

Of A Certain Age: Supervising the Next Generation

Jonathan W. Ball
Amani D. Legagneur

Summary

When issues around generational difference arise, as they do with Millennials, there is an opportunity to illuminate the values, assumptions, and beliefs of both the student and the supervisor. We understand transformative supervision arises from a sustained empathic inquiry and connection with a student.

THE THING ABOUT MILLENNIALS

“Wow, these kids today are really great and worthy of our respect. We could learn much from them!” Sound familiar? If not, you may find yourself oriented to the stereotypical experience of an older generation underestimating its ability to relate to and learn from a younger one. There is something about age that can be a natural barrier to understanding and communication. An older generation works to support and educate the younger generation and the younger generation, as a part of natural differentiation and identity formation, rebels as they seek their own norms, values, and beliefs. The cycle seems as old as time itself.

This ancient pattern is no different in Clinical Pastoral Education (henceforth CPE). In the current demographical landscape of CPE, supervisors tend to be older, sometimes much older, than their students. Many active supervisors have worked hard to become liberated from the forces and pressures of former generations. The body of CPE supervisors is diverse and extends to educate persons and serve communities of ever more nu-

Rev. Jonathan W. Ball, MDiv, ACPE Supervisor, Coordinator of Clinical Pastoral Education, Northside Hospital, 1000 Johnson Ferry Rd., Atlanta, GA 30342 (Email: jonathan.ball@northside.com).

Amani D. Legagneur, MDiv, ACPE Supervisor, Manager, Chaplaincy Services, Northside Hospital, 1000 Johnson Ferry Rd., Atlanta, GA 30342 (Email: amani.legagneur@northside.com).

Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry

ISSN 2325-2855

© Copyright 2014 *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry*

All rights reserved.

anced difference. For the purposes of this article, we are charged with addressing the particularities of supervising a subpopulation that represents a new educational challenge for CPE: the *Millennials* (an abbreviation used by demographers to describe the generation born during the 1980s and 1990s, also referred to as “Generation Y”).¹ Our perspectives on age and generational differences in CPE (and supervision in other ministry contexts) are influenced by our ages and theoretical perspectives. To claim our own bias as “Gen X” supervisors born just before these Millennials, we (the writers of this article) will be drawing both upon our experiences as supervisors and as youngish students ourselves as we delineate some of the issues that some supervisors may face as we seek to improve our understanding of, and facility in, supervising Millennials.

Clinical Pastoral Education, as a culture, has endeavored to be forward thinking about recognizing, valuing, and becoming inclusive of differences in culture and gender. An element of culture that has often been tacitly engaged, but not necessarily explicitly named as a cultural element, is the generation of the student or the context-in-time of the student. Some developmental personality theorists offer a window into the lifecycle stages and challenges students bring to CPE. For example, millennial students that we are supervising now are often dealing with beginning their vocational lives, making decisions about partner relationships, and other issues commonly related to being in one’s twenties and early thirties. Limiting our perspective of generationally sensitive supervision to life-stage thinking, however, can cause us to miss the more specific time-contextual cultural experiences of students. Often supervisors get some glimpse into the generational element of a student’s culture from personal histories and narratives.

LIFE STAGE VERSUS TIME CONTEXT

More than one patient has said to more than one of our millennial students, “You’re awfully young to be a chaplain.” Just yesterday, a millennial student shared the following reflection in supervision, “Most of the time I feel comfortable and relaxed while on duty at the hospital, but I have noticed that one worry that sometimes comes to my mind is related to my age; whether I am actually too young, or people will perceive me as too young, to be competent at this job. I do not believe that this is a helpful worry, but I am aware that it sometimes arises in my mind.” Performance insecurity related

to youth seems like more of a life-stage issue that is affecting Millennials than a Millennial issue per se.

Nevertheless, supervisory challenges occur if processing these encounters includes monitoring our own countertransference as young looking chaplains, helping students to analyze their sense of pastoral authority as it relates to their ages relative to their patients, and helping students to engage possibilities of interacting with pastoral care recipients who may experience turbulence at the boundary of accepting care from a person they perceive as young. I, Amani, have pointed out to students over the past decade of my supervision that, "It's not the age; it's the mileage."² I have recently come to believe, however, that although this helps students to claim their deep empathy-building and wisdom-developing experiences that have no age limit, it disclaims the great value of a certain uninformed not-knowing that can come at any age, but most often coincides with youth.

Our students have always been rooted in a point in time. In the contemporary time context of CPE there is a great imbalance in the ages of CPE supervisors—arguably greater than at any time in the history of our profession. The current average age of newly certified CPE supervisors over the last ten years is about 46.³ The average age of active CPE supervisors is likely much higher. Our students come from a variety of ages. There is a growing gap between the perspectives of our supervisors and the perspectives of younger students. Also, within each peer group age differences crossing generations often exist. Responsibility for how, and if, these differences are ever addressed falls to the group members and the supervisor in the group process. Our certification process has, over the last several iterations of the Associate for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc. *Certification Manual*, engaged candidates for certification on their understanding of how culture affects development and learning. The list of what elements make up culture is always growing.

We assert that for the purposes of supervising students, generational differences are similar to other cultural differences and need to be a factor in the practice of supervision with students. In the midst of globalization, Millennials are being exposed to a world of many more possibilities for identification and categorization than any generation before. Therefore, their ability to function from an internal locus of self-awareness while monitoring and responding to multiple awareness and projections of others (a necessary pastoral skill in our view) may be more challenging than it has been to former generations. I, Amani, recall the difficulty discerning what kind of projection was operative for an ICU patient who made the following

declaration when I entered his room as a young CPE Resident. After I introduced myself as his chaplain he exclaimed, "You don't look like a chaplain." I wondered if he was referring to my age (which is 24, he was over 70), gender (female, he was male), ethnicity (African American, he was Euro-American), attire (professionally chic, he was in a hospital gown), or some other characteristic that immediately defined difference between us. Rallying my courage, I asked him, "What do chaplains look like?" Somewhat bemused he responded, "Well, they are old white men, and they have peeling skin." I laughed and said, "I guess it's okay that I don't look like a chaplain, then?" So began a fruitful and honest pastoral conversation. Remaining culturally curious increases the possibility that we may become culturally sensitive. Curiosity coupled with humility is one of the principle supervisory skills that we use in supervising Millennials.

We, Jonathan and Amani, are both in our mid-thirties and we were both born in the late 1970s. We are labeled as being a part of the latter half of Generation X by most generational demographers.⁴ Demographically this means that we have experienced some different norms than our parents and grandparents. In our lifetime, elective abortion has always been legal. HIV and AIDS has been a known disease since we were children. We were children when the Berlin Wall came down. We grew up in the midst of changing racial and cultural demographics of the US. Though we grew up in different parts of the country, both of us experienced racial and ethnic diversity as a normal part of life. Church attendance has been in a decline for most of our lives. We grew up around electronics and since we were adolescents the Internet has been a part of our lives and our education. Adapting to new information and change has been a constant for us. With the technological advances of the 1990s, 2000s, and 2010s, our generation has been accustomed to learning what new things were possible and then realizing that we would probably need to help our parents to these same things. It is only in this decade that both of us feel we are falling behind the technology curve.

For both of us, generational issues have been at the forefront in our supervisory education process and in our professional experience. As young supervisors, we often hear that we are "the future of CPE." Humbled by the compliment, we are also aware of a struggle to assert that we are the present of our profession. We are in a city that has four large seminaries and several smaller seminaries. The large seminaries tend to attract young, first-career students. So our groups have always had a wealth of younger people in them. In fact, our current intern group is exclusively comprised of Millen-

nials. We are also both parents of young children. The experience of parenting has brought us face-to-face with how the next generation experiences the world, and how different the context of today is from when we were children.

What does all this have to do with our practice of supervision? We come to Pastoral Education with an eye for change, transformation, and growth. We both believe deeply that diversity is a primary learning medium for growth and development. Some of this has been our lived experience from youth, and some of it has come from theorists we have studied. We both use concepts from Jack Mezirow's "Transformative Education Theory." Neither of us use every part of Mezirow's theory, but we both recognize the importance of the concept of *meaning perspectives* as a foundation for our practice of Supervision. Mezirow says, "Meaning perspectives refer to the structure of assumptions within which new experience is assimilated and transformed by one's past experience during the process of interpretation."⁵ Said a little differently, "Meaning perspectives provide us with criteria for judging or evaluating right and wrong, bad and good, beautiful and ugly, true and false, appropriate and inappropriate. They also determine our concept of personhood, our idealized self-image, and the way we feel about ourselves."⁶

We work to help students recognize the meaning perspectives that shape how they see the world. These perspectives create the reality we experience. Transformation, as Mezirow sees it, comes through challenging the deeply held values, assumptions, and beliefs that construct these meaning perspectives. One component of our supervision of students is to understand empathetically the student's meaning perspective and to offer constructive challenges to the values, assumptions, and beliefs that underpin those perspectives. In turn, we hope they will develop more empathy towards the people they serve.

For the purpose of this article, we will look at some forces that have shaped how students of the millennial generation have grown and developed the meaning perspectives they bring to CPE (and other contextual ministry experiences). We will also venture into some of the challenges and opportunities we see for supervisors who choose to take generational culture into account in their supervision.

GENERATION Y

Most of the literature on demographic generational studies defines a generation as a twenty year cycle of births. The Millennial Generation typically

includes people born between 1980 and 2000. Before the Millennials were the Generation Xers who were born between 1960 and 1980, and before the Generation Xers came the post World War II Baby Boomers between 1940 and 1960.⁷ Most of the data demographers use to identify characteristics in generations come from surveys and psychological tests given to students at universities. That fact is one of the first problems we saw with the materials describing the generations. This demographic is typically more affluent, educated, and often has engaged parents and family systems that support their education. This would suggest that perhaps the sweeping labels for each generation may not well represent the culturally and individually diverse population of the United States. On the other hand, CPE students are all college educated and most come with a master's degree either in process or completed. So as limited as these stereotypes may be, they are taken from a sample population that is similar to the population that might seek pastoral supervision.

In May of 2013, *Time* magazine ran a cover that read "The Me Me Me Generation: Millennials are Lazy, Entitled Narcissists who Still Live with Their Parents/Why They'll Save us All."⁸ The articles in the magazine about Millennials (written by Joel Stein, a member of Generation X) gave Millennials a confusing blend of traits like narcissistic, resourceful, lazy, and adaptable. In their work on generations in the United States, historians Neil Howe and William Strauss predicted that the Millennial generation would be the "Next Great Generation" paralleling the "Greatest Generation" who participated in World War II.⁹ In his article "How to Write the Worst Possible Column about Millennials," Derek Thompson warns authors through satire to be wary of the homogenized view provided by media depicting Millennials as anything but, "a uniform blob of rich, self-righteous idleness."¹⁰ Thompson and other authors suggest that the media depiction of Millennials lacks depth of particularity

We have found the majority of information that stereotypes how Millennials feel, think, and act to be less helpful when trying to understand the particular student in front of us. Most of the articles and books on how to deal with Millennials paint too exact a stroke for how "a Millennial" will think, feel, and act. We have preferred to mine these sources for cultural shifts that occurred at the time when Millennials were growing up. Mezirow says, "Meaning perspectives are, for the most part, uncritically acquired through the process of socialization, often in the context of an emotionally charged relationship with parents, teachers, or other mentors."¹¹ Looking at the context of a generation may, if nothing else, provide paths of inquiry that will be relevant and important to engaging a Millennial CPE student.

GROWING UP MILLENNIAL

The 1980s through 2000 saw a wide variety of experiences and changes in the world. Trying to capture all of these shifts would be both impossible and too broad to be of any real use in trying to understand the student born and raised in this time period. So we will focus on three small but important shifts in the American culture and experience. We realize that particular students experience these shifts differently, but we believe there is salient information for supervisors in them.

First, Millennials grew up surrounded by technology, in particular digital technology. In their childhood the personal computer became ubiquitous. Two-thirds of this generation used a computer before the age of five.¹² All of this exposure to digital communications has had an impact on how our students understand privacy and connecting through these media. "You need to know what Marsha put on her Facebook page," Margaret, an older intern, blurted out while walking into my office, "I think it is too much."¹³ She was clearly upset. Marsha was twenty-four and this was the closest experience to a job that she had ever had. As a policy, we do not become Facebook friends with students while they are under supervision. This is as much for our privacy as theirs, but Margaret had printed off the posts from Marsha's Facebook page. It contained her reflections about a difficult case in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. It did not have any explicit references to the family that would be considered protected healthcare information,¹⁴ but it did contain information about the family's situation.

We have had other students who used blogs, Facebook, and other social media as a medium for reflection. Several years ago, the hospital had created a very strict policy on the use of social media around hospital business. This case did not explicitly violate those policies, but it was close enough to raise alarms. Amani and I approached her about the post, and she immediately agreed to remove it. In supervision afterward, we debriefed her about what had been too close to protected patient information and how she might share her reflections appropriately. Henry, a 28-year-old student completing a residency and interviewing for jobs in the church, was shocked to find out that one church decided not to interview him because when they googled his name, they found photos a friend from seminary had posted that showed him drinking alcohol.

Technology, particularly social media, is a part of the social world for Millennials and increasingly for other generations as well. Learning how to

navigate the very public world of social media is both a task of the student and for administrators of supervised ministry contexts. A struggle for our department in setting up policies has been to stay ahead of a technological world that has left us behind. One thing that we have noticed is that helping our students to develop healthy interpersonal educational and pastoral relationships that balance appropriate spiritual intimacy with appropriate boundaries requires mutually heightened awareness of the effects of a culture that shares personal information in cyberspace—information that was once reserved for more private relationships.

In addition to its place in the social world, technology in the workplace through web pages, church/organizational Facebook pages, and electronic medical records has become a required part of today's business world. When we asked a student applying from out of town how she found us, her first response was, "I googled 'CPE Atlanta'" and your center came up. Increasingly, Google has replaced the seminary contextual education office or advertising board as the way our students find out where to apply. In implementing the electronic medical record, our younger students were uniquely helpful in teaching older students (and even some staff) how to navigate the system. For many of them it was second nature. One student even created a helpful step-by-step guide for her peers that we still use today in teaching new students how to chart in the electronic medical record.

Digital technology is here to stay (it does not appear to be regressing or retreating). With Millennial students, supervisors will need to make and enforce policies that provide some norms for the use of media, social media, and other technologies. There are also many opportunities for creative growth that improves the services our students provide and the educational opportunities we may bring into the educational process. We recently interviewed a student whose helping incident verbatim was the manuscript of a pastoral conversation that occurred through text messages on smart phones. As robotics are used more widely for the purposes of medical interpretation and other patient care in our hospital, I, Amani, have begun to have more interesting conversations about the possibilities of using Skype™ or Apple's Facetime™ and other technologies that could "virtually" transport a chaplain to the bedside.

Second, Millennials have grown up in an age of increasing racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation diversity. Millennials, in the United States, are the largest generation, having edged out the Baby Boom generation by almost ten million. Immigration has also been a significant factor in the diversity seen in the millennial generation in the United States.¹⁵ "In

1999, nonwhites and Latinos accounted for nearly 36 percent of the 18-or-under population, a share half-again higher than for Boomer age brackets, and nearly *three times* higher than for today's seniors."¹⁶

The expansion of ethnically and racially diverse peer groups in the millennial generation has implications for how millennial students form their meaning perspectives towards difference and diversity. "Hi, I am Rebecca and I have chosen to use female gender pronouns while I present my story." Rebecca, a 26-year-old Euro-American woman, had opted to go last in presenting her story to the group at the beginning of a summer intensive intern group. She was the youngest member of the group by nine years, and she had come to seminary straight from college. Her peers were a racially and experientially diverse group. Three were Baby Boomers in their fifties and the other two were Gen Xers in their thirties and forties. "What does that mean, 'you are going to use female gender pronouns'?" Lamar, a late fifties African-American man, asked her with a skeptical tone. "Well, some of my friends struggle with their gender identity and I want to support them. So I am aware and conscious of how I talk about myself and how I want people to talk to me." A couple things were important about this exchange for me (Jonathan). First, her perspective on gender pronouns was, at that time, totally new for me. I have since found out that it is an increasingly common phenomenon in colleges in the US. I also realized, as this conversation progressed, that I was likely the next youngest person around the table. I had often supervised groups where I was younger than some of my students, but in this situation it seemed to be a particularly important dynamic.

Millennials experiences of diversity may be very different from their older peers and supervisors. These experiences have not yielded a universal perspective response. We have had several millennial students who were deeply prejudiced about racial, ethnic, and sexual orientation differences. The experience, however, of growing up in a diverse cohort in the midst of growing postmodern discussions of social norms, will likely be an important awareness for supervising millennial students.

Finally, in the United States, there has been a growing trend towards protection and intentional development of people born from 1980 to 2000. In the 1980s, safety standards and a broad social sense of what was safe became a significant part of the middle-class culture in US laws that were passed requiring safety standards for car restraints and bicycle helmets became commonplace.¹⁷ The industry of child protection developed into a thriving business. Public schools came under stricter regulation for the content and

standards for what children should know. Public schools and popular media also began to emphasize positive self-esteem. “Research on programs to boost self-esteem first blossomed in the 1980s, and the number of psychology and education journal articles devoted to self-esteem doubled between the 1970s and 1980s. Journal articles on self-esteem increased another 52 percent during the 1990s, and the number of books on self-esteem doubled over the same time.”¹⁸ How all this protection and encouragement has affected individual Millennials is hard to tell. Several authors suggest that this has made the entire generation feel entitled, yet in need of greater authority approval.¹⁹ Others have suggested that it makes millennial students feel more pressure to do things right the first time rather than learn from their mistakes.²⁰ We suggest that this may be a too complicated phenomenon to easily boil down, but it has significant implications for understanding the millennial context. Inquiring about what “success” among their generational peers means for millennial students can help to get at this complex issue. This cultural shift may also be an important area of inquiry when issues around authority and norms around authority arise.

Mary, a Euro-American woman in her mid-twenties, was a resident in our program. In her pastoral work, she was quick to listen but very slow to give input to her patients, and even slower providing critique and feedback to her peers. “I’m just not sure I trust myself,” she often said. I, Jonathan, was tempted to consider this a conscious or unconscious resistance to her authority and really engaging the risk of offering critique. In a subsequent unit with Amani as her primary supervisor, Mary went deeper into the roots of her diffidence. “I am at a point in my life where I thought I would know what I wanted to do and who I wanted to be with, and today, I know neither.” Mary had always been surrounded with difference and diversity. She grew up technology savvy and researched everything in detail. She had an excellent college and graduate education that taught her to be suspicious of any certainty or objective truth, and her experience growing up in a racially and ethnically diverse community had supported the perspective that there were rational and valid points of view on nearly every topic that often differed. Mary was confronted with many choices of whom to trust, what to believe, and what another person’s perspectives might mean for her life—including her parents who were anxious for her to figure out what career path she would choose. These were the same parents who taught her to research her options thoroughly and to choose carefully. How could she trust her own voice in the cacophony of the crowd of possibilities? Amani’s work

with Mary unveiled the “crowd,” which was a part of her meaning perspective that Mary heard clearly, but who she could not differentiate from and never felt that she could choose to silence. Amani’s suggestion that perhaps Mary could risk venturing away from the protection of her research and her attempts at finding certainty through the volume of differences was both frightening and exhilarating for her.

Mary’s story brings to the surface the question, what happens when the “new” norms are the only norms the next generation knows? Every Millennial will be affected by the changes in technology, social norms around diversity, and norms around safety differently. With Mary, engaging how she experienced the norms of her childhood and education helped open up the meaning perspectives that were clouding her clarity and her ability to risk acting rather than preparing, researching, and protecting. She is in the company of other millennial students who are trying to distinguish between use of power and use of force in pastoral relationships as they identify the privileges and challenges related to their time context identity.

So far we have been presenting the usual suspects, in the form of cultural changes that may come to the surface in managing and supervising millennial students. In this section, we wanted to offer a different perspective that builds on the previous information while also critiquing it. As with other forms of cultural diversity in CPE, assumptions and stereotypes may develop where cultural humility and appropriate curiosity may be more productive.

AN INTERGENERATIONAL-CULTURE APPROACH

Rather than trying to learn and engage all of the stereotypes about Millennials, Gen Xers, and Boomers, we suggest approaching age difference and generational enculturation in pastoral education and supervision from an intercultural angle. In his work on intercultural pastoral care and counseling, Emmanuel Lartey lays out an approach to pastoral care that seeks to honor how “every human person is in certain respects: 1) Like all others; 2) Like some others; 3) Like no other.”²¹ This approach to supervision invites the supervisor to put down the stereotypes and engage the person in front of her or him with a curiosity about who the student is culturally as a person from a different generation. According to Lartey:

An intercultural study attempts to capture the complexity involved in the interactions between people who have been and are being shaped and influenced by different cultures. It takes seriously the different expressions originating in different cultures but then proceeds by attempting to make

possible a multi-perspectival examination of whatever issues is at state. It recognizes that it is impossible to capture the totality of any given social group's culture. It realizes also that dominant or powerful groups may deliberately or unwittingly seek to impose their culture and perspective upon all others, or else control and select what is to be allowed expression. Worse still, and yet most common, has been the attempt to universalize and 'normalize' a particular culture's experience and judge all others by that one's views.²²

Approaching generational differences in group and individual supervision takes seriously the complexity of the relationship and seeks a "multi-perspectival examination of whatever is at stake." Two persons may have much in common: gender, ethnicity, religion/denomination, etc. Coming from different generations will, however, affect how each interprets, remembers, and responds to those points of commonality. This, in turn, deeply affects the values, assumptions, and beliefs of the students and the supervisors. In one case a student, who was twenty-five and a Millennial, decided to leave a year-long residency program before the end of the final unit for a hospice job he had been offered. An older member of his interpersonal relations (IPR) group, who was a Baby Boomer, became angry in their final IPR session together. "You made a commitment to stay here. This program has done so much for you and here you are abandoning it for a job!" The younger student responded, "The whole point of my doing all of this education was to be prepared to take a job in chaplaincy. Why would I owe anything to the program or to the hospital? It says clearly that students leaving the program must give 30 days notice. I have done that. Why are you so angry about this?"

These two students were both men, both white, they shared a denominational background, and they were both married to women around their age. They had often locked horns in group about what "should" or "ought" to be. "You young kids just have no commitment to your word. I would never hire someone your age." My (Jonathan) intervention was to push them both more towards understanding each other's perspective. They had been adept at finding their difference, but I urged them to both try and understand the world through the other's eyes. As they, and others in the group, started to share stories about where they learned loyalty and commitment it became far clearer that the two men were fighting over their father's lives. Both men's fathers had been "company men" they stuck to their company and worked diligently. The elder's father retired after thirty-five years with a healthy pension that lasted until he died. The younger's father had been consistently laid off in virtually every US recession. He had always desired

to be a loyal employee and always spoke favorably about the companies who had laid him off. Now 60 years old, his father had little hope of retiring anytime soon and the young man was quite angry and afraid of this happening to him in the future. This event also took place in the midst of the worst years of the recent recession.

In the above example, it would have been reductionist to say that the younger student didn't value loyalty because he was a Millennial. In the context of his understanding of his father's struggles and his own fears, his decision made much more sense and revealed the complex nature of the conflict. To get beneath the temptation towards stereotyping, we connected with the principles of an intercultural approach by engaging the particulars of each student's story in context, encouraging the expression of differences in perspective, and keeping communication and participation open by affirming the value of each person's perspective and story.²³ Illuminating our deeply held values and beliefs requires understanding the context and perspectives of the other through empathetic engagement.

At the nexus of this approach is the willingness to engage the other without falling into traps of over-idealization or denigration. Attempting to engage in an intercultural supervisory alliance with a student who is from another generation will require self-supervision concerning the supervisor's own experience, assumptions, and blind spots around generational issues. All supervisory practice requires that the supervisor reflect on her or his own perspective and the values, assumptions, and beliefs that support that perspective. Since generational issues touch so closely on unspoken and or taboo areas of the soul, we believe that claiming one's bias is essential to overcoming and working with it in supervision.

Finally, we also inquire about how the difficulty experienced between people of different generations might relate to the shared parallel process. We understand transformative supervision arises from a sustained empathic inquiry and connection with a student. When issues around generational difference arise, there is an opportunity to illuminate the values, assumptions, and beliefs of both the student and the supervisor. This presents an important opportunity for both the student and the supervisor to encounter and evaluate these foundational beliefs. We suggest that reflecting on one's history with age and age-related issues, reflecting on one's countertransference around age, and reflecting on one's conscious or unconscious prejudices around age and generational issues may help a supervisor become "unstuck" and more curious about the nature of how and why the difference

has become such an issue. Using the parallel process to coach students in processing their ideas about the effects of their age on pastoral care can be a conduit for expanding their learning about how all the chosen and unchosen categories they occupy influence their effectiveness in creating intercultural dialogues with those they serve. We believe that every human encounter, because of the inherent differences and similarities between us, is an intercultural event.

As with other intercultural events, supervising across a generational divide necessitates risking sublimation of one's initial proclivity toward pre-judgment to allow for the uniqueness of the other to be revealed. Braving the elemental desire to categorize others in order to seem to protect ourselves is a brazen spiritual act of surrender. It is the movement from beholding the other to bearing witness with the other. It is the movement from opposing mountain fortresses called "them" and "us," through the misty valley of "you" and "me," toward the revelatory relational meeting place that Buber called "I" and "Thou." This movement must be intentional, however subtle it may seem. It requires us as educators to continually remember that our students are also our teachers. And it means that in order to achieve culturally competent, spiritually courageous, beneficially transformative supervisory relationships it behooves us to creatively invite ourselves and one another into dialogue with our own evolution as supervisors of a certain age.

NOTES

1. Neil Howe and William Strauss, *Millennials Rising* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 6. While *Chicago Manual of Style* and the *Associated Press Stylebook* advise not capitalizing generation names, all authors we read preparing for this article did capitalize all of the generational titles. For the sake of simplicity and clarity we have opted to capitalize all the titles we use for generations throughout this article.
2. Using a car analogy to symbolize that though one may be young in years she or he may have significant amount of relevant experiences.
3. Amy Greene, "Critical Components in the Formation of Clinical Pastoral Education Supervisors," December 15, 2011, 47, Doctor of Ministry thesis, accessed March 1, 2014, http://www.acpe.edu/NewPDF/2013%20Annual%20Conference/Greene_DMin_March_2012_%282%29.pdf.
4. Strauss and Howe place Generation X or the 13th Generation as those born between 1961 and 1981. Neil Howe and William Strauss, *Generations* (New York: Quill, 1991), 33.
5. Jack Mezirow, *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990), 2.

6. Jack Mezirow, *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1991), 44.
7. Strauss and Howe say Millennials were born after 1982. Zemke, Raines, and Filipczak say Millennials were born between 1980 and 2004. While the exact year of the beginning and ending of the births of the millennial generation varies. The general consensus points to people born in the 1980s and 1990s. Howe and Strauss, *Millennials Rising*, 4; Ron Zemke, Claire Raines, and Bob Filipczak, *Generations at Work: Managing the Clash of Boomers, Gen Xers, and Gen Yers in the Workplace* (New York: AMACOM, 2013), 4.
8. Joel Stein, "The Me Me Me Generation: Millennials are Lazy, Entitled Narcissists who Still Live with Their Parents/Why They'll Save us All," *Time* (May 20, 2013): cover story.
9. Howe and Strauss, *Generations*, 35.
10. Derek Thompson, "How to Write the Worst Possible Column about Millennials: A Nonsense Guide," *The Atlantic* (November 4, 2013), accessed March 1, 2014, <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/11/how-to-write-the-worst-possible-column-about-millennials/281129/>.
11. Mezirow, *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood*, 3.
12. Zemke et al, *Generations at Work*, 120.
13. All names and certain elements of all vignettes in this article have been altered to protect the confidentiality of our students.
14. "Protected Healthcare Information" (PHI) is defined in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996.
15. Zemke et al, *Generations at Work*, 122.
16. Howe and Strauss, *Millennials Rising*, 15.
17. Zemke et al, *Generations at Work*, 127. Strauss and Howe also depict how flooded the media market of the 1980s was with a new concern for child welfare and safety. Strauss and Howe, *Generations*, 337.
18. Jean Twenge, *Generation Me* (New York: Free Press, 2006), 53.
19. *Ibid.*, 216–217.
20. Zemke, et al. *Generations at Work*, 140.
21. Emmanuel Lartey, *In Living Color* (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2003), 34.
22. *Ibid.*, 32.
23. *Ibid.*, 33. Contextuality, for Lartey means that beliefs and behaviors need to be understood within the framework where it occurs. Multiple perspectives means, "equally rational persons can examine the same issue and yet arrive at very different understandings." Authentic Participation means that all persons have the right to share their participation in the dialogue on their own terms.