It is our intent in this chapter to describe transformative learning theory and practice and to situate transformative learning in the larger context of learning theory in general. First, we provide an overview of transformative learning theory, including a broad definition and a description of the ways in which the theory has evolved over time. Second, we examine in detail three main perspectives on transformative learning: the rational, the extrarational, and the social change perspective. Third, we review how transformative learning can be fostered in practice, focusing on six themes: the individual experience, critical reflection, the role of dialogue, authentic and supportive relationships, a holistic orientation, and the awareness of context.

Transformative learning is a deep shift in perspective during which habits of mind become more open, more permeable, and better justified (Cranton, 2006; Mezirow, 2000). According to Mezirow, the process centers on critical reflection and critical self-reflection, but other theorists (for example, Dirkx, 2001) place imagination, intuition, and emotion at the heart of transformation. Generally, transformative learning occurs when a person, group, or larger social unit encounters a perspective that is at odds with the prevailing perspective. This may be anything from a personal traumatic event to a social movement. The discrepant perspective can be ignored, or it can lead to an examination of previously held beliefs, values, and assumptions. When the latter is the case, the potential for transformative learning exists, though it does not occur until an individual, group, or social unit changes in noticeable ways.

This definition is deliberately general so as to incorporate the wide variety of definitions and perspectives now existing in the literature. Mezirow’s (1978) original theory was based on a study of women who, in returning to college, found that the experience led them to question and revise their personal beliefs and values in a fairly linear ten-step process. By 1991, Mezirow produced his comprehensive theory of transformative learning in *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. In this book, he drew on Habermas’s (1971) three kinds of human interests and the resulting three kinds of knowledge—instrumental, practical (or communicative), and emancipatory. In this view, transformative learning (the acquisition of emancipatory knowledge) occurs when people critically reflect on instrumental and communicative knowledge. At that time, Mezirow (1991) described three types of meaning perspectives—epistemic (about knowledge and how we obtain knowledge), sociolinguistic (understanding ourselves and the social world through language), and psychological (concerned with our perception of ourselves largely based on childhood experiences). He argued that we uncritically assimilate perspectives in each of these domains and do not realize that such perspectives are distorted until we encounter a dilemma that brings this to our attention.
The process of bringing distortions to light and revising them is an individual, cognitive, and rational process. Mezirow (2000) distinguishes between educational tasks—helping people become aware of oppressive structures and learn how to change them—and political tasks, which challenge economic, government, and social structures directly.

Set up in contrast to Mezirow’s work is the extrarational approach, which substitutes imagination, intuition, and emotion for critical reflection (Dirkx, 2001). Also within the individual focus is a developmental perspective. As is the case in developmental psychology in general, transformative learning in this framework describes shifts in the way we make meaning—moving from a simplistic reliance on authority through to more complex ways of knowing or higher orders of consciousness (Kegan, 2000). Belenky and Stanton (2000) report on a similar change in epistemology, but they emphasize connected knowing (through collaboration and acceptance of others’ views rather than autonomous, independent knowing).

Transformative learning theory is, as Mezirow (2000) suggests, a “theory in progress.” Some theorists, including Mezirow and Dirkx, focus on the individual, and others are interested in the social context of transformative learning, social change as a goal, or the transformation undergone by groups and organizations. Although this appears to be a divide in theoretical positions, there is no reason that both the individual and the social perspectives cannot peacefully coexist; one does not deny the existence of the other, but rather they share common characteristics and can inform each other. Gunnlaugson (2008) describes “first wave” and “second wave” theories of transformative learning, the first wave being those works that build on, critique, or depart from Mezirow’s seminal work, and the second wave being those authors who work towards integrative, holistic, and unified perspectives. In the next section, we explore three theoretical perspectives more fully.

**Theoretical perspectives**

To understand transformative learning theory it is important to recognize that many of the processes are consistent with what is known about constructivism from the field of educational psychology (Bruner, Ausbel, Piaget, Vygotsky). It is a view of learning where the learner is an active participant in the learning process, not a passive recipient, creating and interpreting knowledge rooted in personal experience. It recognizes that learners, particularly adults, have a rich life experience that plays a significant role in understanding the meaning-making process both for constructivism and transformative learning theory. Like constructivism, which has multiple conceptions (psychological, social, and sociological) (Woolfolk, 2001), transformative learning theory has multiple conceptions as well, with similar units of analysis. These various forms of transformative learning theory help explain the processes of constructing and appropriating new and revised interpretations of the meaning of an experience in the world (Taylor, 2008).

Since the early 1980s, transformative learning has evolved into a variety of theoretical conceptions and, like constructivism, much of it is due to the shifting units of analysis (individual, social). The exciting part of this diversity is that it has the potential to offer a more diverse interpretation of transformative learning and significant implications for practice. To make sense of these various perspectives, we have collapsed them into three broad views—rational, extrarational, and social—based on an analysis of several interpretations of the different theoretical perspectives of transformative learning (Cranton, 2006; Dirkx, 1998; Taylor, 2008). Each conception is discussed below.

**Rational transformation**

Jack Mezirow’s (1991, 2000) perspective is the dominant view of transformative learning theory, where the unit of analysis is individual change. It reflects a rational approach to transformative learning, emphasizing a critical and objective analysis of an interpretation of experience. Based to some extent on Habermas’s communicative theory (e.g. instrumental, communicative learning), it recognizes that there is an innate drive
among all humans to understand and make meaning of their experiences. Based on the assumption that there are no fixed truths and that change is continuous, individuals cannot always be confident of what they know or believe and therefore it becomes imperative that they continually seek ways to better understand their world, by developing a more critical worldview. Mezirow (2000) argues that adults have a need to better understand “how to negotiate and act upon our own purposes, values, feelings and meanings rather than those we have uncritically assimilated from others—to gain greater control over our lives as socially responsible clear thinking decision makers” (p. 8). Developing more reliable beliefs about the world, exploring and validating their dependability, and making decisions on an informed basis is central to the adult learning process. It is transformation theory as defined by Jack Mezirow that explains this psycho-critical process of constructing and appropriating new or revised interpretations (beliefs) of the meaning of one’s experience.

Furthermore, understanding transformative learning requires recognizing its various structures. Most significant is a frame of reference, which includes the meaning structures of assumptions and expectations that frame an individual’s tacit points of view and influence their thinking, beliefs, and actions. A frame of reference is composed of two dimensions, habits of mind and a point of view. Habits of mind are habitual means of thinking, feeling, and acting influenced by underlying cultural, political, social, educational, and economic assumptions about the world. The habits of mind get expressed in a particular point of view. They often develop uncritically in childhood through socialization and acculturation with family, teachers, and through other significant relationships. Over time, in conjunction with numerous congruent experiences, a frame of reference becomes reified, providing a rationalization for an often irrational world. It offers criteria for evaluating the world that adults interact with, based on a set of cultural and psychological assumptions. These assumptions give meaning to experience, but they are subjective: they can distort thoughts and perceptions, skewing reality.

Frames of reference act as filters when interpreting experience. When an individual comes upon a new experience, depending on the degree of conformity with prior experience, it either reinforces the frame of reference or gradually stretches its boundaries. However, when an individual has a radically different or incongruent experience (e.g. the death of a loved one, moving to a different country), where the experience cannot be assimilated into the frame of reference, it is either rejected or there is a development of a new frame of reference—a perspective transformation. It is the revision of a frame of reference in concert with a disparate experience, often referred to as a disorienting dilemma, in conjunction with critical reflection on the experience that leads to a perspective transformation—a paradigmatic shift. A perspective transformation leads to “a more fully developed (more functional) frame of reference … one that is more (a) inclusive, (b) differentiating, (c) permeable, (d) critically reflective, and (e) integrative of experience” (Mezirow, 1996: 163).

The learning process of a perspective transformation is reflected in a series of phases identified by Mezirow (1978) in his study of women returning to higher education. He inductively identified a process that began with a disorienting dilemma (returning to school), followed by a series of experiences, including a self-examination with feelings of guilt or shame, critical reflections of assumptions, the dialoguing in concert with others, exploration and experimentation with new roles and ideas, developing a course of action, acquiring new skills and knowledge, trying on new roles, developing competence, and over time developing a more inclusive and critical worldview.

**Extrarational transformation**

Boyd and Myers (1988; Boyd, 1985, 1989, 1991) called on Jungian psychology to explain transformative learning. Discernment, rather than reflection, is the central process of transformation; symbols, images, and archetypes lead to personal enlightenment as individuals work to bring the unconscious to consciousness. Boyd (1989) emphasizes the role of small groups in working with unconscious content. The group becomes
the archetypical “mother” and influences the way in which people in the group create images and work through personal dilemmas. Boyd (1989) defines transformation as “a fundamental change in one’s personality involving conjointly the resolution of a personal dilemma and the expansion of consciousness resulting in greater personality integration” (p. 459). This process is the inner journey of individuation (Jung, [1921] 1971).

Jung ([1921] 1971: 448) defines individuation as the process by which individuals differentiate themselves from the collective of humanity. It includes becoming conscious of the psychic structures of anima, animus, ego, shadow, and the collective unconscious. People come to see how they are both the same as and different from others; transformation is the emergence of the Self.

Dirkx (2001, 2006) draws on the Jungian concept of individuation along with others’ work to describe transformative learning as an imaginative, intuitive, emotional, and soulful experience (the way of mythos rather than logos). Mythos is a facet of knowing that engages symbols, images, stories, and myths, paying attention to the small everyday occurrences of life and listening to individual and collective psyches. Dirkx (2006) suggests that the experience of emotional dynamics in learning comes from “largely unconscious issues evoked by various aspects of the learning setting, such as the self, designated leaders, other learners, the context in which learning occurs, and the task that is the explicit focus of our learning” (p. 17). Individuation, suggests Dirkx, is mediated through emotion-laden images (2006: 18).

In the extrarational perspective on transformative learning, people bring the unconscious into consciousness through imagination, intuition, and emotional experiences. We enter into a conscious relationship with images as we discover who we are as separate from and the same as others. As Dirkx (2006) puts it, “Conscious participation in this process directs our psychic energy toward creative, life-enhancing, constructive, and potentially transformative activities” (p. 19).

**Social transformation**

Social transformation is a view of transformative learning of a socially constructed individual (non-psychological) that “is contextualized in the history, culture, and social fabric of the society in which he/she lives … at the intersection of the personal biography and societal structure” (Cunningham, 1998: 16). This view reflects a shift in the unit of analysis from the individual to the individual within the context of society, more specifically about transforming society in concert with individual change. Similar to a sociological perspective of constructivism, it is concerned with how public knowledge is created, as well as emphasizing the importance of fostering an awareness, a consciousness of the dominant culture and its relationship to power and positionality in defining what is and is not knowledge in society.

Most emblematic of this view is the work by Freire (1984). It is about developing “ontological vacation” (p. 12), a theory of existence that views people as subjects, not objects, who are constantly reflecting and acting on the transformation of their world so that it can become a more equitable place for all to live. Social transformation is seen as the unveiling or demythologizing of reality by the oppressed through the awakening of their critical consciousness–conscientization, where they learn to become aware of political, social and economic contradictions and to take action against the conditions that are oppressive. This awakening of an individual’s critical consciousness is the consequence of the transformative experience.

Central to this perspective, similar to rational transformation, is critical reflection; however, it is grounded in critical theory and viewed as ideology critique. “Critical theory views thinking critically as being able to identify, and then to challenge and change, the process by which a grossly inequitable society uses dominant ideology to convince people this is a normal state of affairs” (Brookfield, 2009: 126). As a result, a transformation is more of a social experience where the act of transformation is change in society. It is based on the assumption that humans relate to the world in only two ways, by integration and adaptation. Integration involves the critical capacity to act on the world as a Subject and adaptation is being an Object, acted upon by the world. Transformative learning from this perspective occurs when the learner becomes...
aware of his or her history and biography and how this is embedded in social structures that foster privilege and oppression of persons, based on power. The learner acquires the ability to construct his or her own meaning of the world (Cunningham, 1998).

Along with an emphasis on ideology critique, there is a liberating dialogical approach to teaching “couched in acts of cognition not transferal of information” (Freire and Macedo, 1995: p. 67). Central to this teaching approach is a problem-posing method rooted in praxis, which is a process of moving back and forth in a critical way between reflecting and acting on the world. This approach is framed within the context of dialogue as a social learning process with the objective of removing oppressive structures prevalent both in education and society. Furthermore, there is an emphasis on a horizontal (equitable) student-teacher relationship, built upon a foundation of respect and mutual trust.

**Fostering transformative learning in practice**

Fostering transformative learning is about teaching for change in the classroom. The goal of this approach to teaching is to help “learners move from a simple awareness of their experiencing to an awareness of the conditions for their experiencing (how they are perceiving, thinking, judging, feeling, acting—a reflection on process) and beyond this to an awareness of the reasons why they experience as they do and to action based upon these insights” (Mezirow, 1991: 197). Originally, three interrelated components were identified as central to the process of fostering transformative learning: the centrality of experience, critical reflection, and dialogue. However, through extensive research other practices have emerged (Taylor, 2007) that have been collapsed into three additional elements: a holistic orientation, awareness of context, and an authentic practice. These elements are not a group of teaching strategies that are applied arbitrarily; they are interrelated and theoretically grounded in deeply held assumptions about the transformative nature of adult learning. To engage in the application of these core elements without some awareness of transformative learning would be indicative of teaching without a clear purpose or goal (Taylor, 2009).

**Individual experience**

Individual experience is the practical knowledge, skill, and understanding of the word that every adult brings into the classroom. It “constitutes a starting point for discourse leading to critical examination of normative assumptions underpinning the learner’s … value judgments or normative expectations” (Mezirow, 2000: 3).

Experience, more specifically life experience, is the grist for the mill of an adult classroom, recognizing that it is socially constructed and can be deconstructed through reflection and dialogue. Also, how it is made meaning of is shaped both by the educational context and the teacher-student relationship. Although little is known about the nature of experience in the classroom, there are a number of interesting insights about prior experience and classroom-created experience.

Looking at prior experience, the degree of life experience held by adults, research has shown that those with greater experience (time on the job) were more likely to internalize new perspectives from exposure to education (Cragg, Plotnikoff, Hugo and Casey, 2001). Also, prior experience often represents for the transformative educator “pedagogical entry points”—those experiences that reflect disillusionment and concern in learners’ lives—offering opportunities for engaging a learner’s personal dilemma as a potentially transformative experience (Lange, 2004).

In addition to prior experience is the identification of classroom experiences that educators can create and that can be a catalyst for critical reflection and offer opportunities for transformative learning. One approach is the use of value-laden course content, that facilitates contentious and thought-provoking discussion, such as the topics of HIV-AIDs, abortion, spirituality, death, and dying, all of which have been found to promote reflection among learners (Taylor, 2000). Consistent with value-laden content, is the application of intense experiential activities that can potentially trigger disorienting dilemmas among
learners and promote critical reflection of deeply held assumptions. A few examples include the exposure of white students to a series of activities about race and racism, including a tour of the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee (Herber, 1998) and an educational program for medical students on palliative care requiring them to spend time with a dying patient and family members, “hearing their stories and exploring issues of importance to them” (MacLeod, Parkin, Pullon, and Roberson, 2003: 58).

Critical reflection

Since the inception of transformative learning theory, fostering critical reflection has been seen as one of the central tasks in promoting transformative learning in educational settings. Essentially, the possibility of transformative learning occurring relies on the person being exposed to points of view or perspectives that are discrepant with those currently held (what Mezirow originally called a disorienting dilemma). In educational settings, we simulate life-changing dilemmas through the use of activities and materials that have the potential to lead individuals to critically question their beliefs and assumptions. This can be done through film and the arts, fiction, questioning, role plays, debates, consciousness-raising activities, journal writing, experiential learning, and critical incidents, to name only some of the possible strategies (Cranton, 2006). Mezirow (1991) describes three types of reflection—content reflection (which serves to raise awareness of assumptions and beliefs), process reflection (which addresses how a person has come to hold a certain perspective), and premise reflection (which examines the very foundation of a belief system). Although Mezirow proposes that reflection occurs in the order of content, process, and premise, Kreber (2004) suggests that, in some contexts (e.g. learning how to teach), premise reflection may need to precede the other forms of reflection.

In a review of the history of Mezirow’s transformative learning theory, Kitchenham (2008) sees content and process reflection as leading to the transformation of meaning schemes and labels this “straightforward transformation.” Premise reflection leads to transformation of meaning perspectives, and Kitchenham labels this as “profound transformation” (2008: 115). Kitchenham also reminds us of Mezirow’s distinction between critical reflection as the objective reframing of something communicated to a person from outside of the self, and critical self-reflection as subjective reframing of personal assumptions. He further subdivides subjective reframing into narrative critical self-reflection (on something we are told), systemic critical self-reflection (on taken-for-granted cultural influences), therapeutic critical self-reflection (on problematic feelings and their consequences), and epistemic critical self-reflection (on knowledge and the acquisition of knowledge).

The role of dialogue

Mezirow has long placed discourse as a central component of transformative learning. He defines discourse as dialogue involving the assessment of beliefs, feelings, and values (Mezirow, 2003: 59). Under ideal conditions, participants in this type of dialogue or discourse will have accurate and complete information, be free from coercion and distorted self-perception, be able to weigh evidence and assess arguments objectively, be open to alternative perspectives, be able to reflect critically on presuppositions and their consequences, have equal opportunity to participate, and be able to accept an informed, objective consensus as valid (Mezirow, 1991: 78). Mezirow (2003) goes on to say that the “hungry, desperate, sick, destitute, and intimidated … cannot participate fully and freely in discourse” (p. 60), which may be a problematic claim for those educators working in labor education, literacy education, social services, and with oppressed or marginalized groups in general. For example, Jones (2009): writing in the context of social work education, emphasizes the importance of meaningful dialogue in small group environments as a way of fostering critical reflection and transformative learning. Dialogue, says Jones: creates “bridges of understanding between students and
practitioners from different social identity groups” (2009: 16). Tsang (2007): writing from the same social work context, sees dialogue as a necessary component of critical reflection.

Dialogue creates conditions that support and provoke critical self-reflection and critical reflection. Some strategies, applicable in different contexts, include: using controversial readings and readings from different points of view to stimulate dialogue from different perspectives; giving group members responsibility for monitoring and controlling the direction of the discourse to ensure equal participation without coercion; and being aware of the educator’s power to shape dialogue through verbal and non-verbal communication (Cranton, 2006: 125–26).

**Authentic and supportive relationships**

Fostering transformative learning depends to a large extent on establishing genuine, meaningful relationships with learners. Cranton and Wright (2008) go so far as to describe this role as being a learning companion. Based on interviews with eight literacy educators, they explore how the educators deliberately and consciously create a safe environment, build trust, help learners overcome their fears, create possibilities, and foster self-discovery. Supportive and meaningful relationships among people are based on authenticity—the educator bringing a genuine sense of self into the classroom and working to help learners become authentic in their interactions with the educator and others (Palmer, 2008). Much earlier, Jarvis (1999) described people as being authentic when they chose to act so as to “foster the growth and development of each other’s being” (p. 113). Going back another 20 years, we find Freire (1984) outlining the attitudes that encourage meaningful and authentic dialogue: love for the world and human beings, humility, faith in people, hope that the dialogue will lead to meaning, and critical thinking and the continuing transformation of reality.

In fostering transformative learning through authentic and supportive relationships, educators bring a developed sense of Self, are conscious of getting to know and knowing their students, pay attention to their relationships with learners, are conscious of the context within which they work and how that influences authenticity, and engage in critical reflection and self-reflection on each of the previous facets (Cranton, 2006; Cranton and Carusetta, 2004).

**Holistic orientation**

Another essential core element to fostering transformative learning is the importance of a holistic approach to teaching beyond the rational that engages the whole person. Learners rarely change through a rational process (analyze–think–change) and “are more likely to change in a see–feel–change sequence” (Brown, 2006: 732). Inherent to the holistic approach is an emphasis on affective knowing, which is developing an awareness of feelings and emotions in the reflective process. Greater affective awareness is inherent to successful critical reflection and it reveals much about the psycho- and socio-cultural dynamics of the individual and the group within the classroom. Engaging the affective in practice provides “an opportunity, for establishing a dialogue with those unconscious aspects of ourselves seeking expression through various images, feelings, and behaviors within the learning setting” (Dirkx, 2006: 22). Furthermore, it provides a means to engage the dynamics associated when there is a resistance to learning, but as well potentially to initiate a process of individuation, that of “a deeper understanding, realization, and appreciation of who he or she is” (p. 18).

A means to foreground the affective, beyond dialogue, can occur through presentational or expressive ways of knowing. This involves “an opportunity, for establishing a dialogue with those unconscious aspects of ourselves seeking expression through various images, feelings, and behaviors within the learning setting” (Dirkx, 2006: 22). Furthermore, it provides a means to engage the dynamics associated when there is a resistance to learning, but as well potentially to initiate a process of individuation, that of “a deeper understanding, realization, and appreciation of who he or she is” (p. 18).

A means to foreground the affective, beyond dialogue, can occur through presentational or expressive ways of knowing. This involves “engagement with music, all the plastic arts, dance, movement, and mime, as well as all forms of myth, fable, allegory, and drama” (Davis-Manigualte, Yorks and Kasl, 2006: 27). Other examples include the use of the arts (Berger, 2004; Hanlin-Rowney et al., 2006; Patteson, 2002), online group meditation (Hanlin-Rowney et al., 2006), journaling (Burke, 2006; King, 2000, 2004), and
cultural autobiographies (Brown, 2006). Presentational or expressive ways of knowing are “about inviting ‘the whole person’ into the classroom environment, we mean the person in fullness of being: as an affective, intuitive, thinking, physical, spiritual self” (Yorks and Kasl, 2006: 46).

**Awareness of context**

A final core element to be aware of when fostering transformative learning is developing an appreciation of the personal and socio-cultural factors that influence transformative learning. These factors include the surroundings within the immediate learning event occurring in the classroom, the prior life history of the participants, and the larger societal events that are playing out in society.

As previously discussed, the prior experience of the learners has significant influence on teaching and, the more insight an educator has into this experience, the greater the potential to identify those learners who have predisposition for change. Research has shown that participants with recent traumas or critical events in their lives are more prone to change. “The disturbing events in the participants’ lives … create a fertile ground for perspective transformation”(Pierce, 1986: 296), similar to when learners are in a transitional zone of meaning-making (Berger, 2004).

Research has revealed contextual factors that explain resistance to change, in terms of barriers that inhibit transformative learning. Included are such things as rigid role assignments; a culture of resistance to learning new technology (Whitelaw, Sears and Campbell, 2004); and cohort learning experiences where there is an unequal distribution of group responsibilities and overemphasis on task completion, instead of reflective dialogue (Scribner and Donaldson, 2001). Another factor often overlooked is temporal constraints, due to the time-consuming nature of fostering transformative learning. This is particularly challenging when attempting to include all voices while engaging intense emotional experiences within the rigid time periods often found in classroom settings.

Finally, from a societal context, King (2004) describes a study of using transformative learning in tandem with grief theory (e.g. Kubler-Ross, 2005) in helping students make meaning of the 9/11 experience in the USA; students found that this approach validated their feelings and provided clarity and understanding of others’ feelings.

**Conclusion**

In North America, transformative learning theory is the most comprehensive theory of adult learning developed to date, and it is rapidly gaining the interest of scholars in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Transformative learning is a deep shift in perspective during which habits of mind become more open, more permeable, and better justified. This shift occurs through reflection, imagination, intuition, emotion, and engaging with symbols and myths. It can be an individual process, a group process, and a social change process. The transformative learning literature is fairly consistent in describing transformative learning as a uniquely adult process, especially the rational perspective that calls on metacognition, which is not fully developed until adulthood. However, it is not always clear how transformative learning differs from deep learning, active learning, relational learning, making meaning from experience, and the like. Transformative learning theory has a constructivist foundation, as do many other learning theories, and there is considerable overlap between the characteristics of transformative learning and more general learning theories.

Several perspectives on transformative learning theory have evolved over the decades since Mezirow first presented his concept of “perspective transformation” in the 1970s. Following the first wave of theoretical development, in which authors critiqued and expanded on Mezirow’s work, a second wave of theoretical development focuses on integrative and holistic understandings of the theory. In this chapter, we provided an overview of three broad perspectives, with the intent that they be seen as a pluralistic, inclusive portrayal of the field.
Less has been written about fostering transformative learning, but this is changing with, for example, Mezirow and Taylor’s (2009) book and Hogan, Simpson, and Stuckey’s (2009) collection of ways to incorporate and use creative expression to promote transformation. In this chapter, we reviewed six themes related to fostering transformative learning—themes that were derived from research (Taylor, 2008): the individual experience, critical reflection, the role of dialogue, authentic and supportive relationships, a holistic orientation, and the awareness of context.
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