Frackowiak, M., Russell, P. S., Vowels, M. J., & Hilpert, P. (2025). Disentangling the good, the bad, and the neutral of co-present mobile phone use: A new perspective on partner phubbing. Mobile Media &

Communication, 13(2), 295–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/20501579241298271

Fraley, R. C., Heffernan, M. E., Vicary, A. M., & Brumbaugh, C. C. (2011). The Experiences in Close Relationships—Relationship Structures questionnaire: A method for assessing attachment orientations across relationships. Psychological Assessment, 23(3), 615–625. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022898

Fraley, R. C., Hudson, N. W., Heffernan, M. E., & Segal, N. (2015). Are adult attachment styles categorical or dimensional? A taxometric analysis of general and relationship-specific attachment orientations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109(2), 354–368. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000027

Gander, F., Uhlich, M., Traut, A. C., Saameli, M. A., Bühler, J. L., Weidmann, R., & Grob, A. (2025). The role of relationship beliefs in predicting levels and changes of relationship satisfaction. European Journal of Personality, 39(1), 105–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070241240029

Giacobbi, M., & Lalot, F. (2025). Unpacking trust repair in couples: A systematic literature review. Journal of Family Therapy, 47(1), e12483. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.12483

Gottman, J. M. (1980). Consistency of nonverbal affect and affect reciprocity in marital interaction. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48(6), 711–717. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.48.6.711

Hannon, P. A., Rusbult, C. E., Finkel, E. J., & Kamashiro, M. (2010). In the wake of betrayal: Amends, forgiveness, and the resolution of betrayal. Personal Relationships, 17(2), 253–278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01275.x

Holley, S. R., Haase, C. M., & Levenson, R. W. (2013). Age-related changes in demand-withdraw communication behaviors. Journal of Marriage and Family, 75(4), 822–836. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12051

Holley, S. R., Sturm, V. E., & Levenson, R. W. (2010). Exploring the basis for gender differences in the demand-withdraw pattern. Journal of Homosexuality, 57(5), 666–684. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918361003712145

Hopson, H. L., Fonagy, P., & Rosan, C. (2026). The effectiveness of interventions targeting interparental conflict in improving family outcomes: A systematic review. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 35, 694–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-025-03254-1

Jodouin, J.-F., Rosen, N. O., Merwin, K., & Bergeron, S. (2021). Discrepancy in dyadic sexual desire predicts sexual distress over time in a community sample of committed couples. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 50(8), 3637-3649. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-01967-0

Johnson, L., Chen, Y., Stylianou, A., & Arnold, A. (2022). Examining the impact of economic abuse on survivors of intimate partner violence: A scoping

review. BMC Public Health, 22, 1014. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13297-4

Kim, H. K., Capaldi, D. M., & Crosby, L. (2007). Generalizability of Gottman and colleagues' affective process models of couples' relationship outcomes. Journal of Marriage and Family, 69(1), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00343.x

Kluwer, E. S., Karremans, J. C., Riedijk, L., & Knee, C. R. (2020). Autonomy in relatedness: How need fulfillment interacts in close relationships. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 46(4), 603-616. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219867964

Lavner, J. A., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2014). Relationship problems over the early years of marriage: Stability or change? Journal of Family Psychology, 28(6), 979–985. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037752

Lavner, J. A., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2016). Does couples' communication predict marital satisfaction, or does marital satisfaction predict communication? Journal of Marriage and Family, 78(3), 680–694. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12301

Lee, J. E., Zarit, S. H., Rovine, M. J., Birditt, K. S., & Fingerman, K. L. (2012). Middle-aged couples' exchanges of support with aging parents: Patterns and association with marital satisfaction. Gerontology, 58(1), 88–96. https://doi.org/10.1159/000324512

Leupp, K., Kornrich, S., & Brines, J. (2021). 'Stuck' in nonstandard schedules? Married couples' nonstandard work schedules over the life course. Community, Work & Family, 24(1), 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2019.1619517

Lewis, J. T., Parra, G. R., & Cohen, R. (2015). Apologies in close relationships: A review of theory and research. Journal of Family Theory & Review, 7(1), 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12060

Lima Guerra, L. L., Setti, A. G. B., Santos, G. T., Sarmento, R. S., de Santis, L., de Carvalho, T. R., & Barham, E. J. (2026). Observational procedures for assessing coparenting: A systematic review of the literature. Family Relations. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.70313

Lorenz, F. O., Melby, J. N., Conger, R. D., & Surjadi, F. F. (2012). Linking questionnaire reports and observer ratings of young couples' hostility and support. Journal of Family Psychology, 26(3), 316–327. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028319

Malik, J., Heyman, R. E., & Smith Slep, A. M. (2020). Emotional flooding in response to negative affect in couple conflicts: Individual differences and correlates. Journal of Family Psychology, 34(2), 145–154. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000584

Mallory, A. B. (2022). Dimensions of couples' sexual communication, relationship satisfaction, and sexual satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Journal

of Family Psychology, 36(3), 358-371. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000946

McCurry, A. G., May, R. C., & Donaldson, D. I. (2024). Both partners' negative emotion drives aggression during couples' conflict. Communications Psychology, 2, Article 73. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-024-00122-4

McDaniel, B. T., Uva, S., Cornet, V., & Drouin, M. (2025). Objective phone use during time with one's partner: Associations with relationship and individual well-being. Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2025, 3547526. https://doi.org/10.1155/hbe2/3547526

McNulty, J. K. (2011). The dark side of forgiveness: The tendency to forgive predicts continued psychological and physical aggression in marriage. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37(6), 770–783. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211407077

Métellus, S., Vaillancourt-Morel, M.-P., Brassard, A., & Daspe, M.-È. (2025). Attachment anxiety and relationship satisfaction in the digital era: The contribution of social media jealousy and electronic partner surveillance. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 51(4), e70074. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.70074

Morales-Vives, F., Ferre-Rey, G., & Ferrando, P. J. (2025). Can different adult attachment profiles be distinguished when categorical and dimensional approaches are combined? Evidence based on two questionnaires. Current Psychology, 44, 14899–14913. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-025-08223-x

Murray, S. L., & Pascuzzi, G. S. (2024). Pursuing safety in social connection: A flexibly fluid perspective on risk regulation in relationships. Annual Review of Psychology, 75, 379–404. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-011123-024815

National Domestic Violence Hotline. (n.d.-a). Internet safety. https://www.thehotline.org/plan-for-safety/internet-safety/

National Domestic Violence Hotline. (n.d.-b). Should I go to couples therapy with my abusive partner? https://www.thehotline.org/resources/should-i-go-to-couples-therapy-with-my-abusive-partner/

National Network to End Domestic Violence. (n.d.-a). Financial safety planning. https://nnedv.org/content/financial-safety-planning/

National Network to End Domestic Violence. (n.d.-b). Technology safety. https://nnedv.org/content/technology-safety/

Newkirk, K., Perry-Jenkins, M., & Sayer, A. G. (2017). Division of household and childcare labor and relationship conflict among low-income new parents. Sex Roles, 76(5–6), 319–333. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0604-3

Ni, N., Ahrari, S., Zaremohzzabieh, Z., Zarean, M., & Roslan, S. (2025). A meta-analytic study of partner phubbing and its antecedents and consequences.

Frontiers in Psychology, 16, 1561159. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1561159

O'Leary, S. G., & Vidair, H. B. (2005). Marital adjustment, child-rearing disagreements, and overreactive parenting: Predicting child behavior problems. Journal of Family Psychology, 19(2), 208–216. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.19.2.208

Overall, N. C. (2020). Behavioral variability reduces the harmful longitudinal effects of partners' negative-direct behavior on relationship problems. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 119(5), 1057–1085. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000231

Overall, N. C., & McNulty, J. K. (2017). What type of communication during conflict is beneficial for intimate relationships? Current Opinion in Psychology, 13, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.03.002

Overall, N. C., Pietromonaco, P. R., & Simpson, J. A. (2022). Buffering and spillover of adult attachment insecurity in couple and family relationships. Nature Reviews Psychology, 1(2), 101–111. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-021-00011-1

Papp, L. M., Cummings, E. M., & Goeke-Morey, M. C. (2009). For richer, for poorer: Money as a topic of marital conflict in the home. Family Relations, 58(1), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00537.x

Papp, L. M., Kouros, C. D., & Cummings, E. M. (2009). Demand-withdraw patterns in marital conflict in the home. Personal Relationships, 16(2), 285–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2009.01223.x

Pawlowska, A., Loeys, T., Janssen, E., & Dewitte, M. (2024). The role of dyadic sexual desire similarity in predicting sexual behaviors in cohabitating couples. Journal of Sex Research 61(2), 261-273. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2023.2170965

Peetz, J., & Saxey, M. T. (2026). Quality over quantity? Couple financial communication and relationship satisfaction. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075261484793

Peetz, J., Meloff, Z., & Royle, C. (2023). When couples fight about money, what do they fight about? Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 40(11), 3723–3751. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075231187897

Polenick, C. A., Zarit, S. H., Birditt, K. S., Bangerter, L. R., Seidel, A. J., & Fingerman, K. L. (2017). Intergenerational support and marital satisfaction: Implications of beliefs about helping aging parents. Journal of Marriage and Family, 79(1), 131–146. https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12334

Prager, K. J., Poucher, J., Shirvani, F. K., Parsons, J. A., & Allam, Z. (2019). Withdrawal, attachment security, and recovery from conflict in couple relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 36(2), 573–598. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407517737387

Reich-Stiebert, N., Froehlich, L., & Voltmer, J.-B. (2023). Gendered mental labor: A systematic literature review on the cognitive dimension of unpaid work within the household and childcare. Sex Roles, 88(11–12), 475–494. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-023-01362-0

Rice, J., Fraher, S., Engelkamp, E., McTernan, M., Grigorian, H., & Cordova, J. (2026). Examining the effectiveness of nature metaphor patterns for cultivating intimacy, acceptance, relationship satisfaction, self-compassion, and positive communication in couples. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 52(3), e70146. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.70146. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.70146

Robles, T. F., Slatcher, R. B., Trombello, J. M., & McGinn, M. M. (2014). Marital quality and health: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin, 140(1), 140–187. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031859

Rosen, N. O., Dubé, J. P., Bosisio, M., & Bergeron, S. (2025). Do demand-withdrawal communication patterns during sexual conflict predict couples' relationship satisfaction, sexual satisfaction, and sexual distress? An observational and prospective study. The Journal of Sex Research, 62(5), 787–799. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2024.2386997

Ross, J. M., Karney, B. R., Nguyen, T. P., & Bradbury, T. N. (2019). Communication that is maladaptive for middle-class couples is adaptive for socioeconomically disadvantaged couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 116(4), 582–597. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000158

Salo, K. I., Pauw, L. S., Schubotz, R. I., & Milek, A. (2025). At the heart of couple conflict: Emotion regulation and cardiac reactivity. International Journal of Psychophysiology, 212, 112581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2025.112581

Salvatore, J. E., Kuo, S. I.-C., Steele, R. D., Simpson, J. A., & Collins, W. A. (2011). Recovering from conflict in romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. Psychological Science, 22(3), 376–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610397055

Schoebi, D., Perrez, M., & Bradbury, T. N. (2012). Expectancy effects on marital interaction: Rejection sensitivity as a critical moderator. Journal of Family Psychology, 26(5), 709–718. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029444

Schrodt, P. (2026). Interparental conflict and parent–child triangulation: A meta-analytical review of children feeling caught between parents. Human Communication Research, 52(2), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqaf018

Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Shimkowski, J. R. (2014). A meta-analytical review of the demand/withdraw pattern of interaction and its associations with individual, relational, and communicative outcomes. Communication Monographs, 81(1), 28–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637751.2013.813632

Shields, G. S., Sazma, M. A., & Yonelinas, A. P. (2016). The effects of acute stress on core executive functions: A meta-analysis and comparison with cortisol. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 68, 651–668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2016.06.038

Shrout, M. R., Leonard, M. J., Adisa, R., Orbuch, T. L., Rice Wallace, T. M., Franks, M. M., & Aron, A. (2026). Effects of spousal, friend, and family relationships on marital instability across the first 16 years of marriage. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075261436579

Simpson, J. A., & Rholes, W. S. (2017). Adult attachment, stress, and romantic relationships. Current Opinion in Psychology, 13, 19–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.04.006

Smith Slep, A. M., Heyman, R. E., Daly, K. A., Mitnick, D. M., Lorber, M. F., & Rhoades, K. A. (2026). Can measuring coercive conflict in family dyads be easier? The psychometrics of coercion measures. Journal of Family Psychology, 40(3), 424–434. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0001451

Story, L. B., & Repetti, R. (2006). Daily occupational stressors and marital behavior. Journal of Family Psychology, 20(4), 690–700. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.20.4.690

Timmons, A. C., Margolin, G., & Saxbe, D. E. (2015). Physiological linkage in couples and its implications for individual and interpersonal functioning: A literature review. Journal of Family Psychology, 29(5), 720–731. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000115

Turgeon, L., Julien, D., & Dion, É. (1998). Temporal linkages between wives' pursuit and husbands' withdrawal during marital conflict. Family Process, 37(3), 323–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.1998.00323.x

U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women. (2025, January 22). Domestic Violence [public resource page]. https://www.justice.gov/ovw/domestic-violence

Velten, J., Tavares, I. M., & Rosen, N. O. (2025). What factors are associated with sexual satisfaction, distress, and function in couples? A systematic scoping review of dyadic diary studies. The Journal of Sex Research, 62(9), 1704–1721. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2025.2486475

Venaglia, R. B., & Lemay, E. P., Jr. (2019). Accurate and biased perceptions of partner's conflict behaviors shape emotional experience. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 36(10), 3293–3312. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518818771

Williamson, H. C., Hanna, M. A., Lavner, J. A., Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2013). Discussion topic and observed behavior in couples' problem-solving conversations: Do problem severity and topic choice matter? Journal of Family Psychology, 27(2), 330–335. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031534

Williamson, H. C., Karney, B. R., & Bradbury, T. N. (2013). Financial strain and stressful events predict newlyweds' negative communication independent

of relationship satisfaction. Journal of Family Psychology, 27(1), 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031104

Williamson, H. C., Thomas, C. R., Chen, P.-H., Urganci, B., Alonso-Ferres, M., & Valor-Segura, I. (2026). Relationship attributions are not universal: Cultural variation in levels and links with satisfaction. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221261468380

Wojda-Burlij, A. K., Otto, A. K., Heyman, R. E., Xu, S., Lapshina, N., & Reblin, M. (2026). Testing the generalizability of couple communication typologies: A multisite replication and extension study. Journal of Family Psychology, 40(4), 603–613. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0001438

World Health Organization. (2014). Health care for women subjected to intimate partner violence or sexual violence: A clinical handbook. WHO/RHR/14.26. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-RHR-14.26