

# Two People in the Room, Neither Disappearing

Understanding the couple cycle while preserving connection, selfhood, and responsibility

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT  
2026

“By the time you told me,” Casey says, “I had already worked out how to do the evening without you.”

Rowan looks down. “I couldn’t leave work. I don’t know how many ways I can explain that.”

“I’m not asking you to explain your job.”

There is a pause. Casey has been speaking about an evening plan that changed with little notice. Rowan has been explaining why the change was necessary. Each has heard the words. Neither seems to have reached what the other most wants understood.

In this fictional encounter, the therapist notices an impulse to help Casey make a clearer request. Another impulse follows: perhaps Rowan needs help hearing the hurt beneath the complaint. Both may become useful directions. For a moment, however, there is something to learn from the difficulty itself. What has Casey been trying to bring into the conversation? What does Rowan hear being asked of them? What happens between the first explanation and the point at which both begin to feel there is no room for their experience?

Casey says, “I wanted you to notice what it meant for me.” Rowan replies, “I hear that I’ve let you down again.” The sentences almost meet. Casey wants the burden recognized; Rowan is already responding to a verdict about the person who caused it. The more Casey tries to make the impact visible, the more Rowan feels required to establish that they care. An explanation becomes a defense. A request for recognition becomes harder to hear.

A couple can learn to name this sequence and still feel alone within it. Our work includes helping the map become an encounter in which something different can happen: a concern heard more accurately, a response that can be corrected, a limit respected, or a responsibility finally addressed. Understanding matters because of the possibilities it opens in the life these people share.

My client article *Meet Me Before You Move Me* explores the wish for recognition and the difficulty of offering it without losing oneself. This companion turns toward the therapist’s participation. How do we stay close to both people while distinguishing an old expectation

from a present injury, a need for contact from pressure, and a truthful acknowledgment from surrender?

## **What each person fears the exchange will mean**

Beneath the argument, two painful convictions may be approaching each other. Casey says, “My feelings are always too much. There is never room for what I need.” Rowan says, “Whatever I do, it is never enough. I cannot make you happy.” Each experiences the relationship as a place where something essential about the self becomes unacceptable. One fears that needing will cost connection; the other fears that connection requires capacities they cannot supply.

One person may have learned to intensify a signal because comfort was uncertain; another may have learned to minimize need because turning toward someone brought criticism or little help. These possibilities can explain why a delayed response feels urgent or another person’s disappointment feels impossible to bear. They must be explored with the person whose history is involved. They are neither a required origin story nor evidence that a current complaint is mistaken.

These are possible developmental pathways, explored with the people who lived them. A child who was difficult to soothe was never inherently “too much”; temperament, caregiver capacity, circumstances, and the fit between them all matter. Nor does apparent childhood self-sufficiency establish secure regulation. We ask what happened when comfort was needed, how the child adapted, and what support was available. We cannot reconstruct an attachment history from an adult argument.

Johnson’s formulation places protective emotional strategies within the attachment bond and directs therapeutic attention toward new experiences of accessibility and response.<sup>[1]</sup> Her contribution helps us ask what the protest or retreat is protecting. In the present clinical formulation, the pursuit may contain “Please let my need have somewhere to land,” while the retreat may contain “Please do not make my inadequacy the whole of who I am.” Those meanings must be discovered with each partner.

The same inquiry needs to include what the partners received: dependable care, humor, family solidarity, the pleasure of being useful, or a model of returning after disagreement. Financial pressure, disability, culture, racism, gendered expectations, and caregiving also shape the present arrangement. A couple’s inheritance contains resources as well as wounds. Asking only about injury can make their competence and actual constraints less visible.

## **Let the present qualify the history**

Earlier relationships can supply a familiar cast before the present exchange has unfolded. Casey may already be addressing someone who will not stay; Rowan may already be answering someone for whom nothing will be enough. We explore those expectations as possible transference. We also examine projection: has either partner attributed an intention or feeling without enough attention to its source or to the other person's account? These hypotheses need testing against today's conduct.

The therapeutic question has two directions: "What feels painfully familiar here?" and "What is your partner actually doing now?" Casey's old fear may be active while today's division of labor is unfair. Rowan's old shame may be active while the complaint is expressed contemptuously. Understanding a defense invites compassion and responsibility together. It does not require a partner to absorb harmful conduct in order to prove that the underlying need is welcome.

"Does this feeling have a history for you?" leaves room for discovery. "This is your old wound" closes it prematurely. The therapist's authority makes this distinction consequential: a client may agree because an interpretation fits, or because disagreement already feels unsafe. Their correction belongs within the formulation.

An expectation becomes more useful when it can be checked against present conduct. With this couple, we can begin by asking what the evening plan actually was, what changed, and what each understood about notice and responsibility. If Casey says the problem is the work repeatedly left behind, that answer belongs in the formulation before we ask about the fear of being left. If Rowan reports fatigue rather than fear of intimacy, we retain that account too.

## **Before another person can become hearable**

As Casey describes the evening, Rowan's attention narrows around an urgent response: I did not mean to do that. The explanation is ready before the impact has become clear. Casey notices the shorter reply and feels an impulse to explain more forcefully. There is a moment inside each person before the next sentence reaches the other.

Damasio's somatic-marker hypothesis gives bodily signals a role in considering what may happen next.<sup>[2]</sup> For this couple, we can ask what outcome suddenly feels inevitable when the chest tightens or the answer becomes urgent. That question brings anticipation into the conversation. The sensation cannot tell us whether the feared condemnation is actually occurring.

We can ask Rowan, "What happened just before you started explaining?" Perhaps there is heat, blankness, or the thought that nothing will ever be enough. Some clients report little bodily information. We work with what is available, without requiring inward focus. Casey

can be asked the same question about the moment a short reply became evidence that the concern did not matter.

Schore's synthesis of implicit affective communication directs attention to timing, expression, voice, and the regulation occurring within a relationship.<sup>[3]</sup> The therapist's manner becomes part of the conditions for listening. A question offered with impatience can make acknowledgment feel more dangerous. A steady interruption can protect someone from further pressure. We check its effect rather than infer a brain state from a quiet face.

Siegel's IPNB account places integration in the linkage of differentiated elements, including empathic connection between distinct people.<sup>[4]</sup> As a clinical organizing idea, this asks whether our intervention supports both contact and access to self. A calmer room may contain more capacity. It may also contain a person who has stopped trying to be heard.

An apparent single position can contain several competing responses. Someone may want closeness and resent needing it, want quiet and fear becoming unavailable, or feel love and anger at the same time. Optional parts language can make that plurality easier to notice. We preserve distinctions among IFS Self, Real's wise adult, and other state models; they are not interchangeable names for a single measured condition.

Terry Real distinguishes familiar adaptive responses from a cultivated adult capacity to participate in repair. He also emphasizes the interdependence of the relationship people are helping to create.<sup>[5]</sup> This brings conduct into the foreground without making protective responses shameful.

## **A pause that leaves a way back**

Tatkin's PACT perspective adds close attention to how partners manage arousal in each other's presence. In his terminology, auto-regulation turns inward without requiring another person; self-regulation can support continued social engagement; interactive regulation involves attending and responding to each other.<sup>[6]</sup> These distinctions help us examine the function of withdrawal. A person may be finding enough steadiness to return, or becoming progressively unavailable. Solitude itself does not establish avoidance.

Tatkin also emphasizes deliberate agreements and practice rather than relying on insight during escalating conflict.<sup>[7]</sup> Applied here, Rowan might signal overload and propose a feasible check-in; Casey might agree not to continue messaging during that interval. The proposal needs to account for work and care still waiting. A clear pause is an experiment in preserving contact and choice, not a demand to return automatically or to stop needing a response.

A pause requires clinical discrimination. It can preserve attention, become avoidance, or provide necessary protection. No one needs permission to leave danger. In an ordinary difficult exchange, a credible return and attention to responsibilities help make distance

more understandable. There is no universal interval that can determine readiness for this couple.

Before trying it, the couple names what they expect. Rowan hopes a pause will make it possible to listen without defending every sentence. Casey hopes knowing when they will check readiness will reduce the need to keep reaching. Either may decline joint practice, choose a different arrangement, or rehearse privately. They also agree what would tell them to stop or shorten the trial, and what support or alternative would then be available. The review will ask whether the request was understandable, whether the check-in occurred, and whether the practical concern remained available. A lower level of emotion is only one possible result.

## **Two accounts and the sequence between them**

Now the map can become more specific. Rowan changes the plan; Casey asks what happened and what will be done about the arrangements; Rowan explains the work demand; Casey repeats the concern more sharply; Rowan gives shorter replies. Casey reports feeling taken for granted. Rowan reports pressure and fatigue, and wonders whether any answer will count. Those are two contributed accounts. “You wanted to punish me” or “You were trying to escape intimacy” would be additional interpretations requiring examination.

The cycle becomes self-confirming. Casey experiences distance, reaches more urgently, and becomes sharper when contact does not arrive. Rowan hears criticism, explains or retreats, and becomes less available. That retreat makes Casey’s loneliness more compelling; Casey’s increased pursuit makes Rowan’s inadequacy and fear of engulfment more compelling. Each encounters the other’s defense at the moment they most need access to the person behind it. Each protection can become evidence for the other’s old conviction.

Anxious and avoidant attachment strategies offer a vocabulary for this pattern. They remain hypotheses about how connection is managed, rather than identities assigned to the partners. Positions can reverse across topics and relationships. The more expressive person can also fear being known; the quieter person may be intensely activated. A cycle map becomes useful when both recognize their experience in it and can correct what it misses.

The therapist can slow one link rather than explain the whole relationship. What did Rowan hear in Casey’s second question? What did Casey infer from Rowan’s shorter answer? What did each actually do? The partners may agree about the order and disagree about tone or intention. We preserve that difference. A map with disputed or missing links can be more useful than a complete diagram neither person was free to question.

## Keep responsibility on the map

Knudson-Martin's account of power emphasizes shared relational responsibility, vulnerability, attunement, and influence.<sup>[8]</sup> It challenges the assumption that two people enter therapy with equal freedom to speak or decline. We ask whose needs change the arrangement and who remains responsible for maintaining its emotional atmosphere.

A circular account can describe reciprocal influence while responsibility for a particular action remains unequal. Rowan's changed plan and Casey's repeated messages are each open to examination. One does not cause or excuse the other. Threats, financial restrictions, sexual pressure, and intimidation require assessment as conduct; mapping a cycle cannot make them a shared misunderstanding. Where joint exploration carries risk, confidential assessment and protection take precedence.

Overall and McNulty's review of conflict communication emphasizes that helpfulness depends on context, including the seriousness and changeability of the problem.<sup>[9]</sup> This supports a demanding clinical question: does the exchange address what needs to change? Emotional responsiveness can support that work; it cannot substitute for it.

For this couple, a useful change may be Rowan taking responsibility for the arrangements before Casey becomes more urgent. It may also be Casey making a specific request without repeated personal accusations. Each action can be examined on its own merits. We do not make Rowan's follow-through conditional on Casey's ideal wording, or treat Casey's hurt as permission to intimidate. If the burden is unequal, a balanced-looking diagram must not conceal it.

## When the therapist joins the sequence

The couple's attachment dance does not stop at our chair. Casey's insistence may awaken the part of us that once had to become louder to be heard. We may then press Rowan to engage, explain Casey's hurt with increasing intensity, and experience Rowan's retreat as obstruction. The therapist can become a second pursuer. Rowan now faces two people asking for more and may feel even less able to provide it.

A different history can organize the opposite allegiance. If we survived by containing need and remaining competent, Casey's urgency may feel intrusive. We may praise Rowan's restraint, ask Casey to regulate before we have understood the loneliness, and quietly reproduce the conviction that their emotions take up too much room. Our intervention may sound balanced while one partner again has to become smaller to remain acceptable.

These are countertransference possibilities, including familiar defenses that operate before we have named them. Some therapists will recognize both positions. Others become compulsive peacemakers, seeking a reassuring ending because unresolved tension awakens

their own helplessness. The danger is that our relief becomes the session's organizing goal. The couple may learn to settle us while the underlying encounter remains untouched.

Aponte and Kissil's Person-of-the-Therapist framework asks clinicians to know and work purposefully with enduring personal themes.<sup>[10]</sup> That task is especially relevant when a partner's shame or longing touches our own. Our reactions become material for reflection and supervision rather than instructions about whom to rescue, confront, or believe. We can be affected without allowing the old adaptation to determine our next move.

Before pressing for an enactment, we can ask: whose distress am I finding hardest to accompany? Am I asking Casey to soften because it will help them be heard, or because I need the room to become easier? Am I pressing Rowan for vulnerability when a concrete responsibility has not been addressed? Have I made agreement with my map the price of being understood? Personal therapy, reflective supervision, and experiential training can help us recognize these pulls without making the couple responsible for settling them.

Suppose Casey says, "You keep asking me to soften. You have not asked whether Rowan has followed through." The therapist feels criticized and wants to explain. Pausing with that reaction allows a different response: "I moved ahead of the follow-through. Let's return to what happened." Or Rowan says, "You and Casey have already decided I do not care." We can examine whether our manner has made that fear more plausible. Acknowledging participation does not require accepting every attribution as accurate.

Professional responsibility remains asymmetrical. The couple must not become caretakers of our vulnerability. We bring our activation to appropriate reflection and supervision, repair our contribution in the room, and revise interventions that have narrowed either person's place in the work. Holding both attachment realities also leaves us responsible for naming unequal burdens and harmful conduct. Compassion for both people does not require neutrality about what either does.

## **What the apology has not yet reached**

Later in the conversation, Rowan says, "I apologized. I told Casey I understood. I don't know what else I can say." Casey replies, "It sounds like something to say so we can be finished." Their familiar sequence is beginning again: Rowan seeks acknowledgment of an effort; Casey seeks acknowledgment of the burden; each encounters the other's request as a reason their own experience cannot enter.

"You felt abandoned," Rowan offers.

"Taken for granted," Casey replies. "I knew you were coming home. I didn't know whether what I had to do counted."

That correction changes the clinical task. A familiar attachment interpretation had come close enough to sound plausible while missing the experience Casey wanted acknowledged.

If we immediately search for abandonment fear beneath the correction, we may ask Casey to leave the present concern in order to enter our preferred formulation.

Sue Johnson's attachment-based account helps us hear questions of availability, significance, and responsiveness within a couple's distress. It directs attention to the vulnerable concerns that can become obscured by protective exchanges.<sup>[11]</sup> We still need to discover which concern is present. The question of whether someone will return is different from the question of whether they recognize the work they leave behind.

We might ask Rowan, "What do you understand differently after hearing that?" The answer matters more than a polished repetition. "I was apologizing for a feeling. You were telling me I made a decision as though the rest would be handled." Now the acknowledgment concerns conduct and its meaning. Casey can say whether this comes closer.

The therapist has helped the encounter become more accurate. Whether it becomes more trustworthy depends partly on what Rowan does next.

### **Recognition without a confession of identity**

Jessica Benjamin's account of mutual recognition describes an encounter between distinct centers of experience. Her work on thirdness examines how a relationship can become caught in complementary positions, with one person experienced chiefly as acting and the other as acted upon.<sup>[12]</sup>

Applied here, acknowledgment becomes constrained when one partner must produce it and the other must certify it. Rowan performs the listener; Casey judges whether the performance reaches far enough. The positions may reverse later. This is an interpretation of the exchange to test, not a finding that Casey's continuing hurt is excessive.

Recognition is therefore more than a sentence beginning "I understand." Can the listener describe what mattered specifically? Can they receive a correction without turning immediately toward self-defense? Can the speaker acknowledge an accurate part while retaining what remains unmet? Can a practical consequence enter the conversation?

These are clinical questions, rather than a checklist that certifies attunement. The person receiving the response remains the authority on whether they feel met. Their continuing pain also leaves us with questions about what is missing, what was offered, what can be received, and what action remains owed. Neither partner has complete authority over the other's intention or the whole meaning of a shared event.

Rowan says, "You're right. I don't care enough. I'll try harder." Casey looks relieved for a moment. The therapist might feel that something has finally softened.

Then Rowan becomes distant.

We need to ask what the agreement contained. Was it a painful recognition of neglect? A collapse into shame? A statement made to end the conversation? A global confession may bring temporary relief while obscuring the particular action that needs to change. It can also leave Rowan feeling that relationship requires accepting an identity they do not believe.

Bowen's differentiation framework helps us consider the capacity to retain thoughtful judgment within relational pressure, including realistic dependence and considered generosity.<sup>[13]</sup> Schnarch's solid, flexible self similarly includes maintaining a position and being able to discover that one is wrong.<sup>[14]</sup> Together, these perspectives caution against mistaking agreement for mature participation.

A more usable acknowledgment might be, "I do care, and I made that change as though your time would absorb it. I need to take responsibility for that." Rowan remains a person who can speak truthfully and change conduct. Casey can challenge whether the acknowledgment is adequate without requiring a total confession of uncaringness.

This also asks something of Casey. If every effort becomes evidence of manipulation or every explanation becomes forbidden defensiveness, the listener has little room to become known. Yet an explanation that repeatedly replaces accountability deserves scrutiny. The distinction emerges through the exchange and the pattern over time, rather than through allegiance to either partner's preferred account.

## **Connection and self definition in the same encounter**

Attachment and differentiation guide different clinical questions. Attachment work asks whether a need can be expressed and met through a reachable response. Differentiation asks whether a person can remain connected to thoughtful judgment while receiving influence, tolerating disapproval, and acting responsibly. Bowen's account includes realistic dependence; emotional cutoff is not its achievement.<sup>[13]</sup> Schnarch emphasizes a solid but flexible self, grounded responding, and tolerating discomfort that serves growth.<sup>[14]</sup> Needing support and retaining a position can belong in the same encounter.

Hardy and Fisher compare Johnson's emotionally focused couple therapy and Schnarch's Crucible therapy, identifying convergence in their broader developmental concerns alongside substantial differences in intervention and ideas of healthy functioning.<sup>[15]</sup> Their review supports thoughtful dialogue, not treating the models as interchangeable. Goldman and Greenberg's distinct emotion-focused couples framework brings attachment, identity, attraction, and self-soothing into view.<sup>[16]</sup> These contributions keep us from reducing every disagreement to either insufficient reassurance or insufficient independence.

There remains a real difference in clinical emphasis. Faced with Rowan's shame, an attachment intervention might help the fear become expressible and invite a reachable response from Casey. A differentiation intervention might help Rowan examine the demand to be seen as adequate before acknowledging an impact: Can I act from my values while

Casey is still disappointed? With Casey, attachment work may help transform protest into an intelligible bid; differentiation work may help sustain a legitimate request without requiring immediate agreement as proof of personal worth. These examples are this essay's clinical synthesis, not a claim that either school excludes the other task.

The sequence follows the function of an intervention and the couple's response to it. We do not assume that all attachment work must be completed before differentiation begins, or that partners must become independently regulated before receiving comfort. The following discernment is a proposed integrative clinical approach, not an empirically established treatment algorithm.

First, assess the conditions of the encounter. Are both people free enough to speak, disagree, pause, and decline? Is an actual injury, coercive behavior, or neglected responsibility being reframed as sensitivity? Where protection or accountability is needed, neither a request for vulnerability nor an invitation to tolerate discomfort can substitute for addressing it. When activation makes mutual attention difficult, help the frame and pace become usable before asking for a demanding exchange.

Lean toward attachment work when a reachable need remains hidden behind protest or retreat and the partners have enough capacity to encounter it. Help Casey name the loneliness without sharpening it into accusation. Help Rowan express the shame and fear beneath withdrawal without using those feelings to end discussion of the changed plan. Then explore whether either can receive a modest, freely offered response. If they can, take time to notice what that contact makes possible.

Lean toward differentiation when contact has become conditional on capitulation, when reassurance repeatedly replaces an unfinished task, or when disagreement itself is being treated as relational betrayal. Help each person hold an honest position, examine their own conduct, and bear a tolerable amount of disappointment without attack or disappearance. For Rowan, that might mean remaining present to Casey's dissatisfaction while committing to a fair arrangement. For Casey, it might mean maintaining the request without making Rowan's immediate emotional response its sole measure of legitimacy.

Often the two tasks occur within one exchange. Rowan says, "I understand why you felt alone with the work. I care about that. I cannot talk well while we are calling each other selfish. I can stay with the specific decision I made." Casey replies, "I can stop calling you selfish. I still need us to change how the work is divided." Recognition makes a limit less abandoning; a limit makes continued contact more voluntary. The pair can then negotiate an action neither has purchased through self-erasure.

Our next move depends on what happens. If a boundary intervention leaves Casey feeling that needing is shameful, return to the hurt and examine how the boundary was offered. If an invitation to soothe leaves Rowan surrendering a truthful position or becoming responsible for eliminating all distress, restore authorship and limits. These reactions do not

automatically mean the intervention was wrong; they are information for joint inquiry. We look for increased freedom to feel, think, respond, and follow through, rather than quietness or agreement alone.

## **The therapist as master regulator**

I use the term master regulator to describe the therapist's role with the dysregulated couple. The term describes responsibility for the therapeutic frame, pace, and conditions for contact. We monitor the encounter while remaining emotionally available to both people. We interrupt contempt or pressure, notice when the quieter partner has become unreachable, and help the more activated partner experience interruption as accompanied slowing rather than another abandonment. Authority here requires warmth, clarity, and the capacity to bear tension.

Johnson describes the therapist's attuned responsiveness as offering a safe haven and a base for exploration.<sup>[1]</sup> Tatkin's emphasis on arousal and practiced structure adds a reminder to assess what partners can manage now.<sup>[7]</sup> Neither contribution requires us to erase distress. Our task is to help make it possible to remain present to distress with enough freedom to notice, think, and choose. Regulation can include tears, anger, disagreement, and an unfinished ending.

We might say, "I want to slow this down. Casey, your need for a response matters. Rowan, I want to understand what makes it difficult to stay with that need. I will help us make room for both, and I will stop us when the way we speak makes listening less possible." We then check the effect. A careful sentence is only an invitation; either partner may feel misunderstood and need to correct it.

When both are escalating, the next step may be fewer words, an agreed pause, orientation to the room, or a brief individual check-in within the established therapeutic frame. Eye contact, touch, inward attention, and disclosure cannot be assumed to soothe. A blank expression cannot establish calm. We ask what the person is experiencing and assess whether the intervention increases usable presence or simply produces compliance.

The therapist's steadiness is influential, never absolute control over two nervous systems. Eventually, partners need capacities they can use beyond our presence: recognizing an early cue, making a less attacking bid, responding without self-erasure, and keeping a return agreement. The clinical frame lends support while those capacities are practiced. It cannot make one partner permanently responsible for absorbing the other's distress.

## Let an imperfect contact count

Suppose Rowan says, “I had been trying to prove I wasn’t careless. I hadn’t let myself see that you were alone with the arrangements.” Casey becomes quieter and says, “That is closer.” Before moving to an agreement, we can ask whether Casey wants to notice what reached them. In Fosha’s work, reflecting on the experience of helpful change is itself part of the therapeutic process.<sup>[17]</sup> Here the inquiry is precise: which part of this response was different, and what did it make possible?

Casey says, “You named what I had to do. I didn’t have to keep explaining it.” Rowan is moved and also anxious: “I’m worried you think I understand everything now.” We can help both recognize a particular contact without enlarging it into complete repair. Neither has to reward the moment with certainty, gratitude, or affection.

Stern and colleagues distinguish explicit understanding from implicit relational knowing: the procedural familiarity of how one can be with another person. Their account proposes that particular moments of meeting can alter the shared relational field.<sup>[18]</sup> Here, Casey may encounter a new possibility: a correction does not inevitably lead to withdrawal. Rowan may discover that acknowledging an impact does not require surrendering all perspective. These are experiences to investigate and revisit, rather than proof of permanent transformation.

## The work still waiting outside the conversation

An emotionally moving exchange can leave the division of labor untouched. If Casey remains the person who anticipates, arranges, and follows up, a more tender apology may coexist with the same burden. Our formulation has to reach the practical life the couple is living.

Gottman and Levenson’s longitudinal study of 73 married couples examined behavioral and physiological patterns in relation to later marital outcomes.<sup>[19]</sup> Its observational findings support attention to repeated interaction beyond what partners intend or promise. They do not allow us to predict the future of this couple from one session or treat a single behavior as destiny.

We return to what the couple actually tried. They might choose one planning agreement: when a work demand changes the evening, the person changing the plan gives notice as soon as feasible and participates in reorganizing the arrangements. They identify what can be observed, what constraints could make the agreement unworkable, and when they want to review it. A missed agreement calls for examination and revision; it does not become proof that either person’s entire character has been revealed.

In a later fictional review, Rowan has given notice and completed the task. Casey appreciates both and says the overall division remains unequal. Rowan feels the familiar discouragement, then asks which responsibilities are still unaccounted for. There is an

earlier cue, a different action, a kept commitment, and an unfinished problem. Each belongs in the record.

That mixed result revises the map. Notice helped with uncertainty; it did not distribute the work. The next conversation concerns who anticipates, decides, and follows through. If Rowan instead fails to give notice, the therapist needs to ask what happened to the agreement rather than seek another, more moving apology. If Casey no longer raises concerns because doing so feels futile, a quieter week cannot be counted as improvement.

## **What the research can and cannot establish**

Rodríguez-González and colleagues studied 958 individuals in 479 Spanish and U.S. couples using cross-sectional and longitudinal models. They found links between differentiation and relationship functioning, including anxious attachment and relationship quality.<sup>[20]</sup> Their observational design supports examining these constructs together. It does not show that a differentiation intervention causes attachment security or establish the order in which therapies should be combined.

Calatrava and colleagues' scoping review included 295 studies and identified substantial support for associations between differentiation and psychological and marital functioning, alongside important gaps in longitudinal, causal, and intervention research.<sup>[21]</sup> Hardy and Fisher provide a conceptual comparison; Goldman and Greenberg describe clinical work.<sup>[15],[16]</sup> These contributions have different evidentiary roles. None establishes the particular sequencing proposed here as a validated protocol. The integration remains a reasoned clinical position, accountable to the couple's experience and to continuing research.

The studies inform the questions we bring to a review; they do not replace the couple's account of the trial. A kept promise, an earlier cue, a clearer request, and a respected refusal are different changes. We ask which occurred, under what conditions, and whether either person experienced a cost our first formulation missed. The result may support continuing a practice, changing the arrangement, seeking additional help, or leaving a question open.

## **The partner who remains different**

Some couples become more recognizable to each other and discover a limit. One partner wants frequent emotional exploration; the other values a different amount or form of conversation. Sexual desire may remain unequal. People may want futures that cannot be made compatible through better listening.

Perel and Miller's account of otherness invites us to consider the partner beyond the roles they occupy in our own life, preserving a tension between familiarity and distinctness.<sup>[22]</sup> Clinically, this helps us ask whether one person has become responsible for confirming every

aspect of the other's worth or supplying every form of aliveness. It also leaves real commitments and unmet needs available for discussion.

Recognition can include a truthful no. Affection does not establish consent to sex, disclosure, touch, or a longer conversation. A disappointed person deserves understanding without acquiring authority over another body or private experience. The person declining also needs to hear what the difference means for the relationship, without being required to reverse the answer.

What remains wanted once each partner's position becomes clearer? Casey may still want more shared family life; Rowan may still need less of it. When *Love Does Not Make Us Alike* develops this question further. Here, the couple needs time to consider the actual cost of a workable agreement. Greater compassion can inform that decision without making it for them.

The couple's next learning may differ. One may want to examine receiving; the other, anger or giving. BKL can provide optional places to continue, while therapy remains attentive to what the educational practice actually evokes. Private reflections belong to their author. Sharing, further joint practice, and a particular outcome are choices.

## **Bringing the five modules into clinical work**

The Understanding ourselves, understanding each other pathway gives these inquiries a place between sessions. Its structure can support clinical work without prescribing the order in which a couple must become ready. What they bring back—including disagreement with the exercise—remains part of the next encounter.

What I bring into love examines expectations, remembered experience, strengths, and present conditions. Casey's burden and Rowan's work demand keep the historical inquiry accountable to the current arrangement. What happens inside me makes room for early cues, competing concerns, and a response each person can own while still affected.

What happens between us compares accounts the partners freely contribute. Their agreement about a sequence need not settle their different memories or assign equal responsibility. Meet me before you move me offers a manageable recognition-and-correction exchange. "Taken for granted" can alter an account organized around "abandoned," while the listener retains a perspective of their own.

What changes, and what remains returns to the planning agreement and the life around it. Notice improved; the division of labor remained unresolved. That result determines the next inquiry. The partners may choose different further learning, private rehearsal, practical assistance, or no further exercise. Their notes remain theirs to share or keep private.

## Someone still there to meet

The next encounter tests the usefulness of the map. Does Casey have to sound hurt before Rowan notices a concern? Can Rowan offer an affectionate no without being recast immediately as the withdrawing partner? The pattern can remain informative while each person becomes less confined to a role within it.

The clinical task is to let the living encounter qualify the map. Casey can be hurt and able to listen. Rowan can care and have caused an injury. A longing can be old and a burden current. Recognition can arrive imperfectly and still matter, while a limit or an obligation remains.

We help partners discover whether they can become more available to this complexity without losing a voice of their own. Sometimes the change is a moment of unexpected tenderness. Sometimes it is the first accurate acknowledgment of work, the first respected refusal, or the first promise that is quietly kept.

Two people remain in the room. Each has something to say, something to learn, and responsibility for what they do next. There is more room for an encounter neither has to purchase by disappearing.

## References

1. Johnson, S. M. (2009). Attachment theory and emotionally focused therapy for individuals and couples: Perfect partners. In J. H. Obegi & E. Berant (Eds.), *Attachment theory and research in clinical work with adults* (pp. 410–433). Guilford Press. Original chapter.
2. Damasio, A. R. (1996). The somatic marker hypothesis and the possible functions of the prefrontal cortex. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 351(1346), 1413–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.1996.0125>
3. Schore, A. N. (2022). Right brain-to-right brain psychotherapy: Recent scientific and clinical advances. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 21, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12991-022-00420-3>
4. Siegel, D. J. (n.d.). An introduction to interpersonal neurobiology. Author's framework overview.
5. Real, T. (n.d.). Getting real with relationship expert and author Terry Real [Interview with Elisabeth LaMotte, transcript, episode 120]. *Social Work Talks*. National Association of Social Workers.
6. Tatkin, S. (2013, September 16). Arousal regulation and mindfulness for couples. PACT Institute.
7. Tatkin, S. (2026, June 15). Why couples fight: Arousal, memory, and the missing brake. PACT Institute. Used for the author's clinical emphasis on arousal, structure, and rehearsal; its specific neural explanations are not adopted here.
8. 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>
9. 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>
10. 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>
11. Johnson, S. (n.d.). My, how couples therapy has changed! Attachment, love and science. *Psychotherapy.net*. Author's exposition of attachment-based EFT; see also *The practice of emotionally focused couple therapy* (2nd ed., 2004), Brunner-Routledge.
12. 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>
13. The Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). Differentiation of self. Institutional account of Murray Bowen's theory.
14. Schnarch, D. (2011, January 17). The Crucible 4 Points of Balance. Crucible Institute.
15. Hardy, N. R., & Fisher, A. R. (2018). Attachment versus differentiation: The contemporary couple therapy debate. *Family Process*, 57(2), 557–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12343>
16. Goldman, R. N., & Greenberg, L. (2013). Working with identity and self-soothing in emotion-focused therapy for couples. *Family Process*, 52(1), 62–82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12021>

17. 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.
18. Stern, D. N., Sander, L. W., Nahum, J. P., Harrison, A. M., Lyons-Ruth, K., Morgan, A. C., Bruschweiler-Stern, N., & Tronick, E. Z. (1998). Non-interpretive mechanisms in psychoanalytic therapy: The “something more” than interpretation. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 79, 903-921. Publication record.
19. Gottman, J. M., & Levenson, R. W. (1992). Marital processes predictive of later dissolution: Behavior, physiology, and health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(2), 221-233. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.2.221>. Author's copy.
20. Rodríguez-González, M., Bell, C. A., Pereyra, S. B., Martínez-Díaz, M. P., Schweer-Collins, M., & Bean, R. A. (2023). Differentiation of self and relationship attachment, quality, and stability: A path analysis of dyadic and longitudinal data from Spanish and U.S. couples. *PLOS ONE*, 18(3), e0282482. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0282482>
21. Calatrava, M., Martins, M. V., Schweer-Collins, M., Duch-Ceballos, C., & Rodríguez-González, M. (2022). Differentiation of self: A scoping review of Bowen Family Systems Theory's core construct. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 91, 102101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2021.102101>
22. Perel, E., & Miller, M. A. (2022, February 8). Letters from Esther: Appreciating otherness in relationships. Esther Perel.

Clinical illustrations are fictional and develop the educational situations in the Couples modules. This essay is an integrative clinical argument, not a tested protocol. Sources contribute research, clinical theory, neuroscience hypotheses, and philosophy in different ways. Selected originals, official accounts, and abstracts were consulted; full-book reading is not claimed. The source-use record specifies access limits. Findings from informing research and therapies do not establish outcomes for BKL's educational practices.