

ACPE THEORY PAPER

Chaos, Mutuality, and Paradox as Pathways to Self-Authorship: A Theory of Supervision

Krister White

Summary

I approach the task of supervision in clinical pastoral education with one overarching idea: the only constant you can rely on is the process of change. Themes like interdependence, mutuality, and increasing modes of complexity flow out of my theology, personality, and educational papers. By uniting the pastoral and the prophetic, students in supervision are invited to expand their understanding of pastoral care in order that they might partner with God, me, their peers, and those for whom they care to bring about more just and compassionate holding environments.

PREFACE

The supervisory education process—and specifically the process of writing these position papers—has helped me to see how my theories are so much more than the acquisition and application of ideas to the realm of educating students for ministry. These theories are the culmination of years of hope and despair, creativity and chaos, and agency and receptivity. My theories—like this statement—are intimately personal because I believe all theology is autobiographical. The same could be said about these theory papers. What gives me great excitement and energy moving toward certification is that my story continues, and as it does I presume that my relationship to these ideas will change in turn as I encounter new students, new life events, and new development in how I understand my vocation in the world.

Krister White is ACPE Associate Supervisor at the St. Thomas/Nashville CPE Partnership, St. Thomas Hospital, 4220 Harding Rd., Nashville, TN 37205 (Email: krister.white@stthomas.org).

This article is an abridged version of the theory papers. A complete set of the theory papers is available electronically from the author on request.

Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry

ISSN 2325-2855

© Copyright 2013 *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry*

All rights reserved.

I am a 31-year-old Caucasian, middle-class, heterosexual, married father of one daughter (with another child on the way) who is ordained in the Churches of Christ. The majority of my ministry experience has come as a chaplain in a pediatric hospital. I grew up with parents who were both in the helping professions and as a result I have always had a great deal of respect for the idea of contributing something back to society. It was my support of friends who were struggling with developmental issues that spurred me to think about the possibility of being called to ministry in some capacity. The clarity of that calling was, however, a stickler for me.

As I began to explore my motivation for ministry, it became clear to me that—though I hadn't lived with my parents for years—I needed to begin the difficult yet liberating process of leaving home. Though I love the world of ideas, writing, and other forms that give God's novelty and creativity expression, it was in discovering anew my need for relationship that I encountered the transformative experience of clinical pastoral education (CPE). It was in being faithfully and lovingly supported and challenged by a trusted supervisor during my initial unit that I came to the awareness that I liked who I was becoming as I ministered to people in pain.

The calling I now feel to CPE supervision does not require that I ignore either my intellect or my emotionality and relationality. I can integrate my personal experiences of chaos and creativity as a point of connection with others while encouraging students to become more theologically reflective as they begin their own journeys of integration. Ultimately, I want to be a CPE supervisor because I believe it to be the place where my great passion meets the world's great need. The world needs persons who are willing to join pastoral care with a prophetic intention to transform the structures that create the need for healing in the first place. This transformative process begins with ourselves.

I approach the task of supervision in CPE with one overarching idea: the only constant you can rely on is the process of change. In what follows I will spell out how the themes of interdependence, mutuality, and increasing modes of complexity flow out of my theology, personality, and educational theories as each deals with the dynamic flow of life in relationship. Guided by my desire to unite the pastoral and the prophetic, I am interested in encouraging students to expand their understanding of pastoral care so that they might partner with God, me, their peers, and those for whom they care to bring about more just and compassionate holding environments.

As students confront the powers that have helped form them and that they assist in forming, students' meaning perspectives become more comprehensive and provide the potential for greater empathy with others in ministry. The process of growth in students often mirrors the creation narrative in which God gives form to the formless by taming the chaos (Gen. 1:1-2) to bring about creativity. As students lean into their interdependence, and the inherent disorganization that gives way to something new, they become more adept at establishing relationships of mutuality and developing stature—the capacity to hold increasingly complex contrasts that paradoxically allow students to more effectively minister to people in situations of significant ambiguity. As students encounter transitions in their meaning constructions, they often experience the chaos of letting go of one construction before a more creative, comprehensive one arrives. My role as a supervisor is to provide an environment that confirms, contradicts, and provides continuity as students move through this process.

I am concerned that we understand how culture and institutions influence the development of persons and how persons contribute to preserving the character of these sociocultural holding environments. As students become aware of sociocultural influences in their pastoral practice and identity, they become more likely to operate with mutuality as selves-in-relation. I believe this is the goal of development at the level of interpersonal relationship and a necessity in the provision of “good enough” pastoral care.

Finally, I utilize constructive-developmental theory to address how persons evolve toward greater complexity through the twin desires of being (autonomy) and belonging (inclusion). Assisting students with the acquisition of skills, helping them become more adept interpersonally, and inviting them to replace or rehabilitate unhelpful ways of making meaning are all ways I help students face more creatively the chaos they encounter in ministry. Through the help of their peer group, I challenge students to hold firmly to the paradoxes that exist in their relationships with peers, and in the group a whole, so that they will move both individually and collectively toward greater mutuality and stature in relationship.



A PROCESS APPROACH TO THEOLOGY

My relationship to the Bible has changed over time. In the beginning, Scripture provided certitude in the face of all my questions. Over time and through challenging experiences, I encountered this same scripture from a different perspective. Rather than providing me with answers, the Bible began to ask different questions of me and offered a multiplicity of interpretive possibilities. Scripture is important to me now, not because it solves the mysteries, but because it plunges me deeper into the heart of mystery that is God. Two statements in the book of Genesis serve as springboards for my theoretical positions: Genesis 1:1-2 states, "In the beginning when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth was a formless void and darkness covered the face of the deep, while a wind from God swept over the face of the waters;" and from the second creation account (Genesis 2:18a): "It is not good that the man should be alone." The role of chaos in creation speaks to the formlessness that perpetually gives rise to new form and our ontological relationality speaks to the importance of community for God's co-creative work. *Genesis* speaks to why I believe clinical pastoral education is so vital: it is quite literally about the dynamic process of *becoming*.

WE ARE THE WORLD:
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OUR RELATIONALITY

I am a firm believer that no person is an island. We exist in an interdependent web of relationality that includes God, others, and the created order.¹ Influence flows back and forth among persons, and between God and creation, like a cosmic dance. To take a page out of Paul's writings, we truly are members of one another.² As such, events do not simply evaporate into the ether; rather, every moment—both good and bad—contributes to a collective past that exerts considerable influence on all involved directly and indirectly. This phenomenon is summed up by Whitehead's adage, "The many become one, and are increased by one."³ This view of reality has important implications for how I understand sin and redemption and how it impacts my practice of supervision.

I grew up in a religious tradition that focused heavily on the gravity of personal sin. When I went to college, I was introduced to a more expansive view of sin. I understand systemic sin as the tragic, intractable quality of a world in which the misuse of power between persons over the course of his-

tory seeps into the groundwater of existence impacting all who drink from its wells.⁴ While serving on a mission trip to Honduras this idea became tangible as I spoke with ministers whose congregants were paid pennies on the dollar by various corporations for clothing that would be sold for considerably more in the United States. Sin takes on a different—perhaps more elusive, yet incredibly impactful—quality to a child born into this environment.

One of our interns, Jennifer, came into the office visibly upset from a visit with a teenager who had received a heart transplant. As she told the story, the patient wasn't taking her medicine and seemed to have a death wish. She was angry with the patient and couldn't understand how she could be so selfish. I knew the patient she was referring to and asked Jennifer if she could reflect with me about the patient's situation from a more global perspective. It turned out that the patient's father was in prison, her mother was in and out of her life, and her grandparents were passing responsibility for her care back and forth. She grew up in a poor part of town and never finished high school. She and Jennifer also represented two different ethnicities and cultures. As Jennifer talked more about the patient's context she began to weep. Future visits revealed that the patient was using the money meant for anti-rejection medicines to help her mom pay her rent. Jennifer voiced feeling angry and powerless in the face of the interconnected powers that blunted this young woman's future. The source of Jennifer's anger, however, shifted from this young woman to forces that were beyond her control. Jennifer was more available to offer pastoral support as a result.

A process view of the world challenged Jennifer (and me) to consider the greater context that shapes personal sin and suffering. Given that spiritual care providers are usually sought out in response to experiences of distress, I find that students often become more empathic and compassionate when they consider the tangled web of sin that precipitates suffering. Catherine Keller draws a helpful distinction between the corporate and personal notions of sin: “[F]or all the past sin of the world, however much it infects me and sickens my spirit—I am *not to blame, but responsible*...I am responsible to recognize collective structures of injustice, to recycle my legacy for the better, to resist what *wastes* life and to take part in what *saves*.”⁵ My hope is that as students become more aware of how they are co-opted by systemic sin, they will be more sensitive to God's creative aims in their relationships with careseekers. When we (myself and my students) are collectively more aware of what *has* us, we are better able to relate to and integrate—a move from being *had by* to *having*—the myriad factors that make up who we are and can make decisions that reflect God's desire to make all things new.⁶

Despite the unwieldy power of systemic sin, I believe persons bear the image of God—the “Supremely Related One”—through their participation in relationships marked by authentic mutuality and love. To the extent that persons refuse life in authentic communion they obscure this image. Daniel Day Williams, the theologian whose work helped bridge the gap between existential and process theologies, helps to keep me focused on being response-able to God’s invitation to life in community. He writes, “[People] are not afraid of not existing nearly so much as they are afraid of not being wanted.”⁷ Unlike Williams, I have experienced the struggle on both fronts and don’t see the two as mutually exclusive. What I have found for myself and for my students is that in addition to the “courage to be” we often need the courage to belong. The synergistic relationship between being and belonging is what allows for true mutuality among persons. In the context of pastoral care giving, when students demonstrate courage in living out of their authentic, evolving selves, they are more likely to create hospitable space for those on the receiving end of their care. Similarly, during group process seminars, students experience true belonging only when they are willing to risk revealing their unique individuality through differentiation. This balancing process—of moving back and forth between being and belonging—is often disorienting, but I believe that it reflects another facet of my theology related to the role of chaos in creativity.

GOD BLESS THIS MESS:
THE ROLE OF CHAOS IN CREATIVITY

I remember the first day of my first unit of CPE and how terrified I was, not only by the context of where I would be doing ministry that summer, but also by how different it felt from my seminary experience. My supervisor at the time was helpful by encouraging my peer group to consider our experiences and life histories as another form of knowing that might help us in our ministry in this foreign land. I wasn’t completely ignorant coming into pastoral ministry and the students that I now work with are no different. Some have been through things I can’t imagine, while others initially wonder what they have to offer outside of their formal education. In my experience, the feeling of chaos begets creativity and encourages students to explore boundaries—both personal and interpersonal—that have served to maintain both healthy stability and unhealthy stagnation.⁸ Theologically, Catherine Keller supports this view by suggesting that God created the

world out of chaos—*creatio ex profundis*—rather than out of nothing—*creatio ex nihilo*.⁹ Of the cosmic beginning she writes, “Notice there is no nothingness, but a whole lot of not-quite-somethingness.”¹⁰

Students come to the CPE process with a host of life experiences. The work of pastoral education and supervision necessitates respect for students’ histories. I am not working with blank slates, canvasses upon which I might create something unilaterally. Rather, I see pastoral education as an opportunity to partner with students as they explore how they might more fully embody the *imago Dei* in their relationships with careseekers, colleagues, and peers as they increase their capacity to bring all of who they are to their pastoral relationships. While I am more comfortable in helping students make meaning as they attempt to order the chaos they experience working with suffering children, there are times when I also act as an agent of chaos for the sake of encouraging students’ growth and creative potential.

Kendra was an intern whose pastoral identity was admittedly tied to her desire to please authorities by following the rules. She indicated that she came to CPE only to learn skills and was not interested in learning about herself. Her peers struggled to relate to her due to her difficulty receiving any feedback that wasn’t affirming. This struggle came to a head during mid-unit evaluations when Kendra used her evaluation as a forum to express her anger with her peer group while at the same time calling our attention to the disclaimer at the top of the first page that indicated she did not want to hear any feedback from the group afterwards. Refusing to be in community with her group, Kendra made some disparaging remarks to the group that made me angry. I expressed my anger and frustration with Kendra with her peers present and ended the seminar since she wasn’t interested in feedback. I was nervous that I had created too much chaos by my authentic, passionate response to her presentation, but Kendra sought me out later because she stated that she could tell I was invested in her learning. She was able to make connections between her ways of relating to her peers and how her pastoral visits were going on the floors, which I believe helped her to better claim her growing sense of pastoral identity and authority as the unit progressed.

I believe that God is at work both in bringing order to chaos and in bringing chaos to order for the sake of a more vital creation and—in the context of pastoral supervision—better integrated and more creative pastoral caregivers. The place where God’s desire for new life provides such possibilities is precisely in situations “where there is enough order and enough chaos for what is novel, interesting, creative, and complex to take place.”¹¹ As noted in Kendra’s experience, in addition to students’ relationships with

suffering persons, the group process of CPE provides another setting for this tension to exist. I find that students who wrestle with the inherent chaos of pastoral ministry usually receive a blessing in the process. Often this takes the form of developing greater relational power and a growing capacity to hold increasingly complex contrasts within the self.

AN INVITATION TO BALANCE: BI-POLAR POWER

Having established that persons are created to be in community, that the extent to which we more accurately reflect the image of God depends on our ability to exhibit mutuality, and that chaos promotes creativity, I'd like to examine this through the lens of what Larry Kent Graham calls bi-polar power.¹² Bi-polar power speaks to process theology's claim that God is able to simultaneously be an agent and receptor of influence. Growing up, I never struggled with the idea that God was an agent of influence. That was made abundantly clear. I did not, however, have a sense of whether my life impacted God in anyway. In my personal experiences of grief and in my walking alongside others in their own difficult journeys, it has become imperative for my theology that God is impacted by suffering. I need a God who can give *and* receive. From a biblical perspective, I see this receptive power dynamic at work in the language of the incarnation through which the Christ child receives care, in Jesus' baptism by John the Baptist, and perhaps most strikingly in the characters of Mary and Martha who respectively embody receptive and creative love in showing hospitality to Jesus.

Students come to the CPE process hoping to gain skills in order that they might provide care to families. Often, this care looks more like the shepherd who knows what the sheep need. They create an influence on families by introducing pastoral care services, offering prayer, and providing a theological perspective to families. However, operating primarily out of this frame of reference may cause care seekers to wonder if they have been heard—or received—by the chaplain. Those being cared for may wonder, "Did the chaplain give our emotional context any thought? Because it felt like he was doing a paint-by-numbers pastoral visit." On the other hand, students may be more aligned with a wounded healer approach to ministry that understands how to receive another's story but rarely feels confident in offering anything of substance to the family. Families and patients can only handle the silent, non-anxious presence for so long before they wonder if a chaplain may have

any word that might be of support or comfort to them. In my supervision of students I find that many will operate out of one of these orientations at the expense of the other. My goal through supervision is to wonder with students about how they are using their power and whether they might provide more balanced pastoral care by leaning toward their less pronounced orientation.

Bethany, a 60 year old Zimbabwean nun, came to the CPE process understandably cautious about her engagement of patients, families, and her peer group. She shared that part of her cultural heritage includes a commitment to not looking other persons in the eye out of respect. She also noted that specific to her personality she struggled to speak her mind when she felt angry or when she desired to challenge others. As the unit began, Bethany was quick to accept others' comments and questions as true without offering much resistance or self-definition. She also kept to herself when her peers were presenting or discussing something in verbatim or the interpersonal relations group. My supervisory intervention was to invite Bethany to consider how her comfort with receptivity might be challenged by taking the risk to show more initiative in her pastoral work and with her peers. Bethany, who had been feeling disquieted by her struggle to speak and differentiate, practiced this new behavior in her group, which also began to come out in her visitation. Paradoxically, as she was able to speak to her anger and be more active in the group, she felt more at peace and better able to offer compassionate, balanced care to patients and families on the floor.

This dynamic plays out in group life as well. A recent summer group took a while to come together primarily because they struggled to receive feedback from one another. Everyone was giving feedback, operating out of one-dimensional power, but they were less open to truly receiving one another until Steven, a rabbinical student in his early thirties, voiced displeasure with how the group was functioning. His comment, "It feels like we're all talking but nobody seems to be listening," seemed to strike a chord with his peers who had been working on listening skills the week before. To use a sports analogy, the groups' lack of relational mutuality was similar to a game of tennis. As soon as the ball reached one side of the court it was hit back across the net. Bi-polar power in the group would have looked more like a game of catch where one must hold the ball long enough in the glove before throwing it back to the other. The tenor of the group changed after his remark. They put down their rackets and took up their gloves.

As it applies to my supervision of students, I hope to strike a balance between my agency and receptivity in the hope that students will take their experience of my pastoral supervision and translate it to their own pastoral care relationships. In my thinking, this balance of power is what distin-

guishes between appropriate spiritual guidance and spiritual authoritarianism and between healthy empathy and boundary-blurring enmeshment. Mutuality is what transpires when these features are incarnated in relationship. Within the boundaries of the supervisory relationship, there are times when mutuality is neither preferable nor possible, as my interaction with Kendra demonstrated above. Chaos and mutuality are unlikely bedfellows, but they both serve to enhance creativity and novelty. Despite this caveat, I believe that God is most fully present in the hospitable space created by mutual relationship. As students move toward a more relational balance of power in their provision of care they open themselves up to greater paradox—and thus the possibility for more chaos and creativity—which provides an opportunity to develop a more robust view of the world and their role as representatives of God amidst such mystery.

GROWING PAINS: THE REALIZATION OF STATURE

As students begin to reach their own limits and experience things that are beyond the scope of their meaning making structures (whether it is the death of a child, the nonsensical nature and injustice of child abuse, or the mystery of the organ transplantation process for children) they are faced with the need to increase their capacity to hold contrasts—the epitome of paradox—as a way of being able to face the chaos of life without disintegrating. The process of increasing one's stature is a lifelong process that is never fully complete. Bernard Loomer describes stature—or size—as “the volume of life you can take into your being and still maintain your integrity and individuality; the intensity and variety of outlook you can entertain in the unity of your being without feeling defensive or insecure.”¹³ As it relates to the practice of ministry I can think of no better description for the kind of transformative experience that awaits students who thrust themselves headlong into the wonderfully awe/full world of ministry. Joy and grief, hope and despair, life and death all vie for control in student and supervisor alike. In the world of clinical ministry, practitioners can experience each of these in the scope of one visit. As a supervisor, I see my role as one who supports and challenges students to maintain their connection to both poles on the continuum, not because I am sadistic but because I believe it is only in experiencing both together that true transformation takes place, for “change happens at the edge of chaos.”¹⁴ If students can begin to hold these contrasts,

they will be better equipped to function as persons with authority. They will run and not grow weary. They will be persons of sufficient size capable of operating with bi-polar power as they give form to the formless so that they might co-create a better world, one relationship at a time

NOTES

1. John B. Cobb and David Ray Griffin, *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), 82; Larry Kent Graham, *Care of Persons, Care of Worlds: A Psychosystems Approach to Pastoral Care and Counseling* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1992), 49.
2. Ephesians 4:25
3. Alfred North Whitehead, David Ray Griffin, and Donald W. Sherburne, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, Corrected ed., Gifford Lectures (New York: Free Press, 1978), 121.
4. Catherine Keller, *On the Mystery: Discerning Divinity in Process* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008), 80.
5. *Ibid.*, 82.
6. See 2 Corinthians 5:17 and Revelation 21:5.
7. Daniel Day Williams, *The Spirit and the Forms of Love* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 146.
8. In process theology God is considered to be the ground of novelty. Growth and change is considered normative in this view of the God/human relationship. Comparatively, stagnation is akin to triviality in process theology and something that participates in evil. See Graham, *Care of Persons, Care of Worlds*, 49–69.
9. See Catherine Keller, *Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming* (London: Routledge, 2003); Keller, *On the Mystery: Discerning Divinity in Process*, 45–67.
10. Keller, *On the Mystery: Discerning Divinity in Process*, 48.
11. Catherine Keller, "No More Sea: The Lost Chaos of the Eschaton," in *Christianity and Ecology: Seeking the Well-Being of Earth and Humans*, Dieter T. Hessel and Rosemary Radford Ruether, eds. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 194–195.
12. Graham, *Care of Persons, Care of Worlds*, 63–64. For a more in depth look at this conception of power see Bernard Loomer, "Two Conceptions of Power," *Process Studies* 6, no. 1 (1976): 5–32.
13. Bernard Loomer, "S-I-Z-E Is the Measure," in *Religious Experience and Process Theology*, Harry James Cargas and Bernard Lee, eds. (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 70.
14. Keller, *On the Mystery*, 85.



PERSONALITY THEORY

I begin with the belief that persons are relational beings in process. The notion of an isolated, individualistic self that exists outside of relationship—with others and with culture—is oxymoronic to how I understand persons both theologically and psychologically. One cannot become a self without participation in relationship. Similar to my theological position that begins with an examination of our macro-relationality, my personality position begins from an expansive view that takes culture and institutions as starting points in the developmental process of persons by looking at the work of social theorist Ian Burkitt. Janet Surrey's self-in-relation theory meets the need for an explicitly situated interpersonal relationality as the context and goal of development. She sees development occurring through—not in spite of—our relationships while holding up the importance of developing relational mutuality. Defined as the capacity to both empower and be empowered, Surrey's emphasis bears a resemblance to bi-polar power in my theological position. Finally, to help elaborate on the dynamic—and often chaotic/creative—process of human development, I utilize the constructive-developmental theory of Robert Kegan who serves as my primary personality theorist.

SOCIAL SELFHOOD

My theological position is that we are formed by forces beyond our control (where we're born, who our parents are, and how we experience or learn racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, and any other "ism" that shapes the society we know). Because our freedom, while very real, is circumscribed by a multiplicity of factors, how do personality theorists address the formative role of culture and institutions as developmental backdrops for interpersonal relationships? As Walter Wink suggests, such forces—what he calls "the powers"—are quite formative and appear to have a life of their own.¹ Social theorist Ian Burkitt sets "the powers" and individuality in a dialectical relationship so that the direction of influence between society and developing persons moves back and forth. According to Burkitt, persons are not exact replicas of their sociocultural heritage, nor does their development take place completely removed from such influences. Instead, influence flows back and forth through relationships with persons who are situated within and informed by larger contexts.²

Relationships with people from a variety of social locations have helped me to become aware of my largely unnoticed privilege as a middle-

class, Caucasian, heterosexual male. As a supervisor, I see one of my tasks as raising students' and my own awareness to the powers and principalities that serve to shape our development and patterns of relationship. Developmentally significant powers including social class, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation, in addition to other power structures that fall outside the lines of such categories, each tell stories that inform my relationships with students and colleagues. Recognizing our embeddedness in the social locations we represent, are shaped by, and help to shape, moves us in a direction where we are both less likely to use power inappropriately or to operate obliviously in defining persons without regard for how our respective social locations serve to color our vision of the other. Burkitt supports my experience and supervisory practice as he notes that persons are social beings and "that behind even the most personal of actions and emotions there stands social relations and the power structure."³

While I was supervising Larry, a 53-year-old Latino Lutheran male, I was becoming frustrated with what I considered to be a lack of pastoral authority on his part, both in his ministry on the floors and in his interaction with his peers. I realized that I was embodying a capitalist culture that is often more interested in results than in processes. I brought this up one day in individual supervision by asking him to tell me about how his culture influences his pastoral identity, and as he told me his story I began to understand that what I was calling a lack of authority was a manifestation of his upbringing in a culture that prizes respect. As he explained it to me, the need to respect others, especially members of the dominant class, was both a function of his parents' teaching—and more importantly—a way of survival in a culture that is largely inhospitable to the presence of immigrants. By becoming aware of the "power structure" that lurked behind our otherwise cordial educational relationship, I came to a place of understanding that cast Larry in a completely different light. As a result, our relationship shifted, and he began to invite me into his world. He also began to become more interactive in the group and took more ownership in his ministry on the floors as he began to use himself more in his visits.

When I encounter diversity in my students, speaking to the unspoken sociocultural dynamics that play out in our relationships helps me to be aware of how my assumptions and those of the student interact to create a synergy that informs all of our learning together. My hope is that shining light on the dynamic itself will be mutually educational and will allow each of us to operate from a place of greater vulnerability and consideration of the other.

SELF-IN-RELATION

Growing up in a culture that lifts up self-sufficiency as one of the guiding virtues of male development, I never gave a second thought to my tendency to work, emotionally process, and make decisions by myself. I had succeeded most of my life operating out of this disconnected frame, but as one of Samuel Shem's characters in the novel *Fine* notes, "Men find a way to relate, when they see that their lives depend on it."⁴ I came to CPE with an underdeveloped sense of what real relationship looked like and I continue along this journey toward supervisory certification, in part, because I have found a place where I experience mutuality with a trusted group of colleagues who are as committed to my growth as I am to theirs.

Janet Surrey's self-in-relation theory speaks to me on an emotional level. She assumes that persons—specifically women—develop in relationship with others and that the goal of development is toward increased relationality rather than separation.⁵ For Surrey and the other Stone Center theorists, who we are and who we become occurs through the interactivity and space between persons. It is impossible to be a self outside of relationship. Moreover, our individuality and distinctness are heightened by being more relational. This becomes especially important in the context of group supervision when some students would rather observe the process than take the very real risk of becoming known by giving voice to one's experience and feelings. While these students may know others, their difficulty becoming known gets in the way of establishing a relationship marked by intersubjectivity, which Surrey defines as "the ongoing, intrinsic inner awareness and responsiveness to the continuous existence of the other or others and the expectation of mutuality in this regard."⁶ I try to establish a relationship of mutuality with students because I am convinced that both student and supervisor have much to learn from one another. Although there will always be power dynamics at play that mitigate true mutuality, that does not mean that I can't move toward students to create a healthier balance of power and influence. That influence goes both ways is important for my practice of supervision and my view of human development.

Nancy was a 58-year-old, Caucasian Church of Christ female who was finishing her studies at a local seminary when she joined our extended unit group. She struggled with her place in a religious tradition that would not ordain her and began to risk sharing her conflicted feelings with me in supervision. The fact that we shared the same faith heritage made our relationship more complex. I was struck by her courage as she shared first

her grief and later her anger at a tradition that would allow her to minister to children and women but not to men. I was moved to tears by her experience and shared my own grief about being ordained by the same tradition that caused her so much pain. While I could not do anything to change her situation, the fact that I allowed it to impact me and inform my ongoing development was helpful to Nancy and to our supervisory relationship. Acting out of my “self-in-relation” perspective provided Nancy a different experience of male authority from her religious tradition; one that sought connection rather than separation. Before the end of the unit we both affirmed the other’s calling as an intimate act of mutuality.

The self-in-relation view of persons supports my practice by sharing my humanity with students as I continue moving toward the reality that I *am* because of my relationships and that I will continue to *become* so long as I impact and am impacted by others.⁷ This evolving notion of selfhood is precisely what Robert Kegan writes about in his constructive-developmental approach to personality development.

EVOLUTIONARY SELFHOOD

The other day I was reading from a prayer journal I kept during college and almost couldn’t believe how I made sense of the world at that time in my life. Looking back, my thinking seemed so naïve—almost magical—yet it retained a quality of simplicity that I sometimes wish I could get back. However, I can no longer look through the old lenses that once helped me make sense of my life and expect to be able to see with the same clarity as before. Robert Kegan explains this shift as an emergence from a culture of embeddedness, an alteration in one’s subject-object relationship. For example, children move from *being* their impulses to *having* impulses. They move from an embeddedness in a particular construction of the world and emerge, through differentiation, with a new subjectivity. What was subject—the impulse—becomes something one can relate to as object and a new subject emerges that is broader in scope. Through this ongoing process of recognizing what is “not me,” an individual’s embeddedness in a particular worldview begins to shift, which then allows her to relate to the object as she transitions to increasingly complex orders of mind.

From a constructive-developmental perspective, becoming more complex is an inherently chaotic-creative process. It requires that one’s current manner of making meaning give way to a new construction that literally threatens one’s sense of self. Crises and other problems in living that may result from such a threat are understood as evidence of evolutionary move-

ment rather than personal deficit. One of the most attractive features of Kegan's work for me is his refusal to attribute pathology to persons who are struggling to make meaning. Instead, he considers such painful events to be evidence that we are experiencing the dynamic motion of life itself and are likely involved in a shift toward another order of mind or way of constructing meaning. I have found great freedom and hope in Kegan's respectful sense of wonder at how the power of the experience of developmental motion can have the effect of creating strong *e/motion*.⁸ As a supervisor, being able to understand my own experience in light of Kegan's observations helps to shape my posture toward students' difficulties in ways that avoid blame or avoid an overzealous desire to interpret their experience for them.

Before I go on to describe how Kegan further informs my pastoral supervision, it may be useful to give the reader a brief overview of his stages of development/orders of mind. The first two orders of mind are part of childhood, while the latter three generally occur during and following the transition to adolescence on through adulthood. In the first order of mind (the impulsive self), the child is embedded in her impulses. There is no distinction between how she views or experiences the world and how the world actually is. This begins to shift in the middle of childhood when the child moves toward having and controlling impulses rather than being identified with them. What was subject—the impulse—now becomes object and a new subject emerges. During this second order of mind (the imperial self) children are embedded in—and therefore subject to—their wishes and needs. Children at this order of mind are at a place similar to concrete operational thinking (Piaget) in that they do not yet have the capacity to begin to think abstractly.

The movement toward the third order of mind (the interpersonal self) ushers in adolescence and continues into adulthood. It involves a shift to more abstract modes of thinking and a form of meaning making where importance lies in connection to others and the need to conform to group expectations or other external authorities. People at this order now recognize that they have wishes and needs, but those needs do not define them. This opens up space for mutuality in relationship with others.

The transition toward the fourth order of mind (the institutional self) is marked by a growing capacity to differentiate from one's identification with one's relationships, values, and ideals so that one might relate to each of them on a more complex level. That is, persons begin to grasp the ability to define themselves—to literally engage in self-authorship—and develop

an ideology that allows them to begin to make judgments between what may be competing value commitments.⁹

The fifth order of mind in Kegan's writing (the inter-individual self) describes persons who are able to move beyond self-authorship—the previous subjective enterprise—and enter into authentic interdependence with others. Like the previous movement between the third and fourth orders, this shift asks persons to see how our radically relational world—even when those relationships are beyond our conscious awareness—contributes to our sense of self.¹⁰ It is a movement toward paradox, toward the both/and, toward being better able to hold the tensions between various positions, beliefs, and experiences without collapsing them. It is about the development of stature.

While the stages provide a helpful taxonomy for development, I believe it's more important to attend to how persons experience the evolutionary process itself, as opposed to focusing on the details of the stages when working with students in CPE.¹¹ It is highly unlikely that students will undergo complete stage transitions in the course of a single unit of CPE, but there is a significant likelihood as they minister with suffering persons that they will experience their own crises of meaning that will move them further along the bridge that is anchored on the other side of their evolutionary balance. To support such movement, I see the CPE process as providing a unique culture of embeddedness where students experience the three features of all good holding environments: confirmation, contradiction, and continuity.¹² As students experience chaos in their own lives or in the lives of those for whom they care, I consider it my pastoral and educational responsibility to confirm them by holding on with them through compassionate engagement as their current meaning making structures are threatened. As students begin to move toward differentiating from one mode of meaning making, I see my role as beginning to let go either through direct contradiction or by mirroring students' own letting go process. Finally, as they undergo the transition from one order to another order, I hope to stay in place to provide some continuity for students as they begin to integrate what "before was confused with the self."¹³

Some students come to CPE at a transitional point where they have begun the process of letting go of one self-construction without knowing what awaits them on the other side. Mark's experience provides a window into what this looks like in my supervision.

Mark, a 44-year-old British-American Caucasian male in the ordination process for the Presbyterian Church USA, came to supervision struggling with holding on to his love for academic theology and his allegiance to his own

denomination's views while at the same time experiencing dissonance in what he was experiencing with the suffering and death of children during his clinical work. He talked of feeling like he didn't know what he believed or who he was anymore. His interest in theodicy as an intellectual enterprise was giving way to an experiential knowing. He began to talk about how one's beliefs really didn't make much difference in the long run. I experienced his expression of chaos as an authentic wrestling with his culture of embeddedness, that he was experiencing something of an emergency—that is, that Mark was emerging from his own subjectivity—and was beginning to reflect on and evaluate the emphases passed down to him from other places of authority. I could see the pain in his expression and felt the internal tug to try to normalize, identify, or “fix” his experience—but that kind of intervention would have shifted my focus to his anxiety rather than to Mark, who was clearly in the middle of an important, creative evolution in his sense of self. I decided to sit with him and confirm his experience of disorientation. Holding Mark's experience as evidence that something important was happening, we joined together in a trusting wonderment about where this movement was taking him in his developing identity as a minister.

I believe in the evolutionary process that carries students along the path toward greater personal and pastoral identity and authority. I am buoyed by my hope that the Source of relationship and change will continue to invite each of us to move beyond where we are for the sake of co-creating a more hopeful future for ourselves, for our relationships, and for the cultures and institutions that hold us all.

NOTES

1. Walter Wink, *The Powers That Be: Theology for a New Millennium*, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1998).
2. Ian Burkitt, *Social Selves: Theories of the Social Formation of Personality* (London: Sage Publications, 1991), 189–216.
3. *Ibid.*, 211.
4. Samuel Shem, *Fine* (New York: Dell Press, 1985), as cited in Stephen Bergman and the Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies, Wellesley College, Working Paper Series, “Men's Psychological Development: A Relational Perspective,” *Work in Progress* 48 (1991), accessed April 15, 2013, <http://www.jbmti.org/pdf/48sc.pdf>.
5. Judith V. Jordan, Alexandra G. Kaplan, Jean Baker Miller, Irene P. Stiver, and Janet L. Surrey, *Women's Growth in Connection: Writings from the Stone Center* (New York: Guilford Press, 1991), 52–53.
6. *Ibid.*, 61.

7. Surrey's (and the other Stone Center writers) emphasis on mutuality is similar to my theological position grounded in a process notion of bipolar power. This is the ability to be both assertive/creative and sensitive/receptive in relationship.
8. Robert Kegan, *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 81.
9. Kegan's earlier work creates the impression that this evolutionary process necessarily entails movement away from relationship, but his later writing reveals that movement toward self-authorship need not be equated with isolationism or disconnection. See Robert Kegan, *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 217–230. This is precisely what Janet Surrey proposes in her self-in-relation theory of development as relationship-differentiation. See Jordan et al., *Women's Growth in Connection*, 59–60.
10. Kegan, *In Over Our Heads*, 307–355. Kegan also considers this a movement toward the postmodern. Process and liberation theology serve as good examples of what the fifth order of consciousness might look like when applied to theological reflection.
11. An important caveat in light of Kegan's schematic is that there is nothing about the stages themselves that makes a person inherently better or even more intelligent or moral based on a higher stage of development. However, some orders of mind are more inclusive in their ability to take into consideration a greater number of factors and may be more suitable for the demands of an increasingly complex world. Kegan is aware of the dangers of offering a normative theory as he notes, "We had all better check whether what may even appear to be an 'objective' theory is not in reality a tool or captive of a 'ruling' group (such as white people, men, Westerners) who use the theory to preserve their advantaged position." See Kegan, *In Over Our Heads*, 229.
12. Kegan, *The Evolving Self*, 121–132.
13. *Ibid.*, 129.



LEARNING THEORY

As a new father I have experienced a host of feelings as my daughter changes before my eyes. I was terrified to hold her in my arms the day she was born. I have often wondered if my parenting will be "good enough." At the same time, I love being a father and trust that I already have what it takes. I marvel at her ability to create meaning and make connections as she leans into her limitations and develops new awareness and skills. I want her to learn, but more importantly, I want her to *want* to learn. But if I speak from my deepest desire, I hope that Marin will be the kind of person whose knowledge is more akin to wisdom than to the acquisition of information. As a pastoral educator, my hopes for students—and for myself—are not unlike those for my daughter. I am committed to journeying with students as

they are engaged in their own evolving self-constructions by learning pastoral skills and by attending to the more nuanced learning at the edge of chaos that leads to wisdom and transformation.

In my approach to pastoral education these twin motivations—the acquisition and application of theory and skills, coupled with a focus on personal development—align with my theology of bi-polar power (one's ability to both create and receive influence) and the development of stature (the ability to hold increasingly complex paradoxes in the self). When students *receive* new ideas and diverse persons, while retaining sufficient *agency* to respond either to the content or process that takes place in the space in between the two, there is movement toward bi-polar power and learning. As evolving selves-in-relation, learners are on a journey of development that moves beyond their capacity to hold information. It taps into that sacred place where passion, empathy, and wisdom take root as we develop new and more comprehensive ways of seeing that allow us to better hold the myriad tensions and paradoxes in a complex and interdependent world. I serve as a mentor to those who begin such a journey in the context of CPE by offering support, challenge, and vision.¹ This journey is aided by the peer group as students are faced with paradoxes in the life of their group that both confirm and contradict their developing pastoral identity, authority, and competency. In simple terms, education is about change. Change invites both educator and student to risk in relationship and asks that they be open to their own transformation in the process.

INSTRUMENTAL, COMMUNICATIVE, AND EMANCIPATORY LEARNING IN CPE

Students begin a unit of CPE with a variety of motivations. Some students are required to complete CPE as part of their ordination process, others use it to fulfill degree requirements, while still others embark upon this kind of learning because they believe that it will benefit their ministry or process of discernment. With these different motivations in mind, I encourage students to suspend their disbelief—often brought about through the horror stories they've heard from peers or the natural resistance brought about by any new experience—long enough to consider that they may undergo some kind of positive change during and after the course of their time in CPE.

Most students expect to change one way or another and I invite students to document their hopes along these lines through the use of the learning contract. Sharing these goals and the strategies by which they commit to address-

ing them provides an added layer of accountability for following through on their intentions when they are presented to a group of one's peers and supervisor. For students in their initial unit of CPE, it's not unusual for goals to be related to acquiring skills and sufficient theoretical knowledge to support their practice of ministry. Other goals tend to fall into categories related to more relational ways of being, such as, "I want to begin to speak more confidently in the group environment," or "I want to learn how to empower others rather than overpower them." Jack Mezirow calls these respective domains *instrumental learning* and *communicative learning*.² Both forms are essential to the educational process of CPE as both personal experience—in testing the validity or benefits of one's beliefs or new skills—and consensual validation serve the learning process in a complementary fashion. For example, when we ask students to learn to tell Godly Play stories³ to children in the hospital, most of their anxiety falls upon the details of learning the scripts and gathering the courage to risk being rejected by the patient in their offering to share a story. To be sure, there is an important amount of instrumental learning in this process, but as students begin to loosen their death grip on the stories themselves they become open to communicative learning through which they can reflect with the supervisor or peers about what they are experiencing in themselves as they tell these stories. Not unlike the move from applying listening skills in pastoral visits to allowing one's self to enter into the world of the other, instrumental and communicative learning are important for their applicability to pastoral education. A third learning domain that holds the most promise for students in CPE is *emancipatory learning*, which "impels us, through reflection, to identify and challenge distorted meaning perspectives."⁴

When I think back to my first experience of CPE, I remember being both excited and terrified at the thought of trying to apply the knowledge I was learning in seminary to the "living human documents" I would encounter in the hospital. However, my embedded theology began to reach its practical limits almost immediately. As a result, my learning was much more chaotic and uncomfortably inductive than anything I had encountered in my education up to that point. As a supervisor I encounter similar experiences in students who come to CPE with what Mezirow calls "uncritically assimilated habits of expectation."⁵ These meaning schemes may come in the form of "how the world works," what one believes about oneself, one's conception of how God works in the world, etc. Some meaning perspectives are less trustworthy than others and may prove unhelpful as students encounter the "other," whether at the bedside of a patient or across the room in the context of a group process

seminar. What makes the clinical method of learning so meaningful is that the process of evaluating and transforming such mind-sets is connected to practical experience situated in the context of holding environments—including the CPE program, the supervisory relationship, and the peer group. These containers serve to assist students in practicing, reporting on their practice, reflecting with a group of peers, evaluating their own ministry and mind-set, and then acting again in light of that process of reflective discourse.⁶

Larry came to the CPE process as a result of a denominational requirement. He had grown up Catholic, but around the middle of his life he transitioned to the Lutheran church (ELCA) where he was functioning as a solo pastor for a Spanish-speaking congregation in town. He approached the CPE process with the assumption that he was bringing God into the room in each of his visits. As he presented a verbatim to his peers in which he referenced this assumption in his reflection, I—along with his peers—wondered with him about how he understood God’s presence and activity and how his view may have been related to the authority he held leading six worship services every weekend. Larry was quick to discount these concerns and continued acting out of this assumption until he met a situation where he encountered God in the face of a dying child. He presented his experience to the group in IPR and said he no longer believed that he brought God in the room but that he was beginning to entertain the idea that he met the Divine in different ways in each of his visits. He voiced feeling less pressure in his visits as a result of this shift.

For students like Larry, the process of transforming one’s frame of reference is emancipatory precisely because it liberated him from ways of “seeing” that limited his options in offering pastoral care.⁷ Although Larry seemed to take this reconstruction in stride, transformative learning “is often an intensely threatening emotional experience,”⁸ as the price paid for creativity is the momentary experience of chaos.⁹ While I appreciate Mezirow’s emphasis on transformative learning as it applies to altering unhelpful habits of expectation, I have found that not all students are capable of the same levels of reflection and that, while each student may be self-directed in her learning, the type of self she is directing is another thing altogether.¹⁰

THE ROLE OF DEVELOPMENT IN PASTORAL EDUCATION

Eleanor Drago-Severson’s work in adult education—which takes its cues from Robert Kegan’s understanding of human development—has been insightful in helping me understand different learners. She focuses her theo-

retical material around the three most common developmental orientations of adult learners: the *instrumental*, the *socializing*, and the *self-authoring*.¹¹

Instrumental-oriented persons have a “what-do-you-have-that-can-help-me/what-do-I-have-that-can-help-you perspective of life.”¹² They are students who want to know what’s expected of them, who learn the “rules” and stick close to the script, and who are more comfortable in the world of either/or, right/wrong dualisms. These students are unable to hold the tension between their own perspective and that of another person and are largely led by their own self-interests to fulfill concrete goals and objectives. Socializing learners are able to be more abstract in their thinking and can take into account the needs of others unlike instrumental learners. For socializing learners, however, other people become the means by which they receive approval and validation. For example, if a student in this way of knowing receives a challenging comment from a peer or supervisor they are unable to consult themselves to test its validity and tend to accept it at face value. These students tend to avoid expressing anger for fear that it may negatively impact their relationships. External authority is important to these students, as they tend to move toward shame when they receive criticism. Belonging is also important to persons in this orientation.

Self-authoring students, unlike socializing learners, are not “‘made up by’ someone or something outside themselves.”¹³ They move from being subject to their relationships to gaining perspective on their relationships (as object) to order the impact of others’ feedback based on an internal authority. These students can judge their performance for themselves based on internal values and self-expectations. Students in this orientation are also capable of holding simultaneous contradictory emotions or thoughts without feeling like their integrity is being compromised. From the vantage point of my theological position related to the notion of bi-polar power, instrumental learners are generally focused on their own agency at the expense of their receptivity. Socializing learners are generally focused on their receptivity at the expense of their agency. Self-authoring learners are able to balance both their agency and receptivity and thus become adept at operating with bi-polar power. As it applies to educating students with their development in mind, I see my role as one who supports and challenges students to continue their movement toward the next way of knowing. My work with Sharon helps to illustrate how I use this in supervision.

Sharon, previously the president of a successful company, came to the CPE process unsure of herself. Being in the role of chaplain was her first

practical ministry experience outside of seminary. She approached her learning in CPE with a keen ability to listen to her peers and to patients, families, and staff in the hospital and seemed to relish the time to soak in any feedback she received from me as her supervisor. I recognized that she operated primarily out of a socializing learning mode and decided to work toward affirming any movement she made toward self-authorship. When she would ask me what I thought about her pastoral interventions, rather than play into her hyper-receptivity, I challenged her to listen to what her inner voice was telling her. When she came to me frustrated about how she felt the group was functioning, I challenged her to risk speaking her voice even if it was an unpopular position. When she managed the courage to confront her peers, they reacted defensively toward her. Nevertheless, Sharon came to supervision the next week full of excitement as she had begun moving toward an inner authority.

Approaching students with developmental considerations in mind also helps me to be a more patient supervisor. I have to consider whether “resistance” to learning is truly a feature of the learner or a function of what I am expecting from the learner that may be at odds with a student’s developmental orientation to the world. In the event that resistance to learning is not a result of this incompatibility, I find Kegan and Lahey’s work on “immunity to change” helpful as they understand resistance as evidence of competing commitments that are ultimately set in place as a form of self-protection.¹⁴ When I sense students’ “immune systems” responding to a troubling didactic, challenging group process seminar, or a difficult clinical experience, I honor the difficulty and compassionately engage them in dialogue in hopes of drawing them out of the experience so that—in gaining some distance from it—they can relate to it and integrate it for the sake of their provision of pastoral care. Ultimately, the goal is for students to practice self-supervision so that they will become more aware of the assumptions with which they are fused in order to be more available in their pastoral care to the other. Thankfully I am not on this educational journey by myself. The group and the myriad paradoxes that exist within its boundaries also assist students’ learning.

PARADOXICAL GROUP LEARNING

As students enter groups, they struggle with what Kegan refers to as the desire to be both included and autonomous. Smith and Berg believe that these desires work together in group formation. They note that “the only way for a group to become a group is for its members to express their individuality... and that the only way for individuals to become fully individuated is for them

to accept and develop more fully their connections to the group."¹⁵ One way I encourage this is by inviting students to tell their life stories in the form of parable boxes. I model vulnerability and risk by sharing my story the week before they share their own stories. Paradoxically, this curriculum actually promotes the safety that group members crave and it requires significant risk in order to happen. When group members' identities become more complex and their difference becomes more pronounced, group cohesion becomes more likely.

As our Godly Play curriculum suggests, boundaries and rules are necessary in order for play to be meaningful. Group life is no different. While the group may provide therapeutic benefits that serve to support students' learning, I am clear that the purpose of our time together is for the development of self-awareness and transformation for the sake of providing more competent and reflective pastoral care as opposed to healing deep-seated problems in living. Keeping the group's attention to their purpose for gathering—to promote one another's learning and to support their respective learning goals—helps to keep the process as clean as possible.

When groups reach moments of stuckness, I move toward that which provokes anxiety as a way to engage the paradox. Similarly, I challenge students to hold their own experience of tension including the paradoxes of belonging (identity, involvement, individuality, and boundaries), engaging (disclosure, trust, intimacy, and regression), and speaking (authority, dependency, creativity, and courage).¹⁶ My hope is that students will hold these paradoxes in tension not only to increase their own stature but the stature of the group as well. As stature increases, students are more available to others as they become capable of greater empathy and engagement. The group as a whole becomes a place where confirmation, contradiction, and continuity provide a supportive culture of embeddedness.

THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN EDUCATION

In the interview and selection process I am committed to creating groups with as much diversity as possible since "the single greatest source of growth and development is the experience of difference, discrepancy, anomaly."¹⁷ Kegan's understanding of cultures of embeddedness includes the multiplicity of cultures that often hold students captive to a particular way of viewing the world. When students encounter others who don't share their socially constructed assumptions—whether connected to ethnicity, race, social location, gender, or sexual orientation—they are faced with a dangerous opportunity

to practice humility by distancing themselves from their “family religion” to consider other ways of seeing the world. This distancing process is connected both to emancipatory learning and to the development of self-authorship, for as students reflect on problematic habits of mind in the context of diverse relationships they become more aware of the spectacles they bring to their “seeing” and less likely to continue using unhelpful lenses. Throwing off the old lenses, students begin to truly engage in self-authorship. On a practical level, when students take cultural differences into account in their ministry, it allows them to distinguish between communicational impasses that naturally occur in any relationship and those that are the result of divergent, culturally based assumptions running up against one another. To act effectively with bi-polar power in the context of cultural difference, I encourage students to explore the limitations of their own worldviews by listening to how others’ experiences give form to different constructions of reality that require more inclusive, humble, and flexible ways of relating and offering pastoral care.

EVALUATION

With the myriad factors influencing students’ education, my assessment of their learning is guided by a dual focus on students’ learning goals and self-evaluations and by what I have observed during the unit. Rather than offering the majority of my feedback to students at the end of the unit, I consider my evaluation of their work to be an active and evolving part of the students’ learning throughout the unit. As such, there should not be any surprises in my final evaluation of the student. Instead, the final evaluation is—not unlike a student’s own developmental process—the integrative, accumulative sum of what they experienced during that concentrated time in their pastoral education, including both the students’ strengths and areas for future growth. Finally, The Association for Clinical Pastoral Education *Standards Manual*—with its clearly delineated objectives and outcomes—helps to keep my assessment on task and accountable not only to my center but also to the organization as a whole. At the end of the day, the lasting mark will always be how students interact in relationship with other ideas, other persons, and their own history as they give form to the formless through an ongoing synthesis of their learning in CPE once they have left this holding environment. My hope is that our work together reverberates with the Divine call to creativity, development, and transformation in the service of the world we dream of and dare to help bring into being through our care.

NOTES

1. Laurent A. Daloz, *Mentor: Guiding the Journey of Adult Learners*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999), 31.
2. Jack Mezirow, *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991), 72–86; and “Learning to Think Like an Adult: Core Concepts of Transformation Theory,” in *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*, Jack Mezirow and Associates, eds. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000), 8–10.
3. The cornerstone of the curriculum at Children’s Medical Center Dallas is Godly Play by Jerome Berry. One of the ways we incorporate this curriculum is to have our students tell their life stories in the form of a parable box similar to what Berryman developed in his work to help provide language to children to give voice to existential experiences including death, freedom, aloneness, and the need to make meaning.
4. Mezirow, *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*, 87.
5. *Ibid.*, 4.
6. Mezirow, *Learning as Transformation*, 10–16.
7. From the perspective of my theological position, God is the source of novelty and creativity in the process of change.
8. Mezirow, *Learning as Transformation*, 6.
9. This is not to say that important learning cannot take place without the experience of disorientation, for there are certainly times when a new perspective provides welcome relief and understandable excitement.
10. Robert Kegan, *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 271–304.
11. Eleanor Drago-Severson, *Becoming Adult Learners: Principles and Practices for Effective Development* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004), 23.
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*, 27.
14. Robert Kegan and Lisa Laskow Lahey, *Immunity to Change: How to Overcome It and Unlock the Potential in Yourself and Your Organization* (Boston: Harvard Business Press, 2009).
15. Kenwyn K. Smith and David N. Berg, *Paradoxes of Group Life: Understanding Conflict, Paralysis, and Movement in Group Dynamics*, 1st ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987), 100.
16. *Ibid.*, 89–151.
17. Kegan, *In Over Our Heads*, 210.