

A Fair Relationship With Room for Both of Us

The old expectations beneath power, fairness, and shared responsibility

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT

You ask your partner to take care of something, and the conversation becomes much larger than the task. They hear criticism where you meant a request. You hear indifference where they meant a limit. Soon you are defending your character, your contribution, or your right to have a need. The practical question is still waiting, but both of you feel alone.

Sometimes an unequal arrangement is being named. Sometimes an ordinary difference touches something older: the expectation that needing will lead to disappointment, that saying no will cost love, or that accepting influence means losing yourself. Often the present difficulty and the older expectation are both involved.

I want to help you become curious about those expectations without losing sight of what is actually happening. Understanding your history should give you more room to respond. It should also help you see whether the relationship has room for your needs, your partner's needs, and the responsibilities you share. We are looking for an arrangement in which neither person has to disappear for the other to feel secure.

What makes a relationship fair

Stan Tatkin's idea of secure functioning offers a useful starting point: partners make a shared commitment to mutuality, justice, fairness, collaboration, and sensitivity [1]. Both people matter. Both can influence important decisions. Care is expressed through dependable action, including when the relationship is under strain.

Equal standing does not mean that every contribution must be identical. Someone may be ill, working longer hours, or caring for a parent. A fair agreement can take different capacities into account. But the person carrying more needs to remain visible, supported, and able to ask for change. Earning more does not make one person more entitled to decide. Needing more help does not make someone less worthy of respect.

Fairness includes the freedom to disagree and the responsibility to take the disagreement seriously. You may not get the outcome you prefer. Your concern should still influence the conversation. A relationship in which one person routinely yields because the consequences of disagreement are too costly needs more than reassuring words.

Nor does fairness mean keeping score until affection becomes another debt. It means attending to what each person carries and what the arrangement costs them. Who gets rest? Who remembers what needs

doing? Who can ask for help? What happens after somebody says they are exhausted? These ordinary questions bring a shared commitment into view.

The rules we learned before we could name them

Children learn more than what adults explicitly teach. They also learn what seems to keep connection available. You may have discovered that being helpful brought warmth, that disagreement brought distance, or that needing comfort made somebody angry. Those experiences can contribute to expectations about what relationships require.

An unconscious expectation is an assumption that operates before you have fully considered it. You may agree to something before noticing your reluctance. You may prepare a defense before your partner has finished speaking. The response can feel like common sense because the underlying rule has gone unquestioned for so long.

Andersen and Chen's work on the relational self offers a way to understand how expectations linked with significant people can become active in later relationships [2]. A present person may be experienced partly through a familiar pattern. This does not mean your partner is secretly your parent, or that every strong reaction comes from childhood. It means the meaning of an encounter can include more than the encounter itself.

Winnicott's writing helps us notice how adapting to others can narrow the room for spontaneous expression [3]. You may be good at meeting expectations and less familiar with knowing what you want. The adaptation may once have protected belonging. The question now is whether it still serves you, and what it asks of the person beside you.

There is no need to force a childhood explanation. Start with a recurring response you can observe. Notice what it seems to predict and what it makes difficult. History becomes useful when it clarifies a possibility, rather than supplying a verdict about who you are.

You might remember being praised for never causing trouble, or watching a parent become silent when someone disagreed. You might also have learned that a promise was usually kept and that people could disagree without losing affection. The inquiry includes those resources. It asks what you came to expect, how you learned to respond, and whether this relationship offers something different. Remembering a pattern can open a question without proving that it explains every present difficulty.

When being needed becomes the way to belong

You may be the person who sees what needs doing and moves toward it. You arrange the appointment, remember the birthday, notice the tension, and make sure everybody is comfortable. This may express love, skill, and a real commitment. It can also become difficult to stop, especially when being useful has become closely tied to feeling valued.

You might feel guilty resting while somebody else is working. You might offer before they ask, then feel hurt when your effort goes unnoticed. Asking directly for care may feel more exposing than giving it. Resentment can arrive after a long series of agreements that sounded voluntary but left little room for your own preference.

In *Coming Home to Yourself*, I explore the longing to belong without continually earning a place. Here that longing asks a practical question: can your contribution remain meaningful when you also need rest, support, or a different arrangement?

Notice what you fear would happen if you did less. Would something important be neglected? Would somebody become angry? Would you feel less lovable? These are different concerns, and more than one may be true. A child still needs care. A partner may really be unreliable. An old fear may also make it difficult to discover whether help is now available.

The work includes asking clearly and allowing a response to become visible. If the other person follows through, you may have room to practice receiving. If they repeatedly do not, the arrangement needs attention. You should not be asked to solve a current lack of participation by becoming less sensitive to it.

When responsibility feels like losing your freedom

For another person, safety may have come through needing little and remaining hard to influence. Perhaps closeness once meant intrusion, demands, or responsibility for an adult's feelings. Keeping your own space may have been a sensible response. In a later relationship, even a reasonable request can carry the feeling that someone is taking over.

You may defend your freedom before asking what is being requested. You may hear a partner's disappointment as an order to change your feelings. You may withdraw to recover yourself while they experience your absence as another task they must manage. Protecting space is understandable; its effect on the shared life still matters.

The question is whether a particular responsibility threatens your agency or asks you to use it. Choosing to care for a child, honor an agreement, or share household work can express your values. A commitment has real demands even when it is freely chosen. Freedom also includes having a say in how those demands are met.

In *When Someone Else's Pain Becomes Your Assignment*, I distinguish care from taking complete responsibility for another person's inner life. You can take their feeling seriously without being required to make it disappear. You can also remain answerable for behavior that contributed to it.

Try making the request specific before deciding what it means. Is your partner asking you to abandon a preference, agree with their interpretation, complete work you already accepted, or help renegotiate an unfair burden? The answers may call for a limit, an apology, a practical change, or a conversation about capacity. They need not all produce the same response.

When feeling controlled and being controlled are different

The feeling of powerlessness deserves attention. It does not, on its own, tell us how power is being used. We need to look at present conduct: who controls money and information, whose decisions prevail, whether agreements apply to both people, and what happens when someone says no.

Consider this **fictional example**. A partner asks that large purchases from shared savings be discussed first. The other feels watched and constrained. Looking more closely, both can access the account, the agreement applies equally, and each has personal spending money. The request may touch an older experience of having every choice supervised. Recognizing that possibility creates room to explain the fear and negotiate the terms. It does not decide in advance that this particular agreement is appropriate.

Now imagine one partner concealing accounts, spending freely while restricting the other, and threatening consequences for questions. The imbalance is present in the arrangement. Being told that your reaction comes from childhood does not give you access or make disagreement safe.

History can heighten a sense of threat. It can also make mistreatment difficult to recognize because it feels familiar. A person used to holding authority may feel deprived when decisions become shared. Another may call themselves demanding for asking to participate. We need curiosity about both the feeling and the situation.

Be careful with explanations of someone else's history. Telling a partner that their concern is simply their trauma can close the very inquiry you need. Ask what they are experiencing, describe what you observe, and allow the facts to complicate your first account. Both people's interpretations can be incomplete without their feelings becoming unworthy of care.

What happens when our protections meet

An optional parts perspective can help you notice competing protective concerns [4]. A part of you may work hard to be indispensable. Another may be furious about how much you carry. A part of your partner may dread failing you; another may insist that your expectations are impossible. These are ways of understanding responses, rather than separate people whose actions are beyond responsibility.

The protections can intensify one another. The more you fear being left alone with the work, the more closely you monitor it. The more your partner feels monitored, the more they retreat or resist. Their retreat confirms your fear; your increased urgency confirms theirs. Each can feel that the other started the problem.

Understanding the cycle can make the encounter less personal. It must also leave the original responsibility visible. If one person has repeatedly neglected agreed work, describing both people's defenses does not make their contributions to the problem equal. If the other has begun using contempt, understanding their exhaustion does not justify humiliation.

A useful question is what each protection is trying to prevent. Being forgotten? Being found inadequate? Having no room to choose? Becoming dependent on someone who may disappoint you? Ask about your own response first. Let your partner describe theirs rather than assigning a motive to them.

Then ask what the response costs. Your care may become supervision. Your need for space may become disappearance. Your protest may become an attack. A response can have an understandable purpose and still need to change. The aim is to find a way of protecting something important that leaves more room for the person beside you.

Differentiation gives us room to choose

Bowen's concept of differentiation concerns developing a clearer position while remaining connected and less governed by pressure to please, dominate, or oppose [5]. For this pathway, I use it to ask whether you can recognize your experience, consider the facts, receive another perspective, and choose a response that fits your values and responsibilities.

You might say that a request feels overwhelming while also acknowledging that you agreed to carry the task. You might recognize your partner's exhaustion without agreeing that every accusation is accurate. You might reconsider a rule you have defended after discovering what it costs them. Staying yourself includes the capacity to learn.

Differentiation is not measured by how calmly you speak or how confidently you refuse. An emotional person may be accurately naming an injustice. A quiet person may be avoiding responsibility. Taking distance can help you think, but distance alone does not resolve the issue. What matters is how you return and what you are prepared to address.

Notice the difference between wanting your partner to understand and needing them to agree before you can hold your position. Their recognition matters. Yet you can continue examining what you believe without surrendering it or forcing them to confirm it. The same room needs to be available to them.

This is also where boundaries and shared responsibility meet. You can decline a demand that exceeds your capacity and help find another way to meet a real need. You can ask for time to settle without leaving an agreement indefinitely unanswered. Clear limits become more trustworthy when they include an honest account of what you will do.

Whose work and whose world are we noticing

Some responsibility is easy to see; some lives in remembering, anticipating, and checking. Allison Daminger's study of household cognitive labor distinguishes these forms of work [6]. If one person needs to plan, delegate, remind, and monitor, the other's completion of a task may help without sharing the whole burden.

The person accustomed to managing may also need to allow a different competent approach. But that possibility should be examined alongside reliability. A preference about folding towels is different from a

medical requirement. Releasing supervision becomes more possible when agreements are clear and follow-through is dependable.

We also inherit expectations about whose work counts. Monica McGoldrick's cultural and family lens asks us to look beyond an individual reaction [7]. Your family may have connected care with sacrifice, provision with authority, or respect with not questioning elders. You may value those traditions and still need a different arrangement now.

Gender, culture, faith, economic circumstances, and generation can shape what feels obvious. They cannot tell us what a particular person believes. A man may feel valued only for earning. A woman may feel that unpaid care disappears from view. Partners of any gender can struggle with authority, dependence, and recognition.

Feminist family therapy reminds us that a peaceful interaction can conceal unequal choices [8]. We need to ask who is expected to adapt, who has access to resources, and whose refusal carries consequences. We can also ask what external conditions make things hard for both people. Sometimes the problem includes inadequate income, care, or time, rather than a lack of goodwill.

Understanding needs to become something we can feel

Sue Johnson's attachment-oriented work asks whether partners are emotionally available and responsive [9]. Beneath a practical complaint may be a wish to know that somebody will come alongside you. Being heard can make a difficult agreement feel less lonely.

But understanding alone can leave the same person doing the work. A tender conversation may matter deeply and still need a practical result. Conversely, somebody may complete a task with resentment or contempt, making the recipient feel that having a need is a burden. Care needs both a human response and a workable arrangement.

Receiving help can bring unexpected feelings. You may feel relief, then an urge to check everything. You may feel exposed because relying on someone gives their actions more importance. You may even feel less certain of your place when being indispensable is no longer necessary. These responses can be met gradually without making them reasons to restore an exhausting arrangement.

Fosha and Thoma's clinical writing invites reflection on a helpful experience rather than passing over it [10]. In this educational setting, you might notice what changed when support actually arrived. Was there more room to breathe? Did you feel less alone? Was something still missing? No particular feeling has to occur for a completed responsibility to count.

Repeated conduct matters. Trust may need time and evidence. If the agreement is not kept, the next step is to address what happened, rather than ask the disappointed person to feel grateful for the intention. In *Meet Me Before You Move Me*, I explore recognition that makes room for understanding and for a response that can actually help.

There may also be grief. Receiving care now can bring you closer to what was missing earlier. Sharing responsibility may reveal how tired you have been. A partner's willingness to listen may make the years of not being heard more apparent. Relief and sadness can arrive together. You can give those feelings company while continuing to evaluate the agreement. A moving moment does not require you to declare the relationship healed or the past resolved.

Your partner may be learning too. Someone who has relied on being the provider may feel uncertain about how to receive care. Someone accustomed to being managed may discover that taking full responsibility includes mistakes, repair, and asking for information. The transition can be awkward without being wrong. Both people need enough patience for learning and enough clarity that patience does not become indefinite permission to leave the same burden with the other person.

One small agreement we can examine

Begin with an ordinary situation where disagreement is safe. If questions bring threats, retaliation, monitoring, or fear of leaving, seek confidential individual support before attempting a joint exercise. You can also explore this through private reflection or a fictional situation.

Choose one recurring responsibility. Describe what it requires from noticing the need through completion. Include remembering, time, resources, decisions, and what happens if it is neglected. Ask each person to describe their experience. Resist turning the first difference into a debate about whose character is better.

Then notice the meaning you attach to the situation. Perhaps you predict that asking will make you troublesome, that accepting help will lead to disappointment, or that sharing a decision will erase your freedom. Treat that prediction as something to examine. What current conduct supports it? What complicates it? What remains unknown?

Consider a modest change for a limited period. Clarify who will carry the responsibility, what requirements matter, and what choices remain open. Include available support and a time to review. The agreement should not depend on someone silently exceeding their capacity or continuing to supervise every step.

Fictional example: One partner has organized every appointment for an aging relative. The other agrees to arrange the next visit, including contacting the clinic and transport. They clarify a medical requirement and the review date. The first person notices relief and an urge to check. The second discovers work they had underestimated. The appointment happens, but coordination with other relatives still rests with the first person. The result is helpful and incomplete.

At the review, look at what actually changed. Did work move? Could each person influence the agreement? Did a fear become less convincing, or did the experience support it? Was anything neglected? What would make the next arrangement more accurate? You can learn from an imperfect attempt without declaring it a success or a failure in love.

A shared life with room to remain yourself

You do not need to uncover every childhood connection before changing a present arrangement. You can begin by noticing where you comply before choosing, defend before understanding, or keep carrying something you have not agreed to carry. You can also notice where your partner's experience has been harder for you to recognize.

A fair relationship makes room for feeling and correction, care and limits, dependence and a distinct self. It allows old protections to become understandable while present responsibilities become clearer. Its promise becomes believable through the ordinary things both people are willing to hear, carry, change, and keep doing.

You may begin with a conversation that is quieter than the familiar argument, or an agreement that is more specific than the familiar promise. The aim is to discover what makes care reliable and choice more real for both people. Some arrangements can be revised together. Others reveal a difference that remains difficult or a refusal to participate. Seeing that clearly is also part of learning. You do not have to make every discovery reassuring for it to matter.

Sources and further reading

These sources inform the inquiry; the examples are fictional and the reflection is my educational synthesis.

- [1] Tatkin, S. Interview with Ruth Wetherford. *Stan Tatkin on Psychobiological Couples Therapy*. Secure functioning, mutuality, and fair agreements. A clinical framework for making a relationship protective of both people; the everyday questions in this article are my application of those principles. Interview.
- [2] Andersen, S. M., & Chen, S. (2002). The relational self: An interpersonal social-cognitive theory. *Psychological Review*, 109, 619-645. Explains a framework for significant-other representations and transference. It offers a way to consider familiar expectations without establishing the origin of a particular person's reaction. Abstract.
- [3] Winnicott, D. W. (1960; published 1965). *Ego Distortion in Terms of True and False Self*. Adaptation and spontaneous expression. A psychoanalytic lens on the room available for oneself within relationships; used here as a question about accommodation rather than a label for the reader. Record and abstract.
- [4] IFS Institute. *The Internal Family Systems Model Outline*. Optional language for protective responses. Helps distinguish competing concerns within an experience; the article does not require using parts terminology or treating a protective purpose as an excuse for harmful conduct. Official outline.
- [5] The Bowen Center. *Differentiation of Self*. Connected self-definition and thoughtful response. A family systems framework for holding a position while recognizing dependence and remaining open to influence; the practical examples here are educational applications. Official account.
- [6] Daminger, A. (2019). The cognitive dimension of household labor. *American Sociological Review*, 84, 609-633. Qualitative study of 35 couples. Distinguishes anticipating needs, identifying options, deciding,

and monitoring. Its categories help examine work that a list of completed chores can miss; inspect your own arrangement. Abstract.

[7] Amorin-Woods, D. (2024). Genograms, culture, love and sisterhood: A conversation with Monica McGoldrick. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*. An interview that places family experience within cultural and gender contexts. It supports asking about a person's background rather than assigning expectations from their identity. Publisher article.

[8] Goldner, V. (1985). Feminism and family therapy. *Family Process*, 24, 31-47. Context and power in family relationships. A feminist critique that makes historical divisions of work and authority relevant to understanding a couple; describing mutual influence alone does not settle responsibility or equality. Abstract.

[9] Johnson, S. *Science with Sue*, Episodes 1 and 2. Official descriptions of emotional responsiveness in relationships. These summaries introduce her clinical focus on emotional accessibility and connection. The article keeps the need for responsive company alongside the need for practical participation. Overview.

[10] Fosha, D., & Thoma, N. (2020). Metatherapeutic processing supports the emergence of flourishing in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 57, 323-339. Clinical primer and case illustrations. Invites attention to the experience of helpful change. The reflection in this companion is an educational adaptation, rather than a psychotherapy protocol or evidence of BKL outcomes. Abstract.