

攻击的敌意性动机研究进展与干预方法

戚冰心

西南大学心理学部, 重庆

收稿日期: 2025年2月21日; 录用日期: 2025年3月26日; 发布日期: 2025年4月9日

摘要

敌意性动机被认为是引发反应性攻击的主要原因, 而其具体成分和影响攻击的具体机制还有待进一步探究。本综述以时间维度将敌意性动机划分为事中动机和事后动机, 并概述了以敌意归因偏向为代表的事中动机和以愤怒沉浸、报复动机为代表的事后动机影响攻击的研究现状, 以及可能的干预方法。

关键词

攻击, 敌意性动机, 敌意归因偏向, 愤怒沉浸, 报复动机

Advances in the Study of Hostile Motivation for Aggression and Methods of Intervention

Bingxin Qi

Faculty of Psychology, Southwest University, Chongqing

Received: Feb. 21st, 2025; accepted: Mar. 26th, 2025; published: Apr. 9th, 2025

Abstract

Hostile motivation is thought to be the primary reason for reactive aggression, while its specific components and the specific mechanisms influencing aggression have yet to be further explored. This review divides hostile motivation into in- and post-process motivation using a temporal dimension, and outlines the current state of research on the impact of in-process motivation (e.g. hostile attribution bias) and post-process motivation (e.g. anger rumination and revenge motivation) on aggression, as well as possible methods of intervention.

Keywords

Aggression, Hostile Motivation, Hostile Attribution Bias, Anger Rumination, Revenge Motivation



1. 引言

攻击是指具有伤人意图的伤害行为反应或倾向, 并且这种伤害是对方想要回避的(Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Buss & Perry, 1992; 李芮, 夏凌翔, 2021)。攻击是许多社会危害的根源, 如暴力犯罪和欺凌行为等, 并且可能对社会生活产生长期的有害影响(Knehans et al., 2022)。了解攻击的产生和发展的动机机制, 构建相关攻击动机理论模型, 将有助于寻找预防和干预攻击的有效方法, 从而使社会更加安全稳定(Coie et al., 1991)。

1.1. 反应性与主动性攻击

根据有无激惹和攻击动机的不同, 攻击可以被划分为两类: 主动性攻击与反应性攻击(Dodge & Coie, 1987)。其中, 主动性攻击是个体在未受到激惹(如他人的威胁、阻挠或攻击等)的情况下, 通过伤害他人来实现某种目标、满足自身需要的行为或倾向(Dodge & Coie, 1987; Zhu, Wang, & Xia, 2019), 比如抢劫、校园欺凌等。反应性攻击是个体对感知到的激惹(如他人的威胁、阻挠或攻击等)做出相对反应, 通常表现为带有敌意、愤怒情绪的伤害行为或倾向(Dodge & Coie, 1987; Smeets et al., 2017), 比如自卫还击、路怒等(李芮, 夏凌翔, 2021)。这种攻击分类是稳定且合理的, 比如研究发现, 主动性攻击与更强的自我-攻击关联有关(Lobbestael, Cima, & Arntz, 2013), 而反应性攻击则与对愤怒面孔的敌意解释倾向和注意程度有关(Brugman et al., 2015)。此外, 这两种攻击也分别与许多行为特征和精神障碍有独特相关性(Raine et al., 2006)。

1.2. 敌意性动机

反应性攻击与主动性攻击之间存在的本质区别是攻击动机(Dodge et al., 1997)。驱动主动性攻击产生的特定动机属于工具性动机(Fanning et al., 2019), 是攻击者试图通过攻击来获得物质满足或达到某种目标的需要或倾向(Anderson & Bushman, 2002)。而驱动反应性攻击产生的特定动机则是敌意性动机(李芮, 夏凌翔, 2021), 是攻击者试图通过攻击解除受激惹或受威胁的状态, 从而保护自己免受伤害或发泄消极情绪的需要或倾向(Fanning et al., 2019)。敌意性动机是伴随着愤怒(Dodge & Coie, 1987)、恐惧(Crick & Dodge, 1994)、敌对(Rathert et al., 2011)等负性情绪, 包含敌意归因偏向(Dodge, 2006)、报复动机(McCullough et al., 1997)、敌意沉浸与愤怒沉浸(Sukhodolsky, Golub, & Cromwell, 2001)等认知过程的复杂攻击动机。因此, 有必要对敌意性动机的具体成分进行深入探究, 考察各成分引发攻击的具体过程和机制。本综述主要关注敌意性动机的各认知成分, 以时间维度对其进行划分, 并对各成分影响攻击的研究现状和潜在的干预措施进行概述。

1.3. 敌意性动机的时间分类

根据发生时间的不同, 可以将攻击的敌意性动机划分为事中动机和事后动机。攻击事中动机(in-process motivations of aggression)是指个体对当前出现的攻击或激惹刺激产生的攻击动机, 即初次体验有关刺激后形成的动机, 例如敌意归因偏向等, 这反映了个体对当前攻击或激惹刺激的习惯与偏好(朱文凤, 夏凌翔, 2021)。而攻击事后动机(post-process motivations of aggression)则是个体对已有的攻击或激惹刺激进行回忆或思考产生的攻击动机, 即再次体验有关刺激后形成的动机, 例如愤怒沉浸、报复动机等, 这

反映了个体在回忆或思考先前的攻击事件时的习惯与偏好(朱文凤, 夏凌翔, 2021)。

2. 事中敌意性动机

2.1. 敌意归因偏向

敌意归因偏向(hostile attribution bias)是指将模糊情境内他人的行为意图解释为敌意的反应倾向(Crick & Dodge, 1994)。根据社会信息加工模型(social information processing model, SIP), 个体对相关线索的不同解释会导致不同的反应结果, 因此, 具有高敌意归因偏向的个体做出攻击反应的可能性往往更高(Crick & Dodge, 1994)。先前研究表明, 当个体更倾向于将敌对意图归因于同伴的挑衅时, 可能会变得焦虑并增加攻击, 进而导致长期的攻击行为问题(Dodge, 1980)。总是对他人做出敌意归因的青少年, 在受到挑衅时攻击性会提高, 更可能长期焦虑, 并随着时间的推移增加问题行为, 在成年后攻击水平更高(Pettit et al., 2010)。

2.2. 与攻击的关系

Verhoef 等人(2019)对 111 项研究的多层次元分析表明, 敌意归因偏向与儿童的反应性攻击行为存在正相关, 并且这种效应的大小受到情感投入的调节。Alsem 等人(2022)对 7~12 岁儿童的每周自我报告数据进行多层次分析, 结果发现适应性愤怒调节水平较低且敌意归因偏向较高的儿童比其他儿童报告的攻击性更强, 并解释了三者的共变性。Voulgaridou 等人(2022)使用潜在剖面分析和潜在转化分析, 对间隔 6 个月测量的希腊初中生的关系攻击相关因素进行分析, 发现敌意归因偏向得分高的青少年更可能与高反应性关系攻击特征有关, 并且这种反应性关系攻击特征的基本结构在 6 个月内保持稳定。

Quan 等人(2021)对 600 名本科生的调查发现, 敌意归因偏向在特质愤怒与反应性攻击之间起中介作用。Li 等人(2022)的研究表明, 童年期受虐待经历通过敌意归因偏向的中介作用预测大学生的网络欺凌行为。一项间隔 6 个月的纵向研究表明, 高水平的敌意归因偏向与更不满意的同伴关系和较低的攻击自我效能感有关, 并且预测反应性网络攻击的增加(Ding et al., 2022)。Su, Quan 和 Xia (2021)的纵向研究发现, 在控制了大五人格特质后, 敌意归因偏向预测了 6 个月后自我报告的替代性攻击行为。此外, 敌意归因偏向不仅是部分攻击者发动攻击的原因, 同样也是欺凌受害者的显著特征, 并且可能与受害者的人际关系问题和抑郁症等心理健康风险有关(Franzen et al., 2021)。

综上, 敌意归因偏向主要与反应性攻击存在正相关(Verhoef et al., 2019), 并且常在不同人格特质对攻击行为的预测关系中起中介作用(Quan et al., 2021; Su et al., 2021), 对攻击者和受害者的心理、社会方面均有明显的负面影响(Franzen et al., 2021)。

2.3. 干预

敌意归因偏向已被证实可以通过行为策略进行干预。其中, 说服干预是适用于干预儿童敌意归因偏向的一种有效手段。例如, 对 4~9 岁的高特质敌意归因偏向儿童使用自我说服干预(录制视频, 向同龄人倡导造成负面结果的故事主角可能没有敌意)有效降低了儿童在后续测试中的敌意归因偏向, 并且使用他人说服干预(聆听主试倡导无敌对意图)也产生了同样的干预效果, 但是这类干预对攻击行为的影响较小(van Dijk et al., 2019)。此外, 解释的认知偏向修正训练(Cognitive Bias Modification for Interpretation, CBM-I)则是主要针对青少年敌意归因偏向的一种干预手段。例如, 高攻击特质的青少年在进行 5 次针对敌意归因偏向的 CBM-I 训练(练习对模糊激惹性的社会情境做出积极解释)后, 其自我报告的敌意归因偏向、反应性攻击水平均有降低, 而主动性攻击水平没有影响(Van Bockstaele et al., 2020)。然而, CBM-I 对敌意归因偏向的干预作用似乎存在一定的性别差异。在 Zeng 等人(2023)针对 121 名中学生的干预研究中, 参与者接受了 8 次 CBM-I 训练或对照任务, 结果发现, 仅在女性参与者中, CBM-I 对敌意归因偏向的影响

存在,并且敌意归因偏向在CBM-I与反应性网络攻击之间起中介作用;而在男性中则没有发现这一结果。

此外,也可以通过非侵入式脑刺激(如tDCS)进行调节和干预。例如,对腹外侧前额叶(ventrolateral prefrontal cortex, VLPFC)进行tDCS阳极刺激可以减少被社会排斥的个体对面孔的愤怒情绪识别(即敌意归因偏向),但同时会增强其对面孔的悲伤情绪识别(Rajchert et al., 2022)。这种干预方法比较适用于成年个体,且有助于探索与敌意归因偏向相关的脑机制。但此类刺激有可能具有副作用(如瘙痒、刺痛、灼热感等)(Choy et al., 2018),或对参与者的情绪认知等产生其他预期之外的影响,从而在一定程度上影响干预效果。

3. 事后敌意性动机

3.1. 愤怒沉浸

愤怒沉浸(anger rumination)是在攻击事件发生后,对愤怒体验进行无意识的、反复的思考与回忆,并伴有愤怒情绪(Denson, 2013)。愤怒沉浸的多重系统模型(multiple systems model of anger rumination)指出,愤怒沉浸是激发攻击行为的认知和情绪基础(Denson, 2013),并会通过降低自我控制能力来增加攻击行为。

3.1.1. 与攻击的关系

Quan 等人(2021)的研究表明,在排除性别影响后,愤怒沉浸是高特质愤怒个体进行反应性攻击的重要认知因素。Li 等人(2022)的研究表明,童年期受虐待经历通过愤怒沉浸的中介作用预测大学生的网络欺凌行为。针对7~9年级青少年的纵向研究表明,愤怒沉浸与9个月后的网络欺凌受害和网络欺凌行为增加有关(Camacho, Ortega-Ruiz, & Romera, 2021)。

针对大学生的纵向调查发现,在新冠疫情隔离期间,大学生的愤怒沉浸正向预测了自我报告的身体和言语攻击(Tao et al., 2023)。在86名被试的正念研究中发现,高特质和状态正念均通过愤怒沉浸的中介作用预测较低自我报告攻击行为(Eisenlohr-Moul et al., 2016)。认知需求通过愤怒沉浸的中介作用预测较低的攻击性(Barlett, 2022)。此外,愤怒沉浸和支持暴力的信念共同预测成年人发生攻击行为的经历(Fernandez et al., 2022)。

3.1.2. 干预

已有研究证实认知行为干预对降低愤怒沉浸的有效性,其中代表性的方法有正念和认知重评等。例如,正念可以降低愤怒沉浸,并降低身体和言语攻击行为(Garofalo, Gillespie, & Velotti, 2019)。在线的简短正念情绪意识和认知重评等情绪调节治疗可以有效降低患有适应不良愤怒被试的愤怒沉浸和攻击性水平,并且这种效果在治疗停止后的3个月仍存在(Bjureberg et al., 2022)。因此,认知行为干预似乎对降低愤怒沉浸有良好且稳定的长期效果。

另外,非侵入式脑刺激(如tDCS)也被证实可以对愤怒沉浸进行干预。例如,将tDCS与正念疗法相结合的干预手段可以降低抑郁症患者的抑郁水平、悲伤和愤怒沉浸水平(Monnart et al., 2019)。然而,也有研究发现,针对右侧额叶的阳极tDCS刺激会增加被试自我报告的愤怒沉浸。研究者据此进行推测,与更大的相对左额叶皮质活动相关的愤怒预测了以接近为导向的攻击性行动,而与更大的相对右额叶皮质活动相关的愤怒预测了抑制的愤怒沉浸(Kelley, Hortensius, & Harmon-Jones, 2013)。因此,应用tDCS等脑刺激对愤怒沉浸和攻击实施干预的可行性尚不明确。

3.2. 报复动机

报复动机(revenge motivation)是对激惹者产生怨恨、厌恶和反感并想要伤害对方的需要或倾向(Denson, Pedersen, & Miller, 2006; 李芮, 夏凌翔, 2021)。报复动机引发的攻击行为与正当防卫行为有区别,

正当防卫的目的是保护他人，并在威胁或激惹产生后立即发生，而报复通常是复仇性的，个体往往在紧迫的威胁或激惹平息后过一段时间才产生报复动机(Jackson, Choi, & Gelfand, 2019)。此外，报复动机不仅与直接攻击行为(即通过攻击直接报复激惹者)有关，还是引发替代性攻击的重要认知因素(Denson et al., 2006)。报复的早期进化理论(forerunning evolutionary theory of revenge)认为，报复动机及报复性攻击行为主要作为一种适应性的威慑机制，提醒潜在的对手在再次伤害受害者之前多加思考，并确保报复者不会被反复攻击或激惹(McCullough, Kurzban, & Tabak, 2013)。

3.2.1. 与攻击的关系

Wilkowski 等人(2012)通过问卷和实验研究发现，报复动机可以预测自我报告和行为评估的反应性身体攻击。Dyduch-Hazar 与 Mrozinski (2021)通过两项研究发现，报复动机与更高的群体间攻击有关。针对 979 名青少年的研究表明，网络欺凌受害产生的压力和报复动机可以预测 4 个月后的网络欺凌行为(Quintana-Orts et al., 2020)。Runions 等人(2018)对 7~9 年级学生的研究发现，报复动机是预测反应性攻击主要攻击动机之一，校园欺凌兼受害者在愤怒和报复动机上的得分比纯欺凌者更高。

研究发现，低诚实谦逊特质的成年人与更高的报复动机有关，并且表现出更多的工作场所攻击(MacDonell & Willoughby, 2020)。针对 18~70 岁有伴侣分手经历的成年人研究发现，自我报告遭受伴侣暴力的成年人产生的报复动机更多，这种动机更加冲动、感性，且报复动机及攻击行为与黑暗人格三联征中的精神病和马基雅维利主义维度有关(Clemente & Espinosa, 2021)。

总之，报复动机与反应性攻击和替代性攻击均有相关(Denson et al., 2006; Quintana-Orts et al., 2020)，并且在不同人格特质预测攻击行为的关系中起作用(Clemente & Espinosa, 2021)。

3.2.2. 干预

已有研究证实可以通过行为干预手段降低报复动机。例如，以指导性角色扮演法对暴力犯罪者进行想象的模拟审判后，个体对暴力犯罪者的报复动机在干预和两周的随访访谈中明显下降，此方法可能对预防受害者复仇攻击行为有帮助(Rowe et al., 2018)。

目前尚未查明非侵入式脑刺激手段是否可以降低报复动机，但有研究发现，使用 tDCS 刺激右侧背外侧前额叶(dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, DLPFC)脑区可以显著增加参与者在财产被夺走后的报复动机和行为(Zheng et al., 2021)。

4. 总结与展望

敌意性动机是引发反应性攻击的重要原因之一。本文以时间维度将敌意性动机划分为两类：事中动机和事后动机，并回顾了二者与攻击关系的研究现状。以敌意归因偏向为代表的事中动机被证实与反应性攻击有关，高敌意归因偏向个体更容易对模糊情境做出攻击性解释，从而增加攻击行为的发生概率(Verhoef et al., 2019)。此外，已有多项研究探索了干预策略，如自我说服、解释的认知偏向修正和非侵入式脑刺激(如 tDCS)，这些方法在降低敌意归因偏向方面取得了一定成效(van Dijk et al., 2019; Rajchert et al., 2022)。

事后动机方面，愤怒沉浸和报复动机是影响攻击行为的重要因素。愤怒沉浸作为攻击行为的认知和情绪基础，通过降低个体的自我控制能力来增加攻击倾向(Denson, 2013; Quan et al., 2021)。对愤怒沉浸的有效干预包括正念训练和情绪调节等(Garofalo et al., 2019; Bjureberg et al., 2022)，这些方法在降低个体的攻击性行为和愤怒沉浸水平上表现出良好的持久效果。报复动机则在反应性和替代性攻击中扮演关键角色，研究指出，报复动机不仅与直接攻击行为有关，还与低诚实谦逊特质和黑暗人格特质等相关联(Wilkowski et al., 2012; MacDonell & Willoughby, 2020; Clemente & Espinosa, 2021)。报复动机可以通过行

为手段(例如指导性角色扮演法)进行干预(Rowe et al., 2018)。此外,目前尚不明确应用非侵入式脑刺激手段干预愤怒沉浸和报复动机是否可行。

未来研究可以继续探索敌意性动机的具体成分及其作用机制,尤其是不同认知过程在攻击行为中的作用,进一步验证现有干预方法的有效性,并开发新的干预手段,从而更好地控制和预防攻击行为。此外,跨文化研究和纵向研究同样可以为理解敌意性动机的动态变化和个体差异提供更广泛的视角,并帮助构建更为全面的攻击动机理论模型。最后,也可以通过 fMRI EEG 等手段探究敌意性动机影响攻击行为的脑机制,从而为后续开发非侵入式脑刺激等神经干预疗法提供有效依据。

参考文献

- 李芮,夏凌翔(2021). 攻击动机对特质愤怒与反应性攻击关系的中介作用:一项纵向研究. *心理学报*, 53(7), 788-797.
- 朱文凤,夏凌翔(2021). 大学生神经质纵向预测攻击行为的时间路径模型:敌意归因偏向和愤怒沉浸的双向中介作用. *心理与行为研究*, 19(3), 396-402.
- Alsem, S. C., Keulen, J., Verhulp, E. E., van Dijk, A., & De Castro, B. O. (2022). Capturing Mechanisms of Change: Weekly Covariation in Anger Regulation, Hostile Intent Attribution, and Children's Aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 48, 232-240. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.22019>
- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human Aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 27-51. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231>
- Barlett, C. P. (2022). Thinking through Situations: The Mediating Role of Rumination in the Relationship between Need for Cognition and Aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 49, 172-177. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.22068>
- Bjureberg, J., Ojala, O., Berg, A., Edvardsson, E., Kolbeinsson, Ö., Molander, O. et al. (2022). Targeting Maladaptive Anger with Brief Therapist-Supported Internet-Delivered Emotion Regulation Treatments: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 91, 254-266. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000769>
- Brugman, S., Lobbestael, J., Arntz, A., Cima, M., Schuhmann, T., Dambacher, F. et al. (2015). Identifying Cognitive Predictors of Reactive and Proactive Aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 41, 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21573>
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 452-459. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.3.452>
- Camacho, A., Ortega-Ruiz, R., & Romera, E. M. (2021). Longitudinal Associations between Cybervictimization, Anger Rumination, and Cyberaggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 47, 332-342. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21958>
- Choy, O., Raine, A., & Hamilton, R. H. (2018). Stimulation of the Prefrontal Cortex Reduces Intentions to Commit Aggression: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled, Stratified, Parallel-Group Trial. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 38, 6505-6512. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.3317-17.2018>
- Clemente, M., & Espinosa, P. (2021). Revenge in Couple Relationships and Their Relation to the Dark Triad. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18, Article 7653. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18147653>
- Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., Terry, R., & Wright, V. (1991). The Role of Aggression in Peer Relations: An Analysis of Aggression Episodes in Boys' Play Groups. *Child Development*, 62, 812-826. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1991.tb01571.x>
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A Review and Reformulation of Social Information-Processing Mechanisms in Children's Social Adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115, 74-101. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.115.1.74>
- Denson, T. F. (2013). The Multiple Systems Model of Angry Rumination. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 17, 103-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868312467086>
- Denson, T. F., Pedersen, W. C., & Miller, N. (2006). The Displaced Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 1032-1051. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.6.1032>
- Ding, X., Liu, B., Zeng, K., Kishimoto, T., & Zhang, M. (2022). Peer Relations and Different Functions of Cyber-Aggression: A Longitudinal Study in Chinese Adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior*, 48, 152-162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.22012>
- Dodge, K. A. (1980). Social Cognition and Children's Aggressive Behavior. *Child Development*, 51, 162-170. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129603>
- Dodge, K. A. (2006). Translational Science in Action: Hostile Attributional Style and the Development of Aggressive Behavior Problems. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 791-814. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579406060391>
- Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social-Information-Processing Factors in Reactive and Proactive Aggression in Children's Peer Groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1146-1158. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1146>

- Dodge, K. A., Lochman, J. E., Harnish, J. D., Bates, J. E., & et al. (1997). Reactive and Proactive Aggression in School Children and Psychiatrically Impaired Chronically Assaultive Youth. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 106, 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-843x.106.1.37>
- Dyduch-Hazar, K., & Mrozinski, B. (2021). Opposite Associations of Collective Narcissism and In-Group Satisfaction with Intergroup Aggression via Belief in the Hedonistic Function of Revenge. *PLOS ONE*, 16, e0247814. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247814>
- Eisenlohr-Moul, T. A., Peters, J. R., Pond, R. S., & DeWall, C. N. (2016). Both Trait and State Mindfulness Predict Lower Aggressiveness via Anger Rumination: A Multilevel Mediation Analysis. *Mindfulness*, 7, 713-726. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-016-0508-x>
- Fanning, J. R., Coleman, M., Lee, R., & Coccaro, E. F. (2019). Subtypes of Aggression in Intermittent Explosive Disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 109, 164-172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2018.10.013>
- Fernandez, S. J., Daffern, M., Moulding, R., & Nedeljkovic, M. (2022). Exploring Predictors of Aggressive Intrusive Thoughts and Aggressive Scripts: Similarities and Differences in Phenomenology. *Aggressive Behavior*, 49, 141-153. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.22061>
- Franzen, M., de Jong, P. J., Veling, W., & aan het Rot, M. (2021). Victims of Bullying: Emotion Recognition and Understanding. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 729835. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.729835>
- Garofalo, C., Gillespie, S. M., & Velotti, P. (2019). Emotion Regulation Mediates Relationships between Mindfulness Facets and Aggression Dimensions. *Aggressive Behavior*, 46, 60-71. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21868>
- Jackson, J. C., Choi, V. K., & Gelfand, M. J. (2019). Revenge: A Multilevel Review and Synthesis. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 319-345. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103305>
- Kelley, N. J., Hortensius, R., & Harmon-Jones, E. (2013). When Anger Leads to Rumination. *Psychological Science*, 24, 475-481. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612457384>
- Knehans, R., Schuhmann, T., Roef, D., Nelen, H., Campo, J., & Lobbestael, J. (2022). Modulating Behavioural and Self-Reported Aggression with Non-Invasive Brain Stimulation: A Literature Review. *Brain Sciences*, 12, Article 200. <https://doi.org/10.3390/brainsci12020200>
- Li, M., He, Q., Zhao, J., Xu, Z., & Yang, H. (2022). The Effects of Childhood Maltreatment on Cyberbullying in College Students: The Roles of Cognitive Processes. *Acta Psychologica*, 226, Article 103588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2022.103588>
- Lobbestael, J., Cima, M., & Arntz, A. (2013). The Relationship between Adult Reactive and Proactive Aggression, Hostile Interpretation Bias, and Antisocial Personality Disorder. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 27, 53-66. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2013.27.1.53>
- MacDonell, E. T., & Willoughby, T. (2020). Investigating Honesty-humility and Impulsivity as Predictors of Aggression in Children and Youth. *Aggressive Behavior*, 46, 97-106. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21874>
- McCullough, M. E., Kurzban, R., & Tabak, B. A. (2013). Putting Revenge and Forgiveness in an Evolutionary Context. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36, 41-58. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x12001513>
- McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L. J., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal Forgiving in Close Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 321-336. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.73.2.321>
- Monnart, A., Vanderhasselt, M., Schroder, E., Campanella, S., Fontaine, P., & Kornreich, C. (2019). Treatment of Resistant Depression: A Pilot Study Assessing the Efficacy of a TDCS-Mindfulness Program Compared with a TDCS-Relaxation Program. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 10, Article 730. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00730>
- Pettit, G. S., Lansford, J. E., Malone, P. S., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (2010). Domain Specificity in Relationship History, Social-Information Processing, and Violent Behavior in Early Adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 190-200. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017991>
- Quan, F., Wang, L., Gong, X., Lei, X., Liang, B., & Zhang, S. (2021). Hostile Attribution Bias and Anger Rumination Sequentially Mediate the Association between Trait Anger and Reactive Aggression. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 778695. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.778695>
- Quintana-Orts, C., Rey, L., Chamizo-Nieto, M. T., & Worthington, E. L. (2020). A Serial Mediation Model of the Relationship between Cybervictimization and Cyberaggression: The Role of Stress and Unforgiveness Motivations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17, Article 7966. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17217966>
- Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C. et al. (2006). The Reactive-proactive Aggression Questionnaire: Differential Correlates of Reactive and Proactive Aggression in Adolescent Boys. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32, 159-171. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20115>
- Rajchert, J., Zajenowska, A., Nowakowska, I., Bodecka-Zych, M., & Abramiuk, A. (2022). Hostility Bias or Sadness Bias in Excluded Individuals: Does Anodal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation of Right VLPFC vs. Left DLPFC Have a Mitigating Effect? *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 22, 1063-1077. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-022-01008-w>

- Rathert, J., Fite, P. J., & Gaertner, A. E. (2011). Associations between Effortful Control, Psychological Control and Proactive and Reactive Aggression. *Child Psychiatry & Human Development*, 42, 609-621. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-011-0236-3>
- Rowe, M., Kimmel, Jr., Pavlo, A. J., Antunes, K. D., Bellamy, C. D., O'Connell, M. J., Ocasio, L., Desai, M., Bal, J., & Flanagan, E. H. (2018). A Pilot Study of Motive Control to Reduce Vengeance Cravings. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 46, 486-497. <https://doi.org/10.29158/jaapl.003792-18>
- Runions, K. C., Salmivalli, C., Shaw, T., Burns, S., & Cross, D. (2018). Beyond the Reactive-Proactive Dichotomy: Rage, Revenge, Reward, and Recreational Aggression Predict Early High School Bully and Bully/victim Status. *Aggressive Behavior*, 44, 501-511. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21770>
- Smeets, K. C., Oostermeijer, S., Lappenschaar, M., Cohn, M., van der Meer, J. M. J., Popma, A. et al. (2017). Are Proactive and Reactive Aggression Meaningful Distinctions in Adolescents? A Variable and Person-Based Approach. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 45, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-016-0149-5>
- Su, S., Quan, F., & Xia, L. (2021). Longitudinal Relationships among Interpersonal Openness Trait, Hostile Attribution Bias, and Displaced Aggressive Behaviour: Big Five Treated as Covariates. *International Journal of Psychology*, 56, 669-678. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12745>
- Sukhodolsky, D. G., Golub, A., & Cromwell, E. N. (2001). Development and Validation of the Anger Rumination Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 689-700. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(00\)00171-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(00)00171-9)
- Tao, Y., Niu, H., Li, Y., Liu, X., Wang, S., Ma, Z. et al. (2023). Effects of Personal Relative Deprivation on the Relationship between Anger Rumination and Aggression during and after the COVID-19 Pandemic Lockdown: A Longitudinal Moderated Network Approach. *Journal of Adolescence*, 95, 596-608. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jad.12140>
- Van Bockstaele, B., van der Molen, M. J., van Nieuwenhuijzen, M., & Saleminck, E. (2020). Modification of Hostile Attribution Bias Reduces Self-Reported Reactive Aggressive Behavior in Adolescents. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 194, Article 104811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2020.104811>
- van Dijk, A., Thomaes, S., Poorthuis, A. M. G., & Orobio de Castro, B. (2019). Can Self-Persuasion Reduce Hostile Attribution Bias in Young Children? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 47, 989-1000. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-018-0499-2>
- Verhoef, R. E. J., Alsem, S. C., Verhulst, F. E., & De Castro, B. O. (2019). Hostile Intent Attribution and Aggressive Behavior in Children Revisited: A Meta-Analysis. *Child Development*, 90, e525-e547. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13255>
- Voulgaridou, I., Kokkinos, C. M., Markos, A., & Fanti, K. (2022). Temporal Stability of Relational Aggression Profiles in Adolescents. *Journal of School Psychology*, 92, 19-32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2022.02.001>
- Wilkowski, B. M., Hartung, C. M., Crowe, S. E., & Chai, C. A. (2012). Men Don't Just Get Mad; They Get Even: Revenge but Not Anger Mediates Gender Differences in Physical Aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46, 546-555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.06.001>
- Zeng, K., Cao, F., Wu, Y., Zhang, M., & Ding, X. (2023). Effects of Interpretation Bias Modification on Hostile Attribution Bias and Reactive Cyber-Aggression in Chinese Adolescents: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Current Psychology*, 43, 2373-2386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04433-3>
- Zheng, W., Tao, Y., Li, Y., Ye, H., & Luo, J. (2021). Effect of Modulating Activity in the Right DLPFC on Revenge Behavior: Evidence from a Noninvasive Brain Stimulation Investigation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 608205. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.608205>
- Zhu, W., Wang, H., & Xia, L. (2019). An Experimental Task to Measure Proactive Aggression under Incentive Condition: A Reward-Interference Task. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 149, 273-285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.06.001>