

When Caring Becomes the Price of Belonging

The clinical work of making room for the person who gives

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT · Therapist companion to **Caring Without Losing Yourself** · 2026

A client tells us she has finally asked her brother to help with their mother's appointments. He agreed. The arrangements are adequate; their mother will be cared for. Yet the client has spent the week checking the calendar, offering reminders, and wondering whether she should take everything back.

We might hear difficulty relinquishing control. We might encourage her to tolerate uncertainty. Both could be relevant. But when we ask what the checking does for her, she says, "If I'm not the one who remembers, I don't know what my place is."

The task has changed hands. Her place in the family has become uncertain.

This fictional encounter brings us to a difficulty that advice about boundaries can approach too quickly. A person may understand that they are doing too much and still experience doing less as a threat to belonging. The work of caring has held exhaustion, competence, love, resentment, and a quiet assurance that they remain necessary. Changing that arrangement may bring them closer to a question they have rarely been free to ask: *Will there be room for me when I need something?*

The client article, [When Someone Else's Pain Becomes Your Assignment](#), explores how concern becomes responsibility for another person's emotional life. This therapist companion considers the developmental and relational organization of that movement, the therapist's participation in it, and the experiences through which a more inclusive form of care might become possible.

When usefulness becomes a secure position

Within Bowlby's attachment tradition, care involves both a place to turn in distress and support for moving outward into life. Mikulincer and Shaver describe how expectations about availability and responsiveness organize attachment behavior. These working models concern what people anticipate from others and what they expect their own needs to mean.[1]

For the client who reliably provides care, the question may be less whether relationships are available than *under what conditions* they are available. She can enter confidently as organizer, listener, or steady presence. Arriving confused, disappointed, or empty-handed feels more exposing. The relationship may be familiar while the position of needing within it

remains unfamiliar.

This is a formulation to investigate. The therapist asks where it fits and where it fails. Perhaps she receives easily from a friend. Perhaps she finds emotional support intrusive but welcomes practical assistance. Perhaps her family currently depends on her because nobody else has access to transport. Those differences reveal the particular conditions of her difficulty.

Some people did learn to preserve closeness by monitoring the emotional life of a parent. Their own distress could wait; the adult's distress could not. Others became indispensable after an illness, bereavement, migration, or prolonged shortage of support. A history of generosity can contain pleasure and moral commitment alongside fear. We lose something clinically important when we reinterpret every contribution as an attachment strategy.

What deserves attention is the restriction of available positions. Can the person be loved while giving, and also remain recognizable while receiving, disagreeing, or having nothing useful to offer?

The self that knows what everyone else needs

Winnicott's account of true and false self gives language to the difference between functioning successfully and feeling personally real. His developmental theory connects defensive compliance with protection of spontaneous experience. He also describes degrees of adaptation; ordinary social accommodation is not equivalent to a pathological organization.[2]

This perspective helps us consider a client who knows immediately what would make an evening easier for everyone else but cannot discover what she wants to do. Her uncertainty may be more than reluctance to disclose a preference. Attention has become practiced in moving outward before an inward response has time to take shape.

"What do you want?" can then feel like a surprisingly difficult question. Asked with insistence, it becomes another task she must complete correctly. She may search our face for the answer that will demonstrate progress: less caregiving, a firmer refusal, a more independent self.

The therapist needs enough patience to let an uncertain response exist. "I don't know yet" may be the first answer that does not organize itself around someone else's expectations. We can wonder about a preference without demanding its arrival. We can also recognize that freely choosing another person's wish remains a possible expression of selfhood.

The concern is whether there is someone present in the giving who can acknowledge its meaning and cost. A spontaneous wish to care need not be relinquished for a spontaneous wish to rest to become speakable.

The emotional sequence inside an act of help

A client describes a partner coming home discouraged. She offered suggestions; the partner rejected them; she felt hurt and became insistent. “I was only trying to help,” she says. That intention deserves to be heard. So does the partner’s experience of being directed while wanting company.

The narrative can be slowed before either person becomes the problem. What did she notice? What happened as she realized the partner was unhappy? What became difficult when the first suggestion did not help? Perhaps the distress awakened helplessness, then shame, followed by a growing need to produce a solution. We offer these as questions, listening for a different account.

Schore’s account of implicit affective communication draws attention to exchanges that precede and accompany explicit explanation: timing, tone, expression, and responsiveness. His integration of developmental neuroscience and clinical theory supports attending to these channels; a particular client’s bodily response does not establish the neural mechanism proposed by the model.[3]

Clinically, the speed of our response matters. An immediate interpretation can repeat the client’s own tendency to organize a feeling before meeting it. We might ask, “What was hardest about seeing that your suggestion hadn’t helped?” The answer may bring us nearer to the moment that needs accompaniment.

Gendlin’s Focusing offers another contribution: words and explanations can be checked against a felt sense of the situation, allowing experience to qualify an account that initially seemed convincing.[4] “Helpless” may fit imperfectly. After a pause the client says, “It was more that I couldn’t reach him.” That difference changes the work. We can encounter the sadness of failed contact rather than treating the entire sequence as excessive control. Inward attention remains optional; conversation itself may provide sufficient access.

Respecting the part that keeps everyone together

Schwartz’s IFS model approaches protective responses through their intended function and the fears associated with changing them. Its account of polarization also helps us consider how apparently opposite responses can organize one another.[5]

The dependable helper may be followed by an exhausted, furious response: *I am never doing this again*. Then a severe inner judgment restores the old arrangement: *How could you be so selfish?* Therapy can inadvertently join one side by celebrating the refusal or insisting on compassion for everyone else.

We can instead make room for the competing concerns. What would be endangered if she stopped anticipating? What does the anger know about the cost? What does the accusation of selfishness attempt to prevent? These questions remain useful for clients who prefer ordinary language to parts terminology.

Understanding protective intention does not settle interpersonal impact. Help can carry an unspoken requirement: take my advice, recognize my sacrifice, reassure me that I matter. When the recipient resists, the giver may feel rejected and increase pressure. The person receiving help then has less room to remain a separate person with a different judgment.

We need sufficient warmth to examine this without humiliating the giver. “You wanted to reach him, and it became harder to hear him when he wanted something different.” Such a formulation holds the longing and the cost within the same encounter. It also leaves the client free to correct it.

Staying connected when relief does not arrive

Bowen’s differentiation concerns the capacity to function thoughtfully within the emotional pressures of relationships. The Bowen Center’s account explicitly includes realistic dependence and the possibility of considered selflessness. Compliance and reflexive opposition both organize the person around pressure from others.[6]

For this pathway, a central task is remaining available after a considered response has failed to make someone happy. A person says, “I can listen tonight, but I cannot solve this for you.” The partner remains sad. Can the listener stay interested without interpreting the sadness as proof that the offer was inadequate?

The answer also depends on conduct and commitments. Perhaps the client has broken a promise or repeatedly avoided shared work. Then disappointment calls for acknowledgment and practical repair. We cannot decide what is owed by observing whose distress is greater or whose language sounds more differentiated.

The person may need help holding two kinds of information together: *I feel guilty* and *I have checked what I agreed to*. Neither cancels the other. Emotional urgency can be given room without being assigned sole authority over action.

Weinstein and Ryan’s four studies distinguish autonomous from controlled motivation for helping and report benefits associated with more autonomous helping for helpers and recipients.[7] Their findings support examining the experience of choice; they do not establish that demanding duties are unhealthy or that less help is preferable. A thoughtful yes may involve considerable sacrifice. The clinical question is whether the person can know what they are choosing and remain present in that choice.

When accompaniment reaches the caregiver

Fosha’s AEDP formulation emphasizes undoing aloneness with difficult affect and attending experientially to what happens when something new becomes possible. Metatherapeutic processing brings the experience of change itself into reflection rather than moving immediately to the next difficulty.[8]

Applied here, the therapist's task includes accompanying what the caregiving arrangement has kept at a distance. We might meet fear of becoming unnecessary, anger about an unequal burden, or grief that someone had to become so capable so early. The feeling emerges through inquiry; its presence is not a requirement for depth.

Returning to the fictional client, imagine the therapist says, "You have carried a great deal." She becomes brisk: "I'm good at it. Someone has to be." Rather than intensify reassurance, the therapist asks whether the acknowledgment landed as intended.

"It sounds like another compliment for being the one who can cope," she answers.

That correction is the encounter. If we defend our empathy, she is back in the position of making another person's effort successful. We might respond, "You want me to notice what this costs, too." She sits quietly, then says, "I'm tired of needing so little."

There is now room to ask whether she wants company with that tiredness. Perhaps she feels relief. Perhaps she feels exposed and wants to stop. If something helpful occurs, we can ask what made it helpful: the recognition of exhaustion, permission to disagree, the absence of advice, or something we had not noticed.

This inquiry makes a new experience more specific and available for later reflection. It also tests our understanding. Tears do not certify that we have reached the truth; a quiet correction may carry greater clinical consequence.

Two people who can affect the arrangement

Jessica Benjamin's recognition theory adds a necessary relational challenge. Mutual recognition involves encountering the other as a subject with a center of experience. Her work on doer-done-to complementarity and thirdness considers how relationships become organized around opposed positions, and how a shared relational space can become possible.[9]

In this essay's application, the fixed identities of giver and receiver can constrain both people. The caregiver becomes valuable through providing; the recipient becomes someone whose need confirms that value. Either person's movement outside the arrangement may feel disruptive. An offer of help can therefore be generous and still leave little room for the recipient's independent response.

A useful question is whether the arrangement can be influenced from either side. Can someone say, "I need more help," and also, "That kind of help does not fit"? Can the giver name capacity without threatening withdrawal of affection? Can appreciation coexist with disagreement?

These questions extend the principle developed in *Meet Me Before You Move Me*: recognition allows another person's experience to become more knowable while preserving a distinct self who can respond. Neither gratitude nor immediate relief is sufficient evidence that this has

happened. Changed agreements and repeated conduct matter.

The work that cannot simply be put down

An exclusively psychological formulation can become unjust. We may understand why a client assumes responsibility and still fail to ask whether anyone else will do what is necessary. A parent's medication, a child's meals, or a household's rent remains a material concern after the client recognizes a pattern.

Kittay's philosophy of dependency places care within obligations, labor, and social provision. Dependency is integral to human life; the person providing indispensable care also requires support.[10] This challenges an ideal of maturity measured chiefly by how much responsibility a person can relinquish.

Daminger's interview study of 35 couples identifies anticipating needs, identifying options, making decisions, and monitoring as components of cognitive household labor. Women in that sample carried more of this work overall, particularly anticipation and monitoring.[11] Naming these activities helps us ask whether responsibility has actually changed hands when someone else performs a visible task.

In the opening illustration, we therefore examine the handover before interpreting the checking. Does the brother have the information, authority, and time to organize the appointments? Has he agreed to reminders and follow-up? Who provides backup? If these remain hers, vigilance may accurately register unfinished work.

If the agreement is complete, we can explore what remains emotionally difficult. If it is incomplete, the next intervention may concern coordination or resources. Gender, culture, disability, finances, and power shape the possibilities. Where refusal brings threats or retaliation, confidential support and protection take precedence over an experiment in greater vulnerability.

The grief beneath becoming less necessary

Sometimes a more workable arrangement reveals how much a person hoped their effort would secure. They may have wanted someone to recognize the sacrifice without being told, notice their exhaustion, or choose them with the same attentiveness they have offered others.

Making a request can carry its own grief: *If I have to explain it, is it still the care I wanted?* The question deserves company before instruction. Asking may become useful while the longing to be spontaneously noticed remains real.

Welwood's account of intimate relationship as a spiritual crucible takes seriously the vulnerability, disappointment, and disillusionment that closeness can expose.[12] His philosophical perspective invites attention to what an idealized relationship cannot protect us from. It does not establish that a particular painful relationship should continue.

The therapist can help the client distinguish an old longing from what this person is presently willing to offer. Some relationships become more reciprocal when needs are visible. Others resist a change that benefits the caregiver. Grief may concern the past, the limits of the current relationship, or both.

There is also the possibility of pleasure. A person who is less continually occupied may discover an interest, a friendship, or an afternoon whose value is difficult to justify through usefulness. We need room for this experience without making enjoyment the next accomplishment.

The therapist's investment in helping

This work asks us to examine our own relationship to usefulness. A client's distress can awaken the same urgency we are helping them understand. We offer one interpretation, then another, then a practice, while becoming less able to hear that they wanted us to stay beside something we cannot resolve.

Aponte and Kissil's Person-of-the-Therapist framework treats enduring personal struggles as potential resources for clinical connection and judgment when therapists learn to work responsibly with them.[13] Here, that means recognizing our need to be effective, welcomed, or beyond reproach, and taking responsibility for its influence on the session.

The unusually considerate client may make this difficult to see. They praise the session, protect us from disagreement, and return with evidence that they have followed our suggestions. Apparent collaboration can coexist with the familiar burden of making the other person feel successful.

We can ask whether the client has room to disappoint us. Their decision to continue caregiving, decline a practice, or reject an interpretation needs a thoughtful hearing. Supervision helps us distinguish clinical concern from impatience with a role we recognize too personally. The professional responsibility remains ours; the client should not have to care for our difficulty tolerating unfinished work.

Carrying the understanding through the five modules

The Caring Without Losing Yourself pathway offers a structure for taking these questions into ordinary life. Its five modules follow a developing capacity rather than prescribe progressively firmer boundaries.

When Someone Else's Distress Feels Like Your Responsibility begins at the transition between noticing and assuming an assignment. In therapy, the three columns—what happened in them, what happened in me, and what was mine to do—can reveal the difference between an observable cue, an anticipated meaning, and an actual commitment. The client's correction belongs in the formulation from the beginning.

Care, Rescue, and Overfunctioning follows what help accomplishes immediately and over time. Asking what assistance is wanted may expose the giver's restlessness or reveal a substantial need. Review whether the response supported participation, met a duty, or displaced someone's decision. Keep useful help rather than rewarding reduced involvement by default.

Tolerating Another Person's Disappointment brings attention to the moment after a preference is spoken. The work includes hearing the response, checking overlooked commitments, and choosing while both people remain emotionally present. Reconsideration may express learning. Holding a limit may express judgment. Neither posture alone tells us what occurred.

Giving Without Self-Erasure asks whether the person offering care can also become visible within the agreement. A revised commitment might include rest, appreciation, assistance, or a more wholehearted yes. Explore what requesting these things awakens and whether the other person actually responds. An inadequate response should alter our account of the relationship.

Love Without Taking Over consolidates a practical arrangement: what is freely offered, what is owed, what belongs elsewhere, and what requires negotiation. Include planning and follow-through, necessary coverage, and help received. A usable result may be modest—a responsibility clarified, one need spoken, one task reliably shared.

Return to the opening client after a week. Her brother organized the appointments. She checked twice rather than continually and still felt uneasy. More unexpectedly, she felt sad one evening when nobody needed her to call.

The arrangement and the sadness both deserve attention. She might choose to ask a friend for company, continue observing, or return to what being necessary has meant. The next encounter tests and deepens the account. This is BKL's learning movement: notice, understand provisionally, experiment at a manageable scale, observe, and revise. Completing an exercise does not establish change; what becomes possible in living gives the work its direction.

A place within the care

Over time, the question may become less "How do I stop taking care of everyone?" and more "Can my care include the truth of my own participation?" The person may continue giving a great deal. What develops is room to know the wish, acknowledge the cost, receive influence, ask for support, and make a choice they can inhabit.

For someone whose place has depended on being indispensable, this can be tender work. Becoming more visible may feel riskier than becoming more capable ever did. We accompany the fear without requiring a reassuring conclusion about what every relationship will offer.

There may be a moment when the person says, “I wanted to help, and I also wanted you to notice me.” Both wishes can finally be spoken. Care can then become an encounter in which the person giving it is available to be known.

References

1. Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2023). *Attachment theory applied: Fostering personal growth through healthy relationships*. Guilford Press. Chapter 1 excerpt. Contemporary account of Bowlby’s attachment tradition.
2. Winnicott, D. W. (1965). Ego distortion in terms of true and false self. In *The maturational processes and the facilitating environment* (pp. 140–152). Hogarth Press. (Original paper published 1960.) Collected Works chapter record.
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. Gendlin, E. T. (n.d.). An introduction to focusing: Six steps. The International Focusing Institute. Selected excerpt from *Focusing*.
5. IFS Institute. (n.d.). The Internal Family Systems Model Outline. Institutional account of Richard Schwartz’s model.
6. The Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). Differentiation of self. Institutional account of Murray Bowen’s theory.
7. Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: Autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 222–244. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016984>
8. Fosha, D. (2010). Wired for healing: Thirteen ways of looking at AEDP. *Transformance: The AEDP Journal*.
9. Benjamin, J. (2018). *Beyond doer and done to: Recognition theory, intersubjectivity and the third*. Routledge. Chapter 1. Electronic edition released 2017.
10. Kittay, E. F. (2002). Love’s labor revisited. *Hypatia*, 17(3), 237–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2002.tb00951.x>. Author’s copy.
11. Daminger, A. (2019). The cognitive dimension of household labor. *American Sociological Review*, 84(4), 609–633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419859007>
12. Welwood, J. (2017, November 9). Intimate relationship as a spiritual crucible. *Lion’s Roar*.
13. 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>

Clinical illustrations are fictional. This essay is an integrative clinical argument, not a tested treatment protocol. Source access ranges from selected original passages and institutional accounts to research abstracts; the accompanying editorial record specifies those limits. Research on informing constructs does not establish outcomes for BKL’s educational practices.