Journal of Psychiatry
Psychotherapy & Communication

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf

Narrative Clinical Review

***Abstract*—**Couple counselling addresses distress that is expressed between partners, but safe and effective treatment requires more than communication-skills training. This narrative clinical review examines assessment, shared formulation, therapeutic alliance, communication, emotion, behavior, intimacy, individual mental health, treatment models, outcome monitoring, and safety. Evidence available through 30 May 2025 indicates that established couple therapies improve relationship satisfaction and several relational outcomes on average; benefit is not universal, and some couples deteriorate. Integrative behavioral and emotionally focused approaches illustrate different but overlapping routes to change: altering reinforcement and acceptance, making vulnerable emotion communicable, and revising interactional cycles. The clinically useful unit is neither one partner nor an abstract relationship but a sequence in which each partner's meaning and action changes the options available to the other. Communication is therefore an assessment method, an intervention, and an outcome. Alliance must be considered with each partner and with the couple as a working unit; imbalance can weaken treatment even when the therapist feels close to one person. Screening for coercive control, fear, violence, sexual coercion, child safeguarding concerns, suicidality, and substance-related risk is essential. Conjoint therapy is not neutral when disclosure may trigger retaliation. Couple counselling should increase safety, agency, reciprocal understanding, and workable choice—not preserve a relationship at any cost.

Index Terms—couple counselling, couple therapy, communication, therapeutic alliance, relationship distress, intimate partner violence

I. INTRODUCTION

Couples rarely arrive with a neutral description of a shared problem. One partner may describe emotional distance and the other criticism; one may seek repair and the other clarity about separation. The therapist hears two histories, two accounts of the present, and an interaction that changes while it is being observed. Couple counselling therefore asks how meaning, emotion, behavior, power, context, and health interact between partners while preserving each person's agency and safety.

Outcome research supports couple therapy as a treatment for relationship distress. A recent meta-analysis found large average pre–post gains in relationship satisfaction and significant changes in communication, intimacy, and partner behavior, with important limitations in sample diversity and study dependence (Roddy et al., 2020). Earlier syntheses likewise found benefits across established behavioral, integrative, and emotion-focused models (Shadish & Baldwin, 2005; Lebow et al., 2012). A subsequent decade review continued to classify behavioral, cognitive-behavioral, emotionally focused, and integrative approaches as well established, while emphasizing reach, treatment matching, mechanisms, and progress monitoring rather than assuming that every model is interchangeable (Doss et al., 2022). Average benefit, however, does not mean that all couples improve, that one model fits every problem, or that staying together is the correct outcome.

Communication here is more than a skill deficit. Speech, silence, tone, timing, withdrawal, pursuit, reassurance, touch, and digital contact all carry meaning within a history and a power structure. A technically correct "I statement" can still be contemptuous; a pause can regulate conflict or punish a partner; disclosure can create intimacy or danger. Formulation should identify a recurring sequence in which each partner's protection changes the other's options, then test safer and more flexible responses.

This review treats the interactional sequence—not either partner in isolation—as the principal clinical unit. Communication changes when meaning, emotion, timing, and response change together, and technique is useful only where both partners can participate safely. This framework allows comparison of behavioral, integrative, emotion-focused, and disorder-specific evidence without assuming that the models

Christian Jonathan Haverkampf, M.D., LL.M., is a psychotherapist in private practice in Dublin, Ireland. Correspondence: jonathanhaverkampf@gmail.com. Website: www.jonathanhaverkampf.com.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

are interchangeable or that preserving the relationship is always the appropriate outcome.

II. SCOPE AND REVIEW METHOD

This narrative clinical review uses a literature-search cutoff of 30 May 2025, one calendar month before the nominal issue date of 30 June 2025. Sources were eligible only when a journal article, book, guideline, or stable public record was publicly available by that cutoff; a later issue assignment did not make an unavailable source eligible. Searches combined couple counselling, couple therapy, marital therapy, relationship distress, communication, therapeutic alliance, integrative behavioral couple therapy, emotionally focused couple therapy, depression, post-traumatic stress, substance use, intimate partner violence, coercive control, randomized trial, meta-analysis, and clinical guideline. Reference lists of major reviews were checked for landmark trials and safety literature.

Priority was given to meta-analyses, systematic reviews, randomized trials, process studies, and authoritative violence guidance. The term partner is used unless a study specifically concerned married couples or used gendered categories. Historical studies often enrolled predominantly different-sex married couples, so transfer to unmarried, same-gender, gender-diverse, consensually non-monogamous, culturally diverse, or disabled partners requires care. The review separates treatment of relationship distress from couple-based intervention for an individual disorder and distinguishes selected situational violence studies from coercive controlling abuse.

The synthesis is narrative and does not calculate an effect estimate. Couple trials differ in unit of randomization, whether one or both partners report outcomes, handling of separation, comparator strength, therapist allegiance, treatment dose, and follow-up. Dyadic observations are statistically dependent, and apparent improvement after therapy does not identify which component produced it. Accordingly, efficacy findings are described at the level tested, process findings are not treated as proven mediation, and safety recommendations are not inferred from trials that excluded the highest-risk couples. The clinical aim is to connect credible evidence with decisions that remain revisable as relationship conditions change.

III. RELATIONSHIP DISTRESS AS A DYNAMIC SYSTEM

Relationship distress is maintained through sequences. A partner who fears abandonment may pursue reassurance with urgency; the other, experiencing criticism or engulfment, may withdraw; withdrawal confirms abandonment, and pursuit intensifies. Both actions are understandable attempts at regulation, yet together they narrow the relationship. The same surface pattern can arise from different meanings, so a label such as pursue–withdraw is the beginning of formulation, not its completion. The therapist asks what each partner notices, predicts, feels, does, and experiences next.

Context changes the sequence. Sleep deprivation, childcare, pain, unemployment, racism, migration stress, infertility, illness, neurodivergence, sexual minority stress, financial insecurity, and unequal domestic labor can intensify conflict or reduce recovery time. A formulation that locates every difficulty inside attachment or communication can obscure remediable conditions. Conversely, practical stress does not explain why a particular comment becomes a threat or why repair repeatedly fails. Couple work is strongest when it connects external load with internal meaning and observable interaction.

Longitudinal relationship research indicates that satisfaction reflects the interaction of vulnerabilities, external stress, and adaptive processes rather than any single communication variable (Bradbury et al., 2000). A conversation may improve in therapy yet fail to carry into daily life when partners lack time, safety, health, or willingness to sustain a different pattern. Formulation should therefore attend to exceptions as well as breakdowns: conversations that go better, moments of generosity, shared values, supportive communities, and repairs the partners already make. These are not sentimental counterweights; they show where relational capacity remains available and where change may be feasible.

A systems description should remain temporally specific. Saying that 'the relationship is anxious' hides who noticed what, when the interaction changed, and how one response constrained the next. A sequence map can retain both circular influence and asymmetry: one partner's silence may intensify the other's protest, while an earlier betrayal or present financial control gives the silence a different significance. The map is provisional and should be checked against each partner's account and direct observation. Its value lies in locating a point where a different response is possible, not in producing a diagram on which every contribution looks equal.

Escalation also changes each partner's capacity to receive information. As arousal rises, an ambiguous expression can be read as contempt, a long explanation as evasion, and a request for pause as abandonment. Communication work therefore includes detecting the transition before content becomes unusable. A planned pause is different from unilateral withdrawal: partners agree how it will be signaled, how safety will be maintained, and when the conversation will resume. The return matters as much as the pause because an uncompleted return confirms the pursuing partner's fear. This micro-sequence offers a concrete outcome—recovery of dialogue—without promising that the underlying disagreement will disappear.

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

Table 1. Mapping an interactional cycle

Moment	Partner A	Partner B	Question for therapy
Trigger	Notices delayed reply	Arrives home depleted	What context made this moment vulnerable?
Meaning	I am unimportant	I will be attacked	Which prediction is treated as certain?
Protection	Repeated questions	Silence and screen use	What immediate relief does each action provide?
Consequence	Feels abandoned	Feels controlled	How does each protection confirm the other's fear?
Alternative	Names fear and request	Signals need for pause and return	What response is safe, specific, and testable?

IV. ASSESSMENT BEFORE CONJOINT WORK

Assessment clarifies why each partner is attending, whether goals are compatible enough for joint work, and whether the setting is safe. The clinician explores relationship history, commitment and uncertainty, affection, conflict, repair, intimacy, sexuality, parenting, finances, health, work, culture, prior therapy, and current supports. Each partner's symptoms, trauma, substance use, medication, sleep, self-harm, suicidality, and functional impairment require attention because individual difficulty can both shape and be shaped by relationship processes. Couple therapy does not dissolve individual diagnosis or medical responsibility.

A combination of joint and individual assessment can help partners disclose material that is difficult or unsafe to discuss together. The confidentiality policy must be explained before private meetings: whether the therapist holds individual secrets, requires relevant disclosure, or pauses conjoint work when hidden information prevents safe treatment. No-secrets policies carry risks if applied mechanically, especially where disclosure could trigger violence, eviction, outing, financial retaliation, or loss of children. Policy should support safety and informed consent, not protect the therapist from clinical judgment.

The initial assessment also observes process without staging a test. Who speaks for whom? Can either partner correct the therapist? Does one monitor the other's words, threaten consequences, or control transport, money, medication, immigration documents, digital accounts, or contact with others? Are there injuries, sexual coercion, stalking, strangulation, threats, weapons, escalating violence, or fear after sessions? A calm joint presentation does not rule out coercive control. Separate inquiry and local safeguarding pathways are essential when risk indicators appear.

Goals require direct clarification because 'save the relationship' may conceal different intentions. One partner may seek reconciliation, another a decision, and another a controlled setting in which to announce departure. The therapist asks what each hopes will be different, what outcome each fears, and whether either feels compelled to attend. Discernment, separation planning, and treatment for relationship distress are different tasks even when they share assessment. Conjoint work needs enough overlap to define a legitimate shared purpose. Where overlap is absent, a time-limited decision-focused process or separate referrals may be more honest than treating ambivalence as resistance to a reconciliation agenda.

Readiness also concerns practical capacity. Shift work, childcare, disability, language, digital privacy, transport, and cost determine whether partners can attend or practise safely. Homework that depends on uninterrupted private time may be impossible in crowded housing; remote sessions may expose disclosures to monitoring. These constraints belong in the formulation because they alter what can be tested and how noncompletion should be understood. Adaptation can change format, pacing, examples, or who attends while preserving the target process. It should not convert barriers into evidence that a partner lacks commitment or use treatment access as leverage within the relationship.

Children and dependent adults widen the assessment without turning them into reasons the relationship must continue. Conflict may affect caregiving consistency, emotional security, transport, finances, medication, or contact arrangements; separation can reduce some risks and increase others. The therapist asks how dependants experience the current pattern, whether they are drawn into messages or alliances, and what safeguarding duties apply. Couple goals remain distinct from co-parenting goals: partners may end an intimate relationship while needing a workable caregiving relationship. Where child-focused assessment or legal expertise is required, referral and interprofessional communication are more responsible than assuming couple technique can resolve every family-system need.

Safety questions before and during conjoint treatment

- Can each partner speak freely in the room and disagree without feared retaliation afterward?
- Has there been physical or sexual violence, strangulation, stalking, threats, coercive control, or destruction of property?
- Are children, dependent adults, immigration status, housing, finances, medication, or digital access being used as leverage?
- Do intoxication, withdrawal, suicidality, weapons, or escalating separation conflict increase immediate risk?
- Would private disclosure, a homework task, or ending a session place either partner in greater danger?

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

V. SHARED FORMULATION WITHOUT FALSE SYMMETRY

A shared formulation describes interaction without flattening responsibility. Both partners may participate in a pursue–withdraw cycle, but this does not make coercion, assault, sexual violence, or intimidation mutual. The therapist should distinguish reciprocal distress from unilateral control and distinguish impact from moral equivalence. 'Both contribute' is not a neutral systems statement when one partner's behavior is designed to restrict the other's freedom or when resistance is an act of self-protection.

In noncoercive distress, the therapist helps each partner see how protection becomes signal. Anger may conceal fear; problem solving may communicate dismissal; repeated reassurance may become surveillance; withdrawal may prevent escalation while also denying contact. This reframing can reduce blame because it explains function without excusing harm. Each partner remains accountable for choices and repair. The cycle is externalized only to create joint leverage, not to erase agency or consequences.

The formulation should yield testable alternatives. If criticism is thought to arise when a request is heard as an accusation, the experiment may be a specific request preceded by a statement of vulnerable meaning, followed by the receiving partner summarizing before responding. The outcome is not whether the script was performed but whether each partner's prediction changed and whether the conversation remained safe. If the alternative repeatedly fails, the therapist reviews motivation, skill, unresolved injury, power, diagnosis, and whether joint treatment remains appropriate.

The therapy room provides immediate but incomplete evidence. A partner who becomes articulate only when the therapist is present may have gained a safer communication context without yet gaining a portable skill. Another who stays silent may be intimidated, disengaged, ashamed, processing slowly, or unconvinced by the formulation. The therapist can slow the exchange, ask each partner what was happening internally, and compare this episode with life outside therapy. An in-session enactment becomes useful when it clarifies a sequence and permits a different response; it becomes harmful when the therapist provokes conflict for observation or assumes that behavior under professional containment represents safety at home.

VI. THE MULTI-PERSON THERAPEUTIC ALLIANCE

Couple therapy contains several alliances: each partner's bond and task agreement with the therapist, the partners' shared alliance with the treatment, and the alliance between partners around the work. Research indicates that alliance in couple and family therapy is associated with outcome, while within-couple imbalance can matter (Friedlander et al., 2011; Symonds & Horvath, 2004). A therapist may feel effective because one partner is engaged while the other feels pathologized, outnumbered, or recruited as the identified patient.

Balanced alliance is not identical treatment. One partner may need more protection to speak; another may need firmer limits on interruption or intimidation. Neutrality should refer to fair process and freedom from a predetermined relational outcome, not equal validation of incompatible factual claims or harmful conduct. The therapist can validate each person's emotion while declining to endorse threats, contempt, or coercive behavior. Explaining this stance early reduces the likelihood that safety limits will later be experienced as an unexpected alliance shift.

Alliance monitoring should be explicit. The therapist can ask separately and jointly whether the goals fit, whether either partner feels blamed, whether tasks are credible, and what was hard to say in the session. Knobloch-Fedders and colleagues found that alliance dimensions and partner perceptions predicted progress in couple psychotherapy (Knobloch-Fedders et al., 2007). The clinical implication is not to chase equal ratings but to notice divergence before it becomes dropout, concealed compliance, or escalating conflict at home.

Coalitions can form through small asymmetries: whose language appears in the formulation, whose humor the therapist joins, whose account is summarized first, or whose homework is treated as the real work. Equal airtime is not a sufficient remedy because partners may differ in fear, verbal fluency, or need for containment. The therapist instead tracks whether each can influence the shared account and whether challenge is distributed according to behavior rather than preference. When one partner names imbalance, the first response is inquiry, not an explanation that their complaint merely repeats the couple's pattern. Actual partiality and expected partiality can coexist, and repair requires both possibilities to remain open.

Table 2. Alliance domains in couple counselling

Alliance	Warning sign	Therapeutic response
Partner A–therapist	Feels cast as the cause	Clarify formulation and invite correction
Partner B–therapist	Uses therapist as an ally	Decline coalition and restore shared task
Couple–therapist	Goals remain incompatible	Renegotiate purpose or pause conjoint work
Partner–partner	One punishes disclosure	Prioritize safety and separate assessment
Alliance with method	Exercises feel scripted or culturally alien	Adapt delivery while preserving target

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

VII. COMMUNICATION AS MEANING, TIMING, AND RESPONSE

Communication training can slow conflict, increase specificity, and reduce mind reading, but scripts are insufficient when a partner cannot risk vulnerability or when the receiver hears every request through an injury. The therapist attends to content, emotion, timing, channel, and response. A request made at 01:00 after an argument differs from the same request in a planned conversation. Text messages remove tone and invite rereading; silence can be regulation, shutdown, or punishment. Effective communication is not maximum disclosure but the exchange of usable information under conditions of sufficient safety.

Listening is active. The receiving partner identifies what was heard, checks meaning, and distinguishes understanding from agreement. The speaking partner names experience and request without presenting inference as fact. These practices become meaningful when the underlying prediction is explicit: 'If I say I am frightened, you will see me as weak'; 'If I pause, you will follow me until I explode.' Therapy can test whether a different signal elicits a different response. The experiment fails if either partner uses the method sarcastically or later weaponizes disclosed vulnerability.

Because conflict cannot be eliminated from close relationships, therapy should also build the capacity for repair. A repair may include acknowledging impact, taking responsibility, expressing care, correcting a misunderstanding, making restitution, or agreeing when to resume a paused discussion. It should fit the injury. Reassurance without behavioral change can become empty; explanation without acknowledgment can become self-defense; apology demanded before safety is restored can become submission. The therapist helps partners identify what repair would be credible and whether it is actually delivered.

Communication with oneself precedes some interpersonal change. A partner who experiences only anger may need help noticing the fear, shame, exhaustion, or longing embedded in it before any first-person statement is authentic. This is not a requirement to find a softer emotion or a reason to distrust anger; anger may accurately signal violation. The task is to differentiate feeling, interpretation, impulse, and request. Once that internal sequence is clearer, the partner can decide what is safe and useful to communicate. The receiving partner then has something more precise to answer than accusation or withdrawal, while remaining responsible for how they respond.

Digital communication deserves functional assessment rather than a rule that serious matters must occur face to face. Text can support a partner who needs processing time, preserve an agreed plan, or make contact possible across work schedules. It can also invite rapid escalation, repeated checking, surveillance, and hostile rereading without corrective tone. Partners can identify which medium fits which task: logistics by message, emotionally charged discussion in a planned setting, and urgent safety concerns through an appropriate support route. The test is whether the chosen channel increases mutual comprehension and agency, not whether it conforms to a therapist's preferred style of intimacy.

VIII. BEHAVIORAL, INTEGRATIVE, AND EMOTION-FOCUSED ROUTES

Traditional behavioral couple therapy emphasizes behavior exchange, communication, and problem solving. Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy adds strategies of emotional acceptance and contextual understanding, aiming to reduce polarization while preserving targeted change. In a randomized trial of chronically distressed couples, both traditional and integrative treatments improved outcomes, with some differences in trajectory; five-year follow-up showed substantial maintenance for many couples alongside deterioration and separation for others (Christensen et al., 2004; Christensen et al., 2010). The follow-up cautions against treating post-treatment satisfaction as permanent recovery.

Acceptance in integrative behavioral work means reducing the struggle to force immediate partner change and understanding behavior in context. It does not mean accepting abuse, coercion, betrayal without consequence, or a relationship one wishes to leave. Techniques may include empathic joining around vulnerable emotion, unified detachment from a problem, tolerance building, behavior exchange, and communication practice. Reviews describe IBCT as a coherent integration of acceptance and change rather than a choice between resignation and control (Roddy et al., 2016).

Emotionally focused couple therapy organizes distress through attachment-related threats and repetitive cycles, helping partners access vulnerable emotion and create clearer bids for connection. Early review and later synthesis support benefit, while much of the literature is associated with model developers and historically narrow samples (Johnson et al., 1999; Wiebe & Johnson, 2016). The most defensible shared principle is not that all distress is attachment injury. It is that secondary anger or withdrawal may become more workable when underlying fear, grief, longing, or shame can be communicated and met differently.

Research supports couple therapy as a class for relationship distress, but package comparisons do not establish a single necessary mechanism. Reviews of empirically supported couple interventions and later syntheses find benefit across established behavioral, integrative, and emotion-focused models, with differences in study quality and follow-up (Baucom et al., 1998; Lebow et al., 2012; Snyder et al., 2006; Snyder & Halford, 2012). Meta-analyses of behavioral marital therapy and broader couple therapy likewise report average

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

improvements while retaining heterogeneity and nonresponse (Shadish & Baldwin, 2005; Roddy et al., 2020). Taken together, these findings support several evidence-based routes to improved relational functioning. The selected model should follow a clear formulation, and its expected process of change should be stated and reviewed.

Model selection can therefore follow the dominant obstacle rather than therapist allegiance. Partners who can access vulnerability but lack reliable problem solving may need more behavioral structure; partners who perform skills while remaining emotionally defended may need work on meaning and accessibility; chronic polarization may require acceptance alongside targeted change. These are clinical hypotheses, not validated matching rules. The therapist states the reason for the emphasis and reviews whether its predicted process changes. If a chosen route increases blame, leaves injury untouched, or cannot be used outside sessions, fidelity should not protect it from revision. Responsible integration preserves a coherent rationale rather than borrowing whichever exercise fills the hour.

IX. INTIMACY, SEXUALITY, TRUST, AND BETRAYAL

Intimacy includes emotional, physical, sexual, intellectual, practical, and social connection. Partners may differ in desired closeness, frequency of sex, privacy, affection, or digital boundaries without either being disordered. Assessment should consider pain, medication effects, hormonal or medical conditions, trauma, orientation, gender identity, disability, cultural norms, consent, and relationship agreements. Desire discrepancy becomes a clinical problem through meaning, pressure, avoidance, injury, and loss of choice, not simply through difference in frequency.

Sexual communication requires explicit consent and freedom from retaliation. No couple exercise should prescribe sexual contact, touch, disclosure, or exposure that a partner does not want. Where there is sexual coercion, assault, fear, or trauma activation, safety and specialist care take priority. The therapist should avoid treating one partner's refusal as a symptom maintained for the relationship's benefit. A mutually agreed pause, medical evaluation, individual trauma treatment, or redefinition of intimacy may be more appropriate than conjoint behavioral assignment.

Betrayal—sexual, emotional, financial, digital, or related to substance use—creates questions of fact, impact, boundaries, and future choice. Couple therapy can support disclosure and repair only when disclosure is voluntary, sufficiently safe, and not used for repeated interrogation. Trust is not restored by a decision to forgive; it develops through consistent behavior, transparency that is proportionate and time-limited, acknowledgment of injury, and the injured partner's freedom to decide. Some couples use therapy to separate with greater clarity, which can be a successful outcome.

Trust work benefits from separating verification, accountability, and emotional repair. Verification concerns what can reasonably be established; accountability concerns ownership and changed conduct; emotional repair concerns whether injury can be heard without minimization or forced closure. Therapy may help with all three, but no conversation can guarantee future fidelity or erase the injured partner's uncertainty. Excessive surveillance can become its own maintaining pattern even when it arose after real deception. Any reduction in checking should follow credible behavioral change and mutual agreement, not pressure on the injured partner to demonstrate forgiveness.

X. COUPLE-BASED CARE FOR INDIVIDUAL DISORDERS

Relationship distress and individual mental health influence one another, but causal direction is rarely singular. Depression can reduce energy, warmth, and sexual interest; criticism and isolation can deepen depression. Anxiety can invite reassurance cycles; trauma can alter trust, arousal, and conflict; substance use can impair safety and reciprocity. Couple-based intervention may improve relationship functioning and support disorder-specific treatment, but it should not imply that a partner caused the illness or is responsible for cure.

Evidence varies by condition. A Cochrane review found that couple therapy for depression may improve relationship distress and depressive outcomes, with limited and heterogeneous trials (Barbato et al., 2018). Cognitive-behavioral conjoint therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder improved PTSD symptoms and relationship satisfaction in a randomized trial, but the protocol required careful selection and cannot replace crisis or trauma care for every couple (Monson et al., 2012). Behavioral couple therapy has evidence for alcohol and drug problems, including benefits over individually based comparisons in meta-analysis (Powers et al., 2008).

The partner's role should be negotiated, not assumed. Support can include understanding symptoms, reinforcing treatment-consistent behavior, reducing accommodation, planning medication or appointment routines, and protecting valued connection. Support becomes harmful when it turns into surveillance, coerced disclosure, or responsibility for risk management beyond the partner's capacity. The clinician treating an individual disorder and the couple therapist should communicate with consent, clarify roles, and avoid contradictory plans. Acute suicidality, mania, psychosis, withdrawal, or severe eating-disorder risk may require specialized individual or medical treatment before or alongside conjoint work.

A disorder-focused formulation should show exactly where relational intervention adds value. In social anxiety, for

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

example, withdrawal, limited disclosure, or muted expression may be interpreted by a partner as indifference, while pressure for reassurance may heighten self-focused attention. In depression, reduced initiation may be read as rejection; in PTSD, avoidance and hyperarousal may reorganize intimacy and conflict. The therapist can help partners distinguish symptom from intention and still preserve responsibility for impact. The proposition is not that relationship communication causes or cures the disorder. It is that better shared meaning can reduce secondary cycles that otherwise compound symptoms and obstruct evidence-based individual care.

XI. VIOLENCE, COERCIVE CONTROL, AND SAFEGUARDING

Intimate partner violence is not one homogeneous phenomenon, and distinctions matter for treatment, but typology must never be used to minimize danger. Trials of conjoint approaches have generally concerned selected couples with mild-to-moderate or situational violence, structured screening, explicit safety procedures, and exclusion of severe coercive control (Stith et al., 2004; Stith & McCollum, 2011). A meta-analysis concluded that couple therapy may be viable in selected situations while emphasizing limited evidence and the risk of retaliation (Karakurt et al., 2016). These findings do not authorize routine conjoint treatment wherever violence is disclosed.

Coercive control, fear, stalking, strangulation, sexual violence, escalating threats, weapon access, severe injury, and retaliation for disclosure shift the clinical priority to safety and specialist pathways. Joint sessions can give an abusive partner information, create false equivalence, and increase danger after therapy. The World Health Organization recommends first-line support that listens without pressure, validates, enhances safety, and connects survivors with services; NICE emphasizes coordinated multi-agency response (World Health Organization, 2013; National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2014). Local law and safeguarding duties govern action.

Safety planning is individualized. It may include private contact, secure communication, emergency options, documentation practices, child or dependent-adult safeguarding, technology safety, and careful timing of separation. The therapist should not promise confidentiality beyond legal and professional limits or require confrontation with a person causing harm. Perpetrator treatment, survivor advocacy, medical care, legal advice, housing, and child services may require separate agencies. The decision to remain, leave, or report belongs to the affected partner within applicable duties and realistic constraints; therapy should expand rather than narrow agency.

Risk status can change during treatment, especially around disclosure, pregnancy, separation, legal action, financial change, or increased substance use. Screening is therefore repeated, not completed once at intake. A homework conversation that was safe in one phase may become dangerous in another. Therapists need a private route for reporting concern, a documented decision process, and consultation that does not expose confidential material unnecessarily. When conjoint work is paused, the explanation should avoid signaling private disclosures to the other partner. Safety practice is part of relational competence because the consequences of an intervention unfold between sessions, where the therapist is absent.

Table 3. Conjoint treatment decision boundaries

Presentation	Primary concern	Likely response
Nonviolent reciprocal distress	Entrenched cycle and low repair	Standard couple assessment and treatment
Selected situational aggression	Escalation without coercive control	Specialist assessment; structured safety conditions
Coercive control or feared retaliation	Freedom and disclosure are compromised	Do not rely on routine conjoint therapy; use specialist pathways
Acute intoxication, withdrawal, mania, or suicidality	Immediate safety and capacity	Stabilize and coordinate appropriate care
Uncertain pattern	Insufficient private information	Pause joint intervention and assess separately

XII. OUTCOME, FEEDBACK, AND ENDINGS

Relationship satisfaction is important but incomplete. Monitoring can include conflict intensity, recovery time, emotional accessibility, affection, sexual consent and satisfaction, parenting cooperation, individual symptoms, safety, and progress toward each partner's goals. Partners may rate the same week differently; disagreement is data, not an averaging problem. The therapist should ask whose outcome changed and at what cost. Apparent calm produced by one partner's capitulation is not improvement.

Review should connect outcome to the formulation. If partners communicate more politely but remain unable to discuss the central injury, skill acquisition has not changed the maintaining process. If conflict frequency is unchanged but escalation and recovery improve, clinically meaningful change may be present. Worsening prompts review of violence, coercion, substance use, untreated individual disorder, incompatible goals, alliance imbalance, and whether the therapy itself is increasing pressure. Feedback is most useful when it changes the plan.

Endings include consolidation, booster planning, referral, or separation work. Partners can identify warning signs, repair

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

practices, protected conversations, and conditions that warrant renewed help. If the relationship ends, therapy can support communication about housing, finances, parenting, social networks, and safety without imposing reconciliation. A therapist should not use the success of a model as a reason to prolong treatment when one or both partners make an informed decision to leave. The endpoint is greater capacity for safe and deliberate relational choice.

Dyadic outcome resists a simple responder label. One partner may report greater satisfaction while the other reports greater clarity that the relationship is untenable; conflict may fall because communication improved or because one partner stopped speaking. Averaging those reports can turn a clinically important divergence into apparent stability. Meta-analytic benefit across outcomes is encouraging, but it cannot show whether change in a particular couple is shared or durable (Roddy et al., 2020). Outcome review should therefore place standardized measures beside each partner's goals, behavior, safety, and account of what changed.

Follow-up should test whether learning survives ordinary stress rather than only whether satisfaction remains above a threshold. Partners can rehearse how they will notice a familiar sequence, request a pause, return to unfinished conversation, and seek help before contempt or fear becomes entrenched. Five-year findings after behavioral couple therapy show both durable gains and later deterioration, making maintenance an empirical question rather than a ceremonial final session (Christensen et al., 2010). A relapse plan should include relational signs, individual symptoms, substance use, and safety changes, with explicit pathways for couple, individual, medical, or specialist support.

When partners separate, outcome remains relational but changes form. Relevant indicators may include reduced intimidation, clearer boundaries, reliable child-related communication, less triangulation through relatives, and each partner's ability to make decisions without therapeutic pressure to reconcile. Joint separation sessions are appropriate only when disclosure and negotiation remain safe; otherwise parallel support, mediation, legal advice, or specialist services may be needed. Calling separation a possible successful outcome does not mean that every separation is benign. It means that therapy is judged by safety, agency, and workable communication rather than by preserving couple status as proof that treatment succeeded.

XIII. LIMITATIONS AND RESEARCH PRIORITIES

Couple therapy research has historically overrepresented married, different-sex, relatively advantaged couples and model-specialist clinics. Trials vary in distress thresholds, treatment dose, therapist training, handling of separation, and whether both partners provide outcomes. Attrition is especially difficult to interpret because leaving treatment may signal improvement, separation, burden, alliance failure, or danger. Meta-analytic averages can conceal dependencies between partners, between multiple outcomes, and between reports from the same sample.

Communication measures also require refinement. Observed laboratory conversations may not represent private conflict, while self-report is shaped by fear, memory, and current sentiment. Research should examine sequences across real contexts without compromising privacy or safety, and should distinguish reciprocal low-level aggression from coercive control using validated assessment rather than post hoc labels. Adverse events—escalated conflict, retaliation after disclosure, worsening individual symptoms, and harmful therapist coalitions—need routine reporting.

Future trials should include diverse relationship forms, cultures, gender identities, disabilities, and material conditions; measure each partner's goals and safety; and identify mechanisms alongside brand comparisons. Research should examine how alliance balance, repair, vulnerable communication, behavioral change, and structural stress interact over time. Average effects alone cannot determine which couples can safely undertake conjoint work, which process should be targeted, or when another format is preferable.

Mechanism studies should preserve the time ordering of interaction. Global reports that communication improved cannot show whether vulnerable expression changed partner response, whether partner response made vulnerability possible, or whether reduced external stress improved both. Intensive but privacy-sensitive measurement, observer coding, and dyadic analysis can test sequences while retaining each partner's perspective. Trials should also report deterioration, coercion-related exclusions, separation, and referral after treatment rather than treating them as missing data. These outcomes are essential for deciding when a relational intervention expands agency and when the conjoint format itself has become part of the risk.

Decision-focused and separation outcomes remain underdeveloped. Most studies define success through relationship satisfaction or couple status, although therapy may instead improve clarity, safety, negotiating capacity, or co-parenting. Future research should distinguish reconciled, uncertain, separated, and unsafe trajectories, record whether benefit is shared by both partners, and report when conjoint treatment is stopped. These outcomes would better match the clinical remit without implying that therapy causes every decision or that every separation is successful.

XIV. CONCLUSION

Couple counselling is relational treatment, not adjudication and not communication etiquette. Its practical unit is a sequence in which each partner’s meaning, emotion, and

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

protective action alters what the other can perceive and do. Effective therapy makes that sequence visible without flattening responsibility, then creates conditions in which a different response can be attempted, received, and revised.

Evidence supports established couple therapies for relationship distress and selected individual disorders, but benefit is not universal and durability cannot be assumed. Alliance must be built with each partner and with the couple as a working unit. Safety overrides symmetry: coercive control, violence, sexual coercion, stalking, and feared retaliation require specialist assessment and may make conjoint work unsafe.

The central outcome is relational agency, not preservation of the couple at any cost. Where conjoint work is safe, treatment should expand the partners' capacity to exchange usable information, set boundaries, repair injury, and choose repair, reorganization, or separation with greater clarity. That judgment should draw on each partner's goals, observed behavior, safety, treatment burden, and follow-up—not therapist confidence or couple status.

XV. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND DISCLOSURES

Conflicts of interest—The author developed and writes about Communication-Focused Therapy (CFT). Where CFT is discussed, it is presented as a formulation perspective and not as a substitute for established assessment, evidence-based treatment, or independent replication. No other conflict of interest was reported.

Funding—No specific funding was reported for this article.

Author contributions—Christian Jonathan Haverkampf is the sole named author and is responsible for the conception, literature review, manuscript preparation, and approval of the final draft.

Patient material—No identifiable patient material is presented. Any brief examples are generic composites created to illustrate clinical reasoning and are not case reports.

XVI. REFERENCES

Barbato, A., D'Avanzo, B., & Parabiaghi, A. (2018). Couple therapy for depression. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2018(6), CD004188. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004188.pub3

Baucom, D. H., Shoham, V., Mueser, K. T., Daiuto, A. D., & Stickle, T. R. (1998). Empirically supported couple and family interventions for marital distress and adult mental health problems. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66(1), 53–88. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.66.1.53

Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2000). Research on the nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. Journal of Marriage and Family, 62(4), 964–980. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00964.x

Christensen, A., Atkins, D. C., Baucom, B., & Yi, J. (2010). Marital status and satisfaction five years following a randomized clinical trial comparing traditional versus integrative behavioral couple therapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 78(2), 225–235. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018132

Christensen, A., Atkins, D. C., Berns, S., Wheeler, J., Baucom, D. H., & Simpson, L. E. (2004). Traditional versus integrative behavioral couple therapy for significantly and chronically distressed married couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72(2), 176–191. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.72.2.176

Doss, B. D., Roddy, M. K., Wiebe, S. A., & Johnson, S. M. (2022). A review of the research during 2010–2019 on evidence-based treatments for couple relationship distress. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 48(1), 283–306. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12552

Friedlander, M. L., Escudero, V., Heatherington, L., & Diamond, G. M. (2011). Alliance in couple and family therapy. Psychotherapy, 48(1), 25–33. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022060

Johnson, S. M., Hunsley, J., Greenberg, L., & Schindler, D. (1999). Emotionally focused couples therapy: Status and challenges. Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 6(1), 67–79. https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy/6.1.67

Karakurt, G., Whiting, K., van Esch, C., Bolen, S. D., & Calabrese, J. R. (2016). Couples therapy for intimate partner violence: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 42(4), 567–583. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12178

Knobloch-Fedders, L. M., Pinsof, W. M., & Mann, B. J. (2007). Therapeutic alliance and treatment progress in couple psychotherapy. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 33(2), 245–257. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2007.00019.x

Lebow, J. L., Chambers, A. L., Christensen, A., & Johnson, S. M. (2012). Research on the treatment of couple distress. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 38(1), 145–168. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2011.00249.x

Monson, C. M., Fredman, S. J., Macdonald, A., Pukay-Martin, N. D., Resick, P. A., & Schnurr, P. P. (2012). Effect of cognitive-behavioral couple therapy for PTSD: A randomized controlled trial. JAMA, 308(7), 700–709. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2012.9307

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2014). Domestic violence and abuse: Multi-agency working (Public health guideline PH50). https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph50

Powers, M. B., Vedel, E., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2008). Behavioral couples therapy (BCT) for alcohol and drug use disorders: A meta-analysis. Clinical Psychology Review, 28(6), 952–962. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.02.002

Roddy, M. K., Nowlan, K. M., Doss, B. D., & Christensen, A. (2016). Integrative Behavioral Couple Therapy: Theoretical background, empirical research, and dissemination. Family Process, 55(3), 408–422. https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12223

Roddy, M. K., Walsh, L. M., Rothman, K., Hatch, S. G., & Doss, B. D. (2020). Meta-analysis of couple therapy: Effects across outcomes, designs, timeframes, and other moderators. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 88(7), 583–596. https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000514

Shadish, W. R., & Baldwin, S. A. (2005). Effects of behavioral marital therapy: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73(1), 6–14. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.1.6

Haverkampf, C. J. (2025). Couple Counselling: Assessment, Communication, Safety, and Relational Change. J Psychiatry Psychotherapy Communication, 2025 Jun 30;14(2):31-40

Snyder, D. K., Castellani, A. M., & Whisman, M. A. (2006). Current status and future directions in couple therapy. Annual Review of Psychology, 57, 317–344. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070154

Snyder, D. K., & Halford, W. K. (2012). Evidence-based couple therapy: Current status and future directions. Journal of Family Therapy, 34(3), 229–249. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6427.2012.00599.x

Stith, S. M., & McCollum, E. E. (2011). Conjoint treatment of couples who have experienced intimate partner violence. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16(4), 312–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2011.04.012

Stith, S. M., Rosen, K. H., McCollum, E. E., & Thomsen, C. J. (2004). Treating intimate partner violence within intact couple relationships: Outcomes of multi-couple versus individual couple therapy. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 30(3), 305–318. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2004.tb01242.x

Symonds, D., & Horvath, A. O. (2004). Optimizing the alliance in couple therapy. Family Process, 43(4), 443–455. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2004.00033.x

Wiebe, S. A., & Johnson, S. M. (2016). A review of the research in emotionally focused therapy for couples. Family Process, 55(3), 390–407. https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12229

World Health Organization. (2013). Responding to intimate partner violence and sexual violence against women: WHO clinical and policy guidelines. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241548595