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Abstract

In a follow up to his earlier writing about avoidantly attached individuals, STAN TATKIN explores the characteristics of angry resistant individuals, particularly as pertain to their treatment in couple therapy. Whereas the primary issue for avoidants is dependency, the primary issue for angry resisters is dashed hope, leading to anticipatory disappointment and negativism, and to a perpetual cycle of relationship failure. These issues are discussed in light of attachment theory, arousal regulation theory, and recent advances in developmental neurobiology. Practical applications for the clinician include the use of characteristic patterns of expression, interpersonal contact, mode of communication, and attitudinal predisposition in the assessment
of angry resisters, as well as the engagement of the angry resistant’s partner as a means to help the angry resistant overcome his or her allergy to hope. TATKIN concludes that couple therapists who understand the regulatory bias and basic neurobiological make-up of their angry resistant patients have an advantage when it comes to moving these individuals toward a satisfying and long-lasting relationship based on a two-person psychological system.

Keywords: angry resistant, insecure attachment, couple therapy, arousal regulation, neurobiology

Allergic to Hope:

Angry Resistant Attachment a One-person Psychology Within a Two-person Psychological System

In "Addiction to Alone Time" (Tatkin, 2009), I described the idiosyncratic behaviors and attitudes that mark the avoidantly attached individual. Here I turn my attention to the opposite side of the insecure attachment spectrum: the angry resistant individual. In Wired for Love: How Understanding Your Partner’s Brain and Attachment Style Can Help You Defuse Conflicts And Spark Intimacy (Tatkin, in press), I euphemistically refer to the avoidant attachment style and the angry resistant attachment style as islands and waves, respectively. These terms may evoke images that help illustrate the differences between these two insecure orientations.

The Insecure Model

Organized insecure attachment is grounded in a one-person psychological system that is unfair, unjust, and insensitive too much of the time. Unlike the secure system, the insecure model focuses away from relationship priorities in favor of self-interests that range from demands for external emotional regulation to narcissistic qualities, such as beauty, intelligence, power, performance, wealth, and youth. In the secure model, partners put the safety and security of the relationship above all other matters. In contrast with the insecure model, secure partners operate as a two-person system, based on true mutuality. They have, explicitly or implicitly, a social contract with principles that ensure fairness; equality; and sensitivity to bids or signals for attention, whether for distress relief, celebration, or mind-sharing.

The attachment system is built on signal-response interactions between self and other. I signal to my partner, verbally and/or nonverbally, and she responds. How long it takes for her to respond, the quality of her response, and the consequences (if any) for my signaling in the first place become part of the calculus that determines how I signal in the future. If my history contains many repeated experiences of signaling only to get no response or a delayed response or a response that was ill attuned or unhelpful (for which I paid with rejection, punishment, or attack), I would necessarily organize according to an insecure model. In addition, I would experience a significantly higher load of interpersonal stress whenever in an attachment relationship than I would if I had a more secure history.

The avoidant tends to focus away from relational needs and agreements in favor of autonomous-like needs. I say autonomous-like because the avoidant's version of independence is a result of neglect by way of a dismissive or derogating care-giving style. In a sense, the avoidant is allergic to dependency and experiences a high degree of interpersonal stress. He or she adapted
to aloneness by turning to the self for stimulation and soothing, so much so that turning to others became nearly impossible.

In contrast, the angry resistant tends to focus away from the self in favor of external regulation by and for another person. The anticipation of relationship failure is as psychobiologically wired for the angry resistant as autoregulation and indifference are for the avoidant. By *wired*, I mean recorded and recalled in procedural (implicit) memory via the signal-response system, and played out in defensive actions by way of the autonomic nervous and neuroendocrine systems. These defensive actions are largely reflexive and sub-psychological, which is to say that they are driven by somatosensory/sensorimotor, brainstem, and lower limbic neuro-pathways.

The angry resistant’s strategy is to offset anticipatory disappointment and failure through negativistic conduct, a personality feature influenced by early childhood development (Fairbairn, 1941; Kurtz & Morey, 1998; Levy & Inderbitzin, 1989; Lewin & Schulz, 1992; Sroufe & Waters, 1977). Driven by hope that is instantly dashed by anticipatory failure, the angry resistant employs negativism as a control mechanism against dependency. Hope is incurred most often during periods of reunion with one’s partner. That reunion may or may not follow a physical separation. Reunions, which spring hope of an eternal merger, instead bring memories of past reunion failures, which are likely followed by the other’s impatience, frustration, and withdrawal, quickly leading to yet another separation. The angry resistant "knows" with certainty within his or her body what is to come from hope, and it is bad. This becomes, in fact, what is in essence an allergy to hope. Whereas the avoidant is allergic to dependency, the angry resistant is allergic to hope.
Background

Ainsworth (1969, 1978) identified the anxious, clinging qualities found in some infants as belonging to the anxious ambivalent (i.e., or what I term angry resistant) group of insecure attachment. These same qualities were discovered through Mahler’s work with mother-infant pairs, in what she called the rapprochement phase of separation-individuation (Mahler, 1968; Mahler, Bergman, & Pine, 1975; Mahler, McDevitt, & Settlage, 1971). Thorough studies of this group of insecurely attached infants, including viewing of Strange Situation video data, have revealed a behavioral pattern whereby anxious ambivalent infants became fussy and preoccupied with their physically present caregiver and demonstrated frequent and intense proximity seeking and contact maintenance toward that caregiver (Margaret S. Mahler Psychiatric Research Foundation, 1980a, 1980b, 1980c; Sroufe, Jacobvitz, Mangelsdorf, DeAngelo, & Ward, 1985; Waters, Wippman, & Sroufe, 1979). During separation from the caregiver, these infants became distressed and preoccupied with the caregiver’s departure, but upon reunion, they again displayed strong proximity-seeking behaviors (along with their caregiver) and usually reunited in a physical embrace. However, these infants were slow to recover and displayed some signs of resistance to folding into their caregiver for comfort. Indeed, some of these infants appeared to express resistance and anger at the caregiver for having left. This resistance and anger may have originated not in the separation itself, but in the quality of reunion. Main and Weston (1981) recognized that caregivers of these infants were themselves preoccupied with their own difficulty with emotional or stress recovery and angry with their own attachment objects. In Strange Situation reunions, these caregivers often become frustrated and overwhelmed by their hard-to-settle infant and may have given up early on attempts to settle the child. This caregiver pattern of
preoccupation, frustration, and eventual misappraisal of the child’s internal world was observed more recently by others (e.g., Cohen et al., 1999; Muir, 1992).

In the world of adult primary attachment relationships, Ainsworth’s anxious ambivalent typically appears without strong behavioral signs of anger. However, it has been my experience, based on clinical and video observation, that most preoccupied partners display frequent behavioral markers consistent with the anger and resistance observed in infants during the Strange Situation. In addition to anger and resistance, particularly during periods of reunion, these preoccupied adults exhibit other characteristics of the angry resistant infant, including fussiness, signal vocalizations, proximity seeking, and contact maintenance behaviors; hence my reference to these adult children as angry resistant rather than anxious ambivalent.

The Angry Resistant on a Regulatory Level

As a result of their negative early life experiences with preoccupied caregiver(s), angry resistant partners often present with problems with self-regulation. Easily overtaxed by responsibilities (e.g., school, work, marriage, children), angry resisters often view themselves not only as overwhelmed, but as envious of and threatened by their partner’s ability to do whatever he or she wants. Feeling the underdog, angry resisters complain about not getting the help they need or deserve. These individuals believe in their special abilities to emotionally care for others, including and especially their partners. This is not simply a delusion of grandeur, though this ability is usually overblown; in contrast with adult avoidants, who were tasked as children with regulating their caregiver’s self-esteem, adult angry resistant have a history of taking care of their caregiver’s emotional well-being, often becoming early victims (before age 14) of parent-child role reversal. However, while adult avoidants mistakenly inflate their impoverished independence for adaptation to neglect, adult angry resistant mistakenly inflate

their impoverished abilities to emotionally regulate others. This is because children ultimately require caregivers who are themselves secure autonomous individuals with abilities to cultivate both dependency and autonomy by consistently valuing relationship before self-interests. In other words, children can step up to almost any task required of them, particularly when safety and security are at stake; however, if tasks such as premature independence or care of others are required because of caregiver need, children will adapt but will never do as well as children unburdened by such caregiver needs.

Individuals who are in the angry resistant range of attachment tend to be biased at the higher end of the arousal spectrum. They are given to high affects—such as excitement, bliss, euphoria, mania, rage, embarrassment (not shame), lust, and fear or terror—that are driven specifically by the sympathetic nervous system. When two angry resistant partners form a couple, we call them high arousal due to their mutual bias toward high sympathetic states; they appear as high conflict and high vitality, while at the same time appear poor at soothing and comforting one another. Because both partners in this case cling, they hold together despite their high conflict and sometimes explosive style of relating. It could be argued that they also enjoy more mutually amplified positive moments than do partners with other arousal profiles. They tend to have lots of excitement and lots of sex and tend to be very loud.

The Angry Resistant on a Neurobiological Level

It could be argued that the angry resistant's brain is wired a bit differently from that of secure-autonomous or avoidant individuals. There is increasing evidence in highly angry resistant individuals of a problem with regard to the vagal brake or vagal tone and the ability to control forward sympathetic acceleration or activation (Austin, Riniolo, & Porges, 2007; Kuo & Linehan, 2009; Porges & Furman, 2011). This problem is akin to a helium balloon that does not

have a rock to hold it down. The vagal issue leads to problems with escalation of arousal; the fast kindling of high sympathetic states (e.g., rage); and a slow rate of recovery to baseline. It is possible the so-called hate circuit (i.e., involving the superior frontal gyrus, insula, and putamen) is over-engaged in angry resistant partners (Bartels & Zeki, 2004; Zeki & Romaya, 2008). Another possible problem in angry resistant individuals, especially those with a history of trauma, is damage to or irregularities with the amygdala. The ventral medial prefrontal cortex and orbital frontal cortex may not be providing proper feedback to lower limbic areas during times of distress or threat, leading to poorly modulated affects, particularly negative ones, and a higher than normal misappraisal rate (Fosha, Siegel, & Solomon, 2009; Henry, 1997; Herpertz et al., 2001; Schmahl, Vermetten, Elzinga, & Bremner, 2003; Schore, 2000, 2002a, 2002b; Siegel, 1999, 2006).

It also may be argued that the angry resistant is better than the avoidant at processing somatosensory and somatoaffective information, which tends to be a right hemisphere dominant specialization (Adolphs, Damasio, Tranel, Cooper, & Damasio, 2000; Cohen & Shaver, 2004; Decety & Chaminade, 2003; Gainotti, 2001, 2005; MacLean, 1996; Weinberg, 2000). As a result, the angry resistant can experience intense empathy, to the point of experiencing affect contagion, a phenomenon according to which an individual catches the mood or affect of another person (Lin, Huang, & Chiang, 2008; Nummenmaa, Hirvonen, Parkkola, & Hietanen, 2008). This might be regarded as “thin boundaries,” whereby differences at an emotional level between self and other become blurred. Because of their high expressiveness, both on a nonverbal and verbal level, we might expect better social emotional development in the right hemisphere, compared with that of the avoidant, who often appears lacking in this area and compensates through the left hemispheric functions of language, logic, and cognitive organization (Cohen &
Shaver, 2004; Fukunishi, Sei, Morita, & Rahe, 1999; Guttman & Laporte, 2002; Horton, 1988; Larsen, Brand, Bermond, & Hijman, 2003; Moriguchi et al., 2006).

On the neurobiological level, particular skills and deficits are common to the angry resistant profile. On the skill side, we might see expressiveness, warmth, empathy, humor, vitality, and social emotional awareness. On the deficits side, we see thin boundaries; misappraisals of another person’s feelings, thoughts, and intentions; preoccupation with self and others that borders on obsessive compulsive; and a poorly developed vagal brake.

Assessment of the Angry Resistant

The following patterns of expression are typical of the angry resistant and are invaluable when it comes to assessment.

- Speech patterns
- Prosody
- Facial expressiveness
- Emotional expressiveness

In addition, the following patterns of interpersonal contact, mode of communication, and attitudinal predisposition are characteristic of the angry resistant:

- Proximity seeking
- Contact maintenance
- Meta complaints
- Negativism

The clinician can observe micro-movements and micro-expressions associated with all of these patterns to assess whether one or the other partner or both have an angry resistant attachment.
style. Each of these patterns is discussed in the sections that follow, with an eye to how the clinician can incorporate them within the assessment process.

**Speech Patterns**

Because speech is a major form of communication, beginning as early as about 18 months, how partners speak to one another (as well to the therapist) can reveal a great deal about their attachment formation. The speech patterns of most secure individuals are characterized by a natural variation in speed and these individuals tend to speak for the right amount of time; that is, they don’t say too much or too little. Secure individuals tend to appear to cooperate with the listener, whether that person is a partner or the therapist. Their speech can be characterized as truthful, easy to follow, self-confident, coherent, and relevant. It also tends to sound fresh, insightful, and balanced.

By contrast, angry resistant individuals often talk too fast or too erratically. They may feel a need to say as much as possible about a given topic, with the result that the quantity of their speech is too great. These partners often take too long to get to their point or to get their point across, and may bring up tangential or irrelevant material without realizing they are doing so. Angry resistants don’t know how to edit what they are saying while they speak, and tend to find it difficult to pause and collect themselves before they speak. Their relationship with the listener may be poor because they do not pay close attention to the effect their words are having on the other person. Their speech can be characterized as hard to follow, overly emotion, and exaggerated.
**Prosody**

Prosody refers to the rhythmic and intonational aspects of speech. The importance of prosody is evident when listening to a good storyteller or actor/actress. It also is recognizable when a person adopts a sing-song, melodic voice (sometimes referred to as *motherese*) while speaking to children or to pets.

Secure individuals tend to demonstrate a naturally wide variance in the sound of their voice, both in terms of tone and volume. One can say they have good prosody, which makes them appear as lively and engaged at times, but also contained or subdued when appropriate. By contrast, angry resistant individuals often display variances in volume and pitch that reflect an overly emotional state and that demonstrate misattunement with their partner. This feature alone can contribute to mutual dysregulation during periods of stress.

**Facial Expressiveness**

Typically, secure individuals show a range of facial expressiveness. Some secure individuals have relatively inexpressive faces; however, this should not be taken as a reflection of their level of security. Neither should secure partners with high facial expressiveness be regarded as overly expressive (i.e., false expression). Angry resistant individuals, on the other hand, often overly express facially, much as they do vocally. Their facial expressiveness can be highly variable, nimbly displaying low affects (e.g., grief) as well as high affects (e.g., glee).

**Emotional Expressiveness**

Secure individuals typically display a wide range of emotions. Some secures have deficits in emotional expressiveness (i.e., affect blindness), but it is rare to find secures who display strong emotions in a manner suggestive of insecure or disorganized states. Angry resistant...
individuals, on the other hand, may appear overly expressive emotionally. Because these individuals tend to be high arousal, their emotions tend to be high intensity. Their expression can be so strong that it appears false or deceptive. Social-emotional deficits (e.g., thin boundaries) are common, leaving the angry resistant vulnerable to affect contagion.

**Proximity Seeking**

Proximity seeking is exemplified by the mother who holds her arms out to her child and invites a hug. It also is exemplified when one adult partner gazes at the other, reaches out to touch that partner, or even smiles or winks to catch his or her attention. In each case, the behavior expresses a need for physical and/or emotional closeness with another person.

Secure individuals engage in frequent proximity-seeking behaviors because these were modeled for them by their parents, starting during early childhood. As a result, they feel comfortable seeking closeness. Angry resistant individuals, by contrast, tend to exhibit a need for closeness that can appear almost insatiable. The only exception is when they are angry; in which case, they over-control their proximity seeking as a means of punishing the partner. These individuals continually check their partner’s face and seek out physical contact, and even try to entrap their partner.

**Contact Maintenance**

Contact maintenance is a cousin of proximity seeking, and refers to the maintaining of physical or eye contact. Secure individuals are at ease with sustained physical contact, but do not need to maintain contact to feel secure. Angry resistant individuals tend to be continually ravenous for contact. They can feel persecuted if they are without contact for too long. However, maintaining eye contact may not be easy for them, especially if they did not experience
comfortable gazing during childhood. When they are angry, these partners often withhold physical contact from a partner, even though they secretly desire it. Lack of physical contact is one of the reasons angry resistants give for being unfaithful to their partner.

**Meta Complaints**

According to Gottman (1994), healthy complaining is the antidote to what he refers to as the Four Horsemen (i.e., criticism, contempt, defensiveness, and stonewalling), which serve as predictors of divorce. No couple is immune to complaints. The most common gripes pertain to money, sex, time, kids, and disorder. However, meta complaints (i.e., complaints originating at the level of personality) are especially insidious because they are tied to an individual’s underlying attachment orientation, and therefore can be difficult for couples to parse. If we understand the developmental trajectory of early attachment formation, we can spot the fractal emergence of these meta complaints in the couple system and even predict their occurrence.

Angry resistant individuals’ meta complaints may appear situational, but really are global and not so easily managed. Their complaints include worries about a partner’s unreliability or recalcitrance, rejection, being neglected or punished, being wrong, being deprived (usually of love and affection), unfair treatment, injustice, confusion, ambivalence, and being hurt or wounded. They are unable to remember ever feeling this way before, yet such sensitivities originate very early in childhood as relational trauma involving caregivers. Inwardly, they believe something is wrong with them, that they are a burden to their partner, that they are too needy, and that they don't deserve to be loved in the way they long to be. Outwardly, their defense suggests otherwise: that they deserve more than they are getting, that their partner is indifferent or unloving, that their partner is selfish and self-centered, and that they’re not going to take it anymore. Angry resistants hold grudges. They make it their mission to settle old scores.
before they will even consider any forward movement. Their tenacious hold on meta complaints can lead them to dominate their partner, as well as therapy sessions, in a very persuasive and at times even despotic manner.

**Negativism**

Negativism comes in many forms—physical, verbal, and nonverbal. Physically, angry resistant individuals may push away when approached or when approaching a primary attachment figure. Their tone can be anywhere from playful to aggressive and hostile. Verbally, angry resistsants can be sharp tongued, particularly if they have been unexpectedly approached with hopeful rapprochements (reunion) following distress (separation)—in other words, all the makings for an allergy to hope. Nonverbally, angry resistsants signal distress through utterances, vocalizations, facial expressions, and physical postures and movements. These nonverbal signals may simultaneously deliver threatening sounds, gestures, and facial expressions. Threats against the relationship are common, as is the perseverance of current and past injustices and insensitivities. The verbal pushing away of hope and successful reunion is reflexive, psychobiological, and in strict obeiyance to implicit (and very real) threat memories of having been too often dropped, rejected, or abandoned. To the angry resistant's partner, the push away is threatening to the safety and security of the relationship, and the angry resistant's preoccupation, lack of recovery, and seeming inconsolability can become highly dysregulating. Any evidence of fear, anger, or distress in the partner's face, eyes, voice, and movements serves as feedback confirmation of the angry resistant's sense of himself or herself as burdensome, needy, and "too much," making the angry resistant exquisitely sensitive to inevitable withdrawal.

Unlike with the avoidant, whose negativism is a signal to avoid or dismiss, the angry resistant's negativism is actually a signal to approach. To the other person, this is not intuitively
obvious because the angry resistant engages by pushing away. The angry resistant’s attempts to reunite are threatening and hostile. The reaction, as read by the angry resistant on the face of the other, is equally hostile and threatening, thus reaffirming the angry resistant's suspicion that he or she will be dumped. In this way, the angry resistant’s negativism becomes self-fulfilling.

**An Antidote to the Allergy**

People are hurt by people, and only people can repair those injuries. No one is better positioned to repair injuries than the primary relationship partner, and the couple therapist can promote this. The angry resistant’s negativism both engages and pushes away, as we have seen. The angry resistant’s partner, regardless of his or her own attachment orientation, likely will be faced with an ongoing challenge to remain undaunted by the waxing and waning of this negativism. The partner must come to understand in therapy that the corrective counter-movement is to move forward on the angry resistant (in friendliness) and not away. Angry resistants *expect* their partner to move away, pull back, or otherwise rebuke their cloaked wish the angry resistant partner to override his or her negativism. The true *hope* of angry resistants is that their most important other, their partner, will see beyond their negativism and recognize it for what it is: a real bid for patience and understanding; kindness and compassion; and ultimate reassurance that the angry resistant is not a burden, overly needy, or destined for rejection. In other words:

SHE: [approach and reunion] “You are so handsome. I love you.”

HE: [angry resistant reaction to approach and reunion] “Yeah, right. Tell that to someone who’ll believe you.”

SHE: [typical but wrong response] “Forget it. You’re impossible.”
SHE: [corrective response] “You are my handsome man and I – LOVE – YOU. Now what do you think of them apples?” [she kisses him]

The couple therapist should expect the angry resistant to respond positively to this forward movement. Why? Because it is the last thing the angry resistant expects, it can cut through entrenched negativism and provide relief for his or her allergy to hope. Partners do not always have to move forward in this manner, but they must find a way to counter the angry resistant’s self-fulfilling negativism.

Conclusion

Couple therapists working with angry resistant partners are advised to keep in mind that, like avoidants, angry resisters operate in a one-person psychological system. This means they make too many pro-self choices at the cost of the relationship. Nevertheless, how this orientation manifests, both within the relationship and in therapy, is quite different for the two insecure types. The couple therapist must become continually attuned to such differences. Understanding regulatory bias and basic neurobiological make-up, and having the ability to accurately assess the attachment style of partners in therapy are crucial for working effectively with angry resistant patients. For example, conventional wisdom from American object relations theory suggests that couple therapists faced with a clinging partner (borderline spectrum, or angry resistant) and a distancing partner (narcissism spectrum, or avoidant) should not confront the distancing partner first because that partner is too vulnerable to exposure and to narcissistic injury, and therefore more likely than the clinging partner to up and leave (Kernberg, 1975; Klein, 1995; Masterson, 1981). Applying the principles of attachment theory and arousal regulation discussed here, the couple therapist understands the angry resistant’s allergy to hope, and thus is able to engage the angry resistant’s partner in providing a sufficient corrective response that paves the way for
confrontation, without risking premature termination by either partner. Couple therapists who can incorporate subtleties such as these stand the best chance of successfully working with individuals who adhere to a one-person psychological system and moving them toward and into a satisfying and long-lasting relationship based on a two-person psychological system.
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