

Giving Anger a Voice Without Giving It the Verdict

Core emotions, self-protection, and the clinical work of responsible assertion

Brian Kennedy, MA, LMFT · Therapist companion to **Anger, Protest, and Assertion** · 2026

“I do not want to be this angry,” Ren says. “It is only a pickup.”

Their partner, Lee, had agreed to collect a family member from an appointment. When Lee became unavailable, Ren left work to cover it. This was the second missed pickup. Ren sent several increasingly sharp messages, then spent the evening explaining why the anger was justified. Lee remembers the messages more vividly than the agreement.

In this fictional encounter, a practical responsibility has become difficult to see through the argument it generated. Ren is ashamed of the intensity and afraid that reducing it will mean surrendering the concern. Lee feels attacked and wants the anger to stop. The therapist may feel drawn toward either reassuring Ren that the protest is legitimate or helping Ren become calmer. Both invitations require judgment about what they leave in view.

Your Anger Deserves a Voice asks us to distinguish anger’s information from the interpretation and conduct that accompany it. This therapist companion deepens that inquiry through the purposes of emotion, developmental adaptation, transference, regulation, and differentiation. It follows the five modules of Anger, Protest, and Assertion, where a clearer voice becomes meaningful through the action it makes possible and the actual result that follows.

Emotions participate in the work of living

Before considering what to do with anger, we need to give it a place within emotional life. Emotions organize attention, bodily readiness, communication, and possible action around something that matters. They can help us approach nourishment, register loss, avoid danger, resist interference, or seek support. A feeling’s adaptive function concerns what a capacity can contribute; it does not establish that every instance is accurate, proportionate, or helpful.

The familiar six-emotion framework associated with Paul Ekman identifies enjoyment or happiness, sadness, fear, anger, disgust, and surprise.[1] It is a useful teaching map, rather than a settled inventory of everything humans feel. Ekman’s later work also discusses contempt, and other theorists organize emotional life differently. In particular, these six are not Panksepp’s seven primary-process systems, nor are they identical to every experiential therapy’s use of the term *core emotion*.

Joy or enjoyment draws us toward rewarding experience and can communicate welcome, pleasure, and affiliation. It helps us recognize what we want to return to or share. Clinically, we can ask what a person is able to enjoy and whether enjoyment can be received without immediate guilt, vigilance, or obligation. Pleasure itself does not guarantee that an activity serves well-being.[1]

Sadness responds to loss and can communicate a need for comfort, support, or time to recover. It helps make the absence of something important emotionally available. In therapy, sadness may need accompaniment rather than rapid encouragement. Its presence does not prescribe giving up, and its absence does not prove that a loss is unimportant.[1]

Fear prepares us to respond to perceived danger. It can orient attention toward protection, escape, stillness, or seeking help. Its life-preserving value deserves respect. The clinical work includes distinguishing a present threat from an anticipated one, while recognizing that learned expectations can be compelling even when circumstances have changed.[1]

Anger mobilizes us when something important appears obstructed, threatened, or unfair. It can provide energy for protest, self-protection, and an effort to change conditions. It can also arise when an unreasonable expectation is frustrated. We need to hear the concern and examine the claim before deciding what the anger should authorize.[1]

Disgust supports rejection or distance from what is experienced as offensive or contaminating. Its protective function is readily recognizable around spoiled food. Its social meanings demand greater caution: learned disgust can also serve exclusion, prejudice, and dehumanization. Feeling repelled cannot establish that another person is morally or physically contaminating.[1]

Surprise interrupts an expectation and redirects attention toward the unexpected. It creates a brief opportunity to register that our account of the situation may need updating. It can give way to fear, joy, anger, or another response as the event becomes clearer. In therapy, surprise can accompany discovery without demonstrating that the discovery is true.[1]

These descriptions are functional orientations, not six commands. Several emotions can arise together or change as an encounter unfolds. Ren may be angry about the missed agreement, afraid of continued unreliability, and sad about how alone the responsibility feels. We need not decide which feeling is the deepest before taking the current task seriously. The work is to help experience become differentiated enough to inform judgment.

Anger's purpose: having an interest that counts

Anger can help recover an essential recognition: *I am here too*. My time, body, commitments, and limits belong in the arrangement. Someone who has learned to accommodate automatically may first discover an objection through irritation. Before they can make a clear request, they may need to know that they do not want what they have already agreed to do.

That recognition contributes to an integral sense of self. It gives a person access to a position from which they can consent, refuse, negotiate, or act. If every objection feels disloyal, relationship can become organized around invisible self-abandonment. If every frustration is treated as proof of entitlement, relationship becomes organized around domination. Anger's developmental value is therefore inseparable from learning that another person has interests too.

Panksepp's cross-species affective neuroscience places RAGE among seven proposed primary-process emotional systems and distinguishes these biological foundations from subsequent learning and higher-order thought.[2] His work offers a way to take the biological roots of emotional mobilization seriously. It does not permit us to locate the meaning of Ren's anger in a named circuit or infer a history from its intensity.

Damasio and Carvalho's account of feelings places bodily states and the regulation of life near the center of affective experience.[3] Clinically, this supports attending to embodied experience alongside thought. Ren notices heat in the face and pressure to send another message. Those cues can help identify the moment choice narrows. They cannot prove that Lee intended disregard.

We can ask, "What is your anger trying to bring into the arrangement?" Ren initially says, "Respect." With further inquiry, the concern becomes more usable: an agreement that does not depend on Ren leaving work whenever Lee's plans change. Anger has helped identify a stake. The stake now needs a response that can be evaluated.

A feeling, a meaning, an impulse, and an action

Ren says, "Lee thinks my work matters less." That may describe a repeated arrangement accurately. It may also be an inference requiring more information. The missed pickup is an event. Anger is an experience. Being treated as less important is a meaning. Sending a contemptuous message is an action. Keeping them distinguishable gives the therapist more than a choice between validating everything and disputing the feeling.

Lee had received an urgent work call, but had not communicated the change until the pickup was already due. That information modifies one part of Ren's account: Lee had not simply chosen a more enjoyable activity. It leaves another part intact: Ren was expected to absorb the disruption without consultation. A correction can reduce certainty about intention while strengthening precision about responsibility.

We might say, "Your anger seems to be pointing toward the assumption that you would cover this. Let us check whether that is what happened, and separately examine what you sent." This leaves the original concern visible while opening Ren's conduct to review. The insult does not become acceptable because the agreement was missed. The missed agreement does not disappear because Ren used an insult.

Aggression is a behavioral question, not a synonym for emotional force. We assess threats, humiliation, obstruction, pressure, and disregard for another person's freedom. A person can be loud without threatening and composed while exerting coercive control. No single appearance settles the matter. We ask what happened and what options remained available to the other person.

Anger can be primary, protective, or both

A common therapeutic reflex is to look for the hurt beneath anger. Sometimes this opens an important experience. Ren may discover the fear that asking quietly means no one will respond. Another client may recognize shame being defended by attack. Anger can protect vulnerability that feels more dangerous to reveal.

Sometimes, however, anger is the direct response we need to encounter. A person has been deceived, exploited, discriminated against, or denied a meaningful choice. Repeatedly asking what is underneath may communicate that anger is acceptable only after it becomes softer. We can inadvertently repeat an environment in which protest had to disappear before care became available.

Gleiser, Ford, and Fosha describe anger's adaptive action tendency in terms of protection and responding to injustice or boundary violation within an experiential framework.[4] Their account invites attention to what anger makes possible when it is processed with support. It does not require treating every angry state as adaptive, or every increase in intensity as movement toward health.

With Ren, we can ask, "Is the anger itself telling us something you have had difficulty allowing?" Perhaps the answer is, "I do not want to be the backup by default." We can remain with that recognition. Later, sadness about the relationship may emerge. Its arrival adds to the account; it does not reveal that the anger was merely a disguise.

The child who could not safely protest

Children learn about anger in particular relationships. In one family, anger belongs to the most powerful person. Others become watchful, agreeable, or unusually attentive to preventing disappointment. In another, escalation is the only protest adults notice. In another, caregivers can receive an objection, hold a limit, and remain available. These environments offer different possibilities for learning how force and connection can coexist.

Winnicott's writing on aggression approaches it within emotional development, rather than reducing it to misconduct.[5] His terminology is broader than a contemporary definition of aggression as behavior intended to harm. That difference matters. We can take a developmental interest in vitality, force, and the emergence of concern without turning aggressive acts into evidence of healthy self-expression.

A possible clinical question follows: could this person experience their own opposition while remaining in a relationship? Ren recalls being praised for being easy and feeling frightened when a parent became disappointed. Anger now carries both the objection and an alarm about having it. The wish to be considered collides with a familiar prohibition against making difficulty for someone else.

We let Ren's history emerge through their own account. Not everyone who struggles to assert was silenced in childhood. Current danger, exhaustion, illness, sensory overload, inaccessible working conditions, and a partner's actual behavior may be sufficient explanations. Developmental depth enriches the picture when it leaves those circumstances available for attention.

When today's person carries yesterday's injury

Ren says, "When the message came, I already knew how the evening would go." That certainty may draw on the current pattern. It may also contain older relational learning. The therapeutic task is to examine both without assigning either in advance.

Transference describes earlier relational feelings and expectations becoming organized around a present person. Projection concerns attributing something of one's own experience to someone else. They are different processes. Ren may expect dismissal before Lee has replied; Ren may also disown their own wish to punish and become certain that punishment is exclusively Lee's intention. These are hypotheses, not accusations that defeat the present complaint.

Jung's account of marriage invites examination of unconscious images and expectations that can shape how the partner is encountered.[6] We can use that depth inquiry without adopting his historical gender assumptions. The practical question is whether we are meeting the particular person, or responding to a figure we already know too well to question.

There may be enough resemblance between an earlier and present encounter to mobilize a much larger response. A missed pickup becomes not only an unfair task but another moment in a lifelong story of not counting. The older grief may deserve therapeutic accompaniment. The present partner remains responsible for the present agreement. Neither task can do the other's work.

An integrative response might be, "This touched the old experience of being the one who adjusts. We can give that experience room here. We also need to decide what today's pickup arrangement requires." Historical understanding should not make Ren responsible for compensating indefinitely for Lee's unreliability. It should also help Ren avoid making Lee accountable for every earlier person who failed to notice.

Attachment protest and the person who retreats

Anger can contain an effort to restore contact. A partner asks more urgently because quiet bids seem to vanish. The other hears inadequacy or accusation and retreats. The retreat increases the first partner's urgency. Each then encounters the other's defense as evidence that the feared relationship is already happening.

Johnson's attachment-based experiential account places defensive strategies within relational context and emphasizes new experiences of accessibility and responsiveness.[7] Here, it invites us to explore what the protest asks for and what makes receiving it difficult. We still need the partners' accounts. Withdrawal may reflect shame, overload, avoidance of responsibility, fear, or a practical constraint. Pursuit may express longing, a neglected duty, coercive pressure, or several concerns together.

A therapist can help the longing become more directly speakable without asking the protesting partner to renounce anger as the price of being heard. "I need to know that when you make an agreement with me, I will not be left carrying it alone" is both relational and practical. The reply must eventually reach the arrangement as well as the feeling.

Two People in the Room, Neither Disappearing develops this attachment dance in more depth. In anger work, its importance is especially clear: we help people become more accessible without making one partner's distress an unlimited claim on the other, and without making the other's discomfort a reason to evade responsibility.

Regulation that preserves the message

Schore's developmental synthesis emphasizes attachment communication and the acquisition of capacities for affect regulation.[8] It directs clinical attention toward timing, voice, expression, and the experience of being accompanied. Its contribution is a relational lens, not a method for reading brain states from how someone looks.

Ren may need support to slow the sequence between heat and message. Another client may need support to notice that the apparently settled answer, "Whatever you want," contains no accessible choice. Regulation cannot be judged solely by reduced display. We ask whether a person can feel, think, consider another account, and choose conduct more freely.

This can mean fewer questions, an external point of orientation, reduced stimulation, or a pause that has a credible next step. Inward attention is an option, not a requirement. Some people find it useful; others become more overwhelmed. We assess the response rather than treating a preferred technique as universally settling.

The original concern needs to survive the intervention. If Ren becomes calmer and the therapist changes the subject, regulation has quietly become accommodation. We might say, "Let us make enough room to decide what you want to say. We will return to the missed agreement." That return gives slowing a relational meaning different from being silenced.

Emotional processing and venting are different tasks

There is an important tension between helping someone contact disallowed anger and helping someone reduce escalating arousal. The distinction concerns function and context. A person moving from numb compliance toward a clear no may need more access to feeling. A person rehearsing retaliation may need help interrupting a process that further narrows choice. Neither direction is therapeutic by definition.

Kjærvik and Bushman's meta-analysis of 154 studies found that activities lowering arousal reduced anger and aggression on average, while arousal-increasing activities were ineffective overall.[9] This challenges the assumption that anger must be discharged through force. It does not demonstrate that every form of experiential emotional processing is ineffective or that intense emotion should always be avoided. The review did not settle the value of every relational therapy intervention.

The experiential account described by Gleiser and colleagues involves supported emotional access, regulation, reflection, and adaptive action.[4] It is not equivalent to repeating accusations or hitting something while imagining the offender. We should keep the difference explicit without claiming that theory alone establishes efficacy for a specific practice.

With Ren, a useful question is, "After attending to this feeling, are you more able to name the concern and choose, or more certain that Lee must be made to suffer?" If an intervention intensifies revenge, loss of choice, or disconnection, we revise or stop it. If it makes the sentence "My time needs to count" available without humiliation, there is a capacity worth exploring and consolidating.

Differentiation: a position that can bear a reply

The Bowen Center's account of differentiation concerns maintaining considered judgment within emotional relationships, including realistic dependence and the capacity to receive influence.[10] It helps distinguish a clear position from a demand that another person validate the whole of one's worth. It also distinguishes remaining a self from simply withdrawing.

Ren can say, "I will not continue being the automatic backup." That position becomes more responsible when it includes the care that still needs to happen. Someone must collect the family member. A limit cannot leave a dependent person stranded in order to make a point. Ren and Lee may need a backup arrangement, a clearer communication rule, or additional support. Anger can supply the energy to revise the arrangement without deciding every detail of that revision.

Lee can disagree with an attributed motive while owning the missed communication. Ren can hear the urgent work context while retaining the request for a different plan. Neither needs to feel completely understood before making a responsible choice. This is one way differentiation and attachment work together: enough connection to hear the concern,

enough self-definition to remain truthful when the reply disappoints.

A private rehearsal can be revealing. “The pickup changed without notice. I left work to cover it. We need a backup that does not assume my availability. I can help plan it, and I cannot promise to leave work next time.” We then imagine a respectful objection. Can Ren hear it, revise for a real constraint, or hold the position without intensifying the attack? The experiment concerns usable agency, rather than perfect wording.

Whose anger are we willing to understand?

Anger arrives in a consulting room with a social history. Audre Lorde’s writing addresses women’s responses to racism and the resistance encountered when that anger is expressed, including within relationships among women.[11] Her work challenges us to ask whether attention to the listener’s discomfort is displacing the conditions the anger identifies. We should preserve that specific political context rather than reduce the essay to generic permission to be upset.

In clinical work, the related questions are concrete. Whose account is presumed credible? Who must become exceptionally composed before being heard? Who has enough money, authority, or security to refuse? A regulation intervention may be useful and still become oppressive if it repeatedly leaves discrimination or unequal labor untouched.

These questions do not exempt any person from examination of conduct. They ask us to make the examination accurate. A man’s anger can express injury, vulnerability, or exploitation, as well as an attempt to recover expected authority. A woman’s anger can express resistance to subordination, as well as conduct that frightens or humiliates another person. Gender cannot determine the meaning of an individual exchange, nor does acknowledging these possibilities establish equal power.

We can help a person speak more clearly and ask whether the environment is willing to respond. When the problem is structural, the next step may include advocacy, collective action, practical resources, or protection. Another communication rehearsal is not always the missing treatment.

Hearing anger without surrender or counterattack

The person receiving anger also has work to do. Lee says, “I cannot listen when Ren is like that.” We examine the actual conduct. If Ren threatened or intimidated, protection and accountability matter. If Lee means that Ren sounded upset, the task may be tolerating a concern that is uncomfortable to hear. The word *unsafe* needs enough specificity to guide action.

Lee might acknowledge, “I told you too late, and I assumed you would cover it.” That statement need not include, “Your work has never mattered to me.” Ren can be met around a real action without gaining authority over Lee’s entire inner life. Conversely, an objection to a

false motive cannot become a way to avoid the action everyone recognizes.

After the Apology, What Changes? develops the movement from acknowledgment to repair. Here the immediate question is whether Lee can hear an accurate correction and take up the practical task without asking Ren to end the anger as payment. Ren's responsibility for the messages remains a separate matter. One injury does not cancel another.

At review, Lee has arranged one pickup reliably. Ren notices the difference and remains angry about earlier disruptions. Both observations belong. We need not label the remaining anger resistance or declare the successful pickup sufficient. We can ask what it changed, what it did not, and what evidence further reliance would require.

The therapist's own relationship with force

Our capacity to accompany anger is shaped partly by what anger has meant in our lives. Some of us learned to read it as approaching violence. Some learned to respect it as authority. Some became especially skilled at absorbing it and staying useful. Others learned that an angry voice was the only voice anyone would hear. These histories may enter our clinical timing before they become conscious.

Aponte and Kissil's Person-of-the-Therapist framework emphasizes recognizing enduring personal themes and using the self purposefully in the therapeutic encounter.[12] In this work, reflection and supervision help us ask whether we are protecting the client's capacity or retreating from our own activation. Personal therapy and experiential self-work may be important places to encounter what a client's anger awakens.

We may prematurely soften Ren because the tension feels unbearable. We may encourage more force because their protest speaks for something in us that was never defended. We may identify with Lee and call Ren excessive, or identify with Ren and press Lee until honest responsiveness becomes less possible. None of those reactions establishes what the couple needs next.

A client's anger toward us can reveal an intervention that missed. "You are helping me understand Lee again. You have not asked what leaving work cost me." We can pause with the sting and examine the claim. Perhaps our formulation has become more elaborate than our recognition. A useful response begins with the missed cost and changes the next question.

We still need professional limits. Accompanying anger does not mean accepting threats, and setting a limit does not require treating the person as a threat. Our responsibility includes providing a frame that can receive protest, interrupt harmful conduct, and tolerate disagreement with our preferred account. Warmth becomes more trustworthy when it can remain present to a correction.

What the angry response is trying to preserve

Parts language can make competing concerns easier to notice. Ren may recognize a forceful response insisting that the issue be addressed and another response fearing that any objection will cost love. The IFS model describes protective roles and a relationship of curiosity toward them.[13] These are model-specific ways of organizing experience, not anatomical divisions or categories assigned from an outburst.

We might ask what the demanding response fears would happen if it stopped repeating the concern. Ren answers, “Nothing would change.” That answer deserves to be checked against the relationship’s actual history. An internal protector can be frightened and also correctly notice a repeated failure. Listening inwardly should not divert attention from the arrangement.

We can appreciate the wish to preserve dignity while asking about the contemptuous messages. Could the same concern be expressed through a clear request, an altered responsibility, or a practical decision? The aim is a broader range of action. We do not need the angry response to become grateful, disappear, or reveal a hidden child before responsible conduct becomes possible.

The five modules as a clinical learning arc

Recognizing Anger Without Becoming Its Verdict begins with Ren’s observable encounter. Separate event, feeling, meaning, impulse, and action. A private account is enough. The first useful change may be an inference becoming a question while the practical objection remains intact.

What Your Protest Is Asking For identifies the stake. Ren initially wants respect; the work clarifies dependable pickup arrangements, communication, and the cost of assuming Ren’s availability. Distinguish acknowledgment, a negotiable preference, and an established responsibility. One cannot automatically substitute for another.

Speaking Clearly Without Punishing invites a manageable statement and a responsible next action. Rehearse what would happen if the other person disagreed respectfully. A client can retain firmness, revise for new information, or decide not to speak in that setting. Credible risk calls for protection and support rather than more courage on demand.

Hearing Anger and Owning Your Impact turns attention outward. Ren examines the messages; Lee examines the missed communication. Keep actions separate, allow correction, and identify what can honestly be owned. Acknowledgment is not a confession to every alleged motive and does not require praise or renewed closeness.

Turning Assertion Into Reliable Action reviews what followed. In the fictional continuation, a written backup agreement works once and fails later because the named backup is unavailable. Ren’s first prediction—that a clearer agreement would solve the difficulty—needs revision. They now consider actual resources and what each can reliably

commit to. The next step may be practical support rather than another intense conversation.

A review holds the mixed result in detail. Ren sent fewer attacking messages, Lee communicated earlier, and the arrangement still failed on one occasion. Those are distinct observations. Neither continued anger nor an improved conversation settles whether the workload is fair. BKL's educational cycle supports noticing, understanding, chosen experiments, and revision; it does not establish a treatment outcome from completion.

A voice with room for judgment

Ren may eventually say, "I am still angry that I had to work so hard to make this matter. I also know more clearly what I will do next time." There is grief in that statement, and a position. The anger no longer has to carry every part of the history, every practical decision, and the whole proof that Ren counts.

Our work makes room for the full emotional repertoire. Fear can ask for protection; sadness can register loss; joy can reveal what nourishes; disgust can signal a wish for distance that still requires examination; surprise can loosen an expectation. Anger contributes its particular readiness to protest and act. None is required to govern alone.

A fuller self can feel force without making another person smaller. It can acknowledge an old wound while responding to present conduct, preserve a limit while considering a real duty, and hear a correction without abandoning dignity. The task is to help anger become available to a person who can think, feel, choose, and remain answerable for the next act.

References

1. Paul Ekman Group. (n.d.). Universal emotions, with official explanatory pages on enjoyment, sadness, fear, anger, disgust, and surprise. Institutional explanations of Ekman's framework; the six-emotion teaching map is distinguished from later additions and other theories.
2. Panksepp, J. (2011). Cross-species affective neuroscience decoding of the primal affective experiences of humans and related animals. *PLOS ONE*, 6(9), e21236. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021236>
3. Damasio, A., & Carvalho, G. B. (2013). The nature of feelings: Evolutionary and neurobiological origins. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14, 143-152. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3403>
4. 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. Author manuscript. Used for its experiential formulation, not its historical diagnostic descriptions or as a current comparative treatment verdict.
5. 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. Chapter record and abstract. Bounded abstract-level use; full chapter access was unavailable.
6. Jung, C. G. (1925). Marriage as a psychological relationship. Reprinted in *The development of personality, Collected Works*, Vol. 17, paragraphs 324-345. Transcribed original essay.
7. Johnson, S. M. (2009). Attachment theory and emotionally focused therapy for individuals and couples: Perfect partners. In J. H. Obegi & E. Berant (Eds.), *Attachment theory and research in clinical work with adults* (pp. 410-433). Guilford Press. Original chapter.

8. 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. Author's copy. Developmental synthesis; not a method for inferring individual neural states.
9. Kjærøvik, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2024.102414>
10. The Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). Differentiation of self. Institutional explanation of Bowen's theory.
11. Lorde, A. (1981/1997). The uses of anger. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 25(1-2), 278-285. Reprinted original address. Also collected in *Sister outsider* (1984).
12. Aponte, H. J., & Kissil, K. (2014). "If I can grapple with this I can truly be of use in the therapy room": Using the therapist's own emotional struggles to facilitate effective therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 40(2), 152-164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmft.12011>
13. IFS Institute. (n.d.). The Internal Family Systems model outline. Official account of model-specific assumptions and protective roles; used as an optional lens.

Clinical illustrations are fictional and develop the educational encounters in the client article and modules. This essay is an integrative clinical argument, not a tested protocol or a complete review of emotion science. Research, theoretical models, cultural criticism, and clinical synthesis have different evidentiary roles. Selected original passages, official explanations, and abstract-level sources were consulted; full-book reading is not claimed. Evidence for informing research and therapies does not establish outcomes for BKL's educational practices.