Open Access Library Journal
2026, Volume 13, e14945
ISSN Online: 2333-9721
ISSN Print: 2333-9705

Pedestal Prejudice Bias: The Illusion of Absolutes and the Emergence of Moral Self Exemption

Julius Melvin Jefferies

Department of Clinical Mental Health (Independent Practice), Knoxville, TN, USA
Email: jefferiesjulius@gmail.com

How to cite this paper: Jefferies, J.M. (2026) Pedestal Prejudice Bias: The Illusion of Absolutes and the Emergence of Moral Self Exemption. *Open Access Library Journal*, **13**: e14945.
https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1114945

Received: January 27, 2026
Accepted: March 1, 2026
Published: March 4, 2026

Abstract

Pedestal Prejudice Bias (PPB) is advanced here as a trauma-informed cognitive moral process in which perceived righteousness produces self-exemption from accountability. PPB is proposed as a patterned alteration in moral information processing whereby individuals or groups experience their identity, cause, or suffering as inherently incapable of wrongdoing. In this state, corrective feedback is reinterpreted as an attack, and ethically inconsistent behavior is reframed as justified action while preserving a subjective sense of justice. Drawing from moral injury research, motivated reasoning, social identity processes, echo chamber dynamics, algorithm-mediated amplification, and dehumanization theory, this manuscript provides an explicit operational definition for PPB, differentiates it from adjacent constructs, and clarifies which links in the proposed causal pathway are hypothesized versus supported by existing evidence. Clinical implications are expanded with concrete assessment prompts, formulation guidance, and intervention targets aligned with Acceptance and Commitment Therapy and moral injury-informed moral repair approaches. Limitations and ethical safeguards are articulated to reduce the risk of pathologizing moral commitment, advocacy, or culturally grounded conviction. PPB is offered as a clinically relevant lens for understanding rigidity, escalation, and ethical drift in individuals, relationships, organizations, and societies.

Subject Areas

Clinical Psychology, Moral Psychology, Trauma Studies, Social Psychology, Ethics

Keywords

Pedestal Prejudice Bias, Moral Self-Exemption, Moral Absolutism, Moral Injury, Motivated Reasoning, Echo Chambers, Algorithm-Mediated Social

Learning, Weaponized Morality, Dehumanization, Accountability

1. Introduction

Human beings seek certainty when the world becomes unstable. Certainty can regulate fear, organize action, and restore a sense of predictability. Under threat, the nervous system favors quick categorization over slow deliberation. From a clinical perspective, that shift is often protective in the moment and costly over time. When certainty becomes rigid, it frequently expresses as moral absolutism, a cognitive pattern that compresses moral complexity into binary categories of right and wrong, good and evil, us and them.

Absolutist moral framing is not merely a style of opinion. It alters what counts as evidence, which emotions are permitted, and which kinds of moral questions are tolerated. Once moral narratives fuse with identity and belonging, reflection can be experienced as a threat. Accountability can feel like persecution. Humility can feel like betrayal. In such climates, the same behavior may be condemned as atrocity when committed by an out-group and excused as necessity when committed by the in-group.

This paper introduces Pedestal Prejudice Bias (PPB), a construct coined and developed by Rev. Dr. Julius Melvin Jefferies, to describe a cognitive moral process in which moral certainty transforms into moral exemption. Unlike traditional prejudice models that begin with out-group hostility, PPB begins with in-group sanctification. The self, whether an individual or collective, is placed on a pedestal beyond ethical scrutiny. From that elevated position, harm can be cognitively reframed as protection, aggression as defense, and dehumanization as clarity.

The intent of this manuscript is clinical and educational rather than ideological. PPB is offered as a language for a widely observed phenomenon: the way pain, certainty, and group belonging can converge to produce moral self-exemption, thereby accelerating dehumanization and ethical drift. The paper, therefore, focuses on operational criteria, differentiation from adjacent constructs, pathway clarity, boundary conditions, and clinically actionable assessment and intervention guidance.

2. Operational Definition of Pedestal Prejudice Bias

A construct gains usefulness through its boundaries. To reduce overlap with strong moral conviction or ordinary in-group preference, PPB is defined here with explicit operational criteria.

Pedestal Prejudice Bias is a cognitive moral processing pattern characterized by moral self-exemption. It occurs when a person or group treats their identity, cause, or suffering as conferring moral immunity, such that accountability is reinterpreted as an illegitimate attack and harm is selectively justified.

PPB is identified when all three of the following criteria are present.

First, the moral infallibility belief is present, either explicitly or implicitly. The person or group holds a stable belief that their side is inherently incapable of wrongdoing, or that wrongdoing by their side does not count as wrongdoing in the usual sense. This can appear as purity claims, claims of exceptional virtue, or categorical excuses that rely on the premise that the in-group is morally different by nature.

Second, accountability is consistently reframed as an attack. Corrective feedback, dissent, or calls for ethical consistency are routinely interpreted as persecution, betrayal, or evidence that the critic is immoral. The feedback is not processed as information but as a threat. The defining feature is persistence across settings and relationships, not a single defensive moment.

Third, a moral double standard enables harm justification. Comparable harms are evaluated differently depending on group membership, and this discrepancy functions to justify, minimize, conceal, or celebrate in-group harm. This criterion marks the transition from belief to ethical consequence.

In practice, clinicians and researchers can observe PPB through reliable indicators. One indicator is identity purity logic, in which harm by the in-group is dismissed as not representing the true group, while harm by the out-group is treated as representative and essential. A second indicator is persecutory accountability narratives, where requests for restraint or repair are framed as complicity with evil, and emotional intensity escalates when accountability is introduced. A third indicator is justified dehumanization, where language shifts from disagreement to moral essentialism and the out-group is described as undeserving of rights, mercy, or protection.

These criteria distinguish PPB from strong moral conviction. Conviction can be intense and still accountable. PPB is conviction fused to exemption.

3. Differentiation from Adjacent Constructs

PPB overlaps with several established constructs while adding a distinctive initiating mechanism. It names moral self-exemption as the point at which feedback integration collapses and ethical inconsistency becomes subjectively righteous.

Strong moral conviction involves certainty and emotional investment. It does not require an exemption. A person can be certain and still accept accountability, practice repair, and apply consistent standards. PPB requires stable infallibility beliefs, accountability rejection, and double standards that justify harm.

In-group bias, as conceptualized in social identity theory, describes preferential evaluation and trust toward in-group members and is a common social process [1]. It does not necessarily include moral immunity claims. PPB describes an escalation of in-group favoritism into ethical exceptionalism, where in-group actions are evaluated as morally different in kind.

Moral licensing describes how prior moral behavior or perceived moral credit can increase willingness to engage in later transgression [2]. PPB differs in duration and structure. It is not a temporary credit system but a stable assumption of

righteousness that makes exemption continuous rather than episodic.

Confirmation bias and motivated reasoning describe the selective processing of information to protect prior beliefs and identity. Contemporary work demonstrates that identity-relevant motivations can shape how individuals interpret evidence and update beliefs, especially in polarizing contexts [3]. PPB specifies the moral direction and consequence of that selectivity. It is not only belief maintenance but maintenance of infallibility and defense of double standards that permit harm.

Dehumanization reduces moral concern for others by framing them as less than fully human. Recent work highlights how perceptions of the out-group as fundamentally aberrant can catalyze blatant dehumanization [4]. PPB often culminates in dehumanization but is not reducible to it. PPB describes a pathway into dehumanization through sanctified selfhood, accountability collapse, and weaponized moral narratives.

In short, PPB is offered as a bridge construct connecting moral injury, absolutist framing, and reinforcement environments to ethically inconsistent behavior that is subjectively experienced as justice.

4. Trauma, Moral Injury, and the Narrowing of Moral Attention

Trauma reshapes cognition and attention. Under threat, the nervous system prioritizes survival, and survival favors simplification. Cognitive narrowing can be protective in acute danger and costly when generalized to social life. Moral injury adds a distinct layer to this narrowing. Moral injury is widely described as a pattern of functionally impairing moral emotions, beliefs, and behaviors that can follow exposure to potentially morally injurious events [5]. Such events may involve perpetration, failure to prevent harm, witnessing harm, or betrayal by a trusted authority.

Clinically, moral injury can manifest as shame, anger, disgust, grief, spiritual conflict, loss of trust, and a destabilization of meaning. The individual is not only afraid. The individual may feel violated at the level of identity and sacred value. The system then seeks restoration. If integration is available, restoration can occur through mourning, accountability, repair, and meaning-making. If integration feels unavailable, restoration may be sought through certainty and moral dominance.

Within the PPB framework, trauma and moral injury are conceptualized as amplifiers rather than deterministic causes. Trauma alone does not produce PPB. The proposed vulnerability pathway is that injury increases threat sensitivity and reduces tolerance for ambiguity, thereby increasing attraction to absolutist framing. Absolutism can then merge with identity and belonging, particularly in reinforcement environments that reward certainty and punish nuance.

Importantly, not all moral injury leads to weaponized morality. Many individuals respond to moral injury with humility, prosocial restraint, and deeper ethical sensitivity. Boundary conditions that reduce risk include access to moral repair

pathways, stable attachment relationships, cross-cutting community ties, and leadership norms that frame accountability as integrity rather than betrayal. PPB is therefore conceptualized as a contingent outcome of interacting psychological and social variables, not as an inevitable consequence of trauma.

5. Reinforcement Environments: Echo Chambers, Outrage Rewards, and Algorithm-Mediated Amplification

PPB rarely forms in isolation. It is often sculpted within a social ecology that rewards certainty and punishes reflection.

Echo chambers describe environments where exposure to diverse perspectives is limited, and like-minded communities reinforce shared narratives. A large comparative analysis across platforms demonstrated that social media can favor the formation of groups of like-minded users and strengthen echo chamber dynamics [6]. Such environments reduce corrective feedback and can increase identity fusion, making moral narratives more resistant to revision.

Outrage can become a social currency. When moralized emotional expression is rewarded with visibility, approval, or belonging, it can be reinforced through basic learning mechanisms. Experimental and observational work suggests that positive social feedback for outrage expressions increases the likelihood of future outrage expressions and that users conform outrage levels to perceived norms of their network [7]. The clinical implication is not that moral outrage is pathological. The risk emerges when outrage becomes the primary marker of loyalty and the primary route to status.

Algorithm-mediated social learning further intensifies these dynamics. A review in Trends in Cognitive Sciences describes how content algorithms exploit human biases toward prestigious, in-group, moral, and emotional information, summarized as PRIME information, in the service of engagement optimization [8]. When PRIME information is disproportionately amplified, perceived norms can shift, and individuals may infer that extreme certainty and moral hostility are more common and more acceptable than they actually are.

In such conditions, PPB becomes socially reinforced. The pedestal is built through repeated cycles of belonging, reward, and threat-based interpretation. Accountability becomes not only personally uncomfortable but socially dangerous.

6. Weaponized Morality and Ethical Drift

Weaponized morality refers to the use of moral language and values to justify harm rather than restrain it. Within PPB, weaponized morality often functions as the behavioral expression of moral self-exemption. The moral system no longer operates as a compass. It becomes armor and a weapon.

Clinically, a central feature is subjective coherence. Individuals engaging in weaponized morality may not experience themselves as immoral. They may experience themselves as necessary, protective, or sacrificial. This is why the pattern is resistant to challenge. To accept accountability is not merely to admit error. It can

feel like a collapse of identity and belonging.

Dehumanization frequently enters as a permission structure. Contemporary evidence suggests that blatant dehumanization can arise not only from failure to consider others' minds but also from active consideration paired with the conclusion that the out-group thinks in aberrant or fundamentally alien ways [4]. This is clinically relevant because it shows that increased attention to the other does not necessarily increase empathy. The content and framing of attention matter. If the other is framed as essentially inhuman, moral restraints loosen while subjective righteousness remains intact.

Ethical drift then becomes possible. Drift is rarely experienced as drift. It is experienced as clarity. The boundary shifts gradually. Behaviors that once would have felt unacceptable are reframed as necessary responses to injustice. The in-group moral identity remains preserved, and the out-group becomes a container for moral contamination.

PPB, therefore, offers a lens for understanding how groups can replicate the harms they oppose. This replication does not always require conscious malice. It can emerge through unexamined certainty, threat reinforcement, and social reward.

7. Proposed Conceptual Pathway, Evidence Status, and Moderators

Because PPB is proposed as an integrative construct, causal claims must be presented with precision. Some links are supported by prior evidence, while others are hypothesized mechanisms requiring direct testing.

The proposed pathway begins with trauma exposure or morally injurious events contributing to threat sensitivity and cognitive narrowing. This broad link is consistent with trauma science and contemporary moral injury reviews [5]. The next link, from cognitive narrowing to absolutist framing, is hypothesized as a frequent adaptation under threat, particularly when ambiguity is intolerable.

The link from absolutism to in-group moral idealization is consistent with social identity processes, wherein group membership shapes evaluation and increases favoritism [1]. The transition from in-group idealization to PPB is hypothesized as the key step named by this construct. It is proposed to occur when infallibility beliefs become stable, and accountability cues reliably trigger threat responses.

PPB is then hypothesized to increase weaponized morality and harm justification through mechanisms consistent with motivated reasoning and reinforcement learning [3] [7]. Dehumanization is conceptualized as both a product and amplifier of weaponized morality. Finally, escalation and conflict dynamics are proposed to feed back into threat sensitivity, further narrowing moral attention.

Moderators likely to increase PPB risk include high intolerance of ambiguity, high need for closure, strong identity fusion, high immersion in echo chamber environments, leadership cues that reward purity and punish nuance, and sustained exposure to PRIME amplified moral emotional content [6] [8]. Protective

moderators likely include trait humility, reflective capacity, cross-cutting relationships, stable attachment and community support, and cultural or spiritual norms that treat accountability as integrity.

Boundary conditions should be emphasized. Trauma and moral injury do not inevitably culminate in PPB. Moral repair pathways, restorative justice practices, meaning-making, and communities that permit grief without demanding enemies can reduce risk. Clinically, the presence of accountability capacity is a key differentiator. When a person can acknowledge harm while maintaining dignity, PPB is less likely to be operating.

8. Clinical Assessment and Formulation

PPB is clinically relevant across trauma work, moral injury presentations, couples conflict framed in ethical terms, family polarization, group therapy, organizational rupture, and advocacy burnout. The clinician's task is not ideological arbitration. The clinician's task is to restore reflective capacity, reduce threat-based rigidity, and strengthen ethical reciprocity.

Assessment should be non-shaming, culturally humble, and functionally oriented. The clinician is mapping how the client processes moral threat and accountability rather than debating the client's cause. The following prompts are practical and clinically gentle.

One prompt assesses accountability processing. When someone offers feedback about your side's behavior, what do you assume their intention is, and what happens in your body as you hear it? Another prompt assesses double standards. If the other side did the same action your side did, how would you label it, and what word would you use for them versus for you? Another prompt assesses infallibility beliefs. Is there any circumstance where your group or cause could do harm and still remain worthy, and what would accountability look like without becoming betrayal? Another prompt assesses dehumanization risk. When you picture the people you oppose, what do they deserve, and what would it mean about you if they were fully human? Another prompt assesses moral injury content. What value was violated, what did you lose faith in, and what are you trying to restore through certainty?

Formulation can be written as a sequence. A morally injurious experience increased threat sensitivity. Cognitive narrowing increased attraction to absolutist framing. Identity and belonging fused to a moral narrative. Social reinforcement rewarded outrage and punished nuance. Accountability cues began to trigger threat responses. Over time, moral infallibility beliefs stabilized, and double standards emerged as protective logic. The moral system began to function not only as a compass but as armor.

In couples or family systems, PPB can appear as a cycle. One member introduces accountability or nuance. The other experiences a threat and responds with moral attack, contempt, or withdrawal. The first escalates, feeling morally endangered. Both interpret the other through virtue versus vice. Repair becomes difficult be-

cause the nervous system equates repair with surrender. The therapist can name the cycle, normalize the threat response, and reestablish repair as strength.

9. Clinical Intervention Targets and Practical Implementation

Because PPB is a threat-linked processing pattern, interventions should increase regulation and reflective capacity before challenging content. The goal is not to weaken values. The goal is to reconnect values with consistent behavior and relational ethics.

First, restore regulation so reflection is possible. If the body is in survival mode, moral reasoning will be in survival mode. Interventions include paced breathing, grounding, sensory orientation, and somatic tracking of escalation signals. Clients learn to identify early cues such as chest tightness, jaw clenching, heat, tunnel vision, and urgency to punish. The clinical aim is to create a pause point between trigger and moral action.

Second, reduce cognitive fusion with moral narratives. Acceptance and Commitment Therapy is consistent with this target because it strengthens defusion and values-based action. The clinician can invite the client to notice when the mind offers a story that says accountability equals betrayal. Defusion practices help the client distinguish between having a thought and being ruled by it. The client can then choose behavior aligned with core values rather than with the emotional demand of certainty.

Third, separate dignity from infallibility. PPB is often sustained by an implicit bargain that says I must be right to be safe and worthy. Treatment interrupts this bargain by exploring its origin, often rooted in histories of humiliation, betrayal, or unsafe attachment. The clinician can affirm that worth is not contingent on perfection and that accountability is not annihilation.

Fourth, rebuild ethical reciprocity through values-based behavior. Values clarification becomes behavioral through a values behavior audit. The client names a value such as justice, compassion, dignity, truth, protection, or mercy. The clinician asks what that value looks like when anger and fear are present. Then the client identifies a concrete behavior that expresses the value under stress, such as speaking with restraint, telling the truth about impact, acknowledging harm without collapsing dignity, setting boundaries without dehumanization, or repairing ruptures.

Fifth, address moral injury directly through moral repair work. Contemporary reviews emphasize the need for structured meaning making, accountability, and social functional rehabilitation in moral injury treatment [5]. Within PPB, moral repair is preventative. It reduces the need to convert pain into exemption. Moral repair may include naming the violation, mourning what was lost, distinguishing grief from vengeance, engaging spiritual or existential reconciliation when relevant, and identifying restitution or repair that is possible.

Sixth, reduce dehumanization by increasing narrative complexity. Recent research suggests that imagined otherness can catalyze blatant dehumanization [4].

Interventions therefore target the content of imagination. The clinician can guide the client to articulate how a person on the other side might be acting from fear, love, or loyalty, even when the client disagrees. Humanization is not agreement. It is accurate reality testing that reactivates empathy-based restraint.

Implementation in groups and organizations requires structural support. Helping professions and advocacy spaces are vulnerable because moral purpose is central to identity. Organizations can protect against PPB by implementing reflective supervision, encouraging ethical dialogue, and protecting constructive dissent. When outrage is rewarded and reflection is punished, ethical drift becomes more likely. When accountability is restorative and symmetrical, ethical resilience grows.

10. Limitations and Ethical Safeguards

PPB must not become a clinical weapon. It is intended to illuminate a process, not to label populations or invalidate advocacy. Several limitations are important.

First, PPB is currently a proposed construct. It requires empirical operationalization, measurement development, and validation across contexts. Second, there is a risk of over-attribution if clinicians confuse intense moral language with PPB. Many cultural, spiritual, and justice-oriented traditions use strong moral framing while still practicing humility, accountability, and restraint. Third, power differences matter. Oppressed groups may use moral certainty as survival communication. Strong conviction is not evidence of PPB. PPB requires moral infallibility beliefs, accountability rejection, and double standards that justify harm.

Fourth, measurement challenges in moral injury and moral distress research highlight the need for careful instrument development. A systematic review and content analysis of existing scales notes ongoing issues in measurement quality and recommends improvements for research and clinical use [9].

Safeguards for ethical application include assessing operational criteria rather than ideology, leading with function rather than judgment, practicing cultural humility, and maintaining symmetry. Symmetry means the standards used to evaluate others are also applied inward. PPB language should never be used in organizations to silence whistleblowing or suppress moral critique. A final safeguard is clinical pacing. Directly challenging moral beliefs can intensify threat responses and entrench absolutism. It is often more effective to first restore regulation and curiosity, then invite the client into ethical self-examination without humiliation.

11. Future Research Directions

Future research should focus on making PPB empirically testable.

First, scale development is needed. Items should assess moral infallibility beliefs, accountability as attack framing, and moral double standards that justify harm. Reliability should be tested across populations, and discriminant validity should be examined in relation to measures of moral conviction, in-group bias, need for closure, authoritarian attitudes, moral licensing, and dehumanization.

Second, longitudinal models should examine whether exposure to potentially morally injurious events predicts increases in absolutist framing and PPB indicators over time, and whether social media ecology moderates this relationship. Echo chamber research provides measurable variables for network insulation and biased diffusion [6]. Algorithm-mediated social learning research provides measurable exposure proxies for moral emotional PRIME content [8].

Third, experimental intervention studies should evaluate whether increasing reflective capacity reduces PPB indicators. Candidate interventions include Acceptance and Commitment Therapy defusion, moral repair protocols, deliberative dialogue training, and restorative accountability practices.

Fourth, cross-cultural research is essential. PPB should be tested across faith traditions, political systems, and organizational cultures, with attention to how norms around shame, honor, collectivism, and moral authority influence expression. Fifth, clinical outcome research should explore whether PPB indicators predict relational rupture, escalation risk, burnout in helping professionals, and treatment resistance, and whether targeted interventions improve outcomes.

12. Conclusions

Pedestal Prejudice Bias describes a quiet moral failure mode: not a failure of values, but a failure of reflection. When pain, certainty, and identity fuse, moral conviction can transform into moral self-exemption. In that state, accountability is experienced as injustice, and harm can be experienced as righteousness.

This model is not an argument for neutrality or moral relativism. It is an argument for ethical reciprocity and moral humility. The standards applied outward must also be applied inward. Healing requires accountability paired with dignity, conviction paired with humility, and justice practiced with consistency.

Moral injury often produces a hunger for restoration. PPB offers a counterfeit restoration, innocence without accountability. The work of healing is harder and more enduring: accountability without annihilation, conviction without dehumanization, and repair without humiliation. No wound has ever been healed by cutting deeper. No community has ever regained its humanity by declaring itself incapable of harm. PPB calls clinicians, leaders, and communities to reclaim morality as a living relational practice rather than a static shield against self-examination.

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges the clinical experiences, supervision dialogues, and reflective work that contributed to the development of this theory. PPB is offered with the intent of strengthening ethical resilience, clinical discernment, and the capacity for accountability under moral stress.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1979) An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In: Austin, W.G. and Worchel, S., Eds., *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Brooks/Cole, 33-47.

[2] Merritt, A.C., Effron, D.A. and Monin, B. (2010) Moral Self-Licensing: When Being Good Frees Us to Be Bad. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, **4**, 344-357. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00263.x

[3] Lois, G., Tsakas, E., Yuen, K. and Riedl, A. (2024) Tracking Politically Motivated Reasoning in the Brain: The Role of Mentalizing, Value-Encoding, and Error Detection Networks. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, **19**, nsae056. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsae056

[4] van Loon, A., Goldberg, A. and Srivastava, S.B. (2024) Imagined Otherness Fuels Blatant Dehumanization of Outgroups. *Communications Psychology*, **2**, Article No. 39. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44271-024-00087-4

[5] Litz, B.T. and Walker, H.E. (2025) Moral Injury: An Overview of Conceptual, Definitional, Assessment, and Treatment Issues. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, **21**, 251-277. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-081423-022604

[6] Cinelli, M., De Francisci Morales, G., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W. and Starnini, M. (2021) The Echo Chamber Effect on Social Media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **118**, e2023301118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023301118

[7] Brady, W.J., McLoughlin, K., Doan, T.N. and Crockett, M.J. (2021) How Social Learning Amplifies Moral Outrage Expression in Online Social Networks. *Science Advances*, **7**, eabe5641. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abe5641

[8] Brady, W.J., Jackson, J.C., Lindström, B. and Crockett, M.J. (2023) Algorithm-Mediated Social Learning in Online Social Networks. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, **27**, 947-960.

[9] Houle, S.A., Ein, N., Gervasio, J., Plouffe, R.A., Litz, B.T., Carleton, R.N., *et al.* (2024) Measuring Moral Distress and Moral Injury: A Systematic Review and Content Analysis of Existing Scales. *Clinical Psychology Review*, **108**, Article ID: 102377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2023.102377