

After the Apology, What Changes?

Forgiveness, accountability, and the experience of becoming trustworthy again

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT · Therapist companion to **Repair After Hurt** · 2026

“I know you are sorry,” Avery says. “I still wish I had not told you.”

Sam looks toward the therapist. “Then what am I supposed to do? I cannot take it back.”

In this fictional encounter, Sam repeated something private at dinner with friends. Avery became quiet. On the drive home, Sam apologized for the embarrassment and explained that nobody had judged Avery. The explanation was meant to reassure. Avery heard something else: the person entrusted with the information was still deciding how much its disclosure should matter.

Now both are discouraged. Sam feels that remorse has led nowhere. Avery feels that an apology has become a request to stop having an experience. The therapist may feel the familiar pressure to help something land: a better acknowledgment, a softer reception, a sign that the relationship can move forward. That pressure deserves attention before it becomes our intervention.

An Apology Is a Beginning, Not a Repair follows the distance between an apology and the life that gives it substance. This therapist companion develops the emotional and relational work inside that distance. It follows the five modules of *Repair After Hurt*: locating impact and intention, remaining responsible without collapse, hearing hurt, acting on accountability, and discovering what repair does—and does not—make possible.

The injury the apology has not yet met

Sam says, “I understand that you felt embarrassed.”

“Exposed,” Avery replies. “And now I am wondering what I can tell you.”

That correction changes the task. Reassurance about the dinner guests cannot restore confidence about what Sam will disclose. Before asking whether Avery can receive the apology, we need to discover whether it addresses the breach. A person can remain unsettled because an acknowledgment has missed, because earlier promises failed, because grief has become more available, or because several of these are present. Those possibilities call for different responses.

We might ask, “What had you trusted Sam to protect?” Avery describes choosing to share something they had not wanted discussed socially. Sam had understood its sensitivity but assumed that this group was an exception. The disagreement concerns permission, privacy,

and whose judgment governs entrusted information. Naming those stakes gives remorse somewhere more precise to go.

The distinction among intention, conduct, impact, and responsibility helps both remain present. Sam may truthfully deny wanting to humiliate Avery while acknowledging the decision to disclose. Avery can describe exposure without proving a hidden wish to cause it. We can examine a remembered agreement and its context without treating either sincerity or emotional intensity as the final authority over every fact.

An accurate acknowledgment might begin, “You told me that privately. I decided our friends would understand, and I did not ask you. Afterward, I tried to reassure you about them instead of hearing what my decision changed between us.” That is more than a skillful sentence if it reflects something Sam has allowed themselves to know. Whether it does is discovered through the next response and subsequent conduct.

When a breach changes the meaning of the bond

Johnson, Makinen, and Millikin describe attachment injuries as particular failures of responsiveness or trust that become enduring reference points for a partner’s dependability. Their account distinguishes these injuries from ordinary relationship fluctuations and describes an EFT resolution process involving the injury’s meaning, acknowledgment, remorse, and new responsiveness.[1] The concept helps us ask why a specific event remains alive when the offending partner regards it as finished.

We need not call every hurt an attachment injury. The clinical question is what this event has come to mean for this person’s willingness to rely on this relationship. For Avery, privacy may concern control over an intimate part of life. It may also concern whether vulnerability will be protected. We can follow that meaning without insisting on an abandonment narrative or reconstructing a childhood cause.

The past can nevertheless enter. Someone whose confidences were used against them may find disclosure newly dangerous. Someone whose childhood mistakes brought humiliation may experience accountability as the beginning of exclusion. Their histories can help us understand the urgency of protection. Present conduct remains available for judgment: a breach is not made imaginary by its resonance with an earlier one.

Sam may fear becoming the person who cannot be trusted. Avery may fear that making the injury visible will once again require caring for the other person’s shame. The argument can become organized around those anticipations before either has spoken them. We ask what feels familiar, what is actually occurring, and what would correct our account. Developmental understanding expands the encounter when it returns us to these particular people.

The good person who cannot bear an injuring action

Some apologies falter because acknowledging an action seems to threaten the whole self. “I disclosed your confidence” becomes “I am a betrayer.” Under that pressure, explaining can feel like survival. The therapist may recognize the fear and rush to reassure: “You were trying to connect with your friends.” That may be true while arriving too early to help the person face what happened.

Schumann identifies threats to self-image, low concern for the affected person or relationship, and doubts about apology effectiveness as barriers to offering a substantial apology.[2] Her review prevents us from assuming that every refusal reflects shame. A person may be frightened, unconvinced, unwilling, misinformed, or protecting an advantage. Inquiry needs room for these differences.

When shame is present, our task is to make continued accountability more bearable. Tangney, Stuewig, and Mashek distinguish behavior-focused guilt from global shame and review their differing relationships with reparative and defensive tendencies.[3] Applied clinically, the distinction invites specificity: what did you do, what consequence can you recognize, and what remains yours to address? It does not turn an emotion into a verdict about culpability.

With Sam, we might ask, “Can we stay with the decision you made without making it the entirety of who you are?” This protects the capacity to act. It also asks Sam to bear something painful: being a caring person does not prevent one from acting carelessly. Repeated self-condemnation may feel more serious than a specific acknowledgment while giving Avery less assurance that the next confidence will be handled differently.

There may be several protective responses to understand: an explainer defending good intention, a punishing voice trying to demonstrate remorse, an appeasing response offering more than can be sustained. Parts language can help if it fits the person. We need not establish a particular inner structure to ask what each response preserves and what it costs. The immediate task remains an accountable next act, even while the feelings continue.

Listening that allows an unfamiliar truth

Avery repeats the story. Sam hears repetition as evidence that the apology has failed. The therapist could help Avery summarize more briefly. We could also ask what remains unacknowledged. Perhaps Avery has never been able to finish describing the moment Sam laughed along with the group. The event’s emotional center may be different from the one we have been discussing.

Listening becomes consequential when a correction changes our understanding. “You wanted me to stop telling the story,” Sam says. Avery replies, “At that point I wanted you to notice that I had gone quiet.” The second account does not erase the disclosure. It reveals an additional failure of contact: Avery had to sit beside Sam while an intimate experience

became social material.

Benjamin's account of mutual recognition concerns encountering another person as a distinct center of experience; her discussion of thirdness addresses the recovery of space beyond complementary positions of doing and being done to.[4] Here, that perspective helps us avoid a contest in which Sam can remain good only if Avery is excessive, or Avery can remain credible only if Sam admits complete uncaringness. Recognizing two minds leaves responsibility for the disclosure with the person who made it.

The therapist can hold the interruption: "Before we explain why you did not notice, can we understand what it was like for Avery to be beside you then?" We subsequently return to Sam's experience. Explanation has a place when it makes conduct more understandable and prevention more possible. It loses that place when every explanation requires the other person to withdraw the account of impact.

Avery need not speak perfectly to merit attention. Sam need not accept every attributed motive to demonstrate care. A useful exchange allows both people to discover something they did not already know. If our language becomes a script that each performs for approval, we may obtain the appearance of recognition while leaving the encounter unchanged.

Remorse that can be received

The important movement may be quieter than an elaborate apology. Sam says, "I was enjoying being part of the conversation. I did not stop to consider what it was like for you to sit there. I can see why telling me something now feels different." Avery looks up, then away. "Yes. That is the part."

There is a difference between knowing that one's partner is distressed and allowing the particular hurt to matter. In the attachment-injury framework, acknowledgment and emotionally engaged remorse help make a different response possible.[1] The clinical synthesis here emphasizes remorse that remains directed toward the affected person: *I understand something about what my action cost you, and I am willing to remain answerable to it.*

We cannot certify that condition by tears, eye contact, or a soft voice. Some people express remorse through few words, practical care, or a changed decision. Others have learned persuasive emotional performances. We listen to the fit between acknowledgment, the recipient's account, freedom to correct, and what follows. No one must display distress in a prescribed way for the encounter to count.

Lewicki, Polin, and Lount's scenario studies found that apologies were evaluated differently according to their components; acknowledgment of responsibility and offers of repair were among the elements examined.[5] Their findings support attention to substance. They do not establish that a complete formula restores trust after actual betrayal. A technically excellent apology can remain an effort to obtain release from discomfort.

The question for Sam is therefore more demanding than whether the words were correct. Can the acknowledgment remain true if Avery is still hurt tomorrow? Can Sam keep caring about the impact when no reassurance arrives? Remorse becomes more credible when it does not immediately turn into a claim upon its recipient.

Forgiveness as a possibility within an encounter

The longing to be forgiven is deeply human. So is the reluctance to open again where an opening was mishandled. An injured partner may want relief from vigilance while fearing that relief will make the injury disappear from the other person's concern. The person responsible may hear continuing caution as a sentence without an ending. Therapy needs room for both experiences without turning them into equivalent obligations.

Johnson and colleagues' resolution model describes a relational movement in which the injured partner can express what was missing and, when possible, risk receiving a different response.[1] This matters because a couple may understand an injury intellectually while remaining unable to encounter each other around it. We should also be clear about the model's scope: it concerns the restoration of a bond through a particular therapeutic process. It does not define every possible form of forgiveness.

Enright's account distinguishes forgiveness from condoning, forgetting, and reconciliation. It includes an internal change in how the injured person relates to the offender and allows forgiveness without a resumed relationship.[6] That distinction leaves room for work when the other person is dead, unavailable, unrepentant, or unsafe. His moral and therapeutic framework is one approach; we do not have to impose its language or destination on every client.

For this essay, forgiveness remains a personally meaningful possibility to explore. We ask what the client means by the word. They may mean releasing revenge, feeling less governed by resentment, recovering tenderness, or being willing to risk closeness again. These are related but different movements. One can occur while another remains unavailable. A therapist who assumes a single definition may mistake a client's refusal of reconciliation for resistance to healing.

Avery might say, "I do not want to keep punishing you. I also do not want to tell you everything yet." There is no necessary contradiction. Sam might wish for the old openness and still honor the present limit. The relationship now has something to learn about protecting a smaller confidence before asking for a larger one.

The experience of receiving what was missing

If Avery wants to continue, the therapist might ask, "When you hear Sam recognize that part, what happens?" Avery says, "I feel less alone. And sadder. You were sitting right there." The response contains relief and the grief that relief allows to become felt.

Fosha's account of meta-therapeutic processing invites attention to the experience of change itself, including affirmation, mastery, and mourning.[7] Its contribution here is an experiential question: what is it like to be met now, and what becomes possible or painful as that meeting registers? This is an extension to the present illustration, rather than a claim that this exchange constitutes an AEDP protocol.

We can stay with the sadness without requiring it to end in gratitude. Avery may be discovering both that Sam can understand and that the original evening cannot be returned. Sam may feel tenderness alongside the wish to hear that the relationship is safe. Helping Sam bear that wish without demanding an answer protects Avery's opportunity to receive something on their own terms.

Receiving also includes being able to say that the offered response has not reached. "You understand the dinner, but this has happened before." Then the task becomes larger. Our interest in a moving moment must not make the person responsible for confirming its significance. A new experience has clinical value when it can survive accurate description, including its limits.

Attachment and differentiation inside repair

Attachment work makes room for a need to become speakable and for a partner's response to become usable. Differentiation work helps each person remain responsible and connected when the response is incomplete, disappointing, or different from what was hoped. The Bowen Center's account of differentiation includes realistic dependence, considered self-definition, and conduct guided by reflection rather than relationship pressure.[8]

Sam may need help reaching Avery's experience without collapsing into a defective identity. Avery may need help holding the privacy requirement without turning Sam's immediate reassurance into the only possible proof that the requirement is legitimate. Both need room to be influenced. Sam's account of intention can change Avery's understanding while the boundary remains; Avery's account of impact can change Sam's conduct without requiring a false confession of malice.

Sequencing depends on what is happening now. When shame makes listening impossible, a brief intervention supporting Sam's dignity may permit a return to responsibility. When the therapist has spent most of the session protecting Sam from shame, the needed movement may be toward Avery's still-unheard account. When acknowledgment is accurate but the same disclosure recurs, another round of emotional deepening may displace the practical question of consent and prevention.

The integration is visible in an ordinary statement: "I care that I hurt you. I will ask before sharing personal information. I also want to be truthful that I did not intend to expose you." Avery can answer, "I can hear that. My confidence has still changed." Neither must abandon an honest position to remain in contact. The response that follows matters more than deciding which theoretical school owns the moment.

Two People in the Room, Neither Disappearing develops the attachment-differentiation distinction and the therapist's role in sequencing these invitations. Here, the emphasis is what that integration asks of us after an actual breach: warmth with accountability, selfhood with responsiveness, and patience with consequences that cannot be hurried away.

The action that gives remorse somewhere to live

Sam proposes telling the dinner guests that the story was private. Avery hesitates: "I do not want another conversation about it." A repair intended to correct exposure could create more of it. The affected person's response changes what counts as a fitting action.

The next step may be quieter: no further disclosure, a conversation about which information requires permission, and Sam taking responsibility for checking rather than leaving Avery to anticipate every situation. If some correction is necessary, they consider what can be said without revealing more. The proposal addresses the breach instead of merely displaying how eager Sam is to be forgiven.

Tatkin's principle of caring for oneself and one's partner simultaneously keeps mutual consideration in view.[9] We can draw on that principle without adopting every rule in his accompanying exercise. Repair may end with sadness, a refusal, or no immediate shared resolution. Mutual care includes respecting what another person cannot presently offer.

Follow-through needs to be realistic enough to observe. Sam can name the conduct, the context likely to make it difficult, and what they will do if they miss the agreement. "I will never disappoint you again" conceals the task inside an impossible promise. "I will ask before sharing information you have told me privately" leaves a specific decision available for review.

At a later fictional review, Sam has protected the information but asked Avery to approve every small social comment. Avery now feels responsible for managing Sam's anxiety. The first plan prevented one problem while adding another. They revise it: Sam will keep clearly personal information private and ask when an actual ambiguity arises. Avery is not required to preauthorize ordinary conversation. Learning includes discovering the burden a well-intended repair creates.

Trust is an expectation, not a reward

Sam may feel disappointed that responsible behavior has not restored earlier openness. That disappointment deserves a place, perhaps in individual support or within a bounded conversation. It cannot decide what Avery is now able or willing to entrust. An action does not lose its integrity because it fails to secure a desired relational outcome.

Trust concerns an expectation about reliance in a particular domain. A person may trust a partner to arrive on time while withholding financial confidence or private disclosure. We therefore ask what has become more dependable, under what conditions, and what remains

unknown. General warmth can matter without answering the uncertainty created by a specific pattern.

The distinction also prevents endless proving. Repair does not justify secret tests, unrestricted surveillance, or a permanent right to humiliation. If the conditions for resumed relationship become unworkable, that reality needs examination. The injured person's freedom to withhold trust and the other person's freedom to decide what relationship they can continue both remain relevant. Actual obligations and appropriate restitution do not disappear with that decision.

Avery might accept an apology, appreciate changed conduct, and remain less open for a time. They might ultimately choose a different relationship. Sam can recognize the loss without treating it as proof that accountability was pointless. Repair concerns what one does in response to harm; reconciliation concerns what the people involved can freely build together.

Who gets asked to carry the healing?

An apparent forgiveness problem may contain an unequal distribution of work. Avery initiates the conversation, softens every sentence, identifies the injury, proposes prevention, reminds Sam, and offers encouragement. Sam's contribution is to feel overwhelmed by the process. A warm session can leave that arrangement intact.

Knudson-Martin's account of power identifies shared relational responsibility, vulnerability, attunement, and influence as important dimensions of mutual support.[10] These questions sharpen assessment: whose pain becomes the agenda, whose distress ends discussion, and who is expected to do the organizing? Culture, gender, disability, economic dependence, and access to outside support can shape the answers.

Where intimidation, coercion, or fear of retaliation is present, joint vulnerability cannot be presumed appropriate. Accountability for threatening conduct remains with the person who used it. Confidential assessment, practical protection, and individual support may be needed. Explaining a cycle does not establish equal responsibility, and forgiveness language must not become another way to obtain access someone has declined.

These considerations also matter in less visibly dangerous situations. A client who has habitually maintained peace by minimizing injury may need help naming anger before forgiveness is a meaningful question. Another may be ready to explore compassion while retaining distance. The therapist's responsibility is to accompany the actual person, rather than recruit them into our preferred picture of a healed relationship.

The therapist's wish for a good ending

Repair work recruits our own history. A therapist who learned to soothe adults may become intensely attentive to Sam's shame and impatient with Avery's continuing hurt. A therapist who was never heard may become Avery's advocate so completely that Sam has no room for an honest account. Both may believe they are protecting the therapeutic process.

Aponte and Kissil's Person-of-the-Therapist framework asks clinicians to work purposefully with enduring personal themes rather than imagine they can leave themselves outside the encounter.[11] In this work, reflection and supervision help us notice when professional judgment becomes organized around preventing criticism, rescuing remorse, vindicating injury, or producing reconciliation.

The regulatory task is to hold enough structure and warmth for both people to think and feel without requiring a quick resolution. We can slow an exchange, interrupt contempt, protect a reasonable pause, and return to an injury we bypassed. A regulated therapeutic frame can hold sadness and anger; it need not produce two calm people by the end of the hour.

Suppose Avery says, "You keep asking whether I can let this in. It sounds like you have decided it should be enough." The therapist feels the sting of being misread. We can ask what in our manner conveyed that pressure. Perhaps we have repeated the question while failing to ask about prior disclosures. A response might be, "I moved toward receiving before understanding what still makes reliance difficult. Let us return to that."

This is also repair. We acknowledge what we can honestly recognize and change the next intervention. We do not ask the client to reassure us that we are good therapists. Nor need we make a global confession that replaces inquiry. Our willingness to be corrected gives the couple an experience of accountability that preserves a person who can continue thinking.

What cannot be given back

Even successful repair leaves some losses irreversible. The confidence was disclosed. The evening happened. An ease once taken for granted may now require a decision. Mourning allows these facts to become part of a relationship's history without requiring that the injury become a gift.

The person responsible may grieve too: the damage done, the earlier image of themselves, or a future no longer available. That sorrow can deepen responsibility if it remains theirs to carry with appropriate support. It becomes another burden when its recipient is asked to forgive in order to end it.

Avery may eventually say, "I no longer feel as alone with what happened. I am still sad that it happened." Sam can hear both sentences. There may be room for tenderness without a declaration that everything is restored. This modest accuracy can support a more livable relationship than an uplifting account neither fully believes.

Where acknowledgment never arrives, the work has another shape. A client may grieve the hoped-for response, protect themselves from renewed injury, and build a life less organized around obtaining it. Forgiveness may become meaningful, remain uncertain, or cease to be the useful question. Therapy can support agency, mourning, and responsible action without making a particular emotional destination compulsory.

Carrying the five modules into practice

Impact and Intention asks what actually needs repair. With Avery and Sam, the account changes from embarrassment to a breach of privacy and a missed signal at dinner. Keep observation, intention, reported experience, and inference distinguishable. A more accurate account guides the next response.

Guilt Without Collapse supports a responsibility a person can remain with. Help Sam acknowledge the disclosure without turning Avery into the custodian of Sam's worth. Where a client assumes false responsibility, the task may instead be preserving a legitimate limit. Neither guilt nor relief settles what happened.

Hearing Hurt Without Defending Yourself makes the speaker's correction consequential. Offer a manageable, consensual exchange or private rehearsal. Ask what became more accurate, what felt pressured, and what remains disputed. Listening does not require agreement with every interpretation or continued unwanted contact.

Accountability That Becomes Action translates the clarified impact into a feasible response. Predict what a proposed action will address and what additional burden it could create. Avery's objection to further disclosure changes Sam's original plan; later review changes an overcautious approval arrangement. The result revises the experiment.

When Repair Does—and Does Not—Restore Trust returns to the evidence and the remaining freedom. What became more reliable? What stayed difficult? Was the practice untried, welcome, unsuitable, or mixed? The review can retain a useful action, revise an agreement, preserve distance, or identify a need for more support. Private notes remain their author's; disclosure and reconciliation are not measures of lesson completion.

The pathway offers an educational structure for noticing, understanding, experimenting, and reviewing. Therapy brings further assessment, accompaniment, and judgment about what the situation requires. We should not ask a worksheet to resolve a serious attachment injury, or infer lasting relational change from a well-completed exercise.

Acknowledgment that remains answerable to life

Return to Sam's question: "What am I supposed to do? I cannot take it back." The answer begins with accepting the limit. The action cannot be undone. Its meaning can be better understood, its consequences addressed where possible, and the next confidence handled differently.

For Avery, the possibility is being able to describe what changed without becoming excessive for describing it. For Sam, it is being able to face an injuring action without disappearing into either defense or shame. For the therapist, it is tolerating an encounter whose value may become visible through ordinary follow-through long after the session ends.

Forgiveness, when it comes, belongs to that larger freedom. It may involve renewed closeness, a quieter relationship to resentment, or compassion held at a distance. Repair gives it conditions in which to become possible; it cannot make it due. What we can help cultivate is a person willing to meet the hurt accurately, own what is theirs, and remain responsible for what happens next.

References

1. Johnson, S. M., Makinen, J. A., & Millikin, J. W. (2001). Attachment injuries in couple relationships: A new perspective on impasses in couples therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 27(2), 145-155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2001.tb01152.x>. Original article.
2. Schumann, K. (2018). The psychology of offering an apology: Understanding the barriers to apologizing and how to overcome them. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(2), 74-78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417741709>
3. Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 345-372. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145>
4. Benjamin, J. (2004). Beyond doer and done to: An intersubjective view of thirdness. *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 73(1), 5-46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2167-4086.2004.tb00151.x>
5. Lewicki, R. J., Polin, B., & Lount, R. B., Jr. (2016). An exploration of the structure of effective apologies. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 9(2), 177-196. Original article.
6. Enright, R. D. (n.d.). Forgiveness therapy in practice: Approach. American Psychological Association. Public description of the approach accompanying the demonstration video; the video itself was not viewed.
7. Fosha, D. (2000). Meta-therapeutic processes and the affects of transformation: Affirmation and the healing affects. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 10, 71-97. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009422511959>. Author manuscript.
8. The Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). Differentiation of self. Institutional explanation of Bowen's theory.
9. Tatkin, S. (2018, June 17). Secure-functioning essentials: Taking care of yourself and your partner at the same time. PACT Institute. Selected simultaneous-care principle; the accompanying exercise's requirements are not adopted here.
10. Knudson-Martin, C. (2013). Why power matters: Creating a foundation of mutual support in couple relationships. *Family Process*, 52(1), 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12011>
11. Aponte, H. J., & Kissil, K. (2014). "If I can grapple with this I can truly be of use in the therapy room": Using the therapist's own emotional struggles to facilitate effective therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 40(2), 152-164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12011>

The clinical illustrations are fictional and develop the educational situations in the client article and modules. This essay offers an integrative clinical argument, not a tested protocol. Research, clinical theory, and the author's synthesis have different evidentiary roles. Selected original passages, official explanations, and abstracts were consulted; full-book reading is not claimed. Findings from informing work do not establish outcomes for BKL.