

22. Margaret J. Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler, 2006).
23. Bennis, *On Becoming a Leader*, 113.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid., 40.
26. Ibid., 56.
27. John P. Martinson, "Coaching Religious Leaders," *Reflective Practice* 26 (2006): 83–98.
28. Whitworth and others, *Co-Active Coaching*, 36.

"There are three types of accountability applicable to both laity and clergy, but applicable to the clergy to a *greater degree*. First, the minister is understood as accountable to an ecclesial community which has authority to interpret how her or his particular ministry is an appropriate expression of God's calling. Second, the minister, clergy or laity, is also accountable to his or her peers in ministry and sometimes to those specializing in a particular type of ministry in order to maintain standards of good practice in the same way that other professionals are accountable to their peers. A third accountability is the accountability of the minister to himself or herself to advance in the practice of ministry—to become competent in caring and in understanding the faith tradition he or she represents."—from John Patton, *Pastoral Care in Context*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993. p 80.

Working to Prevent Clergy Sexual Misconduct

Christie Cozad Neuger

I focus this article on preventing clergy sexual misconduct by presenting four vignettes that together begin to indicate the scope of damage that occurs when clergy cross sexual boundaries with congregants. For this article, I am limiting the definition of clergy sexual misconduct to inappropriate sexual behavior (for example, sexualized comments and touch, various forms of sexually-oriented manipulation, acts of sexual intimacy including sexual intercourse, and so forth) between a clergy person and an adult congregant. I have focused on clergy-to-adult sexual misconduct because, in my experience, this kind of behavior seems to be viewed with the greatest amount of ambiguity and ambivalence by congregants, judicatory representatives, clergy, and the general public. Language like "affair," "misjudgment," and "mutual" get used instead of the language of "abuse," "violation," and "tragedy," which are used more commonly with clergy-to-child misconduct but are also appropriate in its clergy-to-adult forms. It is important to locate the starting point for this conversation in the context of

Christie Cozad Neuger, MDiv, PhD, founding director, Institute for the Support of Pastoral Ministries, and distinguished senior scholar in Pastoral Care, United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, 3000 Fifth Str. Northwest, New Brighton, MN 55112 (E-mail: cneuger@unitedseminary.edu).

Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry

the harm done by clergy sexual abuse because the ambivalence about the seriousness of clergy-to-adult misconduct seems to reside in the evaluation of harmful consequences.

CLERGY SEXUAL MISCONDUCT IS WIDESPREAD

All of the vignettes described below have come out of my own experience as a seminary professor, as a pastoral counselor, as a consultant with clergy and congregations, and as a member of my denomination's congregational response team. The Congregational Response Team is a group of trained clergy who assist congregations after they have experienced a clergy betrayal of trust, most often because of clergy sexual misconduct.

Vignette: A man came to me after a congregational meeting because he wanted to express some of his struggle and pain at hearing the news of sexual misconduct by his pastor.

"My wife and I do not know what to do. This is our third church over the past ten years where there's been a problem like this. The first church had trouble for years keeping a pastor—lots of anger and mistrust and power struggles. We finally called a pastor that we liked and who fit well with the needs and values of the church. Everything went well for the first year or so until the Church Board was told he had been caught having sexual relationships with two women in the church. We learned there had been a series of pastors in the church's history who had done the same thing. We not only left that congregation but the denomination as well. We thought that there must be something wrong with the way that denomination trained its pastors."

"We really liked our next church. It felt like we'd found a home and we got quite involved. Five years later, the same thing happened. Even though we were sworn to secrecy, there were some leaks. There was a petition to fire the pastor, but the church leaders decided to "reprimand" the pastor but not fire him. We were disgusted with the whole thing so we left that church too. After a year of not attending much, we decided to come here. This is a really good church. We like it a lot, but now it's happened again. At least the truth is out in the open, and we're dealing with it as a congregation but I wonder if you can trust any clergy. Is it even worth going to church if this is what you get? God must be pretty frustrated. I know that I am."

Several things seem evident through this story. First, the pervasiveness of clergy sexual misconduct is visible in this man's experience. Over the past thirty years, there have been numerous attempts to measure the frequency of sexual boundary crossing by clergy. Most of the measures have come through

clergy self-reports about their own behavior. *Christianity Today* reported in 1988 that 23 percent of pastors surveyed admitted doing something sexual with someone other than their spouse.¹ A 1991 Fuller Institute for Church Growth study found that 37 percent of clergy questioned had been involved in inappropriate sexual behavior.² These surveys did not limit their questions to involvement with a congregant. However, a 1993 survey done for a Fuller Theological Seminary PhD dissertation found that 39 percent of the 300 clergy polled had sexual contact with a congregant and almost 13 percent reported sexual intercourse with a congregant.³

Since the published research regarding the frequency of clergy sexual misconduct is not uniform in terms of questions asked or methods used to evaluate, it is difficult to get a clear reading from the data. However, Francis and Stacks suggest from their reading of the literature that the reported frequency of clergy sexual misconduct ranges from 0.3 percent to 37 percent across the denominations.⁴ Most suggest it is probably in the 10 percent range. In a new study recently reported out of Baylor University, researchers surveyed a sample of the general population (over 3500 respondents) to see how many people reported that they had been the recipient of inappropriate clergy sexual behavior. They found that approximately 3.1 percent of women who attend religious services at least monthly reported being the object of a sexual advance by a clergy person or religious leader in their own congregation since turning eighteen, with 92 percent of the sexual advances made in secret and 67 percent made by married offenders. All but two of the offenders were male.⁵ In a congregation of about 400 people, there would be on average seven women who had been sexually approached by their clergy. This may miss the people who attended religious services in the past but stopped attending after they experienced clergy sexual misconduct. Stacey, Shupe, and Darnell found that over half the people they surveyed who had experienced intimidation, exploitation, or abuse from a clergy person stopped attending services and/or stopped giving money to the church.⁶ The inescapable conclusion from these various studies is that clergy sexual misconduct is widespread.

SECONDARY VICTIMS OF CLERGY SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

A second point that comes from this first vignette is that there are always secondary victims in clergy sexual misconduct. Whether the misconduct becomes "public" or is kept "secret," congregational members and the congregational system itself suffer from the experience. The greatest damage

to congregations comes in the destruction of trust. Many congregants have to struggle with whether they should have trusted their religious leader or whether they can trust another one. They may wonder if the church can really stand for anything trustworthy if this kind of thing can happen and so they doubt their own shared commitments and mission. In situations where everything is hushed up and only a few know the “real story,” congregations often end up with factions or splits, a lack of energy, loss of hope and trust in one another, anger at new leadership, a loss of a shared future story, and a general malaise—all without really knowing why these things are happening in their community.⁷

Reports of clergy sexual misconduct have an impact on people outside of the congregation as well. Stacey, Shupe, and Darnell found that, an increasing level of public awareness from the media of clergy malfeasance is related to decreased voluntarism, decreased financial support, and decreased interest in religious instruction for the family at statistically significant levels.⁸ Other secondary victims include friends and family of the offending clergy and denominational workers who are responsible for investigating the situation and supporting victims, families, the pastor, and the congregation.

PRIMARY VICTIMS OF CLERGY SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

Vignette: The following representative statement happened at a congregational meeting that was discussing the finding of clergy misconduct by their pastor. “Don’t you people understand? The devil was in that woman. She tempted him beyond what he could endure. He’s only human, and he was weak. It was that woman who caused the trouble, and she’s gone now. The pastor’s sorry for his mistake, and we forgive him. If you’re Christian, you should forgive him, too.”

Vignette: The following is a summary quote from a minister who engaged in clergy sexual misconduct: “I’m sorry, but was it really as bad as you’re suggesting? It was just an affair, a mistake. She was very seductive. I was just trying to counsel her through a hard time when her marriage was ending and things got out of hand. We were both adults, and she was hard to resist. It won’t happen again. My wife has forgiven me; can’t the church?”

Vignette: In this last story, a woman who had been in ministry for several years came to talk to me, wanting to share the story of her experience but fearful to do so. (The woman whose story this is has given me permission to use it for the purposes of this article.)

“The pastor was very affirming of me and my gifts and encouraged me to step into leadership roles at the church. He frequently called me on the phone to ask questions and seek my opinions about church-related topics. Soon, he had me so involved that he made it necessary for me to have to meet with him many times a week along with the weekly counseling sessions. He even offered to come to my house, when my children were napping, so that it would be easier to talk. Eventually the prayers and hand-holding got longer and more intimate. After the prayers, he frequently embraced me for long periods of time, commenting on my physical attractiveness, the scent of my perfume, and stroking my hair. He would put his hands under my arms as he talked with me and rub his thumbs over my breasts. I was sucked in and flattered by his compliments and care, blind to the manipulation and damage he was doing to my spirit.

“When the trouble with the congregation got more intense, he pushed me away. I began to realize that I was being used by him, although I didn’t want to believe it. I was very confused and did not understand what was happening to me. He asked to leave the church, and I was left to struggle and live with what had happened to me. I felt betrayed by a man and by the church and felt incredible shame. The church was no longer satisfying or meaningful to me. References to Jesus and to discipleship repulsed me and made me think of the pastor.

“I am presently struggling with my relationship to the church. How can I be part of a church where sexism continues to flourish? This week I was holding my newborn granddaughter, and I couldn’t help but think about her faith and wonder, ‘Do I want her to go to church? Is the church going to be a safe and healthy place for her?’”

These three vignettes tell us about the harm that is done to the immediate victims of clergy sexual misconduct. The personal consequences of clergy sexual misconduct between a congregant and a trusted pastor are often extreme. Frequently, victims experience confusion, depression, and grief. Their healing process is often complicated by the isolation they experience in trying to heal. They usually leave the particular church in which they were harmed and may well have trouble both finding and trusting another congregation that will support their experience. Quite often, victims feel they cannot talk about their experience in a church context because secrecy about sexual abuse is normative in the Church. Because of all of these factors, the spiritual life of a victim of clergy misconduct is usually significantly affected by their experience. As the woman in the above vignette described, “References to Jesus and to discipleship repulsed me and made me think of the pastor.” Because the pastor is often some form of symbolic representation of God for a congregation, the victim may well find herself (or himself) unable to be in a mean-

ingful relationship with God as they try to process and heal from their abuse experience.

As we can see from the first two vignettes in this section, primary victims are often portrayed as the perpetrators or at least protagonists in the misconduct drama. When disclosure of clergy misconduct occurs, the most common reaction from many members of the congregation is to blame the "other woman."⁹ There are several reasons why this may occur. As the congregation experiences anger at the events and the consequent disruption of their status quo, the anger has to go toward someone other than the pastor in order to keep the system as stable as possible. So, anger gets directed at the victim (or at the denomination, the personnel committee, and so forth). Since most clergy sexual misconduct victims are women, the theological tradition of blaming women for sexual temptation and sin makes it likely that the victim receives the congregation's blame and rage. When a victim is blamed, her isolation becomes more profound and harmful. Although many denominational processes in the case of clergy sexual misconduct include providing advocacy and support for the victim, in reality the victim generally receives minimal support and maximum isolation for the reasons just named.

As the above stories and a survey of the literature demonstrate, the harm done in adult-to-adult clergy sexual misconduct is profound.¹⁰ Yet, despite the evidence about the level of harm done there has been surprisingly little research in how to prevent it. Part of the reason for this is the complexity of the problem. There are multiple and sometimes contradictory models that people have proposed to explain the occurrence, the frequency, and the consequences of sexual misconduct by clergy. It is important to look at these as to how they might help us craft a comprehensive plan for preventing clergy sexual misconduct.

UNDERSTANDING SEXUAL MISCONDUCT BY CLERGY

Typologies of psychopathology profiles have been suggested as a way to understand clergy who engage in sexual misconduct. These include profiles of narcissism, general neurosis, sexual addiction, naïve need-meeting, and so forth. Yet, as Francis and Stacks state, "No one clear profile has emerged in the research ... Because no one clear profile has emerged, there is no single measure that can be used to screen potential perpetrators from the ranks of clergy."¹¹ Although there may be characterological factors involved, it is just as common to find that particular psychological profiles do not predict or

explain clergy misconduct nor do they vary from clergy who do not engage in sexual misconduct.

A second focus is on the stressors of ministry and lack of adequate clergy self-care. There have been numerous studies that identify connections between stresses of various kinds and the likelihood of sexual misconduct. Thaddeus Birchard conducted a study using interviews and surveys with clergy that suggested that sexual difficulties, primary relationship problems, stress, and loneliness are all significantly correlated with occurrences of sexual misconduct (although the main correlations he found were with boundary ambiguity and absence of institutional accountability)² Ingeborg Haug also found that stress, primarily job stress resulting from ill-defined work parameters leading to workaholism, was a major factor in sexual misconduct.³ Perry Francis and James Stacks, in a study of Lutheran clergy, found that ministers who engaged in sexual misconduct reported lower levels of spiritual well-being than those who did not engage in misconduct.⁴ A study of Southern Baptist pastors also strongly correlated sexual misconduct with stress.⁵ The primary dynamic that seems operative in these studies is that clergy who are experiencing stress, loneliness, sexual difficulties, spiritual dryness, and burn-out may well turn to their parishioners for emotional support and nurture, particularly when primary models for ministry leave pastors operating in self-isolating ways. Seeking emotional support, friendship, or nurture from congregants blurs both the definition of their roles and the asymmetries of power in the relationships.

There are also studies of models and patterns in ministry that may make it more likely that clergy engage in sexual boundary crossing, particularly when engaged in pastoral counseling (where sexual misconduct often originates). Many researchers talk about the problem of clergy engaging in the kind of counseling that is relationally-driven rather than solution- or problem-driven. This can generate four different kinds of problems relevant to misconduct. First, most clergy are not trained to recognize or deal with the dynamics of transference and counter-transference, and they tend to identify the emergence of sexual attraction as authentic to a mutual relationship. Second, and related, when feelings of attraction emerge, clergy are often not well-prepared to understand or manage their own sexual desires. Donald Capps suggests the importance of clergy learning to "re-educate their sexual desires" as part of their self-care strategy.¹⁶ Third, relationally-driven counseling models tend to be longer-term, which may lead to more inter-woven relationships between clergy and congregant. And, fourth, these kinds of models of coun-

seling use the relationship as the vehicle of healing in ways that intensify that relationship.

Models that focus on the problem/solution tend to be shorter-term and oriented toward resources and actions rather than pastoral connection. The risk with problem-/solution- focused models is that, when clergy are not well-trained in them, they may use them in authoritative or advice-giving ways, which may have implications for increasing clergy power. When pastors operate with a more authority-centered style of ministry (especially in pastoral counseling), the idealization of and reliance on the pastor by parishioners is increased. That authority may make it less likely that parishioners feel empowered to hold a pastor accountable for (or even recognize) misuses of that power or the crossing of boundaries.

The discussion about models of ministry, particularly in terms of counseling, leads to an exploration of dual or multiple relationships that clergy have with congregants. In the codes of ethics of most counseling guilds, dual relationships between a counselor and a counselee (particularly focusing on the dual relationship of friendship or romantic engagement) are prohibited because of the counseling relationship dynamics named above. But prohibiting dual relationships between clergy and congregants is not realistic because, by its very nature, clergy and congregants interact with each other within a variety of roles. One may be in a counseling relationship with a parishioner at one time and interacting with them as members of the personnel committee of the church at another. And, parishioners expect their pastors (more or less depending on the context of the church) to be available, friendly, and even socially accessible. This makes clarity about the nature of the clergy/congregant relationship very difficult to establish and maintain. Yet, without that clarity, it can be exceptionally difficult for either the minister or the parishioner to interpret the meaning of their interactions. This can lead to romantic or sexual boundary crossing and to ignoring the power differences that exist by virtue of their roles.

POWER ASYMMETRY AND CLERGY SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

This leads us to the most common dynamic identified in clergy sexual misconduct in contemporary studies: the dynamic of power asymmetry. Issues of power differences occur at both the professional context of ministerial practice and at the cultural context in which that ministry occurs.

We live in a culture that is ordered by the value of power and, thus, in terms of access to power. This is a complex and problematic ordering, which includes putting men over women, adults over children, and human beings over creation and grants access to power accordingly. Obviously there are many factors that influence these cultural value assignments—issues like skin color, sexual orientation, physical ability, class. The point: we live in a culture that has assigned power arrangements as an enduring aspect of the social order. Our theologies also participate in that ordering, especially in terms of gender. When we name God as male and with ultimate, unquestionable authority, we risk naming males (especially male ministers) as gods. This may help explain why, even though women clergy are subject to the same stressors, ministry models, and professional power dynamics, they are much more rarely perpetrators of clergy sexual misconduct than are clergymen. In fact, clergywomen are often victims of sexual harassment by their congregants.

It is in this context of cultural power arrangements that we locate the power that exists in the ministerial role and practice. Karen LeBacqz and Ronald Barton, in *Sex in the Parish*, describe two of the kinds of power that clergy have. First, they suggest that clergy have the power of freedom. Clergy engage in ministry without a great deal of supervision or observation by others. They also suggest that there is a power of access and accessibility. This is the power of having the right to initiate contact with another and of access to their lives because of the implicit contract of pastoral care and pastoral responsibility to the individuals and families of the parish.⁷ Don Capps identifies a third form of clergy power: the power of knowledge. This power includes knowledge about people's lives, their secrets, and their histories. The pastor has the power of both intimate knowledge and intimate environments.⁸ And, finally, there is the symbolic power of the clerical role. Whether or not clergy want to represent God, they do in some form stand as a personal and concrete representation of God's care or lack of it. These four forms of power that reside in the person and role of the clergy mean that no pastoral relationship can be understood without analyzing how these power dynamics are at work. Although many clergy say they do not experience themselves as having power (clergymen) or wanting power (clergywomen), they cannot walk away from it, and power that goes unclaimed is much more dangerous than power that we name and for which we are held accountable. Marie Fortune notes, "Power is not a feeling; it is a fact of life determined by what resources we bring to bear in the role we are asked to play."⁹ Donald Capps notes, in his discussion of the paradox of power that, the more clergy act in ways that deny their pow-

er, the more power they actually have.²⁰ When asymmetry of power exists between people, then the one with less power is always vulnerable to coercion, even in, or maybe especially in, sexual relationships between clergy and parishioner. By definition, then, that relationship should be seen as abusive.

A lack of ecclesial supervision and accountability is another factor related to the occurrence and frequency of clergy sexual misconduct. There is a general consensus in the literature that the Church, both local and denominational, has not acted in ways that adequately hold pastors accountable for their professional conduct, especially in relation to the maintenance of appropriate boundaries. Ken Wells discovered that 94 percent of the participants in his “listening conferences” believed that churches are “not doing all they can to prevent power structures that fuel clergy sexual abuse,” and 82 percent believed that “the veiled secrecy of clergy sexual abuse is exacerbated by the church’s interest in maintaining the proper image more than in providing justice.”²¹ Thaddeus Birchard found, in his study involving both extensive surveys and interviews with clergy, that one of the three principle causes of sexual misconduct is institutional inattentiveness (along with boundary ambiguity and personal neediness).²²

THE POSSIBILITIES OF PREVENT CLERGY SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

Where does this survey of factors in clergy sexual misconduct leave us in terms of working toward prevention? Although we have no clear consensus on what model best explains (or predicts) the likelihood of clergy sexual misconduct, we do have a substantial amount of literature looking at various causal factors. It has been my experience that among seminaries, churches, and judicatories creating a profile of “best practices” regarding the acknowledgement and prevention of clergy sexual misconduct has had a relatively low priority. Seminary training has often acted as though education in clergy power, boundaries, sexuality, and related models of ministry is optional at best. Churches continue to operate with an elevated or idealized understanding of clergy image and role and, thus, often fail to develop structures of accountability and “surveillance”²³ that might work against the occurrence of boundary violations. While these boundary workshops often address important issues around power, boundaries, and ministry, it is difficult to address the complex puzzle we have been discussing in a day-long workshop by itself.

I would like to end this article with a series of recommendations that are interlocking in terms of potential effectiveness at preventing sexual

misconduct and its damaging consequences.

Seminaries

- Research needs to generate a consensus-based “best practices” understanding for the maintenance of clergy boundaries and related models for ministry. There has been a tendency to present boundary decisions as being “up to the minister” without correlating those to asymmetrical power dynamics related to culture, theology, and ministry. Karen LeBacqz and Ronald Barton reported that the clergy they studied depended upon “feeling-oriented intuition” to make decisions related to appropriate/inappropriate sexual behavior.²⁴ Certainly the work done out of Marie Fortune’s FaithTrust Institute has gone a long way toward presenting educational and normative ideas about boundary maintenance, but those have frequently not been well-integrated into seminary curricula (or faculty knowledge).
- Foundational to education in the maintenance of boundaries is an understanding of power dynamics that operate in the culture, the church, and in ministry practice. Students need to be helped to understand the practical implications of theological sexism, for example, and how theological sexism plays out in sermon illustrations, worship liturgies, division of labor in the church, and in the pastoral counseling office.²⁵ Students also need to be helped to explore the power of the ministerial office and its implications for their own ministry practices. These educational agendas need to find their place throughout the seminary curriculum rather than being relegated to a particular discipline or class.
- Seminary students need to be helped to develop models of ministry, especially pastoral care ministry, that focus on short-term, problem-oriented, or solution-oriented approaches. As Howard Stone has pointed out, much pastoral counseling research has focused on providing models and practices for pastoral counseling specialists, not congregational clergy.²⁶ Consequently, parish clergy have had to modify long-term approaches for short-term work or use models that rely on the personal relationship between clergy and congregant (which risks deepening inappropriate attachment) or on catharsis models (which risk intensifying the emotional quality of the relationship) or on advice-giving (which risks intensifying the authority and idealization of the minister and is also probably ineffective). Part of this education in pastoral counseling needs to help students learn how to intentionally negotiate their way into and out of a counseling relationship. Seminary students also need to be educated in the potential dynamics of pastoral relationships like idealization, transference/countertransference, and dependency. Models of ministry that minimize these dynamics need to be generated and competency in dealing with the relationship dynamics when they occur need to be learned.

- Seminary students should be educated in sexuality, including their own sexual desires and how to manage them. In many seminaries, courses in sexuality are not available, and, when they are, they are generally optional. Given the level of sexual misconduct, to say nothing of other sexual issues that come to the pastor in counseling and education ministries, this is a central educational issue for seminary training.
- Seminary students need careful and thorough education in self-care strategies and practices. This is often a single class session in a semester course rather than a theme that runs through their entire seminary career. It is no wonder that many graduates leave seminary with the assumption that being overwhelmingly busy is both normative and a badge of honor (in other words, important people are overwhelmingly busy) and without any sense of the spirituality of authentic self-care.

Clergy

- It seems like the main thing that clergy need is to participate in some form of ongoing consultation group that helps them to: monitor their understanding and use of power and boundaries in ministry; assess practices of self-care; and encourage continuing development of their theory, theology, and practice of ministry. For example, I currently facilitate consultation groups for clergy that meet once a month in four-hour blocks for ten months. Each member of a group of eight clergy takes turns presenting case studies of their pastoral care ministries so that their peers can ask questions, offer feedback, and serve as a support system for them.

Congregations

- Congregations also need education about appropriate clergy boundaries. Congregations, especially personnel committees, should learn the warning signs of boundary violations (for example, excessive self-disclosure, impulsive touch, meeting with people at times or in places outside of the norm, engaging in secrecy, engaging in self-serving behaviors, and so forth)²⁷
- Congregations need to develop policies and practices that facilitate their ability to consult with clergy (and with denominational officials, when appropriate) about boundary and other concerns. Part of this would involve training personnel committees in effective methods of giving feedback and engaging in consultation.

Congregations also need to be helped to understand cultural and ministerial power dynamics and how those affect the church and its ministry.

Judicatories

Judicatories need to re-think the explicit and implicit models of ministry they see as normative. Questions for exploring these normative models of ministry might include: How do our faith groups understand religious leadership? What messages do we send about isolation, work pressures, and sup-

port systems? How do we communicate and demonstrate appropriately transparent power relationships, including those that are culturally-based?

- Judicatories need to make their values apparent by actively supporting healthy and ethical behaviors in clergy and by making the consequences for unethical behaviors clear and consistent.

Clergy sexual misconduct is not caused by any one thing and cannot be prevented by any one strategy. Seminaries, judicatories, congregations, and clergy need to work together to generate an understanding of best practices around role clarity and boundary maintenance and to hold each other accountable for putting those into practice. There is too much at stake for this to not be a top priority for the Church.

NOTES

1. The Editors, "How Common is Pastoral Indiscretion?" *Church Leaders* (Winter 1988), *Christianity Today* Web site, <http://www.christianitytoday.com/le/1988/winter/8811012.html> (accessed 30 March 2010).
2. Ken Wells, "A Needs Assessment Regarding the Nature and Impact of Clergy Sexual Abuse Conducted by the Interfaith Trauma Institute," in *Sexual Addiction and Compulsivity* 10 (2003): 203.
3. Stanley Grenz, "When the Pastoral Fails: Sexual Misconduct as a Betrayal of Trust," *Crux* 31, no. 2 (1995): 23.
4. Perry Francis and James Stacks, "The Association Between Spiritual Well-Being and Clergy Sexual Misconduct," *Journal of Religion and Abuse* 5, no. 1 (2003): 81.
5. Mark Chaves and Diana Garland, "The Prevalence of Clergy Sexual Advances Toward Adults in Their Congregations," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 48 no. 4 (2009): 817.
6. William A. Stacey, Anson Shupe, and Susan E. Darnell, "Clergy Malfeasance, Victimization, and National/Local Awareness: Their Effects on Church Attendance and Financial Giving," in *Bad Pastors: Clergy Misconduct in Modern America* (New York: New York University Press, 2000): 222.
7. Beth Ann Gaede, ed., *When A Congregation is Betrayed: Responding to Clergy Misconduct* (Herndon, VA: Alban Press, 2006).
8. Stacey, Shupe, and Darnell, "Clergy Malfeasance," 214–238.
9. Ken Wells, "A Needs Assessment," 206.
10. *Ibid.*, 208.
11. Perry Francis and James Stacks, "The Association Between Spiritual Well-Being and Clergy Sexual Misconduct," 81.

12. Thaddeus Birchard, "Clergy Sexual Misconduct: Frequency and Causation," *Sexual and Relationship Therapy* 15, no. 2 (2000): 134.
13. Ingeborg Haug, "Boundaries and the Use and Misuse of Power and Authority: Ethical Complexities for Clergy Psychotherapists," *Journal of Counseling and Development* 77, no. 4 (1999): 411–417.
14. Perry Francis and James Stacks, "The Association Between Spiritual Well-Being and Clergy Sexual Misconduct," 95.
15. Jeff Seat, James Trent, and Jwa Kim, "The Prevalence and Contributing Factors of Sexual Misconduct Among Southern Baptist Pastors in Six Southern States," *Journal of Pastoral Care* 47, no. 4 (1993): 285–294.
16. Donald Capps, "Power and Desire: Sexual Misconduct Involving Pastors and Parishioners," in *Women, Gender, and Christian Community*, ed. Jane Dempsey Douglass and James F. Kay (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1997).
17. Karen LeBacqz and Ronald Barton, *Sex in the Parish* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991).
18. Donald Capps, "Power and Desire," 134.
19. Marie Fortune, "Reactions to Efforts to Address Clergy Misconduct Involving Sexual Abuse," *Journal of Religion and Abuse* 10, no. 3 (1996): 22.
20. Donald Capps, "Power and Desire," 135.
21. Ken Wells, "A Needs Assessment," 207.
22. Birchard, "Clergy Sexual Misconduct," 135.
23. Brent Warberg, Gene Abel, and Candice Osborn, "Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment for Professional Sexual Misconduct Among the Clergy," *Pastoral Psychology* 45, no. 1 (1996): 57.
24. Lebacqz and Burton, *Sex in the Parish*, 54.
25. James Newton Poling, "God, Sex, and Power," *Theology and Sexuality* 11, no. 2 (2005): 68. See also Linda Hansen. Robison, "The Abuse of Power: A View of Sexual Misconduct In a Systemic Approach to Pastoral Care," *Pastoral Psychology* 52, no. 5, (2004): 395–404.
26. Howard W. Stone, *Strategies for Brief Pastoral Counseling* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001).
27. Warberg, Abel, and Osborn, "Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment," 60. See also Gary Schoener, "Preventive and Remedial Boundaries Training for Helping Professionals and Clergy: Successful Approaches and Useful Tools," *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy* 24, no. 4 (1999): 209–217.

SECTION 4

NOT FAR OUTSIDE THE THEME

Twenty years ago, Margot Hover wrote an essay for this journal (then *The Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry*) entitled "Responsibility and Care in the Supervisory Community." It was a candid reflection on a moment when she was threatened with a grievance from the unit of CPE she intended to present to support her certification as a full supervisor. "Our story as a community of professionals involved in the teaching and learning of ministry informs our professional ethics, calling us to mutual accountability and responsibility." Her observations about the importance of mutual accountability among supervisory colleagues in a fragile covenant of peers remain timely.

In this issue, Margot Hover has again examined a difficult topic. How do we identify and supervise students we regard *astoo wounded to heal*? Using a composite case of "Elsie," Hover describes the traits and biographical features common to problematic applicants and then identifies behaviors that emerge after admission. Her aim is not necessarily to screen out *altoo-wounded* applicants. Most supervisors have at one point or another accepted students they later regretted taking but could not, for one reason or another, easily dismiss. "It is difficult to distinguish between 'outside the norm' as creativity and a prophetic voice, on one hand, and pathology on the other" (p. 183). William DeLong's response to the essay raises yet another important question: Is CPE teaching or treating? If it is primarily learning, is CPE limited to a learning style requiring a particular psychological constellation?

One of the recurring themes in this volume of *Reflective Practice* has been mutuality in responsibility and accountability. When this focus on mutuality shifts to the relationship between supervisor and student/intern, it raises questions about authority. Because authority is formed in community, it relies on individuals acknowledging the need to be formed and shaped together in mutual accountability. Paula J. Teague explores the dynamic tension between authority and accountability in a CPE supervisory relationship using a model from 'system-centered therapy.' "Our functioning within a system," Teague proposes, "is determined more by our role as defined by the system than by our person" (p. 205). Within any system, each of us may have several roles defined by context, function, and goal. Because roles change, authority changes as it is shared. And when the authority of the role is shared, so is the accountability.

