

UNITED WISDOM

“I am not being heard”: which response is actually missing?

Relationships and Intimacy

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

R-09-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

“I am not being heard”: which response is actually missing?

Epigraph

> *“what I want”*

Charles Dickens, Hard Times, book I, Chapter I, 1854. An excerpt from Gradgrind's speech. A character's voice within a satirical scene, not the author's recommendation.

What this article is about

After a lengthy discussion, one person says they have again not been heard. The other is surprised: they listened carefully, can repeat the request and even answered it. One phrase sometimes conceals different missing results. Meaning was misunderstood; personal significance unacknowledged; a proposal declined; promised action unperformed. All may matter, but they are different questions. Merging them leaves a listener uncertain what remains to answer, while the speaker again experiences the conversation bypassing their actual difficulty.

This article clarifies expectations through an accessible response or action. Its editorial map is neither a relationship test, diagnosis nor compulsory communication model. Everyday scenes are fictional. Personal experience deserves attention without itself establishing which part another understood. Disagreement, refusal and incomplete answers remain possible. Threats, coercion or danger from disagreement call for no joint exercise; accessible local assistance and safety have separate priority. In calm circumstances, begin with a modest question: what observable difference would help me identify more accurately what is missing from this conversation?

I. One phrase, four possible subjects

Not being heard can describe a painful experience while remaining too broad for the next step. Preserve it as personal experience, then choose a subject. Perhaps the listener answers another question, understands facts but misses significance, declines a request, or accepts it without acting. No interpretation is selected beforehand. The map identifies which question now needs an answer without requiring someone to abandon the broader feeling or call it mistaken. It respects the experience while making its present object available for discussion.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Imagine Vera discussing late plan changes with Ilya. He replies that the journey happened anyway. She wanted to discuss absent warning; he assessed the final outcome. Understanding the subject may be missing. In another version he accurately understands her request for advance notice but considers it unnecessary. Disagreement is present instead. If he agreed but again changed the time without notification, performance becomes the question. The same experience can accompany all three fictional scenes while each requires a different practical response.

Choosing a subject need not be final. Two difficulties can coexist and be named separately: I want you to understand the question and then discuss an available warning method. This does not yet accept the method. It proposes an order voluntarily. Another participant may accept, alter it or stop discussion. No uniquely correct sequence is prescribed, but different expectations should not be hidden behind a demand to hear everything at once and answer through one general gesture. Separate questions allow separate responses to remain visible.

It also helps to identify what would be insufficient. Repeated words can check understanding without replacing action. Practical help may omit needed recognition of significance. If everything is wanted together, name that while preserving differences. Criteria then do not silently change after every response. One part can be completed while another remains open. Precision makes no bookkeeping exercise of conversation. It avoids cancelling a partial genuine response or declaring a difficulty entirely resolved because just one part received attention.

II. When the subject is misunderstood

The first question concerns what another thinks your message means. When they answer something else, clarify one distinguishing detail. The subject is advance warning rather than whether a journey happened, or noise at night rather than the right to play music at all. An event and the desired part of the response make the subject specific. Correction requires no accusation of deliberate ignoring. Someone may have understood differently; their reason remains unknown. First discover whether understanding changes after clarification.

Vera explains wanting to know a new time before beginning preparations. Ilya may paraphrase the subject if willing; she can correct his version or confirm it. Confirmation concerns meaning rather than general agreement. If he accurately paraphrases and declines to warn her, a different divergence is now known. We do not automatically continue claiming he understood nothing. Refusal may be unacceptable to Vera, but assessing its grounds and her subsequent choices requires separate consideration. Understanding one subject does not settle whether its answer is suitable.

Sometimes a person is asked to repeat everything, with any changed wording declared failure. That criterion is too strict for ordinary conversation. Essential meaning can be checked without verbatim reproduction. Distinguishing two subjects that lead to different decisions matters more for a domestic question. Listeners retain their language. Unfamiliar but substantively accurate wording need not indicate misunderstanding. Meanwhile, speakers can clarify a detail lost in broad paraphrase. Checking concerns this message rather than an examination in perfect attention or loyalty to a particular formulation.

Understanding cannot always be established. Someone may decline paraphrasing, be unready for the subject or give an unclear answer. A limited result remains: confirmation is missing. This proves neither deception, lack of love nor a deliberate strategy. Another time, personal plan or stopping is possible. The article requires no securing confirmation at any cost. It identifies missing evidence rather than replaces it through certainty about another's internal state. A precise subject can remain unanswered, and that incompleteness also deserves being kept visible.

III. When personal significance is unacknowledged

An event can be understood without answering why it matters to someone. A listener knows a meeting moved but misses a lost preparation day. They may accept the fact while assessing it differently. Acknowledging personal significance requires no identical experience. An editorial response might recognise that a condition matters to you even though it matters less to me. This is an example rather than a validated script obliged to produce intimacy or replace resolving the actual issue. Its purpose is identifying the response sought.

Vera explains uncertainty disrupting her working day. Ilya calls it merely a small delay. Knowledge of the event may be present while a response to its significance is absent. She can request discussion of its effect on her day instead of delays' size in general. He can retain a different assessment. An intelligible subject nevertheless emerges: this condition's significance. She assigns him no identical feeling and demands no acceptance of every interpretation as objective truth about the whole event. Personal meaning and shared factual conclusions remain distinct.

In Laurenceau, Feldman Barrett and Pietromonaco's 1998 paper, disclosure and perceived partner responses were studied through interaction diaries. Understanding, acceptance and care were distinguished within perceived responsiveness. This is a limited research reference, neither validation of our four-part map nor guaranteed phrase effectiveness. Interaction self-reports establish no particular listener's motive or duty to agree. The relevant reminder here is that experienced response should not be reduced to repeating facts alone; the article's practical distinctions remain editorial.

Significance can be named incompletely. Someone need not disclose their entire history to say an issue matters. They can be unready to explain further. Another may recognise that limit without promising something unclear or unfulfillable. Two forms of agency coexist: defining personal experience and choosing available participation. If suitable acknowledgment cannot be found, this is genuine divergence rather than grounds to declare one participant unfeeling or another excessive from one episode. The map makes a particular missing response discussable without appointing a complete character assessment.

IV. When agreement is absent

The third subject is accepting a proposal. Understanding and acknowledging significance do not automatically create acceptance. Someone can accurately know what is wanted, respect the reason and decline. A request is then heard in one sense but unaccepted in another. That distinction can be substantial and painful. Name it directly instead of declaring every negative answer proof of misunderstanding. Agreement remains independent. Respecting someone does not turn their wish into another's ready-made duty, just as refusal does not invalidate the wish.

Ilya says he understands Vera's need for warning but cannot promise a day's notice because changes reach him late. She may find the arrangement unsuitable. Another possible deadline can be discussed if both want. An option may remain incomplete or unsatisfying. A mismatch can be recognised without forcing a convenient answer. The fictional scene distinguishes subjects rather than appoints the correct outcome. The article decides neither whether Vera should accept conditions, change shared plans nor decline a particular form of participation in future journeys.

When refusal proves someone did not hear, demonstrating understanding may become impossible without submission. Check which responses genuinely remain permissible. If only fulfilling a wish suffices, agreement or action is at issue rather than understanding alone. This does not accuse the speaker; it names expectations' scale honestly. Someone can want a result and consider it essential for participation. That necessity creates no right to appoint another's inner response or force acceptance of a new voluntary proposal. Personal conditions and authority over another remain separate.

Genuine duties can arise from accepted agreements, roles or other grounds. They cannot be cancelled through mere refusal or derived from feeling alone. This article determines no legal responsibility. It distinguishes a new request, disputed conditions and an existing promise. Real grounds concern a demand's content separately from how gracefully significance was acknowledged. Without established grounds, inventing them for persuasiveness is unnecessary. Clear discussion identifies the decision involved without replacing investigation

of actual circumstances that create an obligation. The wording of a conversation does not settle everything.

V. When action has not occurred

The fourth subject follows acceptance: what was actually done? Understanding statements prove no performance, and sincere intention can remain intention. Promised notification that never arrives is observable absence of a specific action. It can be named without concluding every earlier statement was a lie. A reason may be unknown while the result is checkable. Return to the precise promise, deadline and conditions rather than restart a general dispute about someone's listening capacity and entire moral character. Assessing action asks for its own evidence.

Vera and Ilya hypothetically agreed notification by evening when the time is known. No message arrives. Before calling this a breach, check whether the stated condition arose. If Ilya knew the time, non-performance is at issue. If not, there may have been no agreement to report uncertainty. These are different facts. Clarification need not excuse absence; it identifies the promise's actual content. Vera can propose altered conditions or organise preparations independently. Her choice requires no proving the worst possible motive before deciding that arrangements are insufficient.

Action needs a proportionate check. One condition should not become permanent surveillance, access demands for correspondence or secret recordings. Check whether an expected message came, a particular task was done or an agreed deadline arrived. Limited information can be identified. Verification concerns action rather than hidden intention. Repeated known non-performance may nevertheless matter for personal decisions. The article requires no indefinite patience and appoints no number of attempts owed to someone. Evidence of a result and choices about future participation remain different matters.

Completed action does not automatically resolve other subjects. Vera may receive a message and still consider the general arrangement unfair. This is another question. Acknowledge the completed part without making it sufficient for everything. The factual result need not disappear because disagreement continues. Conversely, an apology for failure may matter without itself fulfilling a promise. Different results receive their names. Precision does not cancel emotional experience; it clarifies what happened and what remains undone in a particular shared task. Those facts help locate the next question.

VI. Turning a broad experience into an accessible question

Ask which response would now change your description. Would accurate naming establish subject understanding? Would acknowledgment suffice for this part? After acceptance, what would need checking through action? These questions seek no perfect intimacy criterion; they concern one discussion. Several wanted results can be named separately. The request to be heard becomes more accessible without promising all relationship complexity will disappear through one clarification. An ordinary question can remain modest while the larger experience retains its importance and deserves further attention.

Vera can say she currently wants to know whether Ilya heard the warning question specifically. Later she wants to discuss timing; subsequently she will see whether a message came. This order is proposed rather than generally obligatory. If he is unready, the missing answer remains visible and she can decide her actions. Criteria do not silently shift. Confirmed understanding is recognised, refusal remains refusal, and performance is checked through action. Partial results need neither be inflated into harmony nor cancelled into total absence of contact.

An observable response request need not be emotionally cold. Explain its importance and name pain. Listeners retain the right to their language. A required tone, complete emotional match or facial expression need not be attention's sole sign. Response form may also matter; name that as a separate preference. We establish no universal standard under which a calm voice means indifference and any emotional reaction proves understanding or recognition of the message's genuine significance. Substance and preferred form can be discussed without being merged into one inflexible test.

Questions must permit discovering an unwelcome result. When someone understood but disagrees, clarification should not hide this through another accusation. When they agreed but failed, words cannot replace action. When significance was recognised but a detail missed, accept one part and check another. This openness makes the map useful for assessment rather than producing a predetermined correct answer. Dissatisfaction remains possible alongside honest acknowledgment of an existing result and a still-missing one. The distinction serves accuracy rather than a demand that people feel satisfied immediately.

VII. Avoid replacing listening with the only correct reaction

Feeling heard may involve expected words, familiar tone or customary support. Discuss these expectations without making them universal measures. Another participant may express attention differently. This proves neither suitability nor failure, but preserves clarification's possibility. Identify an intelligible part and a still-missing response. The article requires nobody to accept every style, while one unfamiliar answer cannot establish that someone understood nothing or cannot consider personal significance. Particular expectations deserve discussion rather than automatically determine another's entire capacity for care.

Imagine Vera wants sympathy and Ilya starts making a schedule. He may be trying to help while answering a different current request. She can say solutions are needed later and a brief acknowledgment of why the day was difficult matters now. This proposes an accessible response rather than assigns identical feelings. He can agree, respond differently or report being unable to continue. Correcting the format preserves both voices. The fictional scene does not promise that an accurately named preference will remove tiredness, conflict or longstanding absence of participation. A clarified request is only one result.

Complete emotional openness should not be demanded before recognising understanding. Someone can understand without telling their own history or can state a position briefly. A closer exchange can be wanted separately and receive its own answer. Understanding one question creates no contract giving access to an entire inner world. That boundary preserves participants' agency. Intimacy may matter without being proved through compulsory confession or a single reaction selected for someone else without room to object. Openness can remain an invitation rather than a condition silently imposed.

Repeated humiliation, threats or control exceed response format. A desired reaction need not be secured to recognise observed actions as serious. Current danger prioritises accessible local emergency help; coercion calls for suitable specialist support through a safe contact method. Joint checking is unnecessary and refusal no test. The article makes no personal safety plan or relationship-safety measurement. Searching for a feeling of being heard must not become an obligation to continue dangerous discussion until another finally labels your experience correct. Safety does not depend on obtaining verbal recognition first.

VIII. Sources help distinguish without supplying one formula

At Hard Times' opening, Gradgrind demands facts-only education while the satirical narrative presents that approach's authoritarian narrowness. His speech cannot become Dickens's recommendation to remove feelings. Our comparison asks what disappears when only a predetermined kind of answer is accepted. This is an editorial reading of fiction rather than listening research. It proves no four-part map but helps preserve personal significance beside event accuracy without dissolving one into the other. A character's forceful position must remain attributed to that character.

In James 1:19, King James Version, attention to listening belongs to religious ethical instruction. It does not measure understanding of a particular request. Perceived-responsiveness research has different grounds: interaction assessments rather than religious obligations. Our practice adds an editorial level distinguishing results. Comparison preserves attention as a shared concern and substantive differences. Traditions and a scientific model become no unified system guaranteeing outcomes for every pair. The same everyday question can be considered through sources without treating their reasons as interchangeable.

Readers may use one question alone: separate agreement from understanding without accepting an entire intimacy model, or consider attention through religion without requiring shared belief from someone else. Sources support reflection rather than prescribe reactions. Names replace no checking of what happened in your conversation. Unknown conditions should stay unknown. A text's authority creates no information about a particular listener and makes no unsafe practice suitable merely through connection with a worthy ideal. Transfer limits are part of using sources accurately, not reasons to dismiss their significance.

Human complexity retains room within this limit. Events, personal meaning, decisions and actions connect without coinciding. Some want acknowledgment first, others a specific deadline. Their order can be discussed without appointing one route to intimacy. Distinct source foundations reveal choices when not made a universal protocol. This article supplies distinctions and a voluntary way to clarify one subject. Subsequent decisions remain with readers, including another format, a pause or separate help being more suitable for these people now. A map supports their assessment rather than performs it for them.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

IX. Partial response and independent choice

A discussion may end partially: subject understood but significance unrecognised, significance recognised without agreement, or agreement with action still ahead. Name each part without a general success or failure label. Continued feelings of not being heard are not prohibited by precision. It clarifies what is currently missing: perhaps acknowledgment rather than factual knowledge, or an unfulfilled promise. A next question becomes specific without requiring an entire relationship history proved through one sentence. Both a real partial response and a real unresolved difficulty can remain visible together.

In the imagined example, Ilya understands warning's importance and recognises lost time but offers notification only on the journey day. Vera considers this insufficient. Genuine disagreement is now known. She can decide whether these plans suit her, seek alternatives or prepare independently. The article appoints no outcome. Her dissatisfaction need not vanish, while his accurate understanding need not be cancelled to explain it. Real results and a personal next choice can remain separate, equally significant parts of assessment. This permits acknowledging knowledge without requiring acceptance of unsuitable conditions.

When an answer is missing, someone can act within that limit. Name information needed for a shared plan and what you personally will do if it stays absent. This reports an available choice rather than a hidden threat. An absent response should not be treated as consent to your plan, and indefinite waiting should not be demanded to preserve a good-listener image. Agency includes ending discussion, declining uncertain joint action and seeking other support without assigning a proven motive from one silence. An unresolved exchange can have practical consequences without its reasons being completely known.

A modest result might be understanding what was expected, knowing which part received a response, retaining an open question and choosing the next step separately. This promises no universal relief; it improves one's description. Experience can be respected without overstating knowledge of another's mind, partial response acknowledged without being deemed sufficient, and another's freedom preserved without abandoning personal participation conditions. Being heard remains a significant human wish, while its particular meaning becomes a question named and checked proportionately. A limited answer can inform choice without settling every part of the relationship.

What this means in practice

In calm circumstances, select one discussion that remains unfinished for you. Notes are optional. Name a known event separately from experience. Choose the missing result: subject understanding, acknowledgment of significance, proposal acceptance or action under an actual promise. Two can be chosen if distinct. Perfect classification is unnecessary. Seek an accessible next question rather than a listener's personality label or proof your experience lacked justification. This reflection can remain private if joint conversation is unavailable or unwanted.

When exchange is safe and voluntary, propose one observable response. Clarifying a subject, discussing meaning, deciding a proposal and checking action need different questions. Permit a different answer or refusal. Acknowledgment is not consent, and a promise is not performance. Threats and coercion end joint exercises; refusal should not test safety. Accessible local emergency and specialist assistance have separate priority; the article replaces no individual plan. Use the map only where circumstances actually permit voluntary discussion rather than making participation another requirement.

Finally, state knowledge without exaggeration: subject confirmed, significance heard, proposal declined, action not yet done. Uncertainty is possible. Partial answers can remain insufficient while you choose further participation. This map determines no relationship outcome and demands no satisfaction on schedule. It clarifies expectations so the next step concerns a genuinely missing response rather than endless argument about who can listen at all or whose feeling must cancel another's agency. The practical result is a clearer question with its limits retained.

Key quotation

> *“Stick to Facts”*

Charles Dickens, Hard Times, book I, Chapter I, 1854. Gradgrind's short command. Satirical context retained: this is no recommendation to exclude personal significance.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Shared question	Difference
Dickens and editorial map	Responses omitted	Satire is no research protocol
Responsiveness research and map	Understanding and acknowledgment	An intimacy model validates no four-result map
James and attention	Responding to what is heard	Religious instruction does not measure understanding
Literature and research	Personal significance beside events	Fictional voice is no empirical evidence
All three references	Responses and their limits	Grounds create no universal technique

The map is editorial. A shared concern establishes neither traditions' consensus nor an exercise's effect.

Sources

• Charles Dickens — Hard Times, 1854, book I Chapters I–II. Selected school scene read; quotations from Chapter I. Gutenberg transcribes Chapman & Hall's 1905 edition; no whole-novel reading claimed.

• Jean-Philippe Laurenceau, Lisa Feldman Barrett, Paula R. Pietromonaco — Intimacy as an Interpersonal Process, 1998, JPSP 74(5), 1238–1251. Abstract, opening model and selected diary-method description read. No complete statistical analysis claimed; this article's practice remains separate.

• James 1:19 — King James Version. Specified verse read as religious reference; no direct quotations in this package.

Tags

not being heard, understanding, acknowledgment, agreement, action, response, request, significance, experience, fact, interpretation, listening, responsiveness, agency, boundaries, voluntary participation, promise, verification, uncertainty, disagreement, expectation, partial result, conversation, relationships, Charles Dickens, Laurenceau, Feldman Barrett, Pietromonaco, James, personal meaning

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.