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Abstract
Reflective function (RF) is the capacity to reflect on one's own thinking and feelings, as well as on that of others. It involves an increasingly complex awareness that there is more than what is visible on the surface. Most studies of RF have focused on its significance for self-development and interpersonal relationships in dyadic and family contexts. In this article, I suggest that by imparting a more accurate perception of the intra- and interpersonal reality and interrelatedness, RF is inextricably related to concern and to reaching others in widening circles. I further suggest that obstacles to its development and realization can be found at the individual, relational, and sociopolitical levels. I conclude that the construct of RF both captures and facilitates the connection between psychology and ethics, and that psychologists play a key role in exploring the conditions that affect the realization of RF, and in promoting social change in general.
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A human being . . . experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings, as something separated from the rest—a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest to us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty.

—Albert Einstein, letter to a grieving father

The increasing level of insecurity in my country, Israel, and worldwide, as well as the environmental crisis and global interdependence, call for higher reflective capacities. Living in a conflict zone, imprisoned in dichotomous perceptions of “us” versus “them” and cycles of violence, underscores the need for a wider perspective of reality and a
deeper understanding of underlying psychological mechanisms. In this essay, I suggest that reflective function (RF), a metacognitive capacity to reflect on one’s own and others’ thoughts and feelings, is necessary for coping with these challenges. By reflecting on both self and others, and on our interrelatedness with others, RF enables a shift from a focus on the individual to a broader perspective, from which concern naturally evolves. By reaching an increasingly more accurate perception of the intra- and interpersonal reality, RF enables both an awareness of the importance of concern and the capacity for its realization. However, the realization of RF is fraught with obstacles. Overcoming these obstacles necessitates an effort not only at the individual or dyadic levels, but also in the social, cultural, and political spheres, and a transition from an individualistic psychology to a socially committed and ethical orientation. I conclude that by promoting awareness of the internal dynamics and environmental inputs that affect the realization of RF, and by keeping a socially committed attitude, psychologists can assume a key role in this transition. My specific objectives are (a) to review the development of RF and how it is related to concern; (b) to describe the emotional and cognitive aspects of RF and the effort needed for its realization; (c) to highlight the factors that may impede RF in the individual, social, cultural, and political spheres; and (d) to outline the ways in which the construct of RF both captures and facilitates the connection between psychology and ethics.

Development of reflective function: Self–Other dynamics

From an early age, infants share emotional states with others (Tomasello et al., 2005). The caregiver’s emotional availability and response to the infant’s signals seem to enable the development of the infant’s awareness of affective self-states and understanding of mental life (Licata et al., 2016). The infant appears to need recognizable images of their affective states, and the caregiver achieves this by responding with appropriate displays of emotions (Gergely & Unoka, 2008). The caregiver’s capacity to acknowledge and contain emotional experiences, including distress, without being overwhelmed, enables the child to cope with their own experiences and to develop a capacity for concern for others (Steele et al., 2002). Absence of emotional containment and of adequate response by the caregiver may lead to the exclusion of important aspects of the child’s self and of their perceptions of others (Fonagy et al., 2002).

Furthermore, humans seem to possess a species-unique externally oriented learning system, enabling cultural knowledge and conventions to be passed on by significant others (Fonagy et al., 2007; Gergely & Unoka, 2008). The openness of the child to the communication of social knowledge is known as epistemic trust (Fonagy et al., 2019). The development of epistemic trust further emphasizes the role of the social environment in either supporting or obstructing RF, with adversity and deprivation generating mistrust and avoidance of mental states (Fonagy et al., 2019). As children grow, language plays an important role, enabling expression and understanding of emotions and ideas (P. Harris, 1996; Vygotsky, 1981). Children’s interactions with a widening circle of persons permit the development of diverse perspectives of reality (Fuchs, 2013), and allow the development of the capacity to evaluate the significance of new inputs and to manage
complex social relationships (Gergely & Unoka, 2008). Explanatory conversations, ranging from picture book reading to dinner-time discussions, about mental states and particularly about negative experiences, have been shown to promote children’s emotional and social competence (Marin et al., 2008; Sales & Fivush, 2005), and theory of mind (Cutting & Dunn, 1999; Taumoepeau & Ruffman, 2008).

Adolescence sets the stage for further understanding of the relations between self and others (Selman, 1980). There is evidence that the adolescent’s brain is reorganized, with an enhanced development of regions involved in social cognition (Blakemore & Choudhury, 2006). Interaction with others provides adolescents with approval of their self, and recognition of the difference between their own thinking and that of others (Elkind, 1998). Adolescence has been identified as a critical period for the integration of values and ideals (Damon, 1984; Erikson, 1964) and for the development of political points of view (Eckstein et al., 2012). Absence of the capacity to acquire cultural knowledge may limit one’s ability to update one’s understanding of, and adaptation to, changing social situations (Fonagy et al., 2019). Hence, the importance of adolescence for further development of RF and for an ethical perspective.

Thus, RF and epistemic trust develop in the context of meaningful relationships, and form the basis for mutual understanding, and the acquisition of cultural knowledge and concern. By acknowledging the child’s mental states, the caregiver creates a reality of caring and of concern, in which self and others can be perceived and mental states can be acknowledged. By deferring their own needs out of concern for others, caregivers provide a model for an ethical endeavor. By relating to other people, children and adolescents acquire an ability to contain their own emotions and experiences and those of others, rather than their exclusion. Awareness of the feelings and thoughts of self and others is the basis for concern and responsibility toward others. Indeed, the capacity to appreciate our own and others’ internal states has been found to be essential for the development of concern for others (Batson et al., 2003; Jack & Robbins, 2012); and emotional understanding and perspective-taking have been found to be precursors of empathic emotions (Betancourt, 1990), prosocial behavior (Cassidy et al., 2003), and moral sensibility (Dunn et al., 2000).

Moreover, psychological theory and research suggests a blurring of self–other boundaries, with an overlap between one’s own representations and those of others (Davis et al., 1996; Galinsky et al., 2005). The blurring of self–other boundaries has been variously conceptualized as identification (Freud, 1921), I–thou relationships (Buber, 1958), projective identification (Bion, 1962), self-object (Kohut, 1977), enactive intersubjectivity (Fuchs & De Jaegher, 2009), and dissolving (Kulka, 2012). Neuroscience research has identified mirror neurons, that is, neurons that are responsible for one’s sensations and emotions overlap those recruited when one perceives another’s sensations and emotions (Gallese et al., 2004). Thus, humans appear to be able to capture another person’s experiences by watching, even without explicitly reasoning about the contents of someone else’s mind (Ferrari & Gallese, 2007). By blurring the boundaries between self and other, RF is related to concern not only at the cognitive level, but also at a deeper, emotional–intuitive level.
Realization of reflective function: Cognitive and emotional aspects

Evidence suggests the existence of two modes of mental-state processing: an automatic one that activates mental representations outside of one’s awareness, and a controlled, explicit, and reflective mode that brings mental content into one’s awareness for deliberation (Lieberman, 2007). The automatic mode processes information instantly and involves an implicit and direct understanding (Davidsen & Fosgerau, 2015). The controlled mode is slow, conscious, and voluntary. It requires more complex cognitive functions, including manipulation of higher order representations of the social environment (Adolphs, 1999), and top-down appraisal and regulation processes (Gergely & Unoka, 2008). Optimally, the two modes of mental processing are linked: as emotional experiences become more differentiated, their representations move from implicit to explicit form, thereby producing understanding and awareness; on the other hand, conscious experience is internalized and rendered less conscious and more automatic (Jurist, 2008; Knox, 2004).

Brain imaging has identified the amygdala and the ventromedial prefrontal cortex as the sites of the automatic processing (Lieberman, 2007). It is a phylogenetically early system (Shamay-Tsoory et al., 2009) that is related to the mirror-neuron system (Gallese et al., 2004). The controlled mode involves the prefrontal cortex (Lieberman, 2007). It is evident only in phylogenetically advanced mammals and relies on linguistic and symbolic abilities (Shamay-Tsoory et al., 2009). The degree of connectivity between the activity in the amygdala and in the specific areas of the frontal cortex has been found to correlate with the effectiveness of regulation processes (Banks et al., 2007; Ochsner & Gross, 2005). Indeed, understanding one’s self and others has been linked with emotion regulation and control (Fonagy et al., 2002). Similarly, there is evidence that the integration of automatic-emotional and controlled-cognitive aspects of mental-states processing is important for moral reasoning (Greene & Haidt, 2002); whereas reduced connectivity has been associated with psychopathy (Blair, 2007; Motzkin et al., 2011).

Humans seem to share with other primates the capacity to reason about social rules that forbid, permit, or obligate certain kinds of behaviors (Cummins, 2000). However, the capacity to appreciate internal states emerges late in evolutionary history, distinguishes humans from other species, and requires crossing into the realm of the unobserved (Cummins, 2000). Treating others as psychological entities with thoughts, emotions, and beliefs may require an effort to overcome egocentric inferences (Royzman et al., 2003). It involves setting aside one’s own immediate experience and generating a response based on representations of reality as perceived by others (Apperly et al., 2008; Lin et al., 2010). It entails an awareness, rather than avoidance, of negative aspects of one’s self and others, that may require bearing the distress generated by such an awareness (Benbassat & Shulman, 2016; Steele et al., 2002). In analytical psychology, acknowledging the least desirable aspects of one’s self (“the shadow”) is viewed as central in the process of individuation and self-realization (Jung, 1971), and as essential for ethical development (Neumann, 1969). It is assumed that recognition and integration of one’s own experiences and emotions enable more accurate perception of and coping with reality, rather than denial and projection (Neumann, 1969).
Moving beyond appearance toward internal representations and meanings is, therefore, cognitively complex and emotionally demanding, and motivation seems to be a key factor in the realization of RF and in bearing its costs (Ickes et al., 2011; Liotti & Gilbert, 2011). “Mind not willingly indulges unpleasing thoughts” (Boswell, as cited in Mizen, 2009), and an active endeavor seems to be needed in order to deal with the personal and interpersonal realities that are beyond the comfort zone. Motivation for increased reliance on the controlled mode may permit less impulsive responses, especially when the automatic mode is dominated by biased perceptions about self and others (Luyten & Fonagy, 2015). It has been claimed that the automatic mode makes up the greater part of understanding others (Davidsen & Fosgerau, 2015), and that unconscious motivation is central in forming perceptions in everyday life, and in affecting the preconscious processing of visual stimuli and what reaches conscious awareness (Balcetis & Dunning, 2006; Kahneman, 2011). This underscores the importance of early experiences, particularly the extent to which the environment fosters containment of the mental states of self and others (Fonagy et al., 2007), as well as concern for others (Eisenberg, 2000).

**Barriers to reflective function: Personal and social hindrances**

The potential for RF is innate. However, it is more vulnerable to unfavorable conditions than functions that appear earlier in evolutionary history (Goldman, 2009; Meares et al., 1999). There is evidence that the development of RF is inhibited by feelings of threat and facilitated by safety in early relations with caregivers, as well as later, in the cultural milieu and social environment (Liotti & Gilbert, 2011; Lorenzini et al., 2018). Sociocultural frameworks, practices, and norms affect the ways people think, act, and engage with others (Køster, 2017), and biological, psychological, and social factors interact, exemplifying the interconnectedness of individual and context in the course of development (Sameroff, 2010; Teo, 2018). Moving from a deterministic approach to an understanding of the complex interactions between innate processes and the environment requires an exploration of the various factors in the personal, social, and cultural spheres that may undermine the development and realization of RF.

**Education and socioeconomic status**

Verbal abilities and abstract thinking have been identified as affecting the development of RF (Hughes et al., 1999; Rutherford et al., 2012). Education has repeatedly been found to be associated with RF (Benbassat & Priel, 2012; Cook et al., 1994; Stacks et al., 2014) and theory of mind (Cutting & Dunn, 1999; Meins et al., 2002). Similarly, socioeconomic status (SES) has been reported to correlate with RF (Jessee et al., 2018) and theory of mind (Cole & Mitchell, 2000; Hughes et al., 1999) by some authors, but not by others (Rosso et al., 2015). Still other studies found higher empathic attunement to others among individuals with lower SES (Kraus et al., 2010; Stellar et al., 2012). These inconsistent observations could be due to the importance of both cognitive and emotional–motivational determinants for the realization of RF. On the one hand, overall and child-directed
conversations were found to be reduced in families with lower SES (Cutting & Dunn, 1999), and SES explained about 30% of the variance in first-grade children’s performance on language tasks (Noble et al., 2007). Poverty-related concerns may leave people with fewer mental resources for other tasks (Mani et al., 2013), and disadvantages related to SES have been reported to adversely affect parents’ capacity to respond to their children’s needs for warmth and cognitive stimulation (Linver et al., 2002). On the other hand, people with lower SES have less power, are more dependent on external reality, and their motivation to understand others may be higher (Kraus et al., 2010).

Power

People in positions of power control resources and they are less dependent on others. Several studies reported that people in positions of power were found to be less motivated to understand others (De Dreu & Van Kleef, 2004; Muscatell et al., 2012) and to perceive others in an automatic, simplistic way (Fiske, 1993; Keltner et al., 2003). Other studies reported that they revealed more psychological distancing from powerless individuals (Magee & Smith, 2013), a reduced tendency to comprehend how other people think, feel, and act (Galinsky et al., 2006; Hogeveen et al., 2014), reduced perspective-taking and ability to detect others’ emotions (Galinsky et al., 2006; Lammers et al., 2008), and reduced compassion with others’ suffering (Van Kleef et al., 2008). Thus, social power may hinder the emotional–motivational aspect of mental-states processing and create barriers between self and others.

Orientation to social dominance

An orientation to social dominance has been found to reduce empathy (Pratto et al., 2006), promote formation of stereotypes, and enhance a tendency to ignore others’ distress (Twemlow et al., 2005a). Researchers have argued that humans tend to differentiate between in- and out-groups, and to believe that members of different social groups are essentially different kinds of people (Birnbaum et al., 2010). Categorizing people into “us” versus “them” may create an illusion of a stable and separate existence that, in turn, releases the individual from the need to be aware of the feelings of others (Cummins, 2000). Freud (1921) pointed to a decline in personal responsibility and to regressive processes in group dynamics. It has been claimed that empathic response is a culturally scripted norm that is biased towards those who are similar, while overlooking the suffering of particular others (Matthiesen & Klitmøller, 2019). Brain studies have indicated that perceiving others as similar activated the medial prefrontal cortex, whereas its reduced activation was related to dehumanization, that is, to denial of the mental and moral characteristics of others (L. T. Harris & Fiske, 2011; Haslam, 2006; Jack et al., 2013). In another study, the brain response to the pain of others was reduced when the “others” were out-group members (Levy et al., 2016). Dehumanizing perception of out-group members was found to be related to lower levels of helping behavior (Cuddy et al., 2007), and may even herald violence, massacres, and genocide (L. T. Harris & Fiske, 2011; Jack et al., 2013). In trying to understand the genocide during WWII, Arendt (1969) asserted that thinking, by definition, is autonomous and critical, whereas
thoughtlessness is an “almost total inability ever to look at anything from the other fellow’s point of view” (pp. 47–48).

**Individualism, neoliberalism and materialism**

Western culture emphasizes individual autonomy and self-centeredness, and this, in turn, may reduce interpersonal connectedness and commitment to others (Eckersley, 2006; Taylor, 1991). Our culture seems also to be intolerant of discomfort, to focus on reducing unpleasant emotions, and to ignore distress and suffering rather than accept them as part of life (Barreto, 2018; Niederhoffer & Pennebaker, 2005). Neoliberal discourse emphasizes one’s responsibility toward oneself rather than to others, and may thereby reduce social solidarity, and responsibility towards the vulnerable (Layton, 2009). There is evidence of a decline in concern for others over the last three decades (Twenge et al., 2012), and an increase in narcissistic tendencies (Twenge et al., 2008). Materialism has been reported to be associated with reduced social trust (Burroughs & Rindfleisch, 2002; Kasser & Ryan, 1993), and technological development appears to be pulling people further apart (Zimbardo & Duncan, 2012). In particular, the rising prominence of personal technology and media in everyday life, with less time spent interacting with others, seems to affect interpersonal dynamics and reduce empathy (Konrath, 2013; McPherson et al., 2006).

**Gender**

Any discussion of gender differences runs the risk of ignoring the variability within and overlap between genders (Costa et al., 2001). However, in most studies, women were reported to reveal higher levels of RF than men (e.g., Bouchard et al., 2008; Cooke et al., 2017; Rutherford et al., 2012). While these gender differences seem to have a biological component (Con nellan et al., 2001), they are further amplified by social norms (Brebner, 2003; Brody, 2000). Fathers in particular seem to play a significant role in perpetuating gender differences in RF (Chaplin et al., 2005), and various factors in the social and cultural sphere may further impede RF among boys and men. For example, technological development has been reported to affect the interpersonal relationships of boys more than those of girls (Zimbardo & Duncan, 2012), and, cross-culturally, men still have more power than do women and were found to exhibit a higher social-dominance orientation (Maroda, 2004; Pratto, 1996).

Overcoming the hindrances to RF necessitates, therefore, an endeavor not only at the individual and dyadic levels, but also at social and political levels. As pointed out by Køster (2017), by remaining rooted in perceptions of individual and separate minds, the literature on RF overlooks the sociocultural dimension. Dominance and hierarchical relationships may cause people with power to ignore the experiences of those with less power. Although people with power wield the resources to create social change, they may be the least motivated to do so, thereby perpetuating a vicious cycle of power, low motivation, and low RF. Scholars have claimed that social and economic policies during recent decades repudiate vulnerability and disavow responsibility (Layton, 2009); that inequality creates an atmosphere of injustice, mistrust, and aggressiveness (Wilkinson, 2004); and
that state violence may cause a breakdown in epistemic trust towards the social environment (Lorenzini et al., 2018). Although obvious to mental health care providers, the role of the sociocultural context remains under-accounted for in current conceptualizations of psychopathology (Fonagy et al., 2019). However, there seems to be a growing awareness about the importance of the broader contexts in which people are situated, thus promoting social change and justice (Hodgetts & O’Doherty, 2019). As pointed out by Neumann:

> It has to be recognized that—especially in an era of social injustice—the principle of the equality of man does provide a basis for asserting the right of the individual to personal development and for demanding that obstacles placed in the path of this development by unjust external circumstances should be eliminated, once and for all. (1969, p. 72)

**The potential of reflective function: Perceiving and creating reality**

Traditionally, psychologists have restricted themselves to the personal and avoided the sociopolitical sphere and ethical issues (Layton, 2009; Samuels, 2004). They have viewed their knowledge as being value-neutral descriptions of an independent reality (Brinkmann, 2004). Yet, already in 1957, Martin Buber expressed his disappointment of the tendency of psychologists to ignore issues of conscience and guilt. He wrote:

> the investigator cannot truthfully maintain his relationship with reality. . . if he does not again and again, whenever it is necessary, gaze beyond the limits into a sphere which is not his sphere of work, yet which he must contemplate with all his power of research in order to do justice to his own task. (p. 114)

Similarly, Erik Erikson (1964), in a lecture in New Delhi, said: “we cannot afford to live for long with a division of personal, professional, and political ethics—a division endangering the very life which our professions have vowed to keep intact” (p. 241). In recent decades there have been calls for shifting the focus of psychology from the individual to a broader perspective (e.g., Freeman, 2014; Teo, 2018), and for a transition from the “myth of individuality” to recognition of interbeing and complementarity, viewing ethics as an intrinsic aspect of human existence and compassion as an ethical commitment toward others (Kulka, 2008).

The construct of RF encompasses the inward motion of awareness and integration of mental content, as well as the outward motion of ethical commitment and widening circles of concern. Reflecting on one’s own experiences, emotions, and thoughts creates a reality of internal connectedness and responsibility; reflecting on the other’s perspective, beliefs, and desires creates a reality of interpersonal connectedness and recognition; reflecting on how self and others are interwoven creates a reality in which interdependence and mutual influences are acknowledged. Therefore, the construct of RF both captures and facilitates the connection between psychology and ethics, and enables new forms of integration and reciprocal influence between the two. It underscores the link...
between basic emotional functions and higher cognition, combined with appropriate social learning and cultural knowledge, and enables the move to social responsibility and ethical orientation.

In 1970, Iris Murdoch introduced the term “moral imagination,” that is, perceiving reality through the other’s eye, and argued that attention is an essential feature of an active moral agent. “I can only choose within the world I can see, in the moral sense of ‘see’, which implies that clear vision is the result of moral imagination and moral effort” (pp. 35–36). Morality, according to Murdoch, is a continuous effort during everyday interactions, consisting of countless actions of seeing and paying attention; while the “enemy” to moral life is the “selfish consciousness” that, through self-deception, rationalization, dismissal, and lack of attention, obscures reality and avoids seeing the other, thereby leading to moral blindness and unethical behavior. This corresponds with Carol Gilligan’s (1982) concept of “ethic of care,” which is based on the need for paying attention and responsiveness in relationships, and to the costs of losing connection with oneself or with others. According to Gilligan (1982), the ethic of care is the ethic of a democratic society, as it is grounded in core democratic values: the importance of everyone having a voice and being listened to with respect. However, within a patriarchal framework, the ethic of care is a “feminine” ethic, trying to transcend gender binaries and hierarchies (Gilligan, 1982).

This may turn out to be particularly important in an era of “post-truth,” ethnocentricity, and environmental catastrophe, with society losing its perception of reality and its commitment to a code of ethics. The human potential for meaning creation can be distorted in a profound way, confusing what is real and what is fantasy, and the interdependence between self and other can result in an internal dissociation and interpersonal projections. Psychologists have the knowledge and the “epistemic authority” (Fonagy et al., 2019) needed to play a key role in increasing awareness and understanding of these processes in order to create change. Psychologists can increase awareness of the hidden assumptions and motives underlying various social practices, norms, and discourse (Teo, 2018). By widening the scope to include experiences and concepts from other cultures, the historical and cultural specificity of psychology’s epistemic projects can further become apparent (Adjei, 2019). Reflecting on how psychology comes to define particular phenomena as areas of scientific concern, and how the disciplinary shaping of psychological concerns has a bearing on what can and will be researched, is important in order to meet current challenges (Huniche, & Sørensen, 2019).

Psychologists can further investigate barriers to the realization of RF, such as disparities in education and SES, individualism and materialism. Promoting RF seems to necessitate an effort not only at the individual level, but also at the social and political levels, and both bottom-up and top-down processes of change. The individual may be seen as an avant-garde of the collective, so that new ways and new values appear earlier in the development of the individual than in that of the collective (Neumann, 1969). However, the social environment is critical in creating suitable conditions. Various intervention programs aimed at enhancing RF at the individual, family, and community levels have been developed and implemented, and there is evidence to support their effectiveness (e.g., Allen et al., 2008; Slade, 2007; Twemlow et al., 2005a). For example, the
intervention program “Peaceful Schools Project” was found to reduce bullying and disruptive behaviors and to enhance RF among school children (Twemlow et al., 2005b).

Conclusion

This article joins the calls for integrating ethics into psychological theory and practice. I argue that RF is a central construct in this process, and highlight the vulnerability of RF to various personal and environmental conditions. A complex view of self and others is a developmental achievement that depends on relationships, social safety, and sociocultural context. Recognizing the other as an equivalent center of experience requires effort that needs to be cultivated from early stages of development. The relative ease of ignoring complexity, repudiating vulnerability, and dismissing the other’s perspective underscores the importance of motivation to perceive reality accurately, to overcome hindrances, and to relinquish short-term rewards for long-term benefits. By acknowledging the complexity of social reality and interrelatedness, RF allows us to avoid dichotomous perceptions, social essentialism, and biological determinism. Whereas appearance and behavior captivate attention and offer simplicity, and while neuroscience offers concreteness and robustness, RF encompasses subjectivity and meaning, complexity and ambiguity, fine distinctions and connectedness.

Therefore, I believe that psychologists have a responsibility to enhance understanding and awareness of intra- and interpersonal processes and dynamics, at the individual and social levels. Psychologists can explore the conditions that facilitate and undermine RF in individuals and groups, and to promote interventions for its enhancement. Not taking a critical stand in times of oppression and injustice is in and of itself a political statement. By further understanding the internal dynamics and the environmental inputs that affect the realization of RF, we can apply our knowledge in widening circles of concern; by bearing the tension between similarity and difference, between the particular and the universal, we can promote a vision of solidarity. In today’s fast-paced society, higher reflective capacities seem to have a survival advantage as they enable us to transcend immediate experience and ongoing events, and to create new understandings more adaptive for the individual, society, and nature.
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Note

1. The terms RF and mentalization are often used interchangeably. In this article I will use the term RF.
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