

Your Anger Deserves a Voice

Protest, assertion, and the responsibility that comes with being heard

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT

You say it is fine, then spend the evening irritated. You agree to another request and later become sharp about something that seems unrelated. Or you raise a concern plainly enough, only to discover that the conversation has become about your tone. The missed agreement, the unequal work, or the hurtful comment disappears behind a new question: Why are you so angry?

Other people have the opposite difficulty. Anger arrives quickly and seems to organize the whole encounter. You become certain about what happened and what it means. You explain harder, repeat the accusation, withdraw with unmistakable displeasure, or insist that the conversation cannot end until the other person understands. Later, you may recognize that something important was present in your anger, but the way you expressed it made that something harder to reach.

Anger can carry a concern that deserves a voice. It can also become a way of making another person smaller. Learning to work with it involves both truths. We need room to recognize what matters, speak more clearly, and examine what our response does to the people around us. The aim is a voice we can use responsibly, even while we remain affected.

A signal worth listening to

Harriet Lerner writes, “Anger is a signal - and it’s one worth listening to.” She also emphasizes that the signal does not tell us, by itself, exactly what is wrong or how to change it (Lerner, 2009). This is a useful place to begin. Anger asks for attention without settling the entire account.

Perhaps a promise was broken. Perhaps you have been carrying more than your share of a household. Perhaps you were dismissed, interrupted, or treated as though your time had no value. You might be frightened of losing someone, disappointed by a refusal, exhausted, in pain, or reacting to an interpretation you have not checked. Several things can be true together.

A partner who does not answer a message may be unavailable, distracted, avoiding a responsibility, or unaware of what you expected. Your anger might help you recognize a need for dependable communication. It cannot establish their intention. A history of unanswered requests matters, too; curiosity should not require forgetting what has repeatedly happened.

We can ask two questions: What is my anger drawing my attention toward? And what evidence would help me understand this more accurately? The first gives the experience dignity. The second keeps it open to reality. Sometimes the answer is a clearer request. Sometimes it is an apology, a practical change, outside support, or recognition that the other person has already understood and is not willing to respond.

Anger is different from aggression

Anger is a feeling. Aggression concerns behavior intended to harm. The American Psychological Association distinguishes the two, while recognizing that anger can contribute to aggression (APA, n.d.). Feeling angry does not inevitably produce harmful conduct, and an apparently composed person can still intimidate, dismiss, or punish.

A raised voice deserves attention to its effect, but volume alone cannot tell us the whole story. A restrained voice can deliver a threat. Silence can provide needed space, reflect exhaustion, or become a deliberate means of punishment. We need to examine what actually happened: insults, obstruction, threats, repeated pressure, ignored refusals, or a clear and proportionate limit.

“I am angry, and I want to revisit the agreement” makes an experience and concern available. “You will stay here until you admit I am right” removes another person's freedom. The difference is consequential. Intensity does not make a demand legitimate, and composure does not make conduct fair.

We are allowed to feel what we feel. We remain responsible for what we do with it. Someone else's harmful behavior can explain why we are angry without excusing harm in return. Likewise, your harmful expression does not make the original concern disappear. You can apologize for an insult and still need the unpaid bill or unequal workload addressed.

What we learned about being angry

Some people grew up where anger belonged to the most powerful person in the room. A child might become quiet, agreeable, watchful, or very good at preventing disappointment. They may later struggle to recognize anger until it has become resentment, exhaustion, or an unexpectedly sharp reply. Another child might learn that escalation was the only way to be heard. Anger could become a familiar route to influence, even when that route damaged connection.

These are possibilities for understanding, not histories to assign. A person may avoid speaking because the present setting is genuinely unsafe. They may raise a concern forcefully because softer requests have been repeatedly ignored. Temperament, disability, sensory overload, illness, work demands, culture, and current treatment all deserve consideration.

Gender, power, and whose anger we can hear

Anger enters relationships already carrying a social history. Through a critique of patriarchy, a man's anger may be understood as defending an assumed right to authority, accommodation, or control. Michael Kimmel's account of “aggrieved entitlement” examines anger arising when an expected advantage feels threatened or withdrawn (2017). This lens can help us recognize occasions when anger pressures another person to become smaller, surrender a boundary, or restore an unequal arrangement.

Feminist writing has also helped recover women's anger as a source of self-recognition and resistance after being expected to accommodate, remain agreeable, or absorb injury. Audre Lorde's writing gives

particular attention to women of Color responding to racism, including racism within relationships among women (1984). Her work asks us to hear what anger reveals about exclusion and oppression, rather than making the discomfort of those hearing it the central problem.

These perspectives become less useful when they decide the meaning of an individual's anger before we have listened. A man's anger may express wounded dignity, grief, exploitation, or a reasonable protest against mistreatment. A woman's anger may express a necessary refusal, and its expression can still become humiliating or coercive. Neither possibility establishes that power is equally distributed or that responsibility is shared equally. We need to examine the particular relationship: who can refuse, whose account is taken seriously, and what happens when someone disagrees.

We also need to distinguish the feminist reclamation of women's anger from the assumption that women's anger is generally welcomed. Experimental research has documented the opposite in some settings. Brescoll and Uhlmann found that angry women were judged less favorably than angry men in professional contexts (2008). Salerno and Peter-Hagene found that anger increased men's influence and decreased women's influence during simulated jury deliberations (2015). These studies concern particular situations; they do not establish a rule for every relationship or community.

bell hooks offers another necessary dimension. Her critique of patriarchy includes the emotional restrictions placed on men and the difficulty others can have hearing male pain without dismissing it as weakness or manipulation (2004). Recognizing male vulnerability need not excuse domination. Recognizing women's oppression need not make every expression of anger beyond examination.

For our purposes, gender and power should deepen inquiry. What happened? What is this anger trying to protect or change? Is someone asking for dignity and fair treatment, or insisting on another person's compliance? Can we recognize the injury while remaining accountable for the response? The person's gender cannot answer those questions for us.

A relationship or workplace may need a change in power, resources, or responsibilities. Helping one person regulate cannot substitute for addressing the conditions provoking their protest. An invitation to speak more clearly should include an invitation to listen and to act.

Anger does not always conceal something softer

It can be helpful to discover fear, grief, shame, or longing alongside anger. You may be angry when a partner withdraws and also afraid that you no longer matter. You may protest a parent's refusal to understand and encounter sadness about what they cannot offer. Making room for those experiences can change how you approach the conversation.

But anger is not always a cover for another emotion. You may be directly angry about an unfair act. Searching insistently for the sadness underneath can become another way of moving you away from what you know. Anger itself may provide energy to resist a violation or address a problem.

Research reviewed by Charles Carver and Eddie Harmon-Jones explores anger's relationship to approach motivation: the tendency to move toward something rather than only retreat from it (2009). This supports taking anger's mobilizing quality seriously. It does not establish that anger is always useful, that a particular accusation is accurate, or that every impulse it brings should be followed.

The question is what this energy might serve. Could it help you name the unpaid work, protect consent, make a request, or acknowledge a responsibility? Could you use it to remain engaged with a difficult task instead of directing it at the nearest person? You may also decide that you need a pause before you can make that choice.

The feeling that says, “I am here, too”

Anger can help define an integral sense of self: the felt knowledge that you have a body, a point of view, preferences, limits, and a life that matters alongside other lives. It can register the moment you have agreed beyond your capacity, surrendered an important value, or disappeared inside another person's expectations. “I do not want this” can be an early expression of self-recognition. Learning to hear it gives you a chance to choose a response before resentment has to speak for you.

Emotions participate in the work of living. Fear can orient us toward danger; grief can help us respond to loss; enjoyment can draw us toward nourishing experiences. Anger can mobilize resistance to obstruction, injury, or disregard. These functions are possibilities, not infallible instructions. Researchers differ about how to classify primary emotions, and no feeling comes with a guarantee that our interpretation or preferred action fits the situation.

Jaak Panksepp's affective neuroscience identifies a mammalian RAGE system among seven proposed primary emotional systems. His work locates roots of anger in biology, including responses to frustration and restraint, rather than treating it as a moral failure (Panksepp, 1998, 2010). Human anger also involves learning, interpretation, language, and social conditions. We cannot read a particular person's motives or childhood history directly from an account of animal brain systems.

Evolutionary psychologists Aaron Sell, John Tooby, and Leda Cosmides propose that anger can function to influence how much weight another person gives our interests (2009). This offers one explanation for the protest, “You are acting as though I do not count.” It also helps us consider anger used to demand special treatment. A proposed evolutionary function does not make a demand fair. Biology helps explain a capacity; it does not decide how we should exercise it.

Antonio Damasio and Gil Carvalho connect feelings with the brain's representation of bodily states and the regulation of life (2013). This places bodily experience near the center of feeling. In everyday reflection, the first indication of anger may be a tight jaw, heat in your face, pressure in your chest, a clenched hand, or an impulse to push away. These sensations are clues, not diagnostic signs. Asking what is happening in your body can help you notice an experience before the sentence “You always do this” takes over.

Winnicott's psychoanalytic writing connects early aggressive impulses with vitality, relationship, and the developing capacity for concern about one's effect on others (Winnicott, 1950/2016). His use of

“aggression” is broader than the modern behavioral definition of intended harm used above. A useful clinical implication is that growing up involves finding room for force, desire, and protest while developing responsibility. We need to be able to say no and still care what our no does. Neither chronic compliance nor domination provides much room for two whole people.

When the present touches an older injury

Sometimes an encounter contains both a current disappointment and a much older ache. Imagine telling your partner something important while they glance at their phone. That glance may be inconsiderate. It may also resemble years of trying to reach a parent who seemed more interested in everything else. The present event need not be identical to the past. There may be just enough resemblance to awaken a familiar sense of being unimportant, followed by an urgent determination never to feel that way again.

A psychodynamic lens asks how earlier relationships may be organizing this encounter without our realizing it. **Transference** describes the carrying forward of feelings and expectations shaped in important earlier relationships into a present relationship. **Projection** is a different process: attributing something of our own inner experience to someone else. For example, I may be uncomfortable recognizing my hostility and become certain that you are the hostile one. Both ideas can help us question certainty; neither should become an accusation used to dismiss someone else's concern (APA, n.d., transference; projection).

Old learning does not always arrive as a remembered scene. It may arrive as a bodily shift, a prediction, or the conviction that we already know how this will end. This is one way to think about implicit relational learning: expectations and responses can operate without deliberate recollection. The intensity of a feeling, however, does not prove that a particular childhood event occurred. “This feels familiar” is an opening for inquiry, not recovered evidence.

John Bowlby's Separation examines parent-child separation and its accompanying anxiety, including fear of anticipated separation and parental threats of separation (1973). This supplies a developmental lens, rather than a verified explanation for every adult protest. A present-day relational possibility is that anger includes an effort to restore contact: “Notice me. Respond to me. Show me that this relationship matters.” The form of protest can nevertheless make contact harder. Accusation or pressure may invite retreat, which then appears to confirm the fear. This is an educational synthesis consistent with Brian's discussion of recognition and defensive cycles; it does not describe every angry person or withdrawing partner. The current conduct and the other person's own account still need to be heard.

In the phone example, a useful statement might be: “When you looked down, I felt dismissed. It reminded me of trying to get my father's attention. I know you are not him, and I want to check what was happening. I also need us to put our phones away for this conversation.” Here, the older hurt receives recognition, the present interpretation remains open to correction, and the current request stays intact. Perhaps the partner was checking an urgent message; perhaps distraction is a repeated problem. Both people need room to learn what actually happened.

We do not have to choose between “It is all my history” and “It is all your fault.” A present action can be hurtful and carry extra force because of earlier experiences. Differentiating the two lets us address today's

conduct without asking today's partner to repay every old debt. Understanding history should also never require tolerating a recurring present injury.

Giving the angry part a place at the table

Internal Family Systems offers another language for this experience. A Manager may try to prevent humiliation through criticism or control. A Firefighter may react urgently when pain becomes overwhelming. An Exile may carry hurt, longing, or anger that had little room to be expressed. These are possibilities within the IFS model, not labels we can assign from someone's behavior alone (IFS Institute, n.d.).

You might notice, “A part of me wants to make you understand right now. Another part is afraid that speaking will cost me the relationship.” Naming both can create a little room around the urgency. In IFS language, Self brings curiosity and compassion to these competing experiences. Listening inwardly does not mean giving an angry impulse permission to govern the conversation. You can respect what a part is trying to accomplish while taking responsibility for the conduct you choose.

Try asking, “What feels so important here? What am I afraid would happen if I did not act immediately? What do I need you to understand?” An answer might concern an old injury, an actual broken agreement, or something not yet clear. You do not have to locate a hidden wound or decide that all anger is protective. The purpose of the language is to support understanding and choice, not to impose a story.

Enough regulation to remain yourself and recognize another

Allan Schore's regulation theory emphasizes early relationships, nonverbal emotional communication, and the developing capacity to manage affect (2001). His account helps direct attention toward timing, tone, facial expression, and experiences of being helped through distress. It does not mean anger lives exclusively in the right brain or that we can infer someone's brain state from a facial expression. A quiet person can be intensely activated; a person showing emotion may still be able to listen and choose.

Daniel Siegel's interpersonal neurobiology emphasizes integration: distinct aspects of experience becoming connected. Applied here, bodily sensation, emotion, thought, and another person's perspective can all remain available (Siegel, n.d.). Rather than treating our anger as the whole truth, we can include it in a larger understanding. “I am furious” can coexist with “I may have misunderstood something” and “This agreement still needs to change.”

Regulation means having enough flexibility to choose what happens next. You may still feel heat, speak firmly, or have tears in your eyes. Differentiation adds the capacity to hold your own position while recognizing that the other person has a separate mind, history, and needs (Bowen Center, n.d.). Their disappointment does not automatically make your boundary wrong. Your anger does not automatically make their account wrong. You can remain connected without surrendering your position or requiring them to surrender theirs.

In AEDP, developed by Diana Fosha, emotional experience is explored with relational support, including the adaptive possibilities of anger such as self-protection and assertion (Gleiser, Ford, & Fosha, 2008). A therapist may help someone stay with a tolerable amount of feeling and discover the words “That was not okay” or “I needed protection.” The clinical aim includes recovering agency. It does not require aggressive discharge or confronting the person who caused the hurt. This supported therapeutic work differs from trying to intensify emotion alone.

In an ordinary conversation, that agency might sound like: “I do not like being spoken to that way. I want to understand what upset you, and I need the name-calling to stop.” If you cannot keep enough choice to avoid an insult or physical aggression, the next action is to interrupt the encounter and get support. If connection is possible, you can return to the concern. Where there is coercion or danger, distance and protection may be the fitting expression of self-respect.

From protest to a particular concern

Protest often begins broadly: “You never listen.” “I do everything.” “You only care about yourself.” Sometimes these words emerge from a long and painful pattern. Even then, the general accusation may give the other person something to dispute while leaving the actual issue untouched.

Try making the concern more specific. What happened? What mattered about it? What did you want, need, or expect? What request or existing responsibility follows? You might need listening, empathy, affection, reliable help, space, an apology, or a practical arrangement. These are different asks.

“Could you listen for ten minutes before offering advice?” invites a bounded form of support. “You agreed to arrange the appointment; it is still not booked” names an unfinished commitment. “I would like more time together” opens a preference for negotiation. A need can be legitimate while a particular person remains unable or unwilling to meet it. A genuine duty requires more than simply announcing a preference not to perform it.

Specificity also helps you recognize when your protest has become a demand for agreement. Wanting to be understood is different from requiring the other person to endorse every part of your explanation. They can acknowledge your experience and still remember an event differently. Neither person's feeling should have to disappear for the other to retain a mind of their own.

If the concern has already been made clear and repeatedly ignored, another carefully worded request may not be the missing ingredient. You might need practical support, a firmer arrangement, independent advice, or a decision about your own participation. Communication is one resource among several.

Assertion leaves room for two people

Randy Paterson's work on assertiveness offers practical ways to express opinions, make requests, set limits, and receive feedback while staying connected (Paterson, 2022). Assertion can be learned through small rehearsals rather than a dramatic confrontation. It is an act of participation, with no guarantee of the response you want.

A useful statement may include an observable event, its effect, your request or position, and what you can responsibly do next. “The plan changed without notice. I could not arrange childcare. Please check with me before changing it again. I can attend at the original time today.” You do not have to use every piece, and ordinary language is usually enough.

You can be visibly affected while making that statement. Tears, a shaking voice, or continued anger do not automatically remove your right to speak. The practical question is whether you can keep enough choice to avoid threats, humiliation, and pressure. Sometimes a written message or a rehearsal with someone trustworthy will work better than speaking immediately.

A limit concerns your participation: “I want to discuss this, and I will pause if the insults continue.” A punishment attempts to control another person's choices: “You cannot use our money until you agree with me.” Calling something a boundary does not settle which it is. Consider what the action does, especially to someone dependent on you.

You may fear that clarity will make you selfish, unlovable, disloyal, or mistaken. You may also have realistic concerns about retaliation. Those situations call for different responses. A fear can sometimes be explored through a small experiment; a credible threat calls for practical protection and confidential support. No exercise obligates you to confront someone unsafe.

Giving anger a voice is different from rehearsing rage

There is a difference between expressing a concern and trying to discharge anger through aggressive venting. Research does not support the simple idea that anger must be physically expelled to make it harmless. Bushman's laboratory research found that angry rumination combined with punching a bag could increase subsequent anger and aggressive responding (2002). The findings concern particular experimental conditions; they do not mean that every conversation about anger makes it worse.

A later meta-analysis by Sophie Kjærviik and Brad Bushman found that activities lowering physiological arousal reduced anger and aggression on average, whereas activities raising arousal were ineffective overall (2024). That is evidence for considering the effect of a strategy rather than assuming intense release is therapeutic. It is not a requirement to become perfectly calm before addressing injustice, or a reason to dismiss anger's information.

You might pause, turn attention toward the room, reduce stimulation, or ask for help. Choose an option suited to your body and circumstances. If inward attention or a breathing practice makes things harder, use another approach. The point is enough room for responsible action. The original concern should remain available when you return.

When the anger is directed toward you

This work also belongs to the person receiving a protest. Someone says they are angry about what you did, and your attention moves toward defending your worth. You explain your intention, describe how difficult your week has been, or insist that they are too sensitive. Perhaps you apologize globally to end the discussion. The particular action can disappear in either direction.

Try naming what you can honestly own. “I interrupted you twice, and you did not get to finish.” “I agreed to handle that task, and you were left doing it.” You can acknowledge the reported effect without confessing to a motive you do not recognize. An explanation may help shape the next agreement, but it does not complete a missed responsibility.

Ask whether you have understood the main concern, and let the person correct you. Then consider a feasible repair step. They may remain angry. They may not trust the promise yet. Your task is to address the action, rather than obtain reassurance that the apology has restored your standing.

Listening does not require tolerating intimidation. You can name a missed commitment and still decline threats or insults. When there is violence, coercion, or fear of retaliation, joint reflection is not an adequate response. Confidential individual support and practical safety take priority. If you fear you may harm someone, stop the interaction, do not obstruct their leaving, and seek immediate appropriate help.

A small experiment, followed by an honest review

Consider Ren, a fictional example. Ren's partner misses an agreed pickup twice. Ren has been saying, “You do not care about us,” and the conversation repeatedly becomes an argument about whether that is fair. Ren identifies the immediate concern: the missed pickup leaves Ren leaving work unexpectedly. The chosen experiment is a clear question about a reliable arrangement.

Ren predicts that naming the task will make the practical issue more visible. They choose a workable time, decide to stop if insults begin, and keep private rehearsal as an alternative. The request is specific: “The pickup was missed twice. I covered it, and that disrupted work. What arrangement can you reliably keep?”

The result could vary. The partner might keep a new agreement, explain a genuine constraint, refuse, or agree and fail again. Ren's review includes what was said, what was actually done, and what burden remains. A good conversation does not prove reliable follow-through. A disappointed response does not automatically make the request unreasonable.

Your experiment might be a private draft, a clearer request, a proportionate limit, an accurate acknowledgment, or a practical repair. Name what you expect to observe, what conditions you need, when to stop, and an alternative. Afterward, compare the prediction with what happened. Keep, revise, or leave the explanation open. No improvement story is required.

A voice you can stand behind

Your anger may remain after a useful conversation. It may accompany grief, relief, continued uncertainty, or recognition that a situation needs more than individual effort. The capacity you are developing is a more responsible relationship with what you feel and what you do.

You can take your concern seriously, hear another person's experience, acknowledge a mistake, and retain a limit. You can remain open to correction without giving up the right to protest. You can also learn that the next fitting action is support, practical change, or declining further contact.

Your anger deserves attention. What you learn from it deserves examination. The voice you give it becomes more trustworthy when it makes the concern clearer, leaves others room to be people, and is followed by action you are willing to own.

Clinical foundations and further reading

This article brings together anger and aggression research, evolutionary hypotheses, psychodynamic and attachment theory, IFS, interpersonal neurobiology, AEDP, clinical assertiveness teaching, and feminist writing about power. These frameworks overlap in places but are not interchangeable or equally established by empirical research. Damasio's embodied account of self, Winnicott's developmental self, differentiation, and the capitalized Self in IFS refer to different constructs. These are different kinds of contribution. Research about arousal or laboratory aggression does not validate BKL's pathway, and social criticism should not be reduced to an individual emotion-management technique. The fictional example and suggested practices are original educational applications, not a treatment protocol or descriptions of identifiable clients.

American Psychological Association. (n.d.). Anger. In *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. Distinguishes anger from aggression without making the feeling itself misconduct. <https://dictionary.apa.org/anger>

Bushman, B. J. (2002). Does venting anger feed or extinguish the flame? Catharsis, rumination, distraction, anger, and aggressive responding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(6), 724-731. Examines particular forms of venting and rumination in laboratory conditions. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202289002>

Carver, C. S., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2009). Anger is an approach-related affect: Evidence and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(2), 183-204. Explores anger's motivational properties; it does not establish that every angry impulse is adaptive. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013965>

Kjærviik, S. L., & Bushman, B. J. (2024). A meta-analytic review of anger management activities that increase or decrease arousal: What fuels or douses rage? *Clinical Psychology Review*, 109, 102414. Provides evidence concerning arousal-changing activities across studies, distinct from evidence about this educational curriculum. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2024.102414>

Lerner, H. (1985). *The dance of anger: A woman's guide to changing the patterns of intimate relationships*. Harper & Row. A clinical and relational account of anger, self-definition, and changing one's participation in patterns.

Lerner, H. (2009, December 30). What most people don't know about anger. *Psychology Today*. The author's brief account of anger as a signal and the need to identify what it concerns. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-dance-connection/200912/what-most-people-dont-know-about-anger>

Lorde, A. (1984). The uses of anger: Women responding to racism. In *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Crossing Press. Originally delivered in 1981. Retains the essay's attention to racism, unequal power, and hearing anger when one has contributed to another person's oppression. <https://blogs.ubc.ca/hopeprinceengl470a/files/2016/10/audre-lorde.pdf>

Kimmel, M. (2017). *Angry White Men: American Masculinity at the End of an Era*. Bold Type Books. A sociological account of aggrieved entitlement in particular groups of American white men; not a universal explanation of men's anger. <https://www.hachettebookgroup.com/titles/michael-kimmel/angry-white-men/9781568589619/>

hooks, b. (2004). *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity, and Love*. Atria Books. Feminist cultural criticism addressing patriarchal domination, restrictions on men's emotional lives, and the importance of hearing male vulnerability. <https://www.simonandschuster.com/books/The-Will-to-Change/bell-hooks/9780743480338>

Brescoll, V. L., & Uhlmann, E. L. (2008). *Can an angry woman get ahead? Status conferral, gender, and expression of emotion in the workplace*. *Psychological Science*, 19(3), 268-275. Three experiments on gender, anger, and status judgments in professional settings; these findings do not establish how every relationship or community responds. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02079.x>

Salerno, J. M., & Peter-Hagene, L. C. (2015). *One angry woman: Anger expression increases influence for men, but decreases influence for women, during group deliberation*. *Law and Human Behavior*, 39(6), 581-592. A scripted, computer-mediated mock-jury experiment; findings concern influence under those conditions, not a universal gender rule. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000147>

Paterson, R. J. (2022). *The assertiveness workbook: How to express your ideas and stand up for yourself at work and in relationships* (2nd ed.). New Harbinger Publications. Practical teaching on expressing a position, setting limits, and handling feedback. <https://www.newharbinger.com/9781648480270/the-assertiveness-workbook/>

American Psychological Association. (n.d.). Transference; Projection. In *APA Dictionary of Psychology*. Definitions supporting the distinction between relational expectations carried into the present and attribution of one's own experience to another. <https://dictionary.apa.org/transference> · <https://dictionary.apa.org/projection>

Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger. Basic Books. A foundational account of parent-child separation and anxiety. The adult protest example here is an educational synthesis, not a claim drawn from a newly verified adult-protest passage in this book. Publisher description of the reprint:

<https://www.hachettebookgroup.com/titles/john-bowlby/separation/9780465097166/>

Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). Differentiation of self. A family systems account of holding a considered position within emotional relationships.

<https://www.thebowncenter.org/differentiation-of-self>

Damasio, A., & Carvalho, G. B. (2013). The nature of feelings: Evolutionary and neurobiological origins. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14, 143-152. Connects feelings, bodily states, and life regulation; the everyday noticing suggestions here are educational applications. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3403>

Gleiser, K., Ford, J. D., & Fosha, D. (2008). Contrasting exposure and experiential therapies for complex posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 45(3), 340-360. Describes AEDP's relational support and experiential processing, including adaptive action tendencies. This theoretical comparison is not evidence that BKL delivers AEDP treatment. https://aedpinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Gleiser_Ford_Fosha_Exposure_and_Experiential_Therapies_2008.pdf

IFS Institute. (n.d.). The Internal Family Systems model outline. Primary description of Self, Managers, Firefighters, and Exiles. These are model-specific clinical concepts, not established anatomical divisions. <https://ifs-institute.com/resources/articles/internal-family-systems-model-outline>

Panksepp, J. (1998). Affective neuroscience: The foundations of human and animal emotions. Oxford University Press. Chapter 10, "Nature Red in Tooth and Claw: The Neurobiological Sources of Rage and Anger," pp. 187-205. The publisher's chapter abstract describes frustrations, restrictions on action/resources, and RAGE circuits, while distinguishing anger from aggression. This bounded chapter-abstract check does not establish the meaning of an individual encounter.

<https://academic.oup.com/book/53534/chapter-abstract/422109299> Panksepp, J. (2010). Affective neuroscience of the emotional BrainMind: Evolutionary perspectives and implications for understanding depression. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 12(4), 533-545. The primary text's sections "The primary-process emotional-affective networks of mammalian brains" and "The RAGE/anger system" supply the seven-system terminology and comparative account of frustration and restraint. These are theoretical/research contributions rather than evidence of this pathway's effects. <https://doi.org/10.31887/DCNS.2010.12.4/jpanksepp>

Schore, A. N. (2001). Effects of a secure attachment relationship on right brain development, affect regulation, and infant mental health. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 22(1-2), 7-66. An interdisciplinary theoretical synthesis emphasizing attachment and affect regulation; its hemisphere emphasis should not be read as an exclusive location for emotion. <https://www.allanschore.com/pdf/SchoreIMHJAttachment.pdf>

Sell, A., Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2009). Formidability and the logic of human anger. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(35), 15073-15078. Tests predictions from a proposed evolutionary

bargaining account of anger. A functional explanation does not establish moral entitlement.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0904312106>

Siegel, D. J. (n.d.). Interpersonal neurobiology. Explains integration as linking differentiated elements, including autonomy and empathic connection in relationships. This is a broad conceptual framework, not a direct test of the exercises in this article. <https://drdansiegel.com/interpersonal-neurobiology/>

Winnicott, D. W. (1950/2016). Aggression in relation to emotional development. In *The collected works of D. W. Winnicott: Volume 3, 1946-1951* (pp. 333-348). Oxford University Press. A psychoanalytic account of aggression, vitality, love, and developing concern. Its terminology differs from contemporary behavioral definitions of aggression. <https://academic.oup.com/book/1312/chapter/140290269>

Companion article for Anger, Protest, and Assertion · Brian Kennedy Learning.

Explore Anger, Protest, and Assertion and its free reflection