Relational Wounds, Relational Repair

How Structured Groups Rebuild Trust After Infidelity

A WHITE PAPER
Published by Affair Recovery · July 2026

ABOUT THIS PAPER

Prepared and published by Affair Recovery (affairrecovery.com / hope-now.com). This paper is a conceptual synthesis of published research describing the theoretical rationale underlying Affair Recovery's group-based recovery programs. It has not undergone external peer review, and the framework it proposes awaits empirical validation. It is offered as an educational resource and does not constitute clinical advice or a substitute for individual assessment and treatment.

Executive Summary

Insight alone rarely heals the damage of infidelity. Betrayal creates a profound attachment rupture, and the materials a marriage needs to repair it (empathy, emotional responsiveness, compassion, and grief) must come from the unfaithful spouse. Yet by the very nature of what they have done, their presence is itself a reminder that activates the trauma response. That bind is why Affair Recovery believes it takes safe attachment to heal attachment wounds. Betrayed spouses recover connection and belonging in a homogeneous community of people walking through the same experience, where they can feel seen and understood, and where they can offer compassion and concern to others in return. Unfaithful spouses, meanwhile, need an effective tutor to help them grasp the damage betrayal inflicts, and a community whose shared values support healthy relationships and attachment. A group of couples facing the same crisis also makes that damage easier to comprehend, because members can watch other couples objectively, with no shared history to distort the view. And for both spouses, sitting with others who are living it too drains the shame, since they stop seeing themselves as unique. What replaces it is belonging.

This paper draws on attachment research, interpersonal neurobiology, and several decades of group psychotherapy literature to argue that lasting change happens inside relationships and that structured groups create relational conditions weekly individual therapy cannot easily match. Recovery groups built around shared circumstance, continuous peer availability, leaders who have lived through it themselves, and a structured curriculum can serve as secure relational containers, places where trust is rebuilt through repetition rather than instruction. The paper examines four mechanisms: earned secure attachment in adulthood, the experiential revision of working models, the therapeutic factors specific to groups, and the co-regulating effect of attuned connection on the nervous system. Longitudinal outcome data from more than 20,000 participants in Affair Recovery's programs, showing durable reductions in anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress, offer preliminary support. The conviction underneath it all is simple. Relational wounds require relational repair, and the right community makes repair possible.

Keywords: *attachment theory, earned secure attachment, group therapy, relational trauma, corrective emotional experience, internal working models, betrayal trauma recovery*

Character and relational functioning do not form in isolation. They take shape through repeated interpersonal experience, which teaches people what to expect from themselves and from others. Early childhood matters enormously, but development does not close when it ends. Research over the past two decades shows that people keep changing across the lifespan, especially inside relationships that are emotionally safe and consistent (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

For people with histories of betrayal or relational trauma, that formative process has often gone badly, leaving behind a chronic defensiveness that outlasts the original injury. Structured relational environments, including those designed specifically for recovery from infidelity, can supply the corrective emotional experiences that healing requires (Herman, 1992). When a recovery group is built from a shared crisis, sustained peer connection, and a curriculum of transparency, it can

become a secure container, a place where rebuilding trust stops being a matter of chance.

This paper synthesizes findings from attachment theory, developmental psychology, social neuroscience, and group psychotherapy to explain how structured group recovery processes produce lasting relational change. Four questions organize the argument: whether attachment can reorganize in adulthood, how relational experience reshapes internal working models, what group treatment offers that individual treatment does not, and what is happening neurobiologically when relational healing occurs.

Attachment Theory and the Possibility of Change in Adulthood

Bowlby (1969/1982) proposed that early interactions with caregivers form internal working models of self and others. These schemas carry forward into adult life, shaping expectations of trust, safety, and worthiness and organizing how people behave in close relationships.

Attachment patterns show real stability across the lifespan. Even so, adults can develop what researchers call earned secure attachment through sustained experience of reliable, attuned relationships (Main et al., 1985; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007). The finding matters clinically because it means a person whose early relationships were insecure or disorganized is not sentenced to repeat them.

Longitudinal work bears this out. Raby et al. (2015) found that supportive adult relationships can alter attachment trajectories even for people with insecure early histories. The relational environment a person encounters in adulthood, when it is consistent and emotionally available, becomes a setting in which attachment representations are revised.

The practical implications show up in how recovery programs are built. Individual and couples therapy provide real clinical value, but they are episodic by design, usually one hour a week. A group whose members stay connected between sessions offers something structurally different: a persistent secure base (Bowlby, 1988). Members who can reach one another during a 2 a.m. crisis form a real-time co-regulatory system. That kind of availability carries people through the worst stretches and multiplies the corrective experiences that revise working models.

Reshaping Internal Working Models Through Relational Experience

Internal working models are not fixed cognitive structures. They are updated continually by lived experience (Baldwin, 1992). After betrayal, the updating runs in a protective direction, toward hypervigilance and self-protection. These are sensible adaptations to a real threat, and they also make intimacy and trust harder to reach.

Holmes (2001) argued that psychological change occurs when a person encounters relational experience that contradicts, and eventually revises, maladaptive expectations. The process is experiential before it is cognitive. Insight into one’s patterns is useful; what actually revises a working model is repeated contact with relationships that fail to confirm the threat the model

predicts.

Neuroscience points the same direction. Coan's (2008) Social Baseline Theory holds that the presence of supportive others reduces perceived threat and cognitive load. On this account, the human brain seems built to run on connection. Isolation after betrayal therefore compounds the neurobiological burden of threat, while re-entry into a trustworthy relational environment supplies the regulatory scaffolding that reorganization requires.

Structured recovery groups are well suited to this work. They immerse participants in consistent, attuned, trustworthy peer relationships, and corrective experience arrives at high frequency. Each time the group proves reliable in the face of someone's vulnerability, the threat-based schema loses a little ground. Over months, that accumulation is how internal models shift toward earned security, and earned security is the psychological foundation on which long-term relational satisfaction rests.

The Role of Group Environments in Adult Relational Development

Groups offer a context for relational change that individual treatment cannot replicate. A group is many relationships at once, so it multiplies occasions for learning, reinforcement, and chances to internalize new relational patterns.

Yalom and Leszcz (2005) identified therapeutic factors inherent to group process, several of which bear directly on recovery from betrayal. Universality, the recognition that others share the same struggle, cuts against the profound isolation betrayal produces. Hope builds as members watch one another make progress; recovery stops being an abstraction and becomes visible in the person across the room. Imitative behavior lets participants borrow healthier communication and boundary-setting from one another. Interpersonal learning provides live relational feedback inside a structured, safe container.

These factors intensify in homogeneous groups, meaning groups composed of people facing the same type of relational disruption. Universality does not have to be discovered gradually; it is obvious from the first session, which lowers the shame that keeps many people from engaging at all. Feedback also lands differently when it comes from a peer who genuinely understands what is at stake.

Structured psychoeducational content adds another channel. Video-based modeling that shows the real-world outcome of a clinical theme gives skeptical participants visual evidence that healing happens. For someone whose trauma has taught them to distrust reassurance, seeing is often more persuasive than being told.

The broader evidence base agrees. Meta-analytic research confirms that group therapy is effective across a wide range of psychological concerns (Burlingame et al., 2011). Groups do not simply support change. The relational process itself drives it.

Mentoring and Shared-Experience Leadership as Catalysts for Growth

Mentoring research tells a similar story about consistent, supportive connection. In a meta-analysis, DuBois et al. (2011) linked mentoring programs to gains in self-esteem, social competence, and behavior. Rhodes (2005) emphasized that a mentoring relationship's developmental impact rises and falls with its quality and reliability, above all for people whose earlier relationships fell short.

This matters for recovery programs that use shared-experience leadership, in which facilitators have lived through the relational crisis their group members now face. Such leaders do two things no credential alone can. They stand as credible witnesses that recovery is possible. For a participant in the raw skepticism that follows recent betrayal, a leader who has walked the same road is embodied evidence, not theory, and that evidence quiets doubt and speeds hope. They also bring an empathic precision that is hard to reproduce from a purely clinical vantage point. Having navigated the particulars of betrayal and repair themselves, they can model relational steadiness in real time and demonstrate that integrity, once broken, can be restored.

Neurobiological Foundations of Relational Healing

Interpersonal neurobiology backs this up from the physiological side. Schore (2003) and Siegel (2012) describe how attuned interaction regulates emotional systems, promotes neural integration, and helps a coherent self-narrative take shape.

Herman (1992) stated the foundational principle of trauma treatment plainly: recovery unfolds within relationships. Relational wounds require relational repair. The physiology behind that principle is increasingly well mapped. Co-regulation, the calming and organizing of one nervous system through attuned connection with another, is what allows trauma-based defenses to come down (Porges, 2011). A group marked by safety, consistency, and shared experience produces co-regulation again and again. That repetition creates the neurobiological conditions for attachment to reorganize.

Seen this way, a structured recovery group is a neurobiological intervention as much as a psychological one. It supplies the relational ingredients a nervous system needs to move out of chronic threat detection and into social engagement (Porges, 2011).

Implications for Character Development and Moral Formation

Moral and character development are embedded in relational experience at least as much as in cognitive insight or individual willpower. A healthy relational community models integrity, gives people occasions to build trust, makes vulnerability safe to practice, and reinforces prosocial behavior. Repeated exposure to those elements is how empathy, emotional regulation, and ethical consistency develop.

Recovery from betrayal is a case in point. It frequently involves compromised moral functioning alongside attachment injury. Much individual therapy proceeds as if cognitive insight will produce behavioral change, yet the literature suggests insight alone is insufficient for lasting transformation (Fonagy et al., 2002). Groups address the gap by making character development experiential. Accountability, empathy, and integrity are not taught as content; they are absorbed from peers who practice them week after week.

Recovery that lives in a community, not in a string of isolated appointments, carries the social reinforcement needed to address both the attachment rupture and the moral injury, healing relational wounds while building relational virtue.

Preliminary Evidence From Program Outcomes

The framework advanced here is theoretical, but outcome data from Affair Recovery's own programs are consistent with it. In a longitudinal evaluation of the four structured group programs (EMS Online, EMS Weekend, Harboring Hope, and Hope for Healing), data from 20,797 unique participants were analyzed from program enrollment through follow-up points reaching as far as 36 months past completion. Latent growth curve models tracked symptoms of anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress on validated instruments (Scammacca Lewis, 2025a).

Participants in all four programs achieved statistically significant, long-term reductions in anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress symptoms. Improvement held through at least the 24-month follow-up in every program, and up to 36 months where longer-term data were available. Effect sizes ranged from moderate (0.51) to very large (1.16), with most in the large range, meaning the changes were clinically meaningful rather than merely statistically detectable. A comprehensive set of fifteen covariates, including gender, the number of betrayals, and involvement in a faith community, generally did not moderate the rate of improvement. The programs worked across a large and diverse group of participants (Scammacca Lewis, 2025a). Marital adjustment, examined in the detailed program-level analysis, showed smaller and more mixed effects, which fits clinical experience; individual symptom recovery and the repair of a marriage move on different timelines (Scammacca Lewis, 2025b).

Gains that persist for two years or more after a program ends are what the framework predicts. Change cultivated inside a sustained relational environment holds after formal contact stops. The evaluation used an uncontrolled, within-participant design, so it demonstrates that participants improve and keep their improvements; it cannot isolate how much of the effect belongs to group process specifically. It offers preliminary support and a foundation for the more rigorous work described below.

Conclusion and Directions for Future Research

The research reviewed here converges on a single point. Human transformation is relational at its core. Secure attachments formed in adulthood, steady exposure to healthy relational models, and participation in supportive groups all move people in the same direction: toward revised expectations, restored trust, and steadier character.

For people recovering from betrayal, the practical lesson is that environments matter. A recovery process offering only clinical insight leaves out the ongoing, embodied relational experience that change appears to require. Structured groups that surround people with true peers, keep them connected between sessions, put leaders with lived experience at the front of the room, and pair all of it with sound teaching are a promising way to deliver the corrective emotional experiences that attachment theory, neuroscience, and the group therapy literature all point to as essential.

The outcome data reported above are encouraging, but the framework still needs controlled validation. Future studies should track attachment security, relational satisfaction, and psychological distress over time in structured group recovery; compare group-based against individual interventions for betrayal trauma to clarify what group process contributes; and explore the neurobiological correlates of group-based healing through measures such as cortisol reactivity, heart rate variability, and functional connectivity.

Such environments do more than support change. They make it possible.

References

Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of social information. Psychological Bulletin, 112(3), 461–484. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.3.461

Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment (2nd ed.). Basic Books. (Original work published 1969)

Bowlby, J. (1988). A secure base: Parent–child attachment and healthy human development. Basic Books.

Burlingame, G. M., Strauss, B., & Joyce, A. S. (2011). Change mechanisms and effectiveness of small group treatments. In M. J. Lambert (Ed.), Bergin and Garfield's handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change (6th ed., pp. 640–689). Wiley.

Coan, J. A. (2008). Toward a neuroscience of attachment. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications (2nd ed., pp. 241–265). Guilford Press.

DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12(2), 57–91. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611414806

Fonagy, P., Gergely, G., Jurist, E. L., & Target, M. (2002). Affect regulation, mentalization, and the development of the self. Other Press.

Herman, J. L. (1992). Trauma and recovery: The aftermath of violence—from domestic abuse to political terror. Basic Books.

Holmes, J. (2001). The search for the secure base: Attachment theory and psychotherapy. Brunner-Routledge.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50(1–2), 66–104. https://doi.org/10.2307/3333827

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2007). Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change. Guilford Press.

Porges, S. W. (2011). The polyvagal theory: Neurophysiological foundations of emotions, attachment, communication, and self-regulation. W. W. Norton.

Raby, K. L., Roisman, G. I., Fraley, R. C., & Simpson, J. A. (2015). The enduring predictive significance of early maternal sensitivity: Social and academic competence through age 32 years. Child Development, 86(3), 695–708. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12325

Rhodes, J. E. (2005). A model of youth mentoring. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), Handbook of youth mentoring (pp. 30–43). Sage.

Scammacca Lewis, N. (2025a). Summary report: Multi-year outcome analysis of Affair Recovery's programs. Affair Recovery LLC. https://www.affairrecovery.com/research/analysis-of-longitudinal-data-from-affair-recovery-programs

Scammacca Lewis, N. (2025b). 2025 AR report of findings (detailed by course): Efficacy research [Unpublished report]. Affair Recovery LLC.

Schore, A. N. (2003). Affect regulation and the repair of the self. W. W. Norton.

Siegel, D. J. (2012). The developing mind: How relationships and the brain interact to shape who we are (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.

Yalom, I. D., & Leszcz, M. (2005). The theory and practice of group psychotherapy (5th ed.). Basic Books.