

Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry

Established with the support of the North Central Region, ACPE and the Central Region, AAPC

Published in cooperation with the Journal of Pastoral Care Publications

Orlo Strunk, Jr., Managing Editor, Janet H. Emerson, Associate Business Manager

We gratefully acknowledge the following people who participated in the production of Volume 22, 2002

Paul Giblin, Editor

Loyola University of Chicago
Chicago, IL

Jean Dow, Associate Editor

Evanston, IL

Board of Editors

Homer U. Ashby, Jr., Book Review Co-Editor
McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL

Connie Kleingartner
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, Chicago, IL

Beth Burbank, ACPE Theory Paper Editor
Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center, Chicago, IL

David McCurdy, Clinical Vignettes Editor
Park Ridge Center, Chicago, IL

Lee Butler
Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL

Frances McWilliams, Book Review Co-Editor
Breckenridge, CO

John DeVelder, International Section Editor
Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital, New Brunswick, NJ

Robert O'Gorman
Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

David Hogue, Board President
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, IL

Robert Petite, Learning Vignettes Co-Editor
Montgomery Place, Chicago, IL

Mary E. Johnson, Learning Vignettes Co-Editor
Mayo Chaplaincy Services, Rochester, MN

Barbara B. Troxell
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, Evanston, IL

ACPE Theory Paper Readers

Graeme Gibbons

Phyllis Brooks Toback

Mark Jensen

Carol McAninch-Prinz

Production and Business Support

Prepress Production
Kyle Ann Ostler
Arlington Heights, IL

Printing
Thomson-Shore, Inc
Dexter, MI

Indexing and Abstracts

Articles are indexed in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*; book reviews are indexed in *Index to Book Reviews in Religion*. Both indexes are published by the American Theological Library Association, Chicago and are available online through BRS

Information Technologies (Latham, NY) and DIALOG Information Services (Palo Alto, CA).

ISSN 0160-7774

© Copyright 2002 Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry

All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

Symposium: Multiculturality in the Student-Supervisor/Teacher Relationship

Introduction John de Velder, K. Samuel Lee, and Annari Griesel	3
Individualism and the Invisibility of Monoculturalism/Whiteness: Limits to Effective Clinical Pastoral Education Supervision Therese M. Becker	4
Thinking Through Pastoral Education with Culturally Diverse Peer Groups Mark Grace	21
From Multiculturalism to Interculturality: Demilitarizing the Border Between Personal and Social Dynamics Through Spiritual Receptivity Kathleen J. Greider	40
Supervision in Context: Religious Issues in Cross-cultural Counseling Fredrica R. Halligan	59
Teaching and Learning Pastoral Counseling: An Integrative and Intercultural Approach Curtis W. Hart	75
The Teacher-Student in Multicultural Theological Education: Pedagogy of Collaborative Inquiry K. Samuel Lee	81
Pastoral Education and the Orthodox Slav Steven Voytovich	100
Cultural Inclusiveness and Positive Empowerment in Clinical Pastoral Education Patricia A. Wilson-Robinson	110

Article

A Cultural Analysis of the Eastern CPE Region, with Implications for the Future
John J. Gleason118

Field Education

A Case Study Method for Theological Reflection in Field Education
Michael E. Connors and Mark L. Poorman131

Field Education and Clinical Pastoral Education: Desired Outcomes from the Perspective of Those Making Decisions about Ordination
William Kondrath and James C. Gorman147

ACPE Theory Papers

Theology of Hospitality
Learning Through Play, Dialogue, and Conflict
Personality From an Object Relations Perspective
Dorothea Lotze-Kola165

AAPC Theory Paper

Differentiated Solidarity: A Theory and Theology of Pastoral Supervision
Sarah M. Rieth202

Book/Tape Review

Listening for the Soul: Pastoral Care and Spiritual Direction
Jean Stairs, Review by Barbara Sheehan222

SYMPOSIUM

MULTICULTURALITY IN THE STUDENT-SUPERVISOR/TEACHER RELATIONSHIP

Introduction

JOHN DEVELDER
K. SAMUEL LEE
ANNARI GRIESEL

In the post-September 11th era, culture will be an increasingly important consideration in the practice of pastoral and spiritual care, counseling, and education. While pastoral practitioners and educators have been on the “front lines” of ministry with people of cultures different from themselves, they have not been in the forefront of publishing what they are learning about cross-cultural ministry and education.

In this Symposium on Culture, we build on the Symposium on Cross-cultural Supervision of *Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry*, Volume 14. We have gathered articles from practitioners representing a wide-range of perspectives and involvement in culture and ministry. We include voices from the academic classroom, health care institutions, and clinical training programs. We hope that these offerings will stimulate much needed discussion about culture and its essential importance in every human interaction.

John R. deVelder., D. Min. is Supervisor of the Department of Pastoral Care at Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital in New Brunswick, New Jersey.

K. Samuel Lee, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Pastoral Care and Counseling at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, DC.

Annari Griesel, Ph.D. is the Director of Pastoral Care at John F. Kennedy Medical Center in Edison, New Jersey.

Individualism and the Invisibility of Monoculturalism/Whiteness: Limits to Effective Clinical Pastoral Education Supervision¹

Therese M. Becker

Individualism and the invisibility of monoculturalism and whiteness interpenetrate and collude, making it difficult for the white clinical pastoral education (CPE) supervisor to effectively supervise international students and students of color from within the United States. Individualism is a central organizing cultural assumption that underlies clinical pastoral education. Many international students and students of color from the United States live out of a more sociocentric worldview. Most CPE supervisors are white. Although race is deeply encoded into the lives of *everyone* in our society, the dynamic of white privilege is such that most whites are not reflective about their/our race. Whiteness is experienced as “norm, as transparency, as national/natural state of being.”² Unreflective whiteness intensifies individualism in the supervisory process, making it very difficult for the supervisor to understand the experience and behavior of the student who is culturally different from the supervisor.

Therese M. Becker is a supervisory candidate with the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education and a candidate for a Doctor of Ministry at the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, Illinois. She is also a member of the ACPE Multicultural Competencies Task Force.

CLINICAL PASTORAL EDUCATION

Clinical pastoral education is a method of experiential education for professional ministry for practitioners from all faith traditions. Ministry has two faces, one that is directed toward the nurturing of the internal life of the religious community, the other turned toward service to the world. CPE is a part of the religious community's nurturing of its internal life, as here its ministers are intensely formed.

Classically, clinical pastoral education has been defined as supervised encounters with people in crisis, with "living human documents."³ A fundamental though rarely articulated assumption is that it is the person of the minister that is the most important tool in ministry (other than the Spirit of God of course!). This presupposition, rooted in individualism, is woven throughout the ten objectives that the standards of the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education has set out for CPE:⁴

Objectives of CPE define CPE programs and the scope of their curricula. Clinical Pastoral Education includes Pastoral Reflection, Pastoral Formation, and Pastoral Competence. Pastoral Specialization may be offered as an option in some centers. The CPE Center's curriculum is designed to facilitate the student's addressing the following objectives:

- 240.1 To become aware of oneself as minister and the ways one's ministry affects persons;
- 240.2 To develop skills to provide intensive and extensive pastoral care and counseling to persons in their crises and situations;
- 240.3 To understand and utilize the clinical method of learning;
- 240.4 To accept and utilize support, confrontation and clarification of the peer group for the integration of personal attributes and pastoral functioning;
- 240.5 To utilize individual and group supervision for personal and professional growth and for developing the capacity to evaluate one's ministry;
- 240.6 To develop the ability to make effective use of one's religious/spiritual heritage, theological understanding, and knowledge of the behavioral sciences in pastoral ministry to persons and groups;
- 240.7 To become aware of how one's attitudes, values, and assumptions, strengths and weaknesses affect one's pastoral care ministry;

6 INDIVIDUALISM AND THE INVISIBILITY OF MONOCULTURALISM/WHITENESS

- 240.8 To become aware of the pastoral role in interdisciplinary relationships and to work effectively as a pastoral member of an interdisciplinary team;
- 240.9 To become aware of how social conditions, systems, and structures affect the lives of self and others and to address effectively these issues in ministry;
- 240.10 To develop the capacity to utilize one's pastoral and prophetic perspectives in a variety of functions such as: preaching, teaching, leadership, management, pastoral care, and, as appropriate, pastoral counseling.
- 241 Objectives of a pastoral specialty, if selected, are to develop:
 - 241.1 Familiarity with the theories and methods for the ministry specialty;
 - 241.2 One's own philosophy and methodology for the ministry specialty;
 - 241.3 Pastoral competence in the practice of the specialty.

Although CPE students are drawn mainly from the dominant American culture, a consistent number represent “minority” cultures in the United States. Increasingly students are coming from other countries. It is a matter of justice and love that white supervisors be able to facilitate the growth of international students and students of color as much as of those whose worldview they grasp more instinctively.

Supervisory CPE students from other cultures struggle within the supervisory training process. This process is immensely demanding and often painful, even if one shares the cultural assumptions of the “gatekeepers,” the CPE supervisors who sit on certification committees at the regional and national levels. CPE began as a white male Protestant movement and, while it is now more inclusive, much of that culture still remains. If one is from a culture other than the dominant one, the experience of the process can be even more painful and sometimes damaging. As a supervisory candidate, I know this from my own experience of the process, and have seen the hurt, confusion, and frustration experienced by peers from other cultures. I have witnessed the disrespect (at best) they have experienced and have shared anger and tears with them.

Supervisors-in-training (SITs) from other cultures find themselves in a most difficult position. They want into the system. To do that they have to appear before committees that demand emotional transparency and integration of personal history and professional theory and practice. Their cultural style is often not understood and may even be criticized.

I recall vividly an encounter I had with a Filipino priest, a CPE supervisor whose first request for candidacy had been denied at a regional peer group meeting. I asked if the issue at hand were not a cultural one, and the priest said “yes.” A supervisor, who had been on the committee that had denied his initial candidacy request, replied quickly and with much emotion, “But he wants to be certified *here*.” I was shocked. It was as if the supervisor were saying, “This is *our* game and you will play by *our* rules or you will not play. We do not sense that you may have some other insight into the human predicament, that you might be able to teach us something new. This is *our* domain and if you want to participate, you must play by *our* rules.”

SITs from other cultures are in effect required to articulate their cultural style and difference for the committee (a higher level of self-understanding than is required for white American candidates), to convince the committee that their own cultural style is “acceptable” within the norms of CPE, or to change their understanding and style to the dominant one, thereby doing violence both to themselves and to their culture. I would describe this dynamic as a form of cultural violence rooted in the cultural incompetence of the “gatekeepers.” There is no freedom for the SIT to recognize, reflect upon, and evaluate his or her cultural assumptions because of a lack of understanding of, or no interest in, what the SIT is experiencing. The cultural assumptions are inchoately experienced as wrong or inappropriate.

Cultural assumptions are the “abstract, organized, general concepts which pervade a person’s outlook and behavior...they define what is ‘real’ and the nature of that reality for members of a culture.”⁵ They exist outside of conscious awareness. *Cultural values* prescribe which ways of being are better than others. They “refer to the goodness or desirability of certain actions or attitudes among members of a culture...[they] are processes that govern what people in a particular culture agree they ought to do.”⁶ They have both cognitive and emotional content.

The core around which CPE revolves is the clinical method. Its elements are clinical experience and reflection on this experience through individual and group supervision and in an unstructured group experience through which students can come to know themselves more deeply. Within these elements, as well as in the objectives, there are a number of interlocking *cultural assumptions*: 1) the self is viewed fundamentally as individual, i.e., the understanding of self is from one’s own history and experiences rather than from community embeddedness; 2) learning arises from reflection on one’s own experiences (not from a master or from books); 3) group experience and individual supervision are valuable resources for

growth in self-knowledge; and 4) self-knowledge develops through self-revelation and reflection, and this makes one a better minister. The group experience is important to the extent that it helps individuals to deepen their self-understanding. The *cultural values* here include the importance and usefulness of openness and vulnerability (with a group of people one has known and may only know for a brief period of time), of direct and open communication (rather than indirect or subtle communication), and of independence (not conformity). Other underlying assumptions are that the social sciences are a lens through which reflection on experience bears fruit, and that the individual is a subject, not an object, of history.

INDIVIDUALISM

Clinical pastoral education presumes an American understanding of self that is individualistic. Before looking at the specifics of this in CPE, let us examine the connection between identity and social location and the understanding of the self in two types of social organization.

The appropriation of identity and understanding of self are elements in the process of socialization. Socialization is the means through which the individual is inducted into the objective world of society and *at the same time* the process through which personal identity is achieved. "The individual not only takes on the roles and attitudes of others, but in the same process takes on their world. Indeed, identity is objectively defined as location in a certain world and can be subjectively appropriated only *along with* that world...Subjective appropriation of identity and subjective appropriation of the social world are merely different aspect of the *same* process of internalization, mediated by the *same* significant others."⁷ Put another way, "man's [*sic*] consciousness is determined by his social being."⁸

A small yet penetrating example of how individualism is socialized in American society:

It is early in the morning and the mother has placed her baby daughter, who is less than one year old, in her highchair and is preparing to give breakfast to the child. The mother selects two different kinds of baby cereal, each kind packaged in a box of distinctive color. The mother holds up a box in each hand before the child and encourages the small girl to select the one she wants. Before age one, the child has already learned to express her own preferences and make her own decisions, at least with regard to food.⁹

Persons in the United States are thus trained to understand who they are, individual selves who are expected to have individual opinions, make decisions based on those individual opinions, question authority on the basis of individual beliefs, and develop self-reliance. In short, we are trained to view the world from the point of view of the individual self. Contrast this with, for example, “Asian students whose actions are guided by family considerations...[and who] make career and life decisions that are detrimental to themselves but in compliance with the desires of others in their identity network...To the Asian students, the family members *are* themselves.”¹⁰ Different types of societies produce different understandings of self.

Edward Stewart and Milton Bennett, after Tonnies, a German sociologist, distinguish between *gemeinschaft* societies and *gesellschaft* societies. In *gemeinschaft* societies the social order is:

largely based on the customs and traditions of communities sharing the same language, race, religion, and ethnicity, and wielding economic power over their geographic region. Social belonging tends to be total, and community members seek satisfaction of all goals within their communities. Social sanctions and political control are based on informal and traditional ascriptions to elitist groups. Identity of the individual is bound up with belonging to the community. The social fiber of *gemeinschaft* communities creates for its members an *interpersonal reality*...¹¹

In a *gesellschaft* society the social order is more:

a web of impersonal social relations supported by the formal and even contractual ties...Social ties are based on rational agreement and self-interest and are regulated by law...Identity is separate from belonging; the status of the individual citizen and member of the state takes precedence over membership in groups. The status enjoyed by the individual is a product of achievement rather than a birthright as political and professional ties replace traditional social links.¹²

This *gesellschaft* society creates an *objective reality* for its members.

These two types of societies parallel the differences between Western and non-Western, colonizer and colonized. Yet it is not possible to so neatly categorize societies. For example:

the people of Thailand are members of a *gemeinschaft* society, rural and traditional. But Thais think of themselves primarily as autonomous individuals rather than as part of a family or extended group. Their self-concept resembles that of a middle-class member of a *gesellschaft* society. On the other hand, the Japanese, who like Americans, live in a highly industrialized nation, define themselves predominantly in relationship to others.¹³

The distinctions, *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*, sociocentric and individualistic, are very useful, but only as a spectrum for understanding social dynamics. Cultural variations are rich and varied, requiring an open mind and inquiring heart when approaching members of societies different from one's own. And, to state the obvious, we can assume very little about the actual location of any one specific individual in this spectrum. What we know about a person's society of origin must be held lightly as we come to know that person, particularly in CPE where interpersonal relationships are so intense.

The United States is a *gesellschaft* society. Its individualism is rooted in the philosophical tradition of John Locke, a seventeenth century English philosopher, who understood the biological individual as the basic unit of nature. Individuals exist prior to the social order and within it act in their own self-interest. The American economic system is said to be motivated by the "invisible hand" of self-interest. Benjamin Franklin, in the same spirit, coined the phrase, "God helps those who help themselves," so omnipresent in our culture that I have heard people quoting it as from the Bible.¹⁴ Equality and liberty are the cardinal ideals in Western thought. "The individual is quasi-sacred, absolute, the final irreducible unit of value in society. There is nothing over and above the individual's legitimate demands; her or his rights are limited only by the identical rights of other individuals."¹⁵

Individualism is a belief system that isolates. Each person is viewed as an inviolate unit; relationships arise from the consent of autonomous individuals. "Society is an association of parties whose privacy is protected from invasion by a system of laws that treat property as an extension of the person and safeguard as inviolable both persons and property."¹⁶ We therefore internalize deep intuitions about the boundaries of privacy, personal space, responsibility, and security, which yield our values of what is proper and improper, tasteful or polite.

In a *gemeinschaft* or sociocentric society, individuals understands themselves in a radically different way. It can be summed up in this African phrase of John Mbiti, "I am because we are, and since we are therefore I am."¹⁷ Personhood arises out of peoplehood. "In traditional cultures, the society is a *people*, which exists as a whole greater than the sum of its individual parts and from which each individual draws life, receives being, continues family, learns personhood, and expresses the culture's wisdom."¹⁸ In the United States many racial and ethnic minority students come from cultures in which the family is "the primary reference group that provides a bearing on what is right or wrong and transmits the norms of the larger

cultural minority group.”¹⁹ They experience their being as rooted in a people, a sense lacking among the white majority.

Psychological theory, a primary prism for CPE, understands the human person in Western individualistic terms. This creates huge gaps in understanding between the Western psychologist, counselor, or CPE supervisor and the person who experiences self in a *gemeinschaft*, sociocentric, or non-Western way. David Augsburg gives two examples. When a pastoral counselor encourages a Palestinian Arab to “know himself,” he replies, “What do you mean, I must ‘know myself’? How can I know myself in another land? How can I find myself if I am not in my own village?”²⁰ Similarly, in discussing the concept of self-fulfillment in the Indian context, one must understand that, “As an Indian is always an ambassador of the family, achievements, ambitions, and aspirations are merely reflections of those of the family. This is not unconscious and not related to identification but conscious and deliberate. He (she) cannot get away from this behavior without feeling ashamed. In Western psychiatry, helping the patient to achieve autonomy and to separate his (her) needs from that of the family is the goal of psychotherapy, and the goal is the opposite in Indian psychotherapy.”²¹

In a sociocentric *gemeinschaft* society, the person lives in security within the family and is trusting rather than fearful of dependency. This person, then, internalizes deep intuitions about solidarity, comfort in role, pride in peoplehood, and security in being the subject or object of control. For example, in Korean culture, *cheong* is the affective bond that binds family members together and is “the most important part of the Korean conception of the self.”²² It yields values such as sacrifice, empathy, care, and sincerity.²³ In the Philippines, the basic value of *pakikipagkapwa* (sense of fellow being) and the most important concept of social acceptance underlie the need for “smoothness of interpersonal relations.”²⁴ Interpersonal conflict is to be avoided.

Conversely, in CPE, the basic unit of understanding is the self as defined in Western *gesellschaft* individualism. This assumption permeates the ten objectives of CPE as well as the objectives of supervisory CPE. The basic task in CPE is to come to know oneself—as a person becoming aware of one’s personal dynamics and as a minister developing a pastoral identity. In supervisory training, the development of competencies is stressed, but the ability to use one’s own “personality and personal history as a teaching resource in the shaping of a personal supervisory style”²⁵ is even more strongly emphasized. Integration of one’s own history with one’s theology, theory, and practice, and the ability to articulate this clearly, is a primary goal.

Objectives 240.1, .4 and .7 stand out particularly as reflecting an understanding of self as the “bounded, singular, uniquely self-made, more or less integrated, autonomous center of awareness and power *vis-à-vis* other selves”²⁶ CPE focuses on understanding the individual self, how this self has been formed into its uniqueness, and how these unique qualities impact one’s ability to do ministry. It is assumed that open, communicative, and vulnerable engagement with one’s peers will lead to increased self-knowledge and integration of this knowledge with one’s pastoral functioning.

These cultural assumptions and values, when not shared, can create tension and can even be damaging. An example from Native American culture:

The group dynamics process used by every CPE program I am aware of makes an implicit cultural assumption which works for some other cultures. An assumption is the group of like-minded people who are complete strangers with one another can very quickly and easily form most intimate relationships based on openness and trust. Indeed, white Americans are renowned world wide for their overt friendliness and the ease with which they move into friendships. Native American people on the whole form relationships much more slowly than do white Americans, and cross cultural intimacies come at an even slower pace. The imposition, then of Anglo-American instant intimacy, however well-intentioned and natural to them, would be an act of violence against most American Indian people, even in many cases where individuals would seem on the surface to respond well to that kind of treatment. It is an imposition of a cultural value which may be inappropriate.²⁷

In such a situation of cultural difference, using an individualistic psychological lens might severely distort what is actually happening. A Native American CPE student in this situation, for example, might be challenged for lack of commitment to the learning process, for defensiveness, or for “hiding.”

This example reveals that separating out the assumptions about the self, distinct from assumptions about the learning process, is very difficult! Another fine example comes from Hawaii where one supervisor describes an experience with a Samoan student:

A Samoan student always gave deference to me as supervisor when an issue arose. It was his cultural style and was a natural way to respond to authority. My dislike of others’ dependence on me created interesting conversations. At times he had questions about what was the right or proper way to conduct his ministry or personal life. With serious matters, he would talk with me as his supervisor. Then he would privately consult with his Samoan minister (*alii*) to know the correct way to respond. At those times, he would withdraw from discussion with me or the peer group, and simply report his decision knowing full well he was doing the right thing. For me to challenge him to decide on an

independent course of action (American CPE style) would only leave him silent and unavailable for learning. It meant going against the *alii* which he could not do. The supervisory issue became finding ways to ask him to examine the advice of the elders and choose the best course clinically for his patients. Part of the issue which confused the situation even more was that he surpassed his elders in knowledge of clinical skills, and he knew it.²⁸

Here the non-individualistic understanding of self, the notion of pastoral authority, and the understanding of how one learns ministry are fully intertwined.

THE INVISIBILITY OF MONOCULTURALISM AND WHITENESS

The social fact of whiteness and its invisibility to those who embody it intensifies the impact of individualism. The white supervisor experiences self as individual, not a part of a group that has a collective experience. Yet race is a fundamental dimension of social organization and social meaning in the United States.²⁹ It is woven into every major institution in our society³⁰ and is encoded in the daily lives of all of us. A powerful sign of white privilege is that most white people do not think about their/our race. “As long as race is something applied to non-white peoples, as long as white people are not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm. Other people are raced, we are just people...[Yet] race is never not a factor, never not in play.”³¹

I call this phenomenon “white-brain.” Several years ago I had breast cancer. In a support group for survivors I learned about “chemo-brain.” Chemo-brain is a term for the forgetfulness and spaciness caused by chemotherapy. While chemo-brain is a physical process, “white-brain” is a social process. White persons are socialized in our society to *not* see our own privilege, to *not* see ourselves as raced, to see our worldview as normative, and to be oblivious to our impact on others. Two African-American writers have commented on the impact of this non-experience of whiteness on people of color. bell hooks writes, “They [white people] do not imagine the way whiteness makes its presence felt in black life, most often as terrorizing imposition, a power that wounds, hurts, tortures, is a reality that disrupts the fantasy of whiteness as representing goodness.”³² She also quotes James Baldwin: “I...find myself among a people whose culture controls me, has

even in a sense, created me, people who have cost me more anguish and rage than they will ever know, who yet do not even know of my existence.”³³

In one of the earliest articles written about whiteness in 1988, Peggy McIntosh uses her experience of sexism to help her understand her role as a white person in a profoundly racist society. In “White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through work in Women’s Studies,” she makes a list of forty-six “special circumstances and conditions I experience which I did not earn but which I have been made to feel are mine by birth, by citizenship, and by being a conscientious law-abiding ‘normal’ person of good will...As far as I can see, my Afro-American co-workers, friends, and acquaintances with whom I come into daily or frequent contact...cannot count on most of these conditions.”³⁴ A few of them include:

- I can if I wish arrange to be in the company of people of my own race most of the time.
- I can avoid spending time with people whom I was trained to mistrust and who have learned to mistrust my kind or me.
- I can arrange to protect my children most of the time from people who might not like them.
- I do not have to educate my children to be aware of systemic racism for their own daily physical protection.
- I can do well in a challenging situation without being called a credit to my race.
- I am never asked to speak for all the people in my racial group.
- I am not made acutely aware that my shape, bearing, or body odor will be taken as a reflection of my race.
- I can be sure that if I need legal or medical help, my race will not work against me.³⁵

It is a testament to the pervasiveness of our socialization, she writes, that “I repeatedly forgot each of these realizations on this list until I wrote it down. For me, white privilege has turned out to be an elusive and fugitive subject. The pressure to avoid it is great, for in facing it I must give up the myth of meritocracy...this is not such a free country...my moral condition is not what I had been led to believe.”³⁶

Race is a social, not a biological category. “Biological anthropologists, geneticists, and human biologists now claim they no longer accept ‘race’ as having any validity in the biological sciences.”³⁷ J. Craig Venter of Celera Genomics,

which recently completed mapping the human genome, has stated, “There is no basis in the genetic code for race.”³⁸ We now have clear scientific proof that human beings are not divided into separate biological groups. “We think we see ‘race’ when we encounter certain physical differences among people such as skin color, eye shape, and hair texture. What we actually ‘see’ (or more accurately ‘perceive’) are the social meanings that have been linked to those physical features by the ideology of race and the historical legacy it has left us. Physical features were institutionalized as markers of lower or higher race status. They carry those meanings that have been invented and associated with the different status groups, and it is these meanings that we have been socially conditioned to receive.”³⁹

In CPE supervision, there are at least three potential dangers to the lack of awareness of whiteness or white privilege, and the impact this may have on our students. Our lack of awareness can erect barriers in the development of an effective learning alliance, can limit our awareness of the power dynamics in the supervisory process, and can make us insensitive to communication issues.⁴⁰

Trust is an essential component of the learning alliance. For supervision to be effective, students must see themselves as learners. They must be able to reveal weaknesses or areas needing growth, and to receive feedback from the supervisor. Students in CPE may be encouraged to be open about personal issues that relate to their pastoral work while not feeling the protection from judgment that exists in a counseling situation. Trust is central to a student’s ability to be vulnerable. Racism and the mistreatment of minorities in the United States sets the stage for guardedness on the part of non-white students with white supervisors. If the supervisor is not self-aware about the issue of race, is ignorant about the culture of the student, or the struggles of members of non-dominant groups, or is unable to empathize with the experience of oppression, the learning alliance has little chance of becoming fruitful.

Because the supervisor is viewed as having both expertise and an evaluative function, there is unequal power in the student-supervisor relationship. And “because the history of ethnic and race relations in the United States is one of power differentials, White paternalism, and racial minority oppression, minority supervisees may bring high levels of caution to supervision with the White supervisor.”⁴¹ The power dynamics cannot be ignored; they must be carefully managed.

As a white American, my communication style includes direct and prolonged eye contact and speech that can be perceived by others to be loud and rapid. I respond quickly, am very task oriented, and use intense non-verbal communication

such as head-nodding. This is, of course, not a universal style and actually can be disturbing to some persons from other cultures. Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Latinos, for example, have communication styles that are often characterized by softer, slower speech, less direct eye contact, and less direct approaches to issues.⁴² I supervised an Asian student recently who described himself in supervision as “a person who hints and implies things.” He was grateful when others recognized his hints, and felt at other times that people were foolish because they did not get the point and he had to repeat himself. A white supervisor who is not aware of his or her own communication style and how that differs from the style of the student might make inappropriate and incorrect judgments about the student, seeing her or him, for example, as timid or resistant.

When the invisibility of whiteness is joined to individualism, with its concomitant non-experience of peoplehood, the effect on the student can be devastating. A striking example of this is found in a previous edition of this Journal:

Although I could not articulate it when I was a student, I always felt a sense of isolation and apartness because I did not feel I could safely talk about my history, culture and experiences of racism with my peers and supervisors without fear of being labeled angry and defensive. I had no place to process the incident of racism I encountered at Boston City Hospital as a basic student while I was visiting an Irish-Catholic elderly male patient, who exclaimed, “I will be very happy for St. Patrick’s Day to come, so I can get out my baseball bat and hit those niggers who are threatening to come into my South Boston neighborhood and take it over.” Tears came to my eyes and I literally ran back to the Chaplain’s office hurt, confused and bewildered by such venom. I wanted to process this event with my supervisor who was in the office, but I was met with an almost blank stare and was told I may be a little too sensitive, because the patient probably did not mean what he said. The supervisor turned it into a psychological event and I was made to feel guilty because I did not have the fortitude to stay in the room with the patient and thereby deal with my anger in a more creative way.⁴³

Here the supervisor, who was presumably white, inappropriately used the individualistic lens of psychology as the single lens through which to process the student’s experience. He or she was incapable of thinking sociocentrically, of grasping the meaning of the patient’s poisonous words as representative of the social dynamic of profound racism. The supervisor could not connect empathetically with the obvious pain of the student because he or she lacked personal experience as a part of a *people* and was encapsulated in the blindness of white privilege. This privilege allowed this supervisor to be oblivious of the daily experience of suffering of African-Americans.

CONCLUSION

Effective clinical pastoral supervision in a multicultural context requires awareness, knowledge, and skill on the part of white supervisors.⁴⁴ This essay has examined two socially constructed elements in the awareness of supervisors—individualism and the invisibility of whiteness. We have seen how both of these social dynamics can blind the supervisor to the reality of the experience of some CPE students. Although there is a CPE objective concerning awareness of “how persons, social conditions, systems and structures affect the lives of self and others,” currently there are no requirements in supervisory CPE which necessitate the development of multicultural competency skills. The CPE student is required to become aware of how social dynamics impact self and others, but the CPE supervisor is not yet required to do the same in his or her supervisory training process. A new ACPE Multicultural Competency Task Force has been formed to develop these objectives.

NOTES

1. See Derald Wing Sue, Rosie P. Bingham, Lisa Porche-Burke, and Melba Vasquez, “The Diversification of Psychology: A Multicultural Revolution,” *American Psychologist* 54, no. 12 (1999): 1065-66, and K. Samuel Lee, “Becoming Multicultural Dancers: The Pastoral Practitioner in a Multicultural Society,” *Journal of Pastoral Care* 54 (2000): 5-7.

2. Ruth Frankenberg, *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), 16.

3. A term of Anton Boisen, the founder of clinical pastoral education. See Charles V. Gerkin, *The Living Human Document: Re-Visioning Pastoral Counseling in a Hermeneutical Mode* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1984), 200.

4. Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, *The Standards of The Association for Clinical Pastoral Education* (Decatur, GA: Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, 2001), 7-8.

5. Edward C. Stewart and Milton J. Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, Rev. ed. (Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc., 1991), 12.

18 INDIVIDUALISM AND THE INVISIBILITY OF MONOCULTURALISM/WHITENESS

6. Ibid., 14.

7. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Anchor Books, 1990), 132.

8. Ibid., 5-6.

9. Stewart and Bennett, 133.

10. Ibid., 132.

11. Ibid., 7.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid., 11.

14. Ibid., 133.

15. David W. Augsburger, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 80-81.

16. Ibid., 85.

17. Ibid., 82.

18. Ibid., 81.

19. Gargi Roysircar Sodowsky, Phoebe Y. Kuo-Jackson, and Gary J. Loya, "Outcome of Training in the Philosophy of Assessment: Multicultural Counseling Competencies," in *Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, Education and Training, and Supervision*, ed. Donald B. Pope-Davis, Hardin L.K. Coleman, Multicultural Aspects of Counseling Series (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 24.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., 90.

22. Sang-Chin Choi, Uichol Kim, and Soo-Hyang Choi, "Indigenous Analysis of Collective Representations: A Korean Perspective," in *Indigenous Psychologies: Research and*

Experience in Cultural Context, ed. Uichol and John Berry Kim (Newberry Park: Sage, 1993), 199.

23. *Ibid.*, 207.

24. David Yau-Fai Ho, "Relational Orientation in Asian Social Psychology," in *Indigenous Psychologies: Research and Experience in Cultural Context*, ed. John Berry Uichol Kim (Newberry Park: Sage Publications, 1993), 248-249.

25. ACPE, 9.

26. Smith, Archie, "The Relational Self in the Black Church: From Bondage to Challenge," in *Changing Views of the Human Condition*, ed. Paul W. Pruyser (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 140.

27. George E. Tinker, "On Not Requiring CPE for All Lutheran Students: A Letter," *Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* 14 (1992/3): 176-177.

28. John H. Moody, "A Half Decade of Learning: Cross-Cultural Ministry Education at Interfaith Ministries of Hawaii," *Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* 15 (1994): 27-28.

29. Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1994), 55.

30. Joe R. Feagin and Hernan Vera, *White Racism: The Basics* (New York: Routledge, 1995), xiii.

31. Richard Dyer, *White* (London, New York: Routledge, 1997), 1.

32. bell hooks, "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination," in *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism*, ed. Ruth Frankenberg (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), 169.

33. *Ibid.*, 167.

34. Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege and Male Privilege: A Personal Account of Coming to See Correspondences through Work in Women's Studies," in *Critical White Studies: Looking Behind the Mirror*, ed. Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997), 293.

20 INDIVIDUALISM AND THE INVISIBILITY OF MONOCULTURALISM/WHITENESS

35. Ibid., 293-4.

36. Ibid., 294-5.

37. Audrey Smedley, *Race in North America: Origin and Evolution of a Worldview*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1999), xi.

38. Sheryl Gay Stolberg, "Shouldn't a Pill Be Colorblind?," *The New York Times* (May 13, 2001, Week in Review): 1.

39. Smedley, xii.

40. See Margaret L. Fong and Suzanne H. Lease, "Cross-Cultural Supervision: Issues for the White Supervisor," in *Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, Education and Training, and Supervision*, ed. Donald B. Pope-Davis, Hardin L. K. Coleman, Multicultural Aspects of Counseling Series (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 387-405.

41. Ibid., 392.

42. Derald Wing and David Sue, *Counseling the Culturally Different: Theory and Practice*, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1990), 67.

43. Cameron W. Byrd, "Inclusiveness in a Basic Unit of Clinical Pastoral Education," *Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* 14 (1992/3): 202-203.

44. See D.W. Sue, P. Arredondo and R.J. McDavis, "Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards: A Call to the Profession," *Journal of Counseling and Development* 70 (1992): 477-486. and P. Arredondo, R. Toporek, S.P. Brown, J. Jones, D.C. Locke, J. Sanchezand, and H. Stadler, "Operationalization of the multicultural counseling competencies," *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* 24 (1996): 42-78.

Thinking Through Pastoral Education with Culturally Diverse Peer Groups

Mark Grace

“Can we even hope to catch a glimpse of this process, which has given rise to so many of the habits and linguistic prejudices that now structure our very thinking? But perhaps we may take our stand along the edge of that civilization, like a magician, or like a person who, having lived among another tribe, can no longer wholly return to his own.

He lingers half within and half outside of his community, open as well, then, to the shifting voices and flapping forms that crawl and hover beyond the mirrored walls of the city. And even there, moving along those walls, he may hope to find the precise clues to the mystery of how those walls were erected, and how a simple boundary became a barrier, only if the moment is timely—

Only that is, if the margin he frequents is a temporal as well as a spatial edge, and the temporal structure that it bounds is about to dissolve, or metamorphose, into something else.”¹

For almost seven years, Baylor University Medical Center has offered Residencies in Clinical Pastoral Education in a context that seeks to foster a deliberate cultural

Mark Grace, M. Div., B.C.C. is the Director of Pastoral Care and Counseling for the Baylor Health Care System in Dallas, Texas.

balance² in the make up of its peer group. What this has meant practically is that at least half of the CPE Residents in the program bring cultural identities formed outside the dominant European-American culture.

Richard Schweder's conceptual framework for exploring and interpreting cultures has assisted our CPE faculty to identify some important developmental tasks faced by highly diverse training groups. In *Thinking Through Cultures*, Schweder focuses on the search for meaning and the creation of intentional worlds (read "cultures") by setting out an intellectual agenda for cultural psychology. At the heart of this agenda are four ways of "thinking through" that, at least for Schweder, answer the question of how we ought to go about interpreting the worlds and lives of those whose cultures are different from our own.

The first of these tasks is that of thinking by means of the other.

"Thinking through others in the first sense is to recognize the other as a specialist or expert in some aspect of human experience, whose reflective consciousness and system of representations can be used to reveal hidden dimensions of ourselves. Some cultures of the world are virtuosos of grief and mourning, others of gender identity and still others, of intimacy, eroticism, ego striving, and so on."³

The second way of thinking through others carries the sense of "getting the other straight, of providing a systematic account of the internal logic of the intentional world constructed by the other."⁴ This is the process of *representing and defending* the other's views and particular means of interacting with the world.

Schweder identifies the third way of thinking through others with Jacques Derrida and other postmodern deconstructionists. This is thinking one's way out of or beyond the other person's culture. "It is the sense of passing through the other or intellectually transforming him or her or it into something else—perhaps its negation—by revealing what the life and intentional world of the other has dogmatically hidden away, namely, its own incompleteness."⁵

"And then there is 'thinking through others' in the sense of a situated perspectival observer, thinking while there in an alien land or with an alien other, trying to make sense of context-specific experiences."⁶ Schweder points to Clifford Geertz's landmark collection of essays, *Interpretation of Cultures*, and to Geertz's term, the "I-witnessing" author who seeks to turn a personal field experience into a "they-picturing" account of the other.⁷ Put in simpler terms, this represents the experience of "me seeing you seeing me"—that sometimes astounding and sometimes frightening moment when our "selves" slip the anchor of complete

identification with our particular viewpoint and we are freed to observe ourselves interacting with the other.

Before diving into discussion of how these four ways of seeing may inform supervisors and peer groups to move toward one another in meaningful educational dialogue, I want to make a few general observations.

Students in programs that feature cultural diversity as a prominent characteristic of the training milieu ought to have the benefit of walking into an environment that has been adequately prepared. As the degree of cultural and language diversity in a given training program increases, so also ought the degree of structure provided to the group as a whole. Lack of appropriate guidance and structure invariably favors those students who represent the dominant culture.⁸ It also encourages dependency to develop between group members who are more conversant with the dominant culture and language and those who are not. This significantly impacts group formation and the peer group's progress toward establishing an effective learning enterprise. This lesson was brought home to me in a vivid way late in the year of a training group when its members revealed the extent to which one member of the group had been "helped" by his peers. The implicit contract among group members to "carry" their peer resulted in deep division and a debilitating mix of pity, competition, and resentment on the part of group members. The time and effort put into examining the ways in which student deficits in understanding might better be assessed, how appropriate sources of help outside the peer group might be clearly identified and accessed by students, and the ways in which issues of status might be facilitated in the discussion of the peer group had significant positive impact upon later residency groups.

A critical dimension of preparation manifests in the cultural awareness of the CPE faculty. By this I do not mean to refer to the degree of knowledge about cultures or the relative experience supervisors may have in navigating in other cultures. Though that kind of awareness may be of great assistance, it may just as likely represent baggage to be overcome on the way to meeting and developing learning relationships with individuals. The kind of cultural awareness I am referring to here has to do with the degree to which CPE faculty have developed insight and understanding into the dominant social, organizational, and educational cultures that are operating in the learning milieu.

For instance, here in the Baylor Healthcare System, located across the greater Dallas, Texas area, students will encounter a culturally diverse hospital staff, the majority of whom are not originally from Dallas or Texas. They will encounter a fairly hierarchical organization that is quintessential buttoned-down Dallas—

“mobile, agile, and a little bit hostile,” as our CEO is fond of saying (he’s a former college football player), where the motto is “The best belong at Baylor.” They will also encounter a relatively large (27 permanent staff members) but cohesive pastoral care community devoted to participative management that has nonetheless been strongly influence by a culture that focuses on “bests.” They will find a long-established CPE program emphasizing clinical skills and cultural diversity—with many of the tensions and downsides that arise from such ambitions.

Visiting from room to room, students are just as likely to encounter patients who do not speak English (Dallas has the eighth largest concentration of Latinos in the United States as well as rapidly growing populations of folks either just immigrating from or tracing their lineage to Asian and Near Eastern countries.⁹) as they are to encounter patients coming to Baylor from counties with nearly-homogeneous white populations. Each of the layers named will significantly impact trainee experience and education. Each represents both resource and challenge for trainees coming from other cultures and countries.

Another important dimension of awareness has to do with the degree to which supervisors allow themselves to become aware of the aggressiveness of the human tendency to assimilate, rather than to accommodate experience. This dynamic doesn’t represent anything particularly new to folks trained in clinical supervision. The fact is, however, that it is a prominent theme in groups that are genuinely culturally heterogeneous. An illustration of this all-too-human tendency is cited by Ronald Takaki in *Strangers From A Different Shore* as he discusses the paradoxical consequences of the “story of the Asian-American Triumph” which “offers ideological affirmation of the American Dream,” but which has been met with anything but applause by the dominant culture. My point here is that these tendencies at work in the larger culture can also be assumed to be operating in the microcosm of the small process group—even where those gathered profess progressive social and religious ideals.¹⁰

One common manifestation of this dynamic is seen in the tendency of European Americans to initially emphasize what everyone has in common and to downplay differences among group members. Even though the hearty affirmation that “we are all the same” sounds like an invitation to community, in reality it may contain a more subtle demand. “Don’t make my life more difficult around here by presenting me with strangeness.” The unconscious and unintended consequence of this move is to set the group up later for a round of impatience, frustration, and mistrust when genuine differences become apparent.

While CPE supervisors seem largely to have tossed the “culture as a tool of resistance” mentality into the same trash bin as the “seductive female” motif, it is often discovered and used freely by European American trainees when they begin to feel a genuine challenge to accommodate (and not merely to assimilate) the system of symbols, beliefs, behaviors and interpretations of a peer. If supervisors can avoid the mistake of identifying culture as resistance while staying alert to the expression from other group members, this point in group life represents a significant opportunity for growth in the lives of individual members and of the group as a whole.

As a matter of fact, the appearance of this issue often represents the most critical moment in working with culturally diverse groups. This is so because the foundational skill and most common activity in groups of this type is that of learning to stop and seek clarification. Interestingly enough, some students will voice their struggle to engage this kind of learning by expressing anger and impatience at having their learning and the group’s cohesion impeded by the need to “constantly stop and explain.” The challenge is for supervisors to facilitate and challenge group members toward awareness that their experience in the group is intended to function as a primary learning experience.

Encouraging group members to stop one another when they do not understand someone’s pronunciation or when the use of an idiom clouds meaning is sometimes tedious work that frequently results in unexpected benefits. Though group members (and supervisors) often express the fear that the entire year will progress in the same tedious fashion, this hasn’t been the case when I have actively encouraged group members to stop and ask for clarification. Accents thin out, hearing becomes more acute, pronunciation improves, the use of jargon decreases, and clear use of language begins to flourish. In short, group members learn essential lessons about communicating with people who do not talk or think as they do.

When additional stressors of adjusting to a new social, legal, and financial context are added to the already challenging educational and clinical demands, some individuals respond by working harder to hold on to existing frames of reference. Baylor’s CPE faculty has made significant changes in orientation and the curriculum for the initial unit, as well as adopting some “buddy” and mentor strategies to take the demands of adjustment into account. The first unit curriculum focuses on foundational learning issues and rituals as well as learning activities emphasizing welcome, inclusion, and connection. Particular attention is given to trainees’ grief over separation from loved ones and work transitions.

A last general observation has to do with the supervisor's expectations for change in the group process. Schweder's four modalities of interpretation do not and should not represent progressive stages through which trainees and supervisors ought to pass, graduating from one to the next until they reach the final stage of enlightenment. To the contrary, I come from the school of chaotic enlightenment and am devoted to its precepts. What this school of thought teaches is that no thought is an absolute condition for the rising of another thought (or experience).¹¹

While I am in general accord with Schweder's assertion that we ought to focus on appreciating and understanding someone's culture before attempting to critique it (tasks one through three), I don't think that humans proceed in lockstep through such sequences, or that "transformation" (a sadly overused word in education these days) is of the sudden and complete variety. This kind of learning is always provisional, partial, and incomplete. It is always waiting for the next relationship to the next individual from the next culture, whereupon it retreats to seed and awaits our nurture so that understanding may bloom in a different world.

Students may bring reflection papers that describe them in an "open-ended, self-reflexive and dialogic turn of mind"¹² before they have even begun to appreciate the culture of the other, and that experience may pull them through the other three stages as surely and as ineluctably as though they had been pulled by the force of gravity itself.

On the other hand, someone else might assiduously work through the first three modalities of interpretation and be suddenly thrown back and out of the process of understanding entirely through the force of a single revelation, only to have to pick themselves up and begin again. I believe that commitment to this idea of cultural learning forces educators to be alert, to eschew expectations of "growth" that narrow one's field of vision, and to facilitate growth with greater agility and creativity.

THINKING THROUGH AS SEEING THROUGH ANOTHER'S EYES:
EXPERIENCING PROPER SUBJECTIVITY

Each dimension of cultural exploration presupposes a decision to turn toward a new kind of learning. Schweder's first category of "thinking through" signals the decision to engage the act of appreciation. The term "appreciate" has more weight

in Spanish than in English, and it is the connotation of the former usage that I want to emphasize in applying the word to Schweder's thinking. For speakers of Spanish, to appreciate something involves a more in-depth comprehension of the real value of the thing. When Schweder speaks of thinking by means of the other, he associates this activity with a similar kind of comprehension, that of beginning to understand the significance of the other person's culture and the world view that it represents.

This appreciation represents a real accommodation of the other's point of view, *even when the fact of accommodation is not recognized or fully understood*. An example of this kind of appreciation occurred in the last unit of a CPE Residency, when G, a 26-year-old female Methodist seminary graduate from Texas responded to L, a 40-year-old Malaysian minister, in an intense IPR session following significant conflict between L and D, a male, European-American peer. The two males had experienced tension verging on conflict over the course of the year, with little understanding or resolution of the dynamics that were feeding their mutual antipathy. L had finally confronted D in the previous IPR session. The conflict centered on D's perception of L's apparent lack of investment in the peer group. L finally responded vehemently to D's "bullying" tactics, vigorously defending himself. The IPR in question saw L struggling to process the feelings that had been stirred up by this conflict. He made the observation that he would rather withdraw from the program than experience the disturbing emotions engendered by the conflict, especially those emotions related to his own outburst.

The entire peer group participated in the discussion, with the three European Americans in the group visibly confused by L's intense reaction to the conflict. It was a clear and well established fact that D's peers considered his penchant for aggressive and volatile interaction to be problematic, and equally clear to me that most of his peers appreciated L for having given D a little of his own medicine. Now the group appeared nonplussed by L's apparent reversal. They somewhat impatiently wrestled with L, seeking to help him normalize his feelings and to celebrate his breakthrough. After some time, G entered the conversation with a great deal of emotional energy. Speaking with the force of newly discovered insight, G described her growing sense that what L had actually been trying to communicate to the group was his anguish over having to take such extreme measures to help his peers understand the depth of his commitment to the group. Drawing on previous discussions about the difference between European-American culture as a very verbal and emotionally demonstrative world and L's Chinese-Malaysian heritage which involved much more subtle communication and

greater emphasis on emotional control, G began to catalogue the ways in which L had been demonstrating his commitment to group process.

“I was just sitting here, and I began to see all the ways you have been showing us you were invested in each of us and in this group as a whole. I wasn’t giving you any credit for all of the work you have been doing. I can only imagine how frustrating it must have been to you to give so much and not have it recognized by the rest of us.”

This insight marked a significant shift in G’s understanding of L. G’s subsequent reflections in both group and individual settings led me to believe that her ability to properly value one aspect of L’s worldview had a significant impact upon her experience of herself. This is what Schweder is pointing to when he states that this kind of appreciative learning allows us to “recognize the other as a specialist or expert in some aspect of human experience, *whose reflective consciousness and system of representations can be used to reveal hidden dimensions of ourselves.*”¹³ As a result, G advanced her capacity to assist L’s learning and to be assisted in her learning by him.

THINKING THROUGH AS “GETTING IT STRAIGHT:” THE EFFORT TO UNDERSTAND

My colleague, Lee Ann Rathbun, demonstrated what it means to engage the activity of understanding from a supervisory point of view in her supervisory relationship with Y. Y was a middle-aged Nigerian minister from the Ibo tribe who had recently completed his Ph.D. in Gerontology. He was a thoroughly winsome and intellectually gifted individual. His group had some difficulty taking him seriously.

On the one hand, Y’s behavior in informal and direct encounters was deferential and conflict-avoidant. On the other hand, his mannerisms in more formal group settings reflected habits of expression sometimes associated with individuals trained in British educational systems. Y’s peer group considered his behavior to be professorial and slightly pompous.

To the European Americans among us, Y sometimes seemed not to “get it” when asked to disclose feelings or when confronted with direct feedback. He possessed, however, a talent for relating here-and-now dynamics to pastoral care theory, and so provided the group with a considerable fund of theoretical knowledge, as well as the capacity to relate it meaningfully to the happenings of

the moment. As I observed him from a relative distance, I also noted his habit of smiling broadly and nodding his head at times of rising tension and took that behavior to be rather avoidant and submissive.

During one IPR session, a vigorous argument was taking place between W, an Asian male professor, and Q, a European American minister. When Y stepped in to make an observation, Q summarily cut him off. “Butt out, buddy,” was the essential message given to Y. Y smiled broadly, his head bobbing as he maintained steady eye contact with Q. He vocalized a very soft, “I am so sorry, I apologize. You are quite right.”

When Lee Ann met with Y for individual supervision, he addressed the exchange described above with a great deal of anger and frustration. As she worked with him in the session, Lee Ann began to understand the real meaning of Y’s behavior and his words. She worked to help Y find a way to interpret his actions for his peers—especially for Q—so that they might also understand his behavior. In the next IPR, Y claimed time to address Q directly and proceeded to reframe his behavior from the previous session. This time he did not appear to be blustering, but manifested with quiet and attention-getting authority.

“It may have appeared that I was acquiescing to your rudeness in dismissing me...In fact, the reaction I displayed is used in my country when one encounters inappropriate behavior. When one sees a friend doing something that is socially unacceptable, then the custom is to nod, smile with the teeth and to say something placating. The message is quite different than the one you seemed to have taken from me, however. The message is exactly this: ‘My friend, you are out of bounds. I am sorry for you. I do not wish to shame you in front of these people, so please take note of your behavior and collect yourself.’ It is then customary for the person so counseled to break off their interaction and to stop to examine their behavior, and hopefully, to apologize at a later time.”

One might well imagine that this revelation began an animated discussion, not only between Y and Q, but also among the rest of the group and Y. Members began to recall other circumstances in which Y had displayed similar behavior and to question their assessment of it. Though Y did not completely dissolve others’ perceptions of him as being unnecessarily accommodating, group members were much more attentive to his presence and interaction in the group from that point forward.

While the above experience illumines only one dimension of Y’s intentional world, I believe that my colleague’s interaction with Y serves to illustrate beautifully what it means to work at “getting it straight” when supervising students from other cultures. Because of her persistence in seeking to “represent and

defend” the world of the student (that is, to understand the rationality of his acts from his cultural point of view), she enabled him to bridge a widening chasm between himself and his peer group in order to establish effective cross cultural dialogue.¹⁴ She also enabled him to practice transliterating behavior from one culture to another—an essential skill for pastoral caregivers operating in cultures outside their native context.

One of the tools we have developed to assist this dimension of learning is the “Intercultural Communication Seminar.” Lee Ann Rathbun built upon and improved the format of a previous seminar developed by me to address cultural learning needs in the peer group. The purpose of the seminar is to assist participants to inform one another about their native cultures as well as to deepen individual and group understanding of the cultural elements that shape the behavior of their peers.

Seminar objectives include establishing students as resident experts and teachers of their native culture (a value that is maintained beyond the seminar and the unit in which the seminar takes place). The seminar also serves as the formal introduction of “thinking through” skills, as well as providing the first forum devoted to a “mini-immersion” environment in which participants are encouraged to bracket interpretation and to deliberately attempt to place themselves within the world of the presenter.¹⁵

1. Students each prepare a 45-minute “immersion experience” for the group that includes elements from each of the following categories:
2. Concrete: the most visible and tangible level of culture—food, clothes, music, games, holidays, celebrations, festivals.
3. Behavioral: clarifies how we define our social roles, the language we speak, our approaches to nonverbal communication—the behavioral level *reflects* our values; includes language, gender roles, family structure, political affiliation, and other items that situate us organizationally in society; and
4. Symbolic: includes our values and beliefs—customs, spirituality, religion, mores, taboos, sacred stories, among other things.¹⁶

During the immersion experience, group participants may ask for clarification to gain understanding but cannot offer interpretations. After the presentation the presenter adopts the role of observer, while the group offers any associations or feelings that emerged during the presentation. Following this, the group brainstorms for ten minutes about symbols, words, or themes that were reflected in the presentation. For 15 minutes, the group brainstorms theological themes that surfaced in the presentation. At this point the presenter may enter into the discussion. The final ten minutes of the session is devoted to group reflections

on the presenter as minister in the context of his or her culture and on themselves in relationship to the presenter.

Though this brief introduction to students' cultures cannot hope to provide trainees with the information they need for a truly comprehensive understanding of other cultures, it has served well as a catalyst for increased openness to and exploration of each member's point of view. Presentations have incorporated a wide array of learning activities (sharing food and communal eating practices as well as music top the list as favorite means of conveying concrete elements of culture). After experimenting with the timing of this seminar, the CPE Faculty has settled on the second unit as optimal to stimulate learning in this venue. The first unit seems to present too many orientation and adjustment challenges for students while offering the session later in the year seems to unnecessarily delay the group's progress toward cohesion.

It needs to be recognized, however, that understanding at this level is less a product of large-scale events and more the result of persistent effort, lively curiosity, and willingness to engage in the sometimes-tedious task of examining almost every communication.¹⁷ While it is true that very few human beings of any culture could sustain this effort for every moment of group and individual interaction, it is a goal worth returning to again and again.

Some supervisory and interpersonal strategies that have assisted our faculty to facilitate cultural learning include the following:

- Offering trainees the opportunity to submit materials for selected individual supervisory sessions written in their native language, thus shifting the burden of translation to the supervisor.
- Utilizing an internet news clipping service to keep the supervisor and group apprised of current events in the home countries of international residents.
- Contracting with group members to call one another's attention to the habitual use of colloquialisms and idiomatic expressions.
- Contracting with members to allow for members to correct unintelligible pronunciation.
- Inviting trainees to verbalize in their native tongue (this invitation to throw off proper social vocabulary and use one's regional, family or personal idiom works quite well with native English speakers as well).
- Invite each new group to take a hand in reshaping departmental rituals of worship, celebration, and community out of the fund of unique cultural resources they bring.

- Utilizing resources from local communities native to group members in planning the educational curriculum.
- Incorporating Baylor's internationally recognized Cultural Diversity and Prejudice Reduction training programs into our CPE Residency Curriculum.
- Learning and using words and phrases from group members' native contexts—risking correction and laughter when mistakes are made.

Effort in this last area paid an unexpected dividend one day when R, a minister from the Philippines, was faced with distressing news about the burglary of his house in the Philippines, where his wife was still residing with their children. One of R's peers informed me of the incident as I was approaching my office. R walked by at about this time and I called his name then beckoned to him in the manner I had been taught by previous trainees from that country (that is, with palm facing down and all four fingers curling inward). Later in the day, R asked me how I knew to do this and stated, "I felt so warm and cared for when you gestured to me in this way, as though I were being called by a familiar friend from my island."

Another strategy for fostering understanding derives from my orientation toward pastoral supervision, which focuses on story telling from an oral perspective (versus narrative approaches that assume a "textual" framework).¹⁸ For example, I conducted a group supervision seminar (sometimes referred to as "verbatim seminar") one year, in which the required work included a bare minimum of written summary of the pastoral encounter. Instead of reducing the encounter to "text," trainees were invited to utilize their peer group to assist them in telling and enacting stories of selected pastoral encounters. A portion of the group reflection was then focused on soliciting group members' recollections of stories they were told in their childhood that the presented ministry encounters evoked.

While many European Americans may relate to oral traditions established within their subcultures, students from nondominant cultures are more likely to possess knowledge and skill needed for this kind of pastoral reflection. In the seminar just described, two participants were from West African countries. Group understanding and learning about possible pastoral interventions was greatly enhanced as we were taught about the village and tribal custom of gathering in the evening to hear the elders climb the ladder of the moon, telling tales of ancestors, heroes, and gods deep into the night as well as the practice of "hitting" certain members with stories meant to call their attention to wayward behavior and to point the way to correct conduct.

This group also established its own storytelling tradition after being encouraged to use the ritual lighting of a candle (outside formal group settings) as a signal that one member had an important tale to tell. This custom had positive benefits for group cohesion, distribution of power and status within the group, and self-disclosure.

THINKING THROUGH AS “SEEING THROUGH” ANOTHER:
OFFERING CONSTRUCTIVE CRITIQUE

Straightforward communication is a highly over rated commodity in CPE training groups. What sometimes passes for being “straight” or “honest” has more to do with particular methods of expressing personal perspectives or of competing for status that is unique to Western cultures than it does with any universal attributes of honesty. My persistent experience, both as a minister among Hispanics in Texas and as a CPE supervisor, has been that European Americans typically attach the value of integrity and honesty to behaviors that are viewed in other many other cultures as inconsiderate, socially inept, and even injurious.¹⁹ Even among European Americans, small process group culture persistently favors the personality traits of extraversion and overt emotional display to those of introversion and concern for dignity.

So how, you may ask, do we get any work or learning done in a training milieu that proposes to utilize interpersonal exchange and self-disclosure as foundations of the learning process? The short version of the answer to this question is simply this. In order to maintain effective learning in such groups, supervisors are challenged to broaden and deepen their capacity to recognize purposeful communication and to assist group members to negotiate the establishment of a broad repertoire of acceptable styles of communication. In any given group, the aim ought not to be to establish a “CPE” brand of communication, but to advocate for the practice and free exchange of, say, Ibo, Ilocano, Malay, Brazilian, Tamaulipan, Dominican, or Appalachian (or any of an infinite combination of other) styles of communication. The point is that, if we are to take seriously Schweder’s assertion about the ways in which other cultures may serve to revise our worldviews, then the tension between our comfortable ways of

expressing personal values and those that seem strange to us represents a critical path to learning.

There is nothing particularly revolutionary about this task—such learning takes place in every competent training program. The unique contribution that culturally diverse peer groups offer is the creation of a milieu in which interpersonal variety seizes the foreground as a primary learning issue essential to the overall success of the group. Doggedly “facilitating” groups into styles of critique and interpersonal learning that remain focused on high context European American styles of communication creates the educational equivalent of rushing through New York’s Museum of Modern Art in an hour’s time.²⁰ There may be some value in the exercise, but what it is no one can say for sure.

When our 2000-2001 residency group entered into an email exchange of verbatim reports with an Introductory CPE group in Tanzania, supervised by John Eybel, the above-named reality was given opportunity to stand out in bold relief. The session began with a veritable barrage of critique on the pastoral ministry provided by our African colleagues. Then supervisors and group members began to raise questions about the legitimate meaning of certain behaviors, the background of training and the cultural context in which pastoral care was being provided. As the group struggled to take into account the legitimate differences in context and culture, interpretations began to take on a more provisional tone. Interpretation and criticism gave way to a long period of questioning and wondering, then attempts to identify all alternate meanings for a given statement or interaction. Some group members wondered how much of value we had to offer our African colleagues. All were in agreement, however, that the exercise was of great value for our group. Some members observed that the exercise caused them to re-examine their assumptions about a wide range of subjects related to proper pastoral care. Someone else noted that struggling with the meaning of a particular spiritual and emotional issue in such a different context had caused them to see the dynamic in an entirely different light.

It would be difficult for me to stress this principle too much—that is, that the kind of critique that arises from the effort to “think through” another person’s intentional world in each of the other ways named by Schweder produces critique of a profoundly different quality than that which is offered from within the confinement of one’s cultural viewpoint. While CPE trainees may not always spontaneously recognize the good intentions behind such critique, it will almost invariably contain elements of accuracy and relational authenticity that increase its potential as learning material.

When K, a student from Kenya, brought a verbatim report to individual supervision one day, his primary concern was with the pathological relationship the woman he was visiting had developed with a dog. In K's life experience, people did not keep pets, only livestock. For the woman to express such obsession with an animal was a bit shocking. When I finally broke through my cultural blinders I responded with a good belly laugh at my own slowness (K so competently articulated the problem in psychoanalytic terms that I found myself genuinely questioning the emotional healthiness of my attachment to my Labrador). Afterward we began to imagine what it might be like for K to politely use his lack of acquaintance with this peculiar custom as a way to assist this woman to further explore her anxiety and her faith in the face of her upcoming surgery.

It seems to me now that my contribution to K's learning centered around two important efforts. The first was to acknowledge and respond actively to whatever competencies K possessed that would serve him well in his learning experience. K's grasp of psychoanalytic concepts represented a vein of gold in that regard.

The second effort was to assist K to explore ways in which he might actively deal with a reality he experienced with painful self-consciousness—namely his experience as a “stranger in a strange land.” As we played with ideas in the aftermath of my genuine laughter at my own slowness, K also began to explore an alternative self-awareness. When his strangeness was addressed as a possible asset, he began to feel more at home in his work and learning.

For group members of the dominant culture, the resistance to learning from peers whose world view is different sometimes takes the form of the fear of acknowledging both one's dominant position as well as one's often quite-unconscious sense of entitlement about being in the dominant role.²¹ Like many other social problems, the engine of racism and cultural paternalism also seems to be helped along in North American cultures by the shame that is attached to acknowledging one's need for help in this area. Our residents' involvement in Baylor's Diversity training and Prejudice Reduction workshops seems to have provided at least one effective means by which to assist group members to own limitation and need for growth in an environment in which such needs are acknowledged in a matter-of-fact atmosphere.

The Russian historian of the novel, M. M. Bakhtin, sums up the possibilities I have tried to name in this section in his discussion of the impact of the novel upon the worlds that our cultures create. The role of the novelist is to present the old cultural world in a new light, and to offer a tale that provides imaginative alternatives to the story that has lost its power to sustain human communities. The

great novelists, from Homer to Salinger, have helped human beings to stand outside themselves and to renew the intentional worlds they have helped to create and sustain. Those worlds

“...become more free and flexible, their language renews itself...they become self-parody and finally—this is the most important thing—the novel inserts...an indeterminacy, a certain semantic open-endedness, a living contact with unfinished, still-evolving, contemporary reality (the open ended present).”²²

“SITUATED PERSPECTIVAL OBSERVATION:” SEEING YOU SEEING ME

The philosophical orientation that fuels my affinity for Schweder’s categories is best expressed by that line of phenomenology tracing from Kant to Husserl to Merleau-Ponty and finally coming to rest in the hermeneutical stance of Paul Ricoeur. In reading Schweder’s description of the four phases of thinking through other cultures, I was struck by the similarity of Schweder’s language to Ricoeur’s idea that phenomenology’s favorite technique is the “method of imaginative variations.”²³ Ricoeur’s contribution to our understanding of the “living human document” has been to offer a mediating position between our faith in the particular point of view represented by our individuality (and the culture in which individuals are embedded) and the incredible array of alternative possibilities, which the world offers for our consideration. There exists a “surplus of meaning” beyond the worlds we have made for ourselves that awaits our discovery and our full-bodied appreciation.²⁴

This appears to be what G glimpsed when she began to see a small part of her peer group’s life through L’s eyes. It was the opportunity that Y offered to our group as he patiently explained his behavior to the group. I also believe I was privileged to catch sight of myself in this way as I saw the world of pets through K’s eyes. None of these experiences represents anything like a total “conversion” to this kind of seeing. Each represents a single invitation toward a deeper and more fluid understanding of reality itself, issued by a human being through his or her very style of being in the world.

The moment of our arrival at this point is often signaled by the classic experience of confusion and disorientation that attends a real reduction of faith²⁵ in our single point of view. It may be presaged as well by struggle and active

resistance as we seek to hang on to the dreaming innocence in which we, and those like us, were the only ones who defined the world. When we break through the confusion and resistance, for however short a time, we often find ourselves standing a little distance from ourselves, seeing ourselves for the first time in a new light. We become aware that all of our ways of believing, that all of the things we “know” about the world, from the most common to those ideas we consider most noble, are only a fraction of the possibilities. And if we are lucky, we see ourselves standing face-to-face with another human, whose very being represents a portal to a world of other possibilities.

NOTES

1. David Abram, *The Spell of the Sensuous* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1996), 28-29. One may well accuse me of applying the wrong quotation to this discussion of intercultural learning, since Abram’s book deals primarily with the relationship between the human and nonhuman world. I consider, however, that there is no real way to carry on intelligible discussion in the realm of humanity while refusing to acknowledge our urgent need to apply many of the same principles to the question of our larger place in the world.

2. Of course, the notion of a “culturally balanced” peer group is, to some extent, an imaginative artifice that can only be sustained if one’s view is narrowed down to the peer group itself. What I believe was and continues to be worthwhile about working to recruit peer groups that contain a high degree of cultural—and, as it has turned out, national and language—diversity is that group formation and identity are significantly shaped by the need for trainees and supervisors to learn to navigate in a cross cultural training environment—not merely to assimilate the unusual student or two, but to genuinely engage the task of learning to negotiate work, learning, and community in an interpersonal landscape defined by cultural diversity.

3. Richard Schweder, *Thinking Through Cultures* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 108-109.

4. *Ibid.*, 109.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Ibid.*, 110.

8. Steven Pinker, *The Language Instinct* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), 368. "In all cultures, social interactions are mediated by persuasion and argument. How a choice is formed plays a large role in determining which alternative people choose." Pinker's argument here is that social dominance is and has been based in large part upon the ability to use language with fluency and subtlety.

9. "U.S. Census Bureau: State and County Quick Facts," The U.S. Census Bureau (Online Web Server). Accessed May 25, 2001. Available: <http://quickfacts.census.gov/states/48000.html>

10. Ronald Takaki, *Strangers From A Different Shore* (New York: Penguin Books, 1989), 477-480.

11. The term "chaotic enlightenment" is mine, but in using it I am following Jerome Bruner's definition of culture, which "takes the form of a move away from a strict structuralism...to the idea of culture as implicit and only semi connected knowledge of the world from which, through negotiation, people arrive at satisfactory ways of acting in given contents [*Actual Minds, Possible Worlds* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 65.]

12. Schweder, 110.

13. *Ibid.*, 109.

14. David W. Augsburger, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 38-42.

15. John Patton, *From Ministry to Theology: Pastoral Action and Reflection* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1992), 24-28.

16. James P. Spradley, *Participant Observation* (Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt Bruce College Publishers, 1980), 10-12.

17. Spradley, 55.

18. See Kevin M. Bradt, *Story As A Way of Knowing* (Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward, 1997), especially Chapter 2, "Thinking in Story," for an effective discussion of the critical differences between storytelling as an interactive and oral means of knowing vs. narrative, textual hermeneutic approaches like Gherkin's *Living Human Document* and others.

19. Carl D. Schneider, *Shame, Exposure and Privacy* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1977),

20. For a discussion of the differences between “high context” and “low context” cultures and their impact upon education, see A. Maley, “Divided Worlds: Divided Minds,” in *Language Teaching and Learning Styles Within and Across Cultures*, ed. Verner Bickley (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Education Dept., 1989), 20-32.
21. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos (New York: The Continuum Press, 1970), 34.
22. M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holmquist (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981), 256.
23. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Biblical Narrative and the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 21.
24. *Ibid.*, 6-7.
25. Abram, 48. Abram offers an effective summary of the phenomenological technique. I have used the terms “reduction” and “conversion” purposefully to parallel the phases in that process in which individuals’ habitual and largely assumed ways of perceiving a given phenomenon are “reduced” or robbed of their obligatory sense of reality. “Conversion” refers to that process whereby one adopts a more fluid and agile understanding of the alternative ways of perceiving a given phenomenon.

From Multiculturalism to Interculturality: Demilitarizing the Border Between Personal and Social Dynamics Through Spiritual Receptivity

Kathleen J. Greider

In my ministry location, there is no longer time for debate about *whether* supervision and training in ministry will be or, even, why it *should* be, “cross-cultural” or “multicultural.” My current professional point of view is shaped to a significant degree by teaching in the classrooms of a significantly multi-national and somewhat multi-religious theological school of the United Methodist Church, located on the Pacific rim of the United States, in the sprawling metropolis of Los Angeles County, a region estimated by many to be the most *religiously* diverse in the world. The faculty, staff, and student body of my location in ministry—Claremont School of Theology (CST)—wrestle daily with challenges in many dimensions of cultural diversity made urgent by immediate, critical, even life-or-death needs.

Kathleen J. Greider, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor of Pastoral Care and Counseling at the United Methodist Church's Claremont School of Theology in Claremont, California.

This is not to say that southern Californians or “Claremonters” are all or always consciously dedicated or happily amenable to our immersion in diversity. We are as limited as all humans in the spiritual receptivity required for this praxis and reflection. More worrisome, this region of the United States sometimes demonstrates reluctance, stagnation, and failure in our multicultural living because we have tried popular or obvious strategies in cross-cultural communication and found them inadequate. Our naïveté is exhausted.

Religious professionals in southern California are confronted daily by the stark differences between the realities of multiculturalism and cross-culturalism and the potential of interculturality. The population of southern California is, as a matter of fact, multicultural—that is, made up of multiple cultures. Thus, it is rare to have an interaction that is not obviously cross-cultural—that is, an interaction across visible cultural differences. However, the often-staid quality of our factually multicultural identity and unavoidably cross-cultural interactions is typically a far cry from the dynamism of interculturality, which can be described as engagement by a multicultural population in cross-cultural communication characterized not only by careful differentiation and measured collaboration but also by vibrant interrelatedness and, ideally, day-to-day cooperation. Such interculturality requires the development of, among other spiritual gifts, the spiritual capability of receptivity.

Life in southern California is praxis in plurality. For CST scholars and leaders in religion, reflection on praxis in plurality is not an abstract discussion. Unavoidably, though sometimes more unconsciously than consciously, our daily praxis in plurality is a laboratory, where we test hypotheses regarding greater interculturality in ministry and are regularly confronted by our failure to move beyond statistical multiculturalism to dynamic interculturality. Life in southern California forces, minimally, acquiescence to multiculturalism and cross-culturalism. On our best days, however, when we reach beyond acquiescence, huge questions dog us: “Multiculturalism, yes, but how?” More exactly: “How do we move from a unyielding multiculturalism to a more supple interculturality? How can we cultivate in ourselves and our communities the spiritual receptivity required for interculturality?”

In this essay I offer reflection on these questions from the perspective of the following thesis: growth from multiculturalism to interculturality requires a spiritual capacity for receptivity that is enabled by engagement with and effectiveness at the interface of personal and social dynamics. Shaped and confirmed by my ministry in the location I have just described, with the purpose of

helping to grow innate and well-meaning multiculturalism into sagacious interculturality, the essay seeks to show that: conceptual and strategic polarization of personal and social dynamics decreases human capacity for interculturality; interculturality requires development of the spiritual gift of receptivity; and supervision and training can aid ministers in the increase of their spiritual receptivity through focused attention to the interface of what has come to be referred to as “the personal” and “the social.”

My energy for this particular argument is generated not only by my work at Claremont School of Theology but also, and just as significantly, by my education and experience in pastoral theology and caregiving. My experience caring for groups and persons has convinced me that most discourse on multiculturalism— theological and otherwise—is naïve about the intrapersonal and interpersonal demands placed upon humans by multiculturalism (much less interculturality). Consequently, most discourse on multiculturalism fails to offer adequate interpersonal and, especially, intrapersonal emotional strategies for groups and persons challenged to navigate everyday life in multiculturalism. Further, differentiation in social change rhetoric and strategies between what has come to be known as “the personal” and “the social” has become not only reductionistic but also far overstated and dangerous to our goals of meaningful engagement across cultural differences. The pseudo-border thus created between personal and social dynamics is too often a war zone, a battleground between intellectuals and activists arguing for the superiority either of “social analysis” or “personal growth” in the solving of systemic ills, such as schisms along cultural lines.

The spiritual receptivity required for interculturality is made more difficult by naïveté about humans’ psychosocial capacities, minimization of the spiritual demands of multiculturalism, or ideological distinctions between personal and social dynamics. Such naïveté, minimization, and ideological distinctions do nothing to break down either interpersonal or intrapersonal barriers within and between persons or groups. Worse, because such distinctions blithely disregard the fact that all humans are forced daily—and thus struggle mightily—to navigate the complex interaction of personal and social realities, such distinctions can reinforce guardedness and resentment in personal and group identities. Politicized ideological demarcations between personal and social dynamics can be similarly destructive to our goals. Politicizing the sometimes-competing pressures of personal and social dynamics exacerbates social stratification and competitiveness by, for example, caricaturing some as having the “luxury” of personal growth and patronizing others as being sociopolitically “powerless.”

However, teaching, research, and literature are focusing increasingly on the complexities, demands, and resources of what has been called a “third space,” life in the interplay between personal and social dynamics. Teasing out the interrelatedness of personal and social dynamics has the welcome potential to demilitarize the border created between them by the human tendency toward dualistic thinking. Though others are identifiable, I have found the following three emphases at the border of the personal and the social to be meaningful in increasing religious professionals’ capacity for spiritual receptivity and, thus, for interculturality:

- Conceptualization and use of highly inclusive understandings of “culture;”
- Conceptualization and self-reflexive exploration of the inextricable relationship and complex overlap between “personal” and “social” dynamics; and
- Reclamation of the ancient spiritual practice of pilgrimage as a mode for conceptualizing and enabling intercultural relationships and dynamics.

“CULTURE,” INCLUSIVELY UNDERSTOOD

One means to engage effectively the interface of personal and social dynamics and thus increase the spiritual receptivity required for interculturality is by cultivation of the most inclusive understanding and engagement of “culture” possible, an inclusivity that embraces both personal and social cultures. Conceptual and strategic polarization of personal and social dynamics decreases human capacity for interculturality because highlighting either social cultures or personal cultures obscures their equal influence—positively and negatively—in interculturality. One example must suffice.

Unfortunately, in much discourse in the United States about plurality, the term “cultural diversity” has been hijacked by often-simplistic conceptualization of and often-unproductive preoccupation with racial-ethnic differences. In the United States, discussion of “cultural diversity” tends to be limited to discussion of difference in “race,” ethnicity, and national origin; “multicultural” is frequently a code word for “multiracial.” Further, the “social” dynamics of racial-ethnic identity are more commonly understood in the United States than are the “personal” dynamics. One of the several misfortunes from which United States residents suffer when “culture” is commandeered in these ways is that discussions of

multiculturalism (read: racial-ethnic particularities) can contribute to our lack of consciousness of the very diversity of culture we seek to acknowledge and, thus, leave persons diverse in ways other than “race” or ethnicity feeling excluded from the respect and care we seek to increase. Obviously, feelings of exclusion from multicultural life decrease human capacity for interculturality.

Yet, most English speakers can agree that “culture,” when used in contexts not dominated by racial-ethnic tensions, refers to far more than physical appearance or even nationality. When wrestling with plurality in teaching or other dimensions of life, I have found the succinctness and scope of pastoral counselor David Augsburg’s phrase an essential anchor: culture is “patterns of human experience.”¹ When I speak of “culture,” I mean to be mindful of and responsive to any characteristics that a person shares with a group (small or large) of other people. For elaboration, I often turn to the words of clinical social worker Elaine Pinderhughes: “Culture may be defined as the sum total of ways of living developed by a group of human beings to meet biological and psychosocial needs. It refers to elements such as values, norms, beliefs, attitudes, folkways, behavior styles, and traditions that are linked together to form an integrated whole that functions to preserve the society.”²

Pinderhughes’ words rightly draw our attention to the clearly observable fact that all groups of human beings develop patterns in behavior, thinking, and feeling and thus develop their own cultures. Many examples can be identified. All over the globe, teenagers tend to develop their own counter-cultural cultures. Extended and nuclear families frequently develop patterns in communication, emotional expression, and behavior mysterious to onlookers. Every romance, friendship, sports team, committee, and business develops a culture. Cultures develop within specific personality types, for example, the love of most extroverts for parties and the love of most introverts for solitude. Educational institutions develop cultures related to standards and disciplines of study, but also to sports, mascots, colors, and secret traditions. The multiplicity of Protestant Christian denominational cultures is particularly stark evidence of the degree to which seemingly similar and unity-espousing human beings still create powerful—and powerfully differentiating—cultures.

Making culture more complicated still, all these patterns are invested with reality and value not only in the present but also in the past and future. Culture is comprised not only of the values and traditions that characterize us in the present but also the customs, languages, and beliefs that we have held in the past; even if we have distanced ourselves from aspects of the cultures in which we lived our

childhood, adolescence, or young adult lives, those cultures influence us in adulthood through memory, and often unconsciously. Culture is also comprised of the patterns we value for the future, especially those we seek to instill in ourselves and others. Finally, insofar as each of us is a unique combination of personal qualities and social relationships, we each reflect culture a little differently because it comes through the filter of our particular identity.

Thus, perhaps except to the extent we can describe microcosms, everything that we describe as “a culture” is in actuality hundreds of cultures in interaction. A person or group does not have a culture but is many cultures, complexly layered and dynamically interacting.

Certainly, this extraordinarily inclusive way of conceptualizing “culture” has limitations. One problem is that it may dilute the power of the concept by including too much. It is so broad as to include every one of our idiosyncratic habits that some small group of other people happens to share with us. It can be argued that this inclusivity risks diluting the meaningfulness and positive power of the paradigm of culture. For example, when “culture” is used to refer more specifically to “race” or ethnicity, it can carry the power to name (and maybe even create) an empowering sense of bonding within dispersed and marginalized persons and groups.

Interculturality requires development of the spiritual gift of receptivity, including receptivity to the complex interplay of personal and social cultures in cross-cultural human interactions. Thus, in relation to the thesis I am arguing, the limitations of an inclusive conceptualization of culture are easily balanced by other values, especially the value that culture inclusively understood inexorably cultivates the spiritual capacity for receptivity. One aspect of receptivity thus cultivated is receptivity to the inevitability of every person’s cultural formation: no one escapes being shaped by some cultural context. Inclusivizing the concept of culture makes it difficult for anyone to claim they have no culture. In the present era, this is a necessary value for people, families, or groups who have lost touch with the cultures of their racial or ethnic identity—many people of European American descent, for example. Such persons might feel excluded, or wish to exclude themselves, from cross-cultural issues, discussions, and strategies. However, defining culture comprehensively makes it clear that each of us has distinct, multiple, and complex patterns in our behavior. Thus, all persons are more likely to see themselves as having cultural as well as personal and familial characteristics and are, thus, more likely both to feel investment in and take responsibility for moving from multiculturalism toward interculturality.

Another way that an inclusive conceptualization of culture helps cultivate spiritual receptivity is that it hinders any of us from thinking that we have only one culture and promises help to those whose loyalties to multiple cultures may conflict when culture is narrowly defined. Increasingly, people, families, and groups are becoming aware, and vocal, that they hold identities more complex than their identification with any one group. One bit of evidence of this trend is that the 2000 census in the United States caused a furor, in part because it did not provide for bicultural or even more multicultural identity but forced persons to choose from an incomplete list of singular racial-ethnic identities in order to be counted. In both political and interpersonal contexts, broad conceptualizations of culture better acknowledge and can help ease the conflicts sometimes experienced by self-consciously multicultural persons, families, and groups.

An inclusive conceptualization of culture also contributes to spiritual receptivity by undermining the ease with which humans can stereotype a given culture, whether our own or others. Culture comprehensively understood pushes us to fine-tune our understanding of one another, alerting us to the plurality of social realities that shape what it means for persons to belong to any group. Because each of us is a concoction of cultural identities, there is and can be no one way to be, for example, Korean or Jewish or Mexican-American or Norwegian or farmers or middle-class or Christian. By contrast, the more narrow our definitions of culture, the more those definitions encourage both exclusivity and inaccurate generalizations about persons who share a certain racial or ethnic heritage. Such a definition of culture does little to help us see the nuances of identity introduced by other crucial aspects of our communal life.

Spiritual receptivity is required and cultivated in supervision and training for ministry when self-reflection is directed toward inclusion of both personal and social cultures. Supervision and training in ministry can aid students in the increase of the spiritual receptivity needed for interculturality by developing and using inclusive understandings of culture in the ways, and for the reasons, just described. I promulgate receptivity to inclusive definitions of culture because, from my point of view as pastoral theologian and caregiver, the perennial and global nature of cultural particularity is fuel for the energy to move from a static multiculturalism to a more interactive interculturality. The increasing recognition of the interrelatedness of all creation manifests in contemporary pastoral theology and care as an increasing recognition that human societies are not simply multicultural but more dynamically intercultural—though human unconsciousness, rhetoric, and behavior often mask this dynamism. It is precisely the sober acknowledgement and

respectful exploration of the very multiplicity of cultures alive in every human being that moves us from thinking we are merely multicultural by nature toward wrestling with our interculturality in process.

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS, INEXTRICABLY RELATED

Another means to engage effectively the interface of personal and social dynamics and thus increase the spiritual receptivity required for interculturality is through self-reflexive exploration of the complex overlap and inextricable relationship between culture and our “inner” lives. Unfortunately, reductionistic categorization and polarization of personal and social dynamics interfere with interculturality by masking the overlap and relationship between dynamics labeled “personal” and dynamics labeled “social.” Such masking decreases human capacity for interculturality because it conceals the ways that personal cultures and social cultures create each other in every human interaction. One cost of this obfuscation is that self-reflection, though increasingly popular, easily and often ignores the relationship between culture and one’s “inner” life. More damaging still to interculturality is the refusal of groups or persons to “own” psychospiritually “the social” that is inherent in “the personal” and “the personal” inherent in “the social.” Interculturality requires self-reflectivity that explores and embraces the ways in which “personal” cultures and “social” cultures are mutually and constantly co-creating each other. Such exploration and embrace of complexity taxes the good intentions and resources of most human beings. The human capacity for exploration and embrace of interpersonal and intrapersonal cultural complexity can be furthered by development of the gift of spiritual receptivity.

In supervision and training for ministry, such spiritual receptivity is required and cultivated especially when self-reflection emphasizes the socio-personal nature of all human interactions. The openness to and centrality of self-reflective exploration expected in most supervision and training for ministry, and the blend of pastoral and prophetic mandates in most ministerial vocations, makes an extension of self-reflection into cultural complexities relatively commonsensical. Expecting of ourselves and our students a spiritual openness to self-reflective exploration of the relationship between culture and one’s “inner” life will cultivate our capacities for interculturality.

However, supervision and training for ministry has often ignored the relationship between culture and one's "inner" life. The interplay of personal and social factors in the formation of the identity of persons, families, and groups has been the focus of much research in the human sciences, theology, and religion studies, although the increasing militarization of the border between the "personal" and the "social" tends to eclipse this fact and its resultant insights and literature.

For example, psychoanalytic theory was among the first modern disciplines to look at the question in depth, though their insights on the subject are little known or overlooked. Many practitioners of psychoanalysis are accurately characterized as focused on the intrapsychic and, thus, frequently individualistic. Psychoanalytic theory itself, however, doggedly engages the complex ways in which the "personal" and the "social" create each other. Sweeping dismissals of psychoanalytic theory on the charge that it is purely individualistic are mere caricature.

Because psychoanalytic theory provides tools that continue to be useful in engaging the human psyche in both its personal and collective forms, it is an essential conversation partner for those engaged in the soul-nurturance foundational for effective supervision and training for ministry. Therefore, I will use psychoanalytic theory here to identify a few angles from which self-reflection can enter into the complexity and inextricability of "personal" and "social" dynamics and, in so doing, cultivate ministers' spiritual receptivity and the consequent capacity for interculturality.

The founder of psychoanalytic approaches to the human psyche often came to his insights through (culturally-bound) notation of specific ways in which social and personal aspects of human life are, obviously, related. Sigmund Freud pointed out—and I choose this point because it is among the most commonly cited of his claims—that the earliest form of what will later function as our conscience is almost completely comprised of aspects of our parents' culture.³ Significantly and inaccurately, translations of Freud into English have rendered this dimension of conscience in mechanistic language—the "super-ego." Freud's German expression for this aspect of conscience was, however, much more suggestive of how the dynamic interplay of personal and social life actually feels in human experience: some of the oldest parts of conscience are "über-ich," literally, over-me.

This resemblance suggests that receptivity is a fundamental capacity in human beings and, even if we later learn to repress it, in our earliest years it is irrepressible. Noting the frequent though not guaranteed resemblance between the cultures embraced by the parent and the behavior of their children, Freud theorized that our

parents shape the correctness of our behavior and, to a degree, even our emotions, by teaching us the modes of expression, moral and ethical values, ethnic-racial customs, and religious traditions they were taught in their childhoods. This is not just parental but human behavior; each generation does the same with those who follow. We deliberately, consciously, teach children our culture because, of course, we ourselves cherish that particular way of life. It includes all the things that are most important to us, both rationally and affectively.

Many of the intersections between the personal and social in culture are, however, not conscious or intentional but unconscious and inadvertent. Importantly, psychoanalytic theorists contend that the culture in which parents live(d) is so deeply implanted in their children's psyches that the children transmit at least parts of it unconsciously as well, whether or not they currently hold these beliefs themselves. Persons who have had the experience of hearing themselves say to a child—sometimes word-for-word—the very things they hated hearing from their parents have experienced an often-benign version of this phenomenon. One friend recently described hearing herself say, repeatedly, “We’ll see...” to her teenager—the distancing put-off she heard too often from her own parents. This kind of unconscious transmission of the values that comprise culture becomes violent and unacceptable when we end up saying or doing to others the things with which our parents or other formative elders, however unintentionally, really did cause us harm. Alice Miller’s work focuses on this tragedy, especially the way that having our selves and/or our cultures treated with contempt by adults during our childhood will lead almost all of us to some degree or another to act contemptuously toward the selves and cultures of others.⁴

Self-reflection is incomplete if it fails to seek out unconscious as well as conscious awareness. In supervision and training, this involves examining the intrapersonal multiculturalism created by the interplay of personal and social dynamics in our families of origin and choice. Self-reflection seeks especially to make conscious previously unconscious socio-personal cultural material fomented and introjected in the interplay of social and personal dynamics and now being projected into our interactions with others. When it is informed by the inextricable relatedness of personal and social cultures, it can root out our agency in the creation of the patterns that make up our cultures. Such self-reflection identifies where we are choosing and passing on to future generations aspects of culture that are constructive, pleasurable, loved, and thoughtfully chosen. It also works at making conscious where we are choosing and passing on more ambiguous aspects of socio-personal culture, which have challenged or even injured us and others.

Carl Gustav Jung's concept of the collective unconscious articulates the simple reality that the self does not mature apart from the examined intersection of personal and social aspects of culture. The collective unconscious is our psychic inheritance and storehouse, a dimension of our psyches which is not just present and personal but which contains or points toward the issues and images common to humankind over time. Jung claimed that there are some existential aspects and challenges of human existence—questions related to death, birth, survival, enlightenment, relationship, and meaning-making. Jung called these aspects and challenges “archetypes.” The writer of Ecclesiastes captured an enormous range of archetypal tensions and alludes to the perennial challenge of discerning the season of each:

For everything there is a season, and a time for every matter under heaven:

a time to be born, and a time to die;

a time to plant, and a time to pluck up what is planted;

a time to kill, and a time to heal;

a time to break down, and a time to build up;

a time to weep, and a time to laugh;

a time to mourn, and a time to dance;

a time to throw away stones, and a time to gather stones together;

a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing;

a time to seek, and a time to lose;

a time to keep, and a time to throw away;

a time to tear, and a time to sew;

a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;

a time to love, and a time to hate;

a time for war, and a time for peace. (3:1-8, NRSV)

Although archetypes are “universal,” the forms in which they appear—Jung called specific manifestations of the archetypes “archetypal images”—are as varied as the peoples of this planet. Jung's differentiation between archetypes and archetypal images reminds us that to pursue that which is perennial in human experience is no license for riding roughshod over the particular. Still, in an era when human societies are becoming so cognizant of our differences and divisions that we despair of finding anything in common and, thus, comprehensible to all humans, Jung's distinction between archetypes and archetypal images offers realistic hope. The notion of the collective unconscious suggests that we share questions, if not answers. It suggests that the overlap and interplay between personal and social cultures provides a limited basis for mutual understanding.

Archetypal themes and images do not spring to life in us fully developed. The building blocks are there because the unconscious is collective, and we have access to them through imagination, but children and adults need playful spaces in our lives in order to draw them out of the unconscious and to creatively relate to them. The British pediatrician and child psychoanalyst Donald W. Winnicott claimed that our psycho-spiritual and social lives are healthiest when culture serves for us as a kind of play space.⁵ Winnicott called for the creation of spaces for creative exploration of psychospiritual and archetypal tensions. He suggested that we use culture, especially the arenas of imagination in art, education, and—note well—religion, as a kind of virtual playground where we encourage one another into creative expression and safe containment. Supervision and training for ministry can increase its value when supervisors and students practice ways to discern and practice, morally and creatively, the disparate seasons of life enumerated in Ecclesiastes 3. Vital supervision and training in ministry is not a museum tour of ancient archetypal images marked “do not touch,” but more like a museum workshop or museum store where cultural riches can be experienced, creatively modified, and even taken home for play.

Culture is best at supporting us in such playful exploration of archetypal questions and tensions when we are children. For example, some adults—though not all—can tolerate or even enjoy playing with a toddler who delightedly smashes the tower of blocks that we have painstakingly built and then pleads to engage over and over again in this cycle of building up and breaking down. However, such impulses in adults are radically challenging and often downright threatening. For adults who are training for ministry, containing and also encouraging the cauldron of interplay between personal and social cultures requires more detailed preparation than space allows here. For this essay it must suffice to say that Winnicott is not calling for *carte blanche*; individuals and groups have the responsibility to collaborate in the provision of rules and structure necessary for safe and fair expression of the “inner” life in the midst of community. Rather, he is calling us to recognize that human beings will express their destructivity, personally and socially. We must choose whether or not we will consciously work to provide cultural containers that anticipate such expressions and to ease the daily experiences which inflame human destructivity into shame and rage. Not to do so is to live in a culture that contributes to the tyranny of violence.⁶

These issues bring us to one last angle from which to enter into the transactions between culture and the “inner” life: dis-ease. Although the majority of psychoanalytic theory and practice focuses on the pathology of individuals, there

is a significant strand of scholarship and clinical practice that takes a radically alternative position. These writers claim that the very real and painful emotional illnesses suffered by individuals have roots in cultural dysfunction. For example, Karen Horney, one of just a few of Freud's contemporaries bold enough to critique his ideas publicly, observed in her clinical practice that while individuals develop unique aspects to their illnesses, their dilemmas are more alike than different. This is evidence, she claimed, that "neurotic" individuals are the result of a neurotic society. There are individual neurotics but no individual neuroses, only, she argued, cultural neurosis—a "neurotic personality of our time."⁷

Horney traced the root of the pathology engendered by society to the discrepancy between the values a society espouses and the values it rewards, but which are less honestly put forth. These discrepancies create in us what she thought were ultimately unresolvable, unhealable, conflicts. She identified three major cultural contradictions which cause the anguish of these unresolvable conflicts: the contradiction between the reward for competitiveness and success and the call to neighborly love and humility; the contradiction between the stimulation of our needs and the unavailability of means to satisfy our needs; the contradiction between the alleged freedom of the individual and the limited possibilities available to us. Rarely addressed at the level of social discourse, these contradictions painfully emerge in the day-to-day living of the members of the society where the average person tries to ease the conflicts by resorting either to tremendous self-compromise or to tremendous hostility.

These cultural contradictions are clearly dramatized and excruciating for the marginalized and oppressed. It is not surprising to learn that these observations arose from Horney's clinical work with women. The new body of scholarship that has come out in the last several decades focusing on the psychology of women, ethnic-racial groups, lesbians and gay men, and other minorities reveals that people from marginalized and oppressed groups are more likely than people from the dominant culture to experience emotional distress and to be labeled mentally ill. This is in large measure because the cultural contradictions Horney observed are vastly more pronounced in the lives of the marginalized, and yet they have fewer resources with which to work out the "compromise solutions" more easily available to persons in dominant cultures. This last perspective reminds us that cultures carry debilitating messages grounded in misuses of power and the prejudices of persons and societies.

Through attention to ways that the social and the personal are interacting in our "inner" lives, supervision and training in ministry can aid students in the increase

of the spiritual receptivity needed for interculturality. I have described a few angles through which supervision and training in ministry can model and mentor exploration of the complex interplay of social and personal cultures. Engaging and receiving the inextricably related and sometimes battling cultures of “the social” and “the personal” is, after all, one more way of acknowledging and embracing the sometimes competing but always interrelated cultures in ministry of the “prophetic,” the “pastoral,” and the “priestly.”

SPIRITUAL PILGRIMAGE, INTERCULTURALLY ENGAGED

A third emphasis that has potential to decrease polarization of personal and social dynamics and increase the spiritual receptivity necessary for interculturality can be described as reclamation of the ancient spiritual practice of pilgrimage. The militarization of the border between personal and social dynamics often co-exists with—and perhaps helps create—a further polarization between sacred and secular means of growth. Thus, to some readers, pilgrimage may be associated so tightly with the formation of a specific religious identity that it is not obviously identifiable as a mode for conceptualizing and enabling intercultural relationships and dynamics. However, when conceptualized and practiced in nonparochial modes, pilgrimage is in its essence an exercise in interculturality. Because narrative is a mode especially congruent with pilgrimage, I will use an illustrative account to indicate ways that religiously motivated pilgrimages have the potential for cultivating interculturality amidst the multiculturalism of our contexts.

Through his writings, we know that in the spring of 1689, at the age of 45, Japanese poet and diarist Matsuo Basho had already made two long pilgrimages into the tiny villages and remote countryside of his native land.⁸ Travel was especially dangerous in Basho’s day and was seldom undertaken for pleasure. Nonetheless, being Buddhist, Basho undertook these journeys as part of his religious practice—the search for enlightenment—and, thus, they were pilgrimages. Because Basho went in search of a particular kind of enlightenment—“the world of true understanding,” he called it—his journeys were attuned to the potential of pilgrimage to be an exercise in interculturality.

Stringent self-scrutiny had always characterized Basho’s life. Now, despite his two arduous pilgrimages, he found he had yet another attachment (significant in

interculturality) to examine and loosen: his attachment to his part of the world, to familiar faces and places and ways. Therefore, Basho set off on a third major pilgrimage, this time deciding to travel a path even more foreboding than his previous routes—"the narrow road to the deep north," he called it in his writings. Basho chose for his enlightenment a 3,000-mile route through a territory thought by the people of his region to be mysteriously remote and unexplored. This time, not sure he would return, he sold his home before leaving.

The earliest steps of Basho's journey are filled with second thoughts.

It was early on the morning of March the 27th that I took to the road....My friends had got together the night before, and they all came with me on the boat to keep me company for the first few miles. When we got off the boat at Senju, however, the thought of the three thousand miles before me suddenly filled my heart, and neither the houses of the town nor the faces of my friends could be seen by my tearful eyes except as a vision.

The passing spring,

Birds mourn,

Fishes weep

With tearful eyes.

With this poem to commemorate my departure, I walked forth on my journey, but lingering thoughts made my steps heavy.⁹

His account of his travels though the deep north are spare and yet tantalizingly vivid sketches of geography, inhabitants, weather, and interaction. Here is one example:

I decided to follow a short cut which ran for miles and miles across the moor. I noticed a small village in the distance, but before I reached it rain began to fall and darkness closed in. I put up at a solitary farmer's house for the night, and started again early next morning. As I was plodding through the grass, I noticed a horse grazing by the roadside and a farmer cutting grass with a sickle. I asked him to do me the favour of lending me his horse. The farmer hesitated for a while, but finally, with a touch of sympathy in his face, he said to me, 'There are hundreds of crossroads in the grass-moor. A stranger like you can easily go astray. This horse knows the way. You can send him back when he won't go any further.' So I mounted the horse and started off, when two small children came running after me. One of them was a girl named Kasane, which means manifold. I thought her name was somewhat strange but exceptionally beautiful....By and by I came to a small village. I therefore sent back the horse, with a small amount of money tied to the saddle.

Because narratives are multivalent, there are more insights than space allows us to develop. However, I will briefly expand on four perspectives on pilgrimage illuminated by Basho's narrative that seem to me to have special value for the cultivation of receptivity and interculturality.

First, Basho's journey reminds us that pilgrimage rarely happens except by intention or necessity. Human beings do not advance from multiculturalism to interculturality simply by osmosis, by living next to one another and hoping some of our contrasts rub off on each other. Cultural understanding calls for a decision, a commitment to some kind of engagement with that which is perceived to be "other." Basho's decision to go on pilgrimage reminds us that we develop the capacity to relate to people different from ourselves and to cultures different from our own mostly because we desire such understanding and go in search of it. Note well, however, that the decision is not an easy one, from which one never looks back. Basho does not avoid consciousness of either his grief and loss in leaving or the enormity and heaviness of the road ahead. What might motivate and sustain persons with already highly committed lives for choosing the work of interculturality? Perhaps we can see it as Basho did: not as something additional but as the next logical and necessary step of an ongoing search for the holy, a journey on which most persons in ministry embarked many years ago.

Second, Basho's journey can assure us that paths worth pilgrimage are rarely easily accessible. Although his third route was an exceptional physical challenge, all of Basho's travels were lengthy, arduous, and far-reaching. The third journey was also an exceptional emotional challenge because, as we noted, he had made a conscious decision to wrestle with an ultimate attachment. The decision set Basho on a path to a spiritual goal that is not easily accessible: less reliance on the familiar and greater dependence on the unknown. Basho's preparations and route remind us that interculturality—certainly a "world of true understanding"—is not easily accessible. Beware of the temptation to underestimate the similarity between our modern situations and Basho's. While travel has been revolutionized in some ways, it remains an inaccessible luxury to many. If we can afford to travel, then we are also likely to be awash in material possessions that, as Basho's sale of his house remind us, often keep us tethered to familiarity. Moreover, the curbing of ego that must be accomplished in order for human beings to make space for "the other" is a labor for modern people as it was for Basho. The trip to interculturality is threatening to us. The most genuine desire to loosen our attachment to that which is familiar and embrace that which is unfamiliar still is bounded by, and taxes, human capacities. We experience pain on the lengthy, arduous, and far-reaching

journey to interculturality both because we make mistakes and because interculturality is not easily accessible. It is a path worth pilgrimage but also an inherently painful path. On the journey to “true understanding” we can expect to find eyes full of tears and steps heavy with second thoughts.

Third, though Basho could have been more forthcoming about this, pilgrimages are undertaken in humility, because we recognize our lack of enlightenment, and act upon a desire to learn. The incident between the farmer and Basho regarding the horse is instructive with regard to intercultural opportunities. At least in his recording of the encounter, Basho is not forthright about why he needs the loan of the horse. An opportunity is missed here when Basho does not take the initiative to humbly communicate his lack of familiarity with the environs and his dependence upon and respect for the farmer’s local capabilities. Thus, Basho’s record of the farmer’s thoughtful and direct response is crucial for our instruction: yes, once human beings travel far from home, even the local horses know the way better than the humans do.

On authentic pilgrimages we are able to respectfully and cheerfully admit our lack of knowledge, thus demonstrating a capacity to be comfortable in (i.e., not apologetic or otherwise defensive about) our ignorance. We become wiser about the new terrain by relying on sources of guidance we would normally overlook. Perhaps these places and people Basho encountered would have become less strange and even more beautiful if he had embraced his fear, used his questions as an invitation, and created hospitality out of his uncertainty. He could have offered to work for his provisions at the solitary farmer’s house, or stayed longer in the fields with the children and the man with the sickle, or in some other way engaged more intensively with the people he met. Just as Basho could have shared more than his money, pilgrims in search of interculturality can sustain themselves by sharing more than their means, more than their security and confidence. The pilgrimage of interculturality demands that we love and live our questions.

Fourth, Basho’s journey reminds us to undertake pilgrimages with respect for and trust in other environs and their inhabitants as teachers. Though “the narrow road to the deep north” took Basho to a land that seemed to him mysteriously remote and unexplored, it was, of course, neither distant nor unknown to the people who lived there. Basho’s desire to meet persons previously unknown to him and his resultant vulnerability were met with help from local people. His experience reminds us that the respectful desire to learn is a desire that is usually respected. Thus, once we have entered a culture unfamiliar to us, admitting our lack of wisdom is not infrequently the better part of valor. Persons genuinely on pilgrimage

know that they do not know even how to ask their questions appropriately; still, even bumbling ignorance and laughable naïveté is more likely to evoke the empathy of the locals than smugness about whatever little bit of knowledge we possess or seek. Who among us can long resist someone whose unselfconscious curiosity demonstrates a genuine desire to understand us? More often than not, a generosity of human spirit is awakened, in the teacher as well as the learner, by the desire to grow in knowledge.

CONCLUSIONS

I have made a case in this essay for seeing every ministry situation—including supervision and training—as inherently multicultural and potentially intercultural. In my view, there are few learning situations in which the inherent multiplicity of cultures cannot to some degree be named, embraced, and plumbed for its capacity to teach the finer points of interculturality—respectful engagement across daunting differences. Certainly, some academic contexts are accurately charged with being “ivory towers,” that is, out of touch with the “real world.” This charge is more often misrepresentation, however, levied by persons not fully aware of the diversities of cultures produced in human experience, represented to different degrees in every classroom, and experienced by every teacher and student not completely indifferent to difference. With or without racial and ethnic diversity, every educational setting is a multicultural setting with the potential of increasing interculturality.

At Claremont School of Theology, diversity in race, ethnicity, and nationality of the course participants can be breathtaking. For example, in the spring semester of 2001, with my colleague Elizabeth Conde-Frazier, I co-taught a seminar on immigration, education, and care. Among the 20 participants were persons of at least ¹⁰ different racial, ethnic, and/or national origins. However, other cultural diversities were just as influential and frequently more divisive than the more obvious differences. For example, we wrestled with differences in the cultures of theological orientation, denominational identity, sex and gender, native language, social status, economic security and privilege, employment, vocational goals, relational status, age and generation, pedagogical expectations, and personality, to name just a few. We were easily multicultural but constantly challenged to move toward interculturality, which required us daily to acknowledge (yet another) culture, respect (yet another) idiosyncratic mixture of personal and social dynamics, and embrace (yet another) pilgrimage into some area of our ignorance.

Every situation of supervision and training in ministry can be a laboratory in moving from multiculturalism to interculturality. When focused attention is given to the multiplicity of cultures, the inextricable relationship between social and personal dynamics, and the mode of pilgrimage as a humble and energetic way to seek enlightenment amid difference, there is no ministry setting that is not multicultural and thus an opportunity to practice interculturality.

NOTES

1. David W. Augsburger, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986), 58.
2. Elaine Pinderhughes, *Understanding Race, Ethnicity, and Power: The Key to Efficacy in Clinical Practice* (New York: Free Press, 1989), 6. Emphasis added.
3. Sigmund Freud, *The Ego and the Id, The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Freud*, vol. 14, James Strachey, trans. (London: Hogarth, 1953-74).
4. Alice Miller, *The Drama of the Gifted Child*, trans. Ruth Ward (New York: Basic Books, 1981).
5. Donald W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (London: Tavistock, 1971).
6. I have discussed this claim more fully elsewhere. See Kathleen J. Greider, *Reckoning with Aggression: Theology, Violence, and Vitality* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997).
7. Karen Horney, *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1937).
8. Matsuo Basho, *The Narrow Road to the Deep North and Other Travel Sketches*, trans. with an introduction by Nobuyuki Yuasa (New York: Penguin Books, 1966).
9. *Ibid.*, 98-99.
10. *Ibid.*, 102-103.

Supervision in Context: Religious Issues in Cross-Cultural Counseling

Fredrica R. Halligan

“Semper occulta quaedam est concatenatio”

“There is always a certain hidden connection between all things”¹

Optimally, pastoral counselors are persons who see the hidden connection between things—the deep spiritual connection between all beings as well as the intrapsychic dynamics within each soul. Those who strive to counsel others within an authentically pastoral context must be prepared to expand their worldview and to discover the essential oneness of all humanity. Thus our work is spiritually based, even mystical in its process.

At Fordham University, in the Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education, pastoral counseling is taught in a Christian setting to students who come from every corner of the globe. African and Indian priests mingle with Irish sisters and missionaries to Hong Kong. South American Catholic priests join forces and discover similarities, as well as differences, with Protestant ministers from Korea and female clergy from the South Bronx. This international mix of students, with

Fredrica R. Halligan, Ph.D. is a clinical psychologist who teaches psychology, religion, and pastoral counseling at Fordham University and Blanton Peale Graduate Institute. She has a private psychotherapy and consultation practice in Stamford, Connecticut.

eighty percent from foreign countries, represents a major resource of the program.² The challenge in supervising such heterogeneous trainees lies not only teaching psychological theory and counseling skills, but also in melding the student body while helping them to hear and understand one another. This is how a sense of world community formed.

Not all programs for teaching pastoral counseling have the richness of a world community to draw from; nonetheless all pastoral counselors need exposure to diverse cultures in order to develop and refine their listening skills and to appreciate the struggles of their clients within the context in which they have grown, developed, and lived. As Maureen O'Hara points out in her feminist analysis of a case of Carl Rogers, "Critical scholars have long argued that one of the most oppressive aspects of the Eurocentric or androcentric world-view is the way it marginalizes, devalues, and even pathologizes the knowledge of subordinated groups."³ Even Rogers, a brilliant clinician and compassionate human being, sometimes fell into the trap of interpreting "pathology" or "immaturity" in situations where a client was clearly influenced by the cultural oppression. In our own era, as we gradually become more enlightened and aware of cultural differences and the social origins of seemingly aberrant behavior, we must teach our trainees not to blame the victim. We must help them to avoid the tendency of members of dominant groups to see dominated groups as immature, primitive, or less evolved than our own more familiar culture. We must learn and teach our trainees how not to interpret as "intrapsychic pathology" what is actually "completely normal" within a client's culture.

In our efforts to understand persons of other cultures we must begin at the very beginning. As Hill and O'Brien point out, even with attending skills we must be aware of cultural differences.⁴ The meaning of nonverbal behavior varies by culture, and the helper must be aware of such crucial variables as preferred interpersonal distance, use of eye contact, and cultural norms in expressing affect. Without this knowledge, helpers may react unconsciously to persons from another culture.

I learned recently from several of my students that in Latvia there are *no* words for feelings. How do we begin to interpret our work in a way that will make sense to a culture that never speaks of feelings? Do we use images? Metaphors? How can we be creative in bridging such a cultural chasm? First, we must recognize the values that underlie the very nature of counseling. As David Augsburger points out: "Pastoral psychotherapy, as practiced in almost all cultures, promotes the values of clear thinking, openness to feelings, responsible choosing,

effective communicating, and courageous acting.”⁵ In Latvia, not only is there a lack of affective vocabulary, but there is a history of a communist regime where “courageous acting” was definitely *not* a wise or healthy approach to life. We must remember that survival comes first in the hierarchical values that are enculturated.⁶

In their classic text, *Counseling Across Cultures*, Pedersen, Draguns, Lonner, and Trimble have collected papers addressing some of the major issues that one must consider when approaching the sensitive task of counseling an individual from a different culture. It is a complex task and one that cannot be undertaken lightly. Nonetheless, it is a task that we can no longer fail to consider. The statistics alone are convincing:

The composition of the United States is changing....Demographic projections suggest that by the year 2000 one of every three Americans will be [Black, Hispanic or Asian]. Comparative growth rates for the period 1970-1980 are 6% for whites, and 18% for blacks, and 11% for the U.S. population as a whole....In addition to these internal data, there is a high rate of immigration, including 54,000 legal and 3,500,000 illegal immigrants in 1984. Counselors and counseling must prepare for a multicultural clientele.⁷

The importance of learning to work sensitively with ethnic and racial minority populations is not news to most counselors and counselor educators. There is ample and excellent literature about counseling minorities within this culture and I will not pursue that direction further in this paper. What seems to be less well recognized, however, is the importance of religion in defining cultural attitudes and entire worldviews.

In our ongoing efforts to understand counselor, client, and contextual variables, we must understand first that the religion and/or spirituality of the *counselor* has an impact, often at the unconscious (or at least unspoken) level, on the assumptions and expectations that the counselor brings into the helping relationship. Second, the religious or spiritual experience of the *client* has a significant influence on his or her outlook on life, attitudes and interpretations of past events, and expectations and hopes for the future. Third, the *contextual variables* must be considered, including the context in which the counseling is occurring and the context of the client's whole life course. If a Protestant is being counseled in a Catholic setting (or vice versa), certain religiously-oriented expectations will compound the transference relationship. In fact, this phenomenon is sometimes called “institutional transference.” Such feelings are often unconscious and may constitute prejudicial attitudes with hundreds of years of social history behind them. Similarly, there are often deeply prejudiced

relationships between Christians and Jews that arise from two thousand years of mutual history.

Finally, to be effective in cross-cultural counseling, we must be aware—and help our trainees to be aware—of the *various religious contexts of clients* in our religiously pluralistic world. The counselor needs to be cognizant of and affectively attuned to the religious context in which the client grew up and in which the client is currently living. Towards this end, Ralph Hood has edited a comprehensive *Handbook of Religious Experience* which includes excellent chapters on the major world religions: Judaism, Christianity (both Protestant and Catholic), Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism.⁸ In the remainder of this paper, I will address some of the most striking aspects of the inter-religious dialogue. My aim is to further our appreciation of religious differences and to help counselors identify some of the key variables to consider when working with individuals of other cultures and other religions.

INTER-RELIGIOUS DIALOGUE

There is no need to exhaust yourselves in the search for God. He is there like butter in milk, like the chicken in the egg, in every atom of creation. He does not come from somewhere or go elsewhere. He is here, there, everywhere. From the atom to the cosmos, from the microcosm to the macrocosm, He is everything.⁹

We in the West have generally been brought up with a tendency to believe in a white, male Deity but, for many people, it is now clear that this God-image is inadequate. Mystics and theologians have often told us that our concept of God is too small. They have assured us that God is far greater, far more inclusive than we can imagine. If this is true, then it is particularly important to listen seriously to the wisdom that has been invested in other faiths.

Raimond Panikkar, a world leader in inter-religious dialogue, is of Hindu-Christian origin and is a Catholic priest. He writes, “To live at the meeting point of several traditions is the destiny of a large portion of the human race.”¹⁰ Indian by birth, Panikkar witnessed some of the early stages of inter-religious dialogue. With the coming of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), Catholic teachers in India taught that “Hinduism is a genuine religion, and therefore a means of salvation, and that the meeting of the two religions could lead to a positive and beneficial relationship.”¹¹ The World Council of Churches also opened its doors to dialogue

with other religions. An atmosphere of freedom and mutual respect began to prevail:

People began to believe that other religions are also ways of salvation, that the monks of other religions are just as much monks as the Christian ones, that toleration is not a last resort, that religion is not an obstacle to collaboration among human beings. Inter-religious meetings...increased in number, and the circle was enlarged to include Muslims and members of other religions. We must remember that the ground had been prepared by meetings between theologians and prayerful people of different Christian confessions who were interested in a dialogue in depth.¹²

As Karl Rahner pointed out, we will not have peace until there is mutual understanding among the world religions, and such understanding cannot occur until there is dialogue. Although Rome has backed off and, in fact, now seems somewhat ambivalent about dialogue with other faiths, a vibrant dialogue continues, being carried on by such organizations as the Parliament of World Religions, the Temple of Understanding, the Interfaith Center and other local groups in cities around the world.

Huston Smith's classic text, *The World's Religions*, is a fine starting place for learning about other faith traditions.¹³ Counselors should have such a text readily available for use when encountering a client from a tradition different from their own. Understanding the main tenets of other religions is just a starting place, however. What is really needed is absorption of the worldviews of other cultures. This includes an appreciation of the impact of history, including colonialism, on the psyche and inter-cultural relationships that have ensued. Panikkar calls this the "Intra-religious dialogue." By this he means that we need to work at great depth, using all our creative sensitivity to comprehend and integrate the meaning of the different belief systems:

When the dialogue catches hold of our entire person and removes our many masks, because something stirs within us, we begin the '*intrareligious dialogue*.' This is the internal dialogue triggered by the thou who is not indifferent to the I. Something stirs in the inmost recesses of our being that we do not often dare to verbalize too loudly.¹⁴

JEWISH-CHRISTIAN RELATIONSHIPS

Counselors need to work at this deep level within themselves and eventually with their clients to confront and remove the biases and prejudices that we have all

absorbed simply by growing up in our own specific environments. As a Christian, I was stirred deeply when I first learned of the history of Jewish-Christian relationships. I felt troubled to discover that my Christian education (in both Catholic and Protestant settings) had misled me into thinking that I “understood” Judaism. I had consistently been taught, for example, that the God of the Jews was the God of Judgment and that the God of the Christians was the God of Mercy. It came as a surprise to learn that the justice and the mercy of God have always been twin foci in Judaism. I realized then that it was our Christian sense of supremacy that was obliterating the God of Mercy who has always been present for the Jews. I came to have a deeper feeling of kinship and a far greater appreciation for how deeply our Christian roots lie in Judaism.

I was even more greatly troubled—appalled, in fact—to learn about the extent of anti-Semitism that has been present in Christianity from its earliest days. In books such as *Interwoven Destinies: Jews and Christians Through the Ages*¹⁵ and *The Anguish of the Jews: Twenty-three Centuries of Antisemitism*,¹⁶ Christians have begun to take an honest look at the historical interactions between these two great Western religious traditions. The Vatican’s recent “Statement on the ‘Shoah’” has been seen as an apology for past sins, including lack of active resistance during the Holocaust, and has come as a welcome correction and an acknowledgement of our historical role in oppression of the Jews.¹⁷ Catholics, indeed all Christians, need to be made aware of the impact of thousands of years of anti-Semitism on Jewish-Christian relations. In particular, counselors with a background in the Christian traditions, need to identify and work through any residual prejudice they may have in order to empathize fully with Jewish clients.

CHRISTIAN-MUSLIM DIALOGUE

A challenging contemporary arena for inter-religious dialogue is between the Western traditions, both Judaism and Christianity, and Islam. Counselors who work with Muslim clients need to examine their feelings about Islam in order to be fully competent in this cross-cultural work. While some of the potential difficulties relate to political ideology, others may lie in a more fundamental mistrust and prejudice.

For example, when dialogue with Islam is first approached, the question of *jihad*, holy warfare, often comes up. The most essential, spiritual meaning of *jihad* is the warfare within the soul struggling to surrender itself to God. Anyone who is

acquainted with the mystical tradition in the West knows that surrender is a necessary and difficult component of any deep spiritual path. Pastoral counselors and clergy may hear this struggle: “How can I surrender to God? How do I know what is God’s will? How can I discern what is my true path in life? What if God asks me to do something that I feel incapable of doing?” This inner struggle is *jihad*. When we can understand this level of common experience, our kinship with those who practice Islam tends to grow. At a spiritual level, we are brothers and sisters in the search for God and for the answers to our most difficult questions in life.

When I examined more deeply the nature of the tradition, I discovered a deep love of God that I could truly admire and even emulate. The word “Islam” means “surrender” and the essence of the religion is a complete and ongoing surrender to God, or Allah. The name *Allah* is simply another name for the *Father* in Christianity or for the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* in Judaism. Central to the dialogue is the fact that we worship the same God! God, for the Muslim is One—the Source, the Essence from which all else flows.

Thomas Merton, Christian contemplative and an early proponent of the inter-religious dialogue, inquired deeply into the spiritual life of Islam. He read extensively, and spoke openly with members of the various Sufi orders—the mystical branch of Islam. In a new and exciting text, *Merton & Sufism: The Untold Story*, scholars have examined Merton’s published writings, his journals and letters, and even the underlinings and notes in the Sufi texts in his library for evidence of his thoughts and feelings about the mystical path of Islam. Devoted to inner recollection and private prayer, Merton could resonate with Sufi experience. The Sufi practice of *dhikr*, for example, is a repeated calling upon the name of God. *Dhikr* is like the Christian “Jesus Prayer” and Merton wrote appreciatively about the profound religious understanding behind this practice:

Each person knows God by a special name....The secret of the life of prayer is to find the name of your Lord...and to speak to Him who is your Lord. Don’t speak to someone else’s God....one has to be careful not to impose on other people one’s own Lord, your own idea of God....To have this name of God by which we know Him, by which he makes himself known to us, is to receive Islam’s view of God’s mercy.¹⁸

Focusing on common experiences of God can aid the dialogue between Christians and Muslims. Still it is important to recognize differences as well—and the difficulties that have arisen as a result of colonization and Christian missionary activity.

HINDU-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE

India is another country that, because of years of colonial rule, has ambivalent feelings towards Christianity.¹⁹ The Hindus that make up the majority of the population of India tend to be open to many forms of genuine religious experience. Ramakrishna, a leading mystic of the last century, for example, asserted that one can worship God with form or without form, and that the form one chooses is an individual matter. Religious pluralism is a part of Indian culture. Hinduism is itself diverse, with multiple sects and subgroupings. For example, Vaishnavites and Shivites worship two different aspects of the tripartite God, Vishnu (the Protector) and Shiva (the Destroyer-Renewer), respectively. (Brahman, the Creator, is the third aspect.) The result is competing voices among the Hindus, and this can complicate the matter of dialogue.²⁰

Space precludes any but the most cursory explanation of the rich complexity of Hindu thought and experience. I shall confine my remarks to a few major points of similarity and difference between Hinduism and Christianity and then point to the major stumbling blocks in the dialogue. Swami Satprakashananda writes:

In approaching the teaching of a religion other than one's own, it is not only easier but more enlightening to consider the similarities rather than the differences. The background of Christianity, like Hinduism, is Asiatic. Both religions believe in the Incarnation of God in human form. And in the teaching of both religions, devotion to God and His grace and love in return are particularly stressed.²¹

To understand Hinduism, as with any religion, one must enter the mindset of the culture, like an anthropologist does. Our aim is not to criticize or argue, from a Christian/Western point of view, but rather to understand the Hindu/Eastern perspective. To the Hindu, while there are many gods and goddesses, they are all merely aspects of the one underlying Reality of God, usually called Brahman. A second major tenet of Hindu tradition is that the human spiritual core, the Self or *Atman* that resides within the individual soul, is essentially the same as the transcendent. *Atman* equals *Brahman*. This concept parallels the Christian theology of the immanent divine (often called the Holy Spirit) and the transcendent divine (the Father or Creator). On this central tenet Hinduism and Christianity are not as far apart as they might at first seem.

There are four distinct forms of spiritual practice within Hinduism. The first emphasizes worship, devotion, and surrender to the Divine, with love and blessings in return (*Bhakti*). A second focuses on intellectual and intuitive understanding

(*Jnana*), a third on work, especially to remove past sinful deeds and to merit future rewards (*Karma*), and the last emphasizes the heroic individual effort and spiritual progress based on merit (*Raja*). The four paths may come together, especially in advanced spiritual practitioners or mystics.

One of the major differences between Christianity and Hinduism relates to eschatology. The Hindu belief in reincarnation is radically unlike the Christian belief in resurrection. As in the dialogue between Christianity and other major world religions, another point of departure lies in the interpretation of Jesus of Nazareth. Hindus accept Jesus as an Incarnation of the Divine, but not the *only* such incarnation. From time to time throughout Indian history great religious leaders have arisen who have been thought to be *Avatars* or Incarnations of the Divine. For example, Vishnu, the Preserver, is believed to incarnate whenever darkness prevails among humans so as to lead humanity back to the ways of God.²²

Christians have trouble accepting the idea of any divine Incarnations other than Jesus. To the Christian, Jesus is assuredly unique. The idea of multiple Incarnations, however, is not so foreign if we can accept the idea that *Atman*, the inner Divine, is equivalent to *Brahman*, the Transcendent One. All souls are God; the highly realized ones are simply more aware of their status than most of us are. Thus an *Avatar* is an Incarnation of God, but so is all the rest of humanity. Paramahansa Yogananda expressed this insight when he wrote: “Whoever realizes himself as a son of God...can reach any goal by the infinite powers hidden within him. A common stone secretly contains stupendous atomic energies; even so, the lowliest mortal is a powerhouse of divinity.”²³

BUDDHISM’S INFLUENCE IN THE WEST

In the past half century Buddhism has had an increasing impact in Western culture, especially among psychotherapists. Buddhist forms of meditation are frequently used for things such as relaxation, stress management, and pain control. It is important to understand Buddhism as a religion, a philosophy, and a psychology. Buddhism can best be understood by looking at its origins and contrasting it to Hinduism. Buddhism is an *apophatic* path, with emphasis on emptiness—no form—no self, as opposed to Hinduism’s *kataphatic* polytheism. More importantly, Buddhism is a philosophy and meditative spiritual path that strives to help humanity deal with suffering. It is essentially a path of compassion.

The history of Buddhism is complex and, I think, well summarized in a chapter by Gui-Young Hong in *Hood's Handbook of Religious Experience*.²⁴ The important thing to recognize is that there are several main streams within Buddhism. Some stress individual effort to achieve personal salvation/Enlightenment/Nirvana through meditation (e.g., Old Buddhism, Hinayana, Theravada). Others (e.g., Mahayana, Ch'an/Zen) emphasize the role of the Bodhisattva who sacrifices his or her own Enlightenment in order to work for the salvation of "all sentient beings."

Buddhist doctrine is every bit as complex as Christianity, and a Buddhist scholar may argue the fine points with as much zeal and intellectual refinement as Jewish Torah scholars. Buddhist theory is also a psychology and prone to categorize or analyze mental states (e.g., five aggregates or mental states, twenty-eight levels of Enlightenment, etc.), much as Western psychology does. Despite these complications, Buddhism has much to teach us as a simple, yet profound, way to relieve suffering.

As a way of life (*Dharma*), Buddhism is a Middle Way—neither ascetic nor hedonistic. One can find Buddhist temples and places of meditation ranging from the opulent to the sparsely simple, but as a way of life the emphasis is on avoiding the extremes. Peacefulness and harmony are important—lack of extremes, lack of polarization, and subsequently lack of conflict. This is the essence of *Dharma*.

Similarly, there is a branch of Buddhism in India and Tibet known as *Madhyamika* which includes a cognitive or doctrinal middle way. From this outlook there is, in essence, no need to argue "who's right." Thomas Merton wrote about his experience of the purity and harmony of this approach during his final journey to India and Ceylon. About a month after his series of interviews with the Dalai Lama, and about a week before his accidental death in Bangkok, Merton went to visit some caves at Polonnaruwa in Ceylon where huge statues of the Buddha lay. There he had a mystical experience which he described in his journal:

...beside the cave a huge seated Buddha on the left, a reclining Buddha on the right...I am able to approach the Buddhas barefoot and undisturbed, my feet in wet grass, wet sand. Then the silence of the extraordinary faces. The great smiles. Huge and yet subtle. Filled with every possibility, questioning nothing, knowing everything, rejecting nothing, the peace not of resignation but of *Madhyamika*, of *sunyata* [Emptiness, void], that has seen through every question without trying to discredit anyone or anything—*without refutation*—without establishing some other argument. For the doctrinaire, the mind that needs well-established positions, such peace, such silence can be frightening. I

was knocked over with a rush of relief and thankfulness at the obvious clarity...²⁵

Merton was clearly moved by his experience. It was four days before he could write of it in his journal. He continued:

Looking at these figures I was suddenly, almost forcibly jerked clean out of the habitual, half-tied vision of things, and an inner clearness, clarity, as if exploding from the rocks themselves, became evident and obvious....The thing about all this is that there is no puzzle, no problem, and really no 'mystery.' All problems are resolved and everything is clear, simply because what matters is clear. The rock, all matter, all life is charged with *dharmakaya* [Buddha mind]...everything is emptiness and everything is compassion. I don't know when in my life I have ever had such a sense of beauty and spiritual validity running together in one aesthetic illumination....my Asian pilgrimage has come clear and purified itself. I mean, I know and have seen what I was obscurely looking for...I have now seen and have pierced through the surface and have got beyond the shadow and the disguise. This is Asia in its purity...and it is clear, pure and complete. It says everything; it needs nothing. And because it needs nothing it can afford to be silent, unnoticed, undiscovered....It is we...who need to discover it.²⁶

So here is the essence of Buddhism for Merton: the Middle Way in a cognitive sense, Emptiness, compassion, filled with *Madhyamaka*, "that which has seen through every question without trying to discredit anyone or anything—*without refutation*—without establishing some other argument." This attitude and way of being in the world, it seems to me, is the best, most sacred way to approach inter-religious dialogue, or the process of being with another as counselor or therapist.

Scholars write about "the silence of the Buddha." On many vital points of disputation, Buddha would remain silent—not resigned but not taking a position, not refuting the arguments of others. On one key point Buddha was consistently silent. That is the question of God or *Brahman*. Buddha does *not* say, "There is a God or gods," but he also does not say, "There is no God." Buddha takes a neutral, open position on that question. On the one hand, Buddhism is generally regarded as "nontheistic." On the other hand, practitioners experience "something vast and unnameable" at the center and as the essence of spiritual attainment. This is the experience—the mystical knowing—that resonates so well with other spiritual seekers, even those who follow kataphatic paths.

With this understanding of Buddha's teachings—moderation in action, feeling and thought—we look again to the central issue of relieving human suffering. Buddhists and counselors would agree that it is compassionate to relieve

suffering. Buddha's wisdom on this point is called "The Four Noble Truths." They include:

1. *Dukkha* (suffering) is universal,
2. *Dukkha* is caused by attachment,
3. To relieve suffering one must detach from all desire,
4. To live well one must attend to the *Dharma* (or "The Eightfold Path," which includes right view, right thought, right speech, right action, right living, right endeavor, right memory, and right meditation).

To the Buddhist, when trouble strikes one should "take refuge in the *Buddha*, the *Dharma*, and the *Sangha* (community)." But this too is done with moderation, for "the middle path denies even an attachment to the middle path itself."²⁷

The essence of therapeutic Buddhism says that, to relieve suffering, one must extinguish craving. Psychiatrist Mark Epstein, writing about the contributions Buddhism has made to modern psychotherapy, states: "The Buddha reported that his mind spontaneously attained 'unconditional freedom' when he saw his craving clearly, unconditioned by the forces of greed, hatred, or ignorance and therefore free."²⁸ Thus, says Epstein, the therapist's role is to help the client see, as Buddha did, the very nature of the thoughts and urges that are so imprisoning. Seeing the patterns of thoughts and associated feelings is called "dependent co-arising" in meditation. For the Buddhist, meditation can be a study of how the mind works—seeing the cravings and attachments and then letting them go.

In addition to meditation, another technique that Buddhists use that can relieve suffering is the ongoing practice of "mindfulness." Mindfulness refers to keeping a meditative focus on the present moment throughout the day. This practice will be familiar to counselors trained in the Humanistic traditions. But this way of being in the world is not the invention of Western psychotherapy. "Here again is the central Buddhist notion of awareness itself being healing."²⁹ To the Buddhist, the awareness of the mind's processes is what frees the mind to move forward, that is, to become "unstuck." The benefits of mindfulness are often directly therapeutic because: 1) it is non-judgmental; 2) it puts the subject in the here-and-now, in a location that is not one of grief and anxiety; and 3) it is a practical technique for detaching from one's desires. These two techniques—meditation and mindfulness—are largely responsible for the enthusiasm with which Buddhism has been received in Western psychotherapy.

ASIA FACES CHRISTIANITY

In the mid 1990s, the John Main Seminars held several dialogues between British Benedictines and Tenzin Gyatzo, the Fourteenth Dalai Lama of Tibet. At that time the Dalai Lama put forth his conceptualization of the teachings of Jesus. Although he emphasized the *value of difference* in religious tradition, he clearly proclaimed himself as a friend of Christianity. He believed that differences need not be divisive, and that tolerance can give way to respect, deep appreciation, and even love, when the scriptures of another religion are studied in depth. The Dalai Lama acknowledged especially the rich wisdom of the Beatitudes in the Christian New Testament:

This passage seems to indicate the simple fact that those who are willing to embark on a path and accept the hardships and pain involved in it will reap the rewards of their commitment. When we speak of a kind of tolerance that demands that you accept the fact of hardship, pain and suffering, we should not have the erroneous notion that these spiritual teachings state that suffering is beautiful, that suffering is what we all seek....I believe that the purpose of our existence is to seek happiness, to seek a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment. However, since we do experience hardships, pain and suffering, it is crucial that we develop an outlook toward them that allows us to deal realistically with these trials of life so that we gain some benefit from them.³⁰

The Dalai Lama, like many other spiritual leaders from the East, finds in the teachings of Jesus a rich source of wisdom, compatible with the wisdom of his own tradition. Gandhi was another Asian leader who was “deeply influenced by the Sermon on the Mount.”³¹ Other Indian leaders (such as Nehru and Swami Vivekandanda) have seen in Jesus a role model of love and endurance of suffering and, at the same time, of standing up against the existing social order. Christian liberation theology finds ready listeners among the oppressed peoples of the world.

In sum, Jesus of Nazareth is revered in the East, but not with the same exclusivity as Christians view him. Stanley J. Samartha of the World Council of Churches sees this as a challenge to Christianity:

Although most Christians today are unwilling to take a totally negative attitude toward neighbors of other faiths, there seems to be a good deal of hesitation on the part of many to reexamine the basis of their exclusive claims on behalf of Christ. The place of Christ in a multireligious society becomes, therefore, an important issue in the search for a new theology....“Through the incarnation of Jesus Christ, God has relativized God’s self in history. Christian theologians

should therefore ask themselves whether they are justified in absolutizing in doctrines him whom God has relativized in history.³²

Perhaps Thomas Merton has the optimal approach. Voicing his deep appreciation of inter-religious dialogue, Merton wrote of the implications of the mystery of Incarnation:

“Since the Word was made Flesh, God is in man. God is in *all men*. All men are to be seen and treated as Christ....It is my belief that we should not be too sure of having found Christ in ourselves until we have found him also in the part of humanity that is most remote from our own....If I insist on giving you my truth, and never stop to receive your truth in return, then there can be no truth between us. God speaks, and God is to be heard, not only on Sinai, not only in my own heart, but in the *voice of the stranger*.”³³

Pastoral counselors, who are increasingly likely to be working in settings of religious pluralism, will need to come to grips with these issues within their own hearts and minds. To assimilate, accommodate, reshape and remold the elements of their own pastoral theology—*intra*-religious dialogue—will be essential for those in the cross-cultural counseling field of this new century. It is a wider world than we have ever known. Can we approach it as a wider church?

NOTES

1. R. Panikkar, *The Intrareligious Dialogue* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), xvi.
2. Curtis W. Hart, Teaching and learning pastoral counseling: An integrative and intercultural approach. *Journal of Supervision and Training in the Ministry* 2002:75-80.
3. B. A. Faber, D. C. Brink, and P. M. Raskin, *The Psychotherapy of Carl Rogers* (New York: Guilford Press, 1996), 287.
4. C. E. Hill and K. M. O'Brien, *Helping Skills: Facilitating Exploration, Insight, and Action* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press, 1999).
5. D. W. Augsburger, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 169.
6. A. H. Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being*, 3rd ed. (New York: John Wiley, 1968).
7. P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, J. E. Trimble, eds., *Counseling Across Cultures*, 3rd ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1989).

8. R. W. Hood, ed., *Handbook of Religious Experience* (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1995)
9. Sai Baba, *Teachings of Sri Satya Sai Baba* (Tustin, CA: Sathya Sai Book Center, 1974), 114.
10. Swami Abhishiktananda, *Ascent to the Depth of the Heart: The Spiritual Diary of Swami Abhishiktananda*, ed. R. Panikkar, trans. D. Fleming and J. Stuart (Delhi: ISPCK, 1986), xvi.
11. *Ibid.*, xxv-xxvi.
12. *Ibid.*, xvi.
13. Huston Smith, *The World's Religions*, Revised ed. (San Francisco: Harper, 1991).
14. Abhishiktananda, xvi.
15. E. J. Fisher, ed., *Interwoven Destinies: Jews and Christians Through the Ages* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1993).
16. E. H. Flannery, *The Anguish of the Jews: Twenty-three Centuries of Antisemitism* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985).
17. E. Cassidy, "Reflections: The Vatican Statement on the 'Shoah,'" *Origins* 28:2 (1998): 28-32.
18. Thomas Merton, *Merton & Sufism: The Untold Story*, eds. R. Baker and G. Henry (Louisville, KY: Fons Vitae, 1999), 47f.
19. S. R. Goel, *History of Hindu-Christian Encounters* (New Delhi: Voice of India, 1989).
20. S. Caldwell and B. K. Smith, "Introduction: Who speaks for Hinduism," In special theme issue of the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 68 (2000): 708f.
21. Swami Satprakashananda, *Hinduism and Christianity: Jesus Christ and His Teachings in the Light of Vedanta* (St. Louis: Vedanta Society, 1975), frontispiece.
22. Sai Baba.

23. Paramahansa Yogananda, *Autobiography of a Yogi*, 13th ed. (Los Angeles: Self-Realization Fellowship, 1998).
24. Gui-Young Hong, *Handbook of Religious Experience*, ed. R. W. Hood (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1995).
25. Thomas Merton, *The Asian Journal of Thomas Merton*, ed. N. Burton, P. Hart, and J. Laughlin (New York: New Directions, 1975), 233.
26. *Ibid.*, 233-236.
27. Hong, 104.
28. Mark Epstein, *Thoughts Without a Thinker: Psychotherapy from a Buddhist Perspective* (New York: Basic Books/HarperCollins, 1995), 77.
29. *Ibid.*, 76.
30. Tenzin Gyatso, et al. *The Good Heart: A Buddhist Perspective on the Teachings of Jesus: Dialogues with His Holiness the Dalai Lama* (Boston: Wisdom, 1996), 54.
31. S. Kappan, *Asian Faces of Jesus*, ed. R. S. Sugirtharajah (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1999), 176.
32. Stanley J. Samartha, *Asian Faces of Jesus*, ed. R. S. Sugirtharajah (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1999), 104.
33. Merton, 1999.

Teaching and Learning Pastoral Counseling: An Integrative and Intercultural Approach

Curtis W. Hart

INTRODUCTION

The development of an authentically integrative approach to intercultural issues in pastoral counseling is both a challenge and a labor of love. The influential American Psychiatrist, Harry Stack Sullivan, a pioneer in the application of insights from psychiatry to social science, public health, and race relations,¹ advised his students and colleagues to become “human beings to whom nothing is alien.” This same overarching objective provides the larger frame of reference for teaching and learning pastoral counseling in an intercultural context. Without a clear definition of purpose and context, “integration” or “integrative” become words that lose their symbolic and potentially transforming power through easy repetition and undisciplined usage. This essay intends to remain precise and contextually accurate in the matter of integrative approaches to teaching and learning pastoral counseling

Curtis W. Hart, M. Div. is the Director of Pastoral Care and Education at the New York-Presbyterian Hospital and the New York Weill Cornell Center in New York City. He is a Lecturer in Medicine at the Weill Medical College of Cornell University and a Diplomate of the College of Pastoral Supervision and Psychotherapy.

while inviting the sort of expansive and reflective attitude that Sullivan advocated. Both are critical to the letter and the spirit of contextual education and adult learning.

THE SETTING

The Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education at Fordham University, a Roman Catholic and Jesuit institution in the Bronx, New York, provides the site for this exploration into the teaching and learning of integrative approaches to pastoral care and counseling in an intercultural setting. The Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education offers M.A. degrees in both Religious Education and Pastoral Counseling, the latter being divided into two tracks, Pastoral Counseling and Spiritual Direction. For students in the Pastoral Counseling program, a basic course entitled “Skills for Pastoral Counseling and Spiritual Direction” is required. Other students may also take this course.

Each year, there are two sections of this course, each with approximately fifteen students. The classes generally have slightly more men than women and more Catholics than Protestants. Eighty percent of the students are from foreign cultures and generally come with the active support of their bishops. There are often missionaries from the United States who also enroll. Areas represented in this intercultural mix are Asia (Korean, Malaysia, and the Philippines), Africa, the Indian subcontinent, and various countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The course meets for fourteen weeks for three hours each week. The initial hour is spent focusing on a particular topic and includes both lecture and discussion based on assigned readings.² Topics covered include basic listening and attending skills, empathy, and use of accents, summarizing feelings and content, dealing with resistance, and challenging the client. The second part of each session is devoted to work in triads where students practice counseling skills using role-play—taking turns acting in the role of counselee, counselor, and observer. Course instructors move among the groups offering supervisory input. At each session a student in one of the triads is selected and videotaped. This material is then reviewed and commented upon by the entire class. Clearly, the style and purpose of the educational experience relies on a model of clinical supervision with Socratic elements rather than a more formal didactic approach. While based in the

classroom, the course's methodology is far closer to practical, supervisory, and clinical approaches to learning.

An integrative approach, while evident throughout the course, is also addressed directly. Students are required to present materials for evaluation to their instructors on a regular basis. These submissions include two audio-taped counseling sessions and weekly logs noting where issues addressed in the course have come up in both personal reflection and professional work. There is also a final paper that is meant to aid students in focusing and summarizing their learning. Students often describe—both in their triads and in audio-taped submissions—situations related to the problem of integrating into Western, and particularly American, culture. Issues include a sense of loss at leaving home, stress and anxiety in relating and adjusting to academic or work responsibilities, conflicts with authority, problems with child rearing in contemporary American culture, and an inability to communicate on a regular basis with people from one's culture of origin. This latter issue is most transparently painful when students cannot be physically present to give and receive solace and support at times of death or illness due to overwhelming geographical distance. Other students have given poignant descriptions, often apparently for the first time, of experiences of violence and dislocation during times of civil war or unrest. In these cases, features suggesting post traumatic stress disorder have been noted and appropriate referrals for evaluation and treatment have been made.

It is important to note that the instructors of the course are both Caucasian citizens of the United States, one male and one female. Both are highly experienced in the areas of pastoral care and counseling and both have significant intercultural experience. The modeling of shared gender responsibilities in the conduct of the course is considered to be one of its strengths and is an important ongoing component of its structure.

THE INTEGRATIVE APPROACH

As noted above, intercultural issues are regularly emphasized in the material brought by students for reflection in the course. By the twelfth week, when the specifically integrative session takes place, there has been ample opportunity to bring up intercultural issues in the classroom setting. By then students and instructors are quite well known to one another and are prepared to engage in a 90-

minute discussion about this topic. The reading assigned for this occasion comes from David Augsburger's *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* (1986). This book raises the following issues: "The Cross Cultural Counselor," "Values, Worldviews, and Pastoral Counseling," and "Possession, Shamanism, and Healing Across Cultures." In addition to these topical readings, the instructors challenge the students to think critically about how and in what ways the basic skills of counseling and the Western therapeutic context from which they derive might be relevant to their indigenous cultures.

To address this broad issue a variety of approaches are utilized. First, students are asked to think about and respond to the following questions:

- What is mental health?
- What is mental health from the prospective of your culture?
- How do the skills in this course relate to promoting mental health in the culture from which you come?
- Are the promotion of psychological health, the Gospel imperative, and cultural values related? How?

The students are referred to Augsburger's valuable description of the "Boundaries Between Sympathy and Interpathy." Interpathy is a key concept and is defined as:

an intentional cognitive and affective envisioning of another's thoughts and feelings from another culture, worldview, and epistemology....Interpathy is the experience of a separate other without common cultural assumptions, values, and views. It is the embracing of what is truly other.³

This definition is offered as one resource to help the students sort out their own reflections. The key word, of course, is *intentional* because it implies a focused and disciplined response. Earlier in the course, we discuss the difference between sympathy and empathy as well as the basics of transference and countertransference dynamics. Thus, students already possess a theoretical frame of reference into which they might place Augsburger's definition of interpathy. It is also relevant to note that participants in the course are challenged to go beyond the advice-giving and rule-oriented model of pastoral care and counseling that many have grown up with and internalized. Because of previous exposure in the course to an alternative perspective they are better prepared to address the meaning of interpathy. Through their work in class and their work outside, students are stimulated and challenged to become increasingly self-reflective and, in their own ways, to become, as Sullivan suggests "human being to whom nothing is alien."

Responses to the instructors' questions are far ranging but converge on the significance of relationship and the growing awareness that persons in the midst of change and even crisis possess inner resources for health and healing. For example, students from Asia often state that the overt use of challenging might be considered unacceptable in a counseling or any other relationship. Others share the idea that empathy, when expressed in direct ways, might be considered invasive. On the other hand, because the course emphasizes an individual's potential health and inner resources for the resolution of problems, it is edifying to see the degree to which this idea takes root and, according to the students, is valid in an intercultural context. Communal resources including worship adapted to the students' indigenous cultures are also seen to be therapeutic, curative, and helpful. The message here is that one cannot forsake or forget the factors, traditions, and relationships that make up in a cultural sense what D. W. Winnicott calls a "holding environment." This, according to Winnicott, is where both psychological health and religious experience find their source. The students demonstrate a generally acute and intuitive awareness of how the Western therapeutic disciplines can and do have a place in the worlds from which they come but only in service of and with respect for the persons who reside in those places.

Finally, the instructors and students address the original question, "What is mental health?" by considering classically Western and psychoanalytically informed understandings. Reference is made to Freud's notion that the major components of a meaningful life have to do with the ability "to love and to work." This broad definition can be applied interculturally at least as a first step in confronting the question of what constitutes the essence of mental health. For purposes of discussion, the instructors also introduce the "Criteria of Emotional Maturity" as set forth by William Menninger, M.D. They are:

- Having the ability to deal constructively with reality.
- Having the capacity to adapt to change.
- Having a relative freedom from symptoms produced by tensions and anxieties.
- Having the capacity to find more satisfaction in giving than receiving.
- Having the capacity to relate to other people in a consistent manner with mutual satisfaction and helpfulness.
- Having the capacity to sublimate, to direct one's hostile energy into creative and constructive outlets.
- Having the capacity to love.

While clearly bearing the mark of a Western, individualistic, and therapeutic world view, Menninger's "Criteria" are a useful set of ideas for students in their continuing process of self-reflection. To reframe the issue, to what degree and in what particular ways do these concepts apply across cultures and how may they be contextualized in the counseling process? These and other related issues are left open ended as resources for students' future reflection and integration.

CONCLUSION

In an authentically clinical educational experience, instructors and students invariably grow together in skills and awareness, and this has certainly proven to be true in this course. For the instructors, this experience has provided motivation for developing a better defined, comprehensive objective for the course. That objective is to address, in an *intentional* way, increased intercultural awareness as a dynamic dimension of both teaching and learning pastoral counseling skills.

NOTES

1. Harry Stack Sullivan, *The Fusion of Psychiatry and Social Science*, introduction and commentaries by Helen Swick Perry (New York: Norton, 1964).
2. Texts used in the course are:
 - A. Benjamin, *The Helping Interview* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1969).
 - Gerard Egan, *The Skilled Helper*, 6th ed. (Boston: Brooks-Cole, 1998).
 - C. E. Hill and K. M. O'Brien, *Helping Skills: Facilitating Exploration, Insight, and Action* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1999).
3. David W. Augsburger, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 31.

The author wishes to acknowledge Beverly Musgrave, Ph.D. and Fredrica Halligan, Ph.D. for their collegial sharing in the teaching of the "Basic Skills" course at Fordham University from 1997 to 2000.

The Teacher-Student in Multicultural Theological Education: Pedagogy of Collaborative Inquiry¹

K. Samuel Lee

My dear friend and mentor, Herbert Anderson, shared with me during a dinner table conversation last year his new culinary invention, the Mango Dessert. Of course, as the colorful personality and a good storyteller he is, his telling the story on his own would be much more entertaining. Removing his charming personality, I was left with the following recipe:

HERBERT ANDERSON'S MANGO DESSERT

Cut up Mangos

Prepare 2 mangos per 3 people

Prepare 1 pint of plain yogurt

Add 1/2 teaspoon of ground cardamom

Add 1/2 teaspoon of syrup or sugar

Let it sit for a while

Sparingly put coconut on a pan or cookie sheet

Toast in oven at 350°F for 5 minutes

and then check

Put mangos in dish

Pour yogurt over mangos

Sprinkle coconut on top

and serve

K. Samuel Lee, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Pastoral Care and Counseling at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, DC.

When Herbert shared this recipe verbally, I got lost around the fourth line of instruction. Let me repeat the first 4 lines:

1. Cut up Mangos
2. Prepare 2 mangos per 3 person
3. Prepare 1 pint of plain yogurt
4. Add 1/2 teaspoon full of ground cardamom

In receiving the recipe verbally, I got stuck at the fourth line because I did not know what cardamom was. It was impossible for me to follow the rest of the recipe. I have never made any dessert other than homemade ice cream and Jell-O. My idea of dessert, like that of many Koreans, is simply a peeled and sliced fresh apple, orange, or cantaloupe. In order for me to learn this new culinary invention, I had to ask Herbert to write down the recipe. To make it even more difficult for me, however, he misspelled “cardomom” and “coconnut.” I couldn’t even find “cardomom” in my English-Korean dictionary as he had spelled it. From this experience, I learned: 1) how teaching is a complex cultural activity; 2) how culturally conditioned teachers and students are in teaching and learning; and most importantly, 3) that, without examining the cultural and theological assumptions imbedded in multicultural teaching situations, the teacher cannot provide relevant and meaningful learning. I will review below these three and explore how the teacher may become more culturally competent by 1) making visible invisible assumptions, and 2) considering collaborative inquiry as apposite to multicultural learning situations.

TEACHING AS A CULTURAL ACTIVITY

The above example of cooking a simple dessert helps us understand how teaching is a cultural enterprise. Different peoples from different cultures use different materials in cooking. I learned from Herbert that the cardamom is a seed, but I could hardly picture it at the time. To be more accurate, cardamom, also known as Grains of Paradise,

...is a pungent, aromatic herb first used around the eighth century, and is a native of India. It was probably imported into Europe around A.D. 1214. Today, cardamom is cultivated in India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Guatemala, Mexico, Thailand and Central America. The spice known as cardamom is the fruit of several plants of the genera *Elettaria* belonging to the family Zingiberaceae,

whose principal member is *Elletaria Cardamomum*. The plant itself is a perennial herb with a thick, fleshy rootstock which sends up flowering stems from 6 to 12 feet high. Cardamom is usually purchased either in seed pods in its “decorticated” form, that is, taken out of the seed pods: or, the seeds are ground into a powder. This last is the most common form in which cardamom is sold. Cardamom is used in a variety of cuisines today, primarily in and around the Indian subcontinent and in Scandinavia.²

Having grown up with sesame in Korea, I can give similar descriptions, though not academic, about sesame—what it looks like, how it is used in Korean cooking, and how sesame oil is produced from it. I can describe how it tastes in its raw form, when roasted, or when ground. But my knowledge about the sesame was simply irrelevant. The cardamom was like a “secret key” to understanding Herbert’s recipe, and my lack of knowledge made it very difficult for me to learn initially.

Consider also the American kitchen that is equipped with an oven and many other culinary tools. The United States is now the only country that still uses a non-metric measurement system. In order for me to expand my culinary capability in the United States, I would have to teach myself how to operate an oven, know what it means to “pre-heat,” and learn to use the old English measurement system. Non-native learners in North American seminary classrooms may ask why a kitchen needs to be equipped with such a bulky and expensive appliance like an oven. Even for me, understanding a simple tool like a “cookie sheet” was a challenge. Is a “cookie sheet” some kind of special paper used to wrap cookies?

IMPLICATIONS OF CULTURAL ASSUMPTIONS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

Cooking and teaching are both highly specialized cultural activities. When a recipe is shared within a culture, many assumptions are also shared implicitly. A host of invisible and commonly shared concepts, values, and tools, to name a few, make up the common *worldview* within a culture. Although there are many Americans who do not know what cardamom is, the shared worldview (or the shared inner logic of cooking in the American kitchen) is sufficient for their learning not to be impeded. Of course many sub-cultures exist within the United States which have worldviews that are derivative of the dominant culture. Most people who were born and raised in this country, however, have enough of a shared worldview that they are able to navigate through the educational process without much difficulty.

There are undoubtedly exceptions to this. Some educators have argued that women and people of color have been traditionally and systemically excluded in shaping the dominant worldview, and that they find themselves as outsiders to the mainstream educational process. These voices are important and call for an inclusive understanding of multiculturalism, also referred to “pluralist multiculturalism” as opposed to the “particularist multiculturalism.”³

When multiculturalism is seen from a particularist point of view, encompassing only an ethnic and/or cultural agenda, critics may rightly argue that multiculturalism is not good for women, for instance.⁴ Such a critique points out the fact that in certain cultures there are oppressive elements that work against women and that women’s rights have been historically denied by the dominant culture. This suggests not only that equal respect should be given to every culture *per se*, but that every culture also needs to be critiqued against the backdrop of the liberating message of the Gospel. The multiculturalism movement cannot be the sole enterprise of ethnic or cultural study in its narrow definition. Culture must be defined inclusively to account for all who are excluded from the mainstream. Those who experience exclusion because of their minority status must work for the inclusion of other people who are excluded because of their differences. A key assumption here is that “our blindness toward other people also produces a tragic blindness toward God, the Other.”⁵

Pamela Hays extends our understanding of the cultural complexities facing the practicing counselor therefore to include age, disability, religion, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, indigenous heritage, national origin, and gender. She uses the acronym *ADDRESSING*.⁶ While consideration of this diverse range of cultural complexities is important, it should not diminish the priority of the topic at hand. It is cultural, if not theological, naïveté to assume that lived human realities can be conceived in a neatly packaged simplicity. Lived human realities cannot be dismissed for the reason that they are “too messy” for human understanding. Trying to iron out cultural complexities is contrary to God’s creative design, and thus idolatrous.

Some critics get hung up on definitions.⁷ Others dismiss the importance of a minority group’s concern in education for the reasons of economy. They argue that the educational system is not able to accommodate a wide range of concerns. This is only a self-imposed limitation by the dominant group as Paulo Freire’s “banking” concept illustrates.⁸ If the educational process is seen as “depositing” a set of information by the omniscient teacher to the helpless student within a limited curricular resource, there would be no time for the student to learn “extra” matters,

such as a critical consideration of the dominant worldview's enslaving and oppressing power. This is not so much an issue of not having adequate resources, whether time or money, but of "projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, [which] negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry."⁹

As advocated above, teaching the practice of ministry may be conceived of as sharing recipes and helping people learn to cook new things. From a cultural point of view, teachers teach. From a cultural point of view, too, students learn. No teaching or learning can take place in a cultural vacuum. In teaching or, for that matter, in any pastoral practice, a host of *cultural and theological assumptions* are imparted. These assumptions are not necessarily bad. Much of the formational influence for the learner is exerted through these implicit and invisible assumptions. At the same time, they carry critical and potential power to influence the learning process of the student. As Foucault argued:

in thinking of the mechanisms of power, I am thinking...of its capillary form of existence, the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives.¹⁰

Such is the potential power of assumptions that covertly operate within and beneath the majority's discourse. When they are a part of the "hidden curriculum," and indiscriminately exercised without consideration of those who do not share the dominant worldview, these invisible assumptions and the concomitant but hidden power can become the means of oppression in the learning process.

For people who share the common and dominant worldview, a common but invisible privileging takes place. At the same time, invisible and unearned deficits are assigned to those who stand outside of the dominant cultural system. In her observations of the racial configuration in the United States, Peggy McIntosh illumined what she saw as invisible "white privilege." According to McIntosh, "white privilege" is "an invisible package of unearned assets which [white persons] can count on cashing in each day, but about which [they are] to remain oblivious."¹¹ McIntosh was able to identify twenty-six (forty-six in the original list) items from her daily living as "skin-color privilege." Examples include:

- I can if I wish arrange to be in the company of people of my race most of the time.
- When I am told about our national heritage or about "civilization," I am shown that people of my color made it what it is.

- I can be sure that my children will be given curricular materials that testify to the existence of their race.
- Whether I use checks, credit cards, or cash, I can count on my skin color not to work against the appearance of financial reliability.
- I can swear, or dress in second hand clothes, or not answer letters, without having people attribute these choices to the bad morals, the poverty, or the illiteracy of my race.
- I can criticize our government and talk about how much I fear its policies and behavior without being seen as a cultural outsider.
- I can choose blemish cover or bandages in “flesh” color and have them more or less match my skin.¹²

McIntosh goes on to say:

My schooling gave me no training in seeing myself as an oppressor, as an unfairly advantaged person, or as a participant in a damaged culture. I was taught to see myself as an individual whose moral state depended on her individual will. My schooling followed the pattern...: whites are taught to think of their lives as morally neutral, normative, and average, and also ideal, so that when we work to benefit others, this is seen as work which will allow “them” to be more like “us.”¹³

For McIntosh, making visible the invisible white privilege meant a newly discovered sense of accountability. As her work in Women’s Studies had attempted “to reveal male privilege and ask men to give up some of their power,” McIntosh recognized a personal challenge: “Having described [the invisible white privilege], what will I do to lessen or end it?” If, indeed, teaching is a cultural activity and such privileging exists in the cross-cultural teacher-student relationship, making cultural and theological assumptions visible is a crucial first task. Without this, the teacher remains “culturally encapsulated”¹⁴ and may commit “cultural invasion.”¹⁵

McIntosh’s notion of invisible white privilege points to Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus*.¹⁶ Habitus refers to the way one learns to think and act in a social context and how one then internalizes the learning to the extent that his or her thoughts and actions are constrained by what has become habitualized. The habitus is durable and “acts unconsciously to organize our social experiences and encourages us to think and behave in certain ways.”¹⁷ The habitus at a given time in history functions as Foucault’s “episteme,” a set of assumptions, prejudices, and mind-sets that shape what and how we learn. The “episteme” therefore structures and limits the knowledge base.¹⁸ Foucault argues that any knowledge or truth is contingent and inextricably intertwined with power. This kind of power can

insidiously undermine “the essence of education,” which Paulo Freire understood to be “the practice of freedom.”

FAILURE TO EXAMINE CULTURAL AND THEOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS:
UNINTENTIONAL RACISM

Our intentions are important but they do not provide a good enough measure for evaluating the practice of ministry. As I have written elsewhere, “Pastoral practitioners have been well conditioned to express what the society in general desires to be model attitudes and behaviors. Pastoral practitioners are very good at communicating the ethical norms of the society.”¹⁹ Writing about the unique needs of religious professionals, Robert McAllister insightfully cautions that “religion professions” are not “intrinsically motivated to improve their lives.”²⁰

Consider the practice of counseling as a case in point. Charles Ridley states that “counseling is supposed to be helpful, and all clients deserve equitable treatment, regardless of their backgrounds. Counseling should be the most unlikely profession to victimize.”²¹ He argues that, apart from the counselor’s good intentions, when victimization takes place selectively and repeatedly, it is not just victimization. He says, “Racism is what people do, regardless of what they think or feel.”²² What we think or feel is important, but more important in cross-cultural teaching practice is what actually happens in the classroom. Ridley illustrates what happens in the usual practice of counseling:

- *Diagnosis.* Minority clients tend to receive a misdiagnosis, usually involving more severe psychopathology but occasionally involving less severe psychopathology, more often than is warranted.
- *Staff assignment.* Minority clients tend to be assigned to junior professionals, paraprofessionals, or nonprofessionals for counseling rather than senior and more highly trained professionals.
- *Treatment modality.* Minority clients tend to receive low-cost, less preferred treatment consisting of minimal contact, medication only, or custodial care rather than intensive psychotherapy.
- *Utilization.* Minority clients tend to be represented disproportionately in mental health facilities. Specifically, minority clients are underrepresented in private treatment facilities and overrepresented in public treatment facilities.

- *Treatment duration.* Minority clients show a much higher rate of premature termination and dropout from therapy, or they are confined to much longer inpatient care.
- *Attitudes.* Minority clients report more dissatisfaction and unfavorable impressions regarding treatment.²³

The challenge for those who teach in seminaries is to examine critically the various ways victimization is possible when working with those who do not share the dominant worldview. This challenge calls for critical self-evaluation and systematic investigation of the ways teachers behave in their teaching practice. This calls for the vigilant watchfulness—a very difficult challenge to overcome because teachers are less likely to take up issues that they cannot see. For example, they might be unlikely to examine unintentional racism until they are made to see it. Rodney Hunter considers how difficult it is to face invisible systemic evil when he says, “The established, majority social classes and churches are unknowingly blinded spiritually by their power and privilege, and they are systemically unable and unwilling to see the nature and effects of their own predatory power over other classes, races, and groups.”²⁴ There is no conceivable reason why seminary teachers are exempt from such blindness.

The culturally encapsulated teacher’s teaching may be characterized as poor or insensitive. If the teacher continues in this insensitive practice with students who are culturally different, the teacher is a bad teacher. If, however, the teacher knows that his or her teaching is bad but is unwilling to change, or (even worse) is unwilling to examine his or her teaching practice, the teacher is being belligerent, oppressive, imperialistic, and even racist. Racism does not necessarily have to do with the teacher’s intentions. Oppression can take place apart from the oppressor’s intention because oppressors are blinded and remain in oblivion. Sexism, heterosexism, or racism does not have to do with the identity or the intention of the teacher. The teacher, whether or not that teacher is a person of color, can engage in racist or imperialistic teaching practice. The importance of critical self-examination of one’s personal attitudes and invisible assumptions and the willingness to ardently uncover one’s unintentional racism cannot be overstressed.

MAKING VISIBLE INVISIBLE ASSUMPTIONS

John Moody's case study below offers an opportunity to illustrate how teachers might go about making their cultural and theological assumptions visible:

In brief, the case was that of a woman who was in the hospital for surgery related to her paraplegia. Her husband assisted with the admission and then left the hospital. The chaplain was called because the woman was crying as she waited for her surgery. In talking with the woman, the chaplain discovered that the tears were because the husband had moved in with a girl friend after leaving his wife at the hospital for surgery. There had been a history of marital problems following the wife's auto accident. The husband returned to the hospital on several occasions to see the wife and left with her at the end of the hospital stay. The girl friend, a friend of the wife, also made hospital visits.²⁵

A traditional teaching approach with a case study such as this might proceed to list the characters in the story and to note their behaviors and feelings. Then, students might be encouraged to consider both psychological and theological implications and to arrive at suggestions for action for the chaplain. Such a generic approach with culturally different students is at best ineffective, because it makes a host of assumptions about things such as the nature of the marriage covenant, divorce, family, human sexuality, a woman's place in society, and the role of pastoral caregiver. These assumptions may be shared by those from the dominant culture but not necessarily by students from culturally diverse backgrounds, many of whom are enrolled in seminaries and the CPE training programs.

Instead of such a traditional approach, Moody invited his supervisees to consider the case study and describe what the pastor should do and why, in their own cultural context. His group included students who were Japanese, Filipino, American, English/Canadian, German, Chinese, Indonesian, and Korean. He reported the summaries of his students' responses:

The *German* and *English/Canadian* persons quickly said that the woman should care for herself, get into therapy, and tell the husband he was no longer part of her life. The pastor should support the wife in becoming independent and personally stronger. The husband should be seen as the abusive person he was. He could be helped if he were willing to face his own abusive behavior.

The *American* tended to agree with the German-Canadian perspective, but wanted to work more toward reconciliation by helping to arrange counseling, continuing to visit with both parties, and trying to involve the church family as part of a context of healing. No specific outcome of the relationship would be expected.

So far the responses seemed familiar enough and, it could be argued, they reflected the assumed ministry perspective of American CPE.

The *Korean* spoke next. As a pastor, this person wanted to confront the husband about his behavior and insist that he promise to stay committed to his wife, follow the...monogamy,...and attend church regularly. If the husband would agree to this process, the wife should forgive him and resume her commitment to the marriage. Continuing care would be given to the person(s) who regularly attend church.

The two *Japanese* students felt the wayward husband should face his responsibilities....[The] couple's parents [should] meet with the minister to discuss this family problem. The parents, possibly with the minister, should then meet with the husband and wife to settle the matter amicably. The *Chinese* student commented that pastoral care in his country would be much like that in Japan. The parents and elder siblings would be prominent and necessary players in solving the matter. All of these students said divorce or separation was not common and was unlikely in this instance.

The *Indonesian* student said that in his country the matter would be brought by the parents and extended families to the minister, who would be expected to solve the problem. It would be the minister's responsibility to go with the families to confront the husband and tell him to return to his wife. The minister would be the spokesperson for everyone. If the husband did not readily comply, the minister would step aside while the physically fit in the two families beat the husband. The minister would then step forward and again ask the husband to comply....If [the husband] did not [comply], the minister was obligated to excommunicate the husband and both families would disown the husband.

The *Filipino* person had been quiet, observing the discussion. He was asked what would happen in his country. He said he did not know. When asked why, he said the husband would likely disappear and not be seen or heard from again. The minister would help support the two families and financially assist the wife. He indicated that the disappearance would be associated with government troops. No one would attempt to learn what had happened to the husband. The incident would no longer be discussed.

The group fell silent. The westerners looked aghast. They could not comprehend how beatings or possible death had anything to do with pastoral ministry. The Asians in the more "developed" countries understood, but felt that the power of the family and the impact of shame were sufficient to control aberrant behavior. The Asians from the "developing" countries understood that others would not appreciate their countries' styles. They did acknowledge the power of the community to keep primary relationships intact. The westerners, who wanted to trust counseling practices to provide any healing and affirmed

separation as a logical means of settling fractured relational problems, understood neither of the Asian positions.

All the students said they were representing Christian points of view. They came to the group experience assuming these were common pastoral practices that could be understood by their peers. They felt these practices in their countries were representative of the church's values and intentions as well as those of the community at large.²⁶

It is significant to note first that students were *invited* to share their worldview. The teacher and students mutually engaged in a dialogue in this CPE group teaching session. Paulo Freire states that "dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming—between those who deny other [persons] the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them."²⁷ Dialogue for Freire is an existential imperative through which persons achieve significance as human beings. When the dialogue is reduced to one party's depositing ideas in another (i.e., *banking*), a violent cultural invasion occurs. In our multicultural classrooms, the starting point of pedagogy is therefore to invite everyone to engage in a dialogue. But such invitation is possible only when the teacher can see "the other whole"²⁸ in the student's being, as Herbert Anderson advocates. The teacher's invitation to students to be in dialogue facilitates "a constructive, enlarging engagement with the Other."²⁹ Of course, a meaningful invitation would include a sense of mutuality with respect to the shared commitment to the importance the invitation for both parties.

According to Miroslav Volf, inviting means creating "space for the Other."³⁰ There is "a sign of discontent" in all human beings "with [our] own self-enclosed identity, a code of desire for the other."³¹ Thus, Volf asserts, "I do not want to be myself only; I want the other to be part of who I am and I want to be part of the other. A herald of nonself-sufficiency and nonself-enclosure...suggest the pain of the other's absence and the joy of the other's anticipated presence."³² Such a desire to create "Space for the Other" is present because, as Freire argues, "Hope is rooted in [the human being's] incompleteness."³³ The teacher is in search together with the students in "a search which can be carried out only in communion with [the other];"³⁴ teacher and students are *co-inquirers*.

Moody admits that he is not sure how the multicultural group of students he described would address "principles and processes of pastoral care." At the same time, he knows that "Tried and true CPE beliefs, procedures, and processes were thrown to the winds. Issues of trust, basic religious convictions, ministerial

practice, community values, morality, and cultural assumptions were all put on the table.”³⁵ Such is a resultant impact of a genuine encounter with the other. Encounters with the other may produce anxiety from not knowing. Quoting Z. D. Gurevitch, Volf suggests that it is “at ‘the moment of not understanding’ the self understands that what there is to understand about the other can ‘only be addressed as a question.’”³⁶ Finding the right question requires engagement in “critical thinking,” which Freire describes as:

thinking which discerns an indivisible solidarity between the world and [human beings] and admits of no dichotomy between them—thinking which perceives reality as process, as transformation, rather than as a static entity—thinking which does not separate itself from action, but constantly immerses itself in temporality without fear of the risks involved.³⁷

A naïve thinker-teacher would be threatened “not knowing,” and might resort to the “tried and true” practice of ethnocentric teaching. This teacher would do everything possible to stay away from genuine multicultural encounters which only lead to what Paul Tillich calls incurable “existential anxiety.” The critical thinker-teacher understands, however, that in the midst of such genuine and unsettling encounters, “the important thing is the continuing transformation of reality, in behalf of the continuing humanization of [all human beings],”³⁸ however complex the multicultural lived reality may seem. Freire concludes, “the dialogical character of education as the practice of freedom does not begin when the teacher-student meets...in a pedagogical situation, but rather when the [teacher] asks himself [or herself] what [the teacher] will dialogue with [students] *about*.”³⁹ Furthermore, “authentic education” takes place not “by ‘A’ *for* ‘B’ or by ‘A’ *about* ‘B,’ rather by ‘A’ *with* ‘B,’ mediated by the world.”⁴⁰ Freire thus calls for an entirely different “episteme” in considering the teacher-student relationship and pedagogical goals.

COLLABORATIVE INQUIRY AS A MULTICULTURAL PEDAGOGY

How would one characterize the nature of the teacher-student relationship when teacher and student mutually enter the pedagogical process as cultural equals? If all knowledge is contingent, as Foucault argued, and the teacher blindly participates in perpetuating the dominant worldview, as Peggy McIntosh illustrated, how can the teacher escape from such cultural encapsulation? Can the teacher incorporate self-examination as an essential part of teaching for the benefit of both teacher and students? For that matter, can the students’ self-examination process also become a

part of pedagogy? The concept of collaborative inquiry will be considered here as a model for multicultural learning/teaching.

Bray, Lee, Smith, and Yorks define collaborative inquiry as “*a process consisting of repeated episodes of reflection and action through which a group of peers strives to answer a question of importance to them.*”⁴¹ Collaborative inquiry is a qualitative research methodology; it is concerned with the learning of some practice, shared by a group of adult peers who are motivated by a shared question of importance. Bray et al. trace the philosophical foundations of collaborative inquiry to Dewey’s pragmatism, which emphasizes learning from experience, but depart from these foundations as they adopt the hermeneutic phenomenology of Hans-Georg Gadamer. Instead of Dewey’s objectivity in understanding the human experience, Gadamer adopts Husserl’s subjectivity in understanding “the life-world” of the “pre-given basis for all experience.”⁴² Bray et al. summarize Gadamer’s understanding of human experience:

We live in the world as historical creatures whose view of the world is pre-given. No matter how much we may strive toward a position above the cultural traditions and the flow of our own history, that position cannot be obtained. Understanding our tradition can occur only within the context of our language, because tradition is itself linguistic in nature. In other words, we are all embedded within a historical tradition that frames our experience of the world and cannot be transcended in its entirety [sic]. Language, the medium of communication, is itself part of this frame, or life-world.⁴³

While Dewey is concerned with “the interpretation of facts and the application of logical principles,” Gadamer sees learning as “an act of interpretation” which “involves a fusion of horizons between the horizon of the person (who is immersed in his or her life-world) and the horizon of the lived experience that is the object of attention.”⁴⁴ Based on this theoretical foundation, Bray et al. explain:

Collaborative inquiry is a process through which people may find themselves becoming more cognizant of aspects of their life-world. A collaborative inquiry is usually initiated by a person who is uncomfortable with some aspect of their experience and wishes to explore this sense of discomfort. The person joins others with a similar sense of discomfort....some aspect of their life-world has been problematized. As they reflect on their lived experience in their inquiry, inconsistencies between the expectations they initially held and their experience as a result of the inquiry become apparent. Aspects of their life-world become even more problematized. As they make meaning from their experience, their personal horizons and the horizons of the life-world under investigation become merged into a new understanding of their world. Usually

this new understanding is more comprehensive and more integrated than was their previous understanding, a marker of having experienced transformative learning.⁴⁵

In addition to John Dewey's pragmatism and Gadamer's hermeneutic phenomenology, the theory of personhood "that sees the person as a distinct presence in the world" shapes the theoretical bases of collaborative inquiry. The theory of personhood values a holistic understanding of human experience inclusive of "spiritual aspects of life" and "the valuing of experientially based knowledge."⁴⁶ Following the Rogerian tradition, "developing as a person" follows from "learning to be significant as a person, having the power to make a difference in one's situation."⁴⁷ Therefore, as much as collaborative inquiry is a research methodology, it is concerned with adult learning and how adults may best learn. Additionally, and most important, collaborative inquiry points to a far less rigid line between the teacher (or researcher) and student (or subject), viewing them as "peers" and "co-inquirers," and opens a new way of looking at the teacher-student relationship.

Freire advocated above that authentic education takes place when the teacher-student relationship is like "A" *with* "B." Collaborative inquiry assumes that human inquiry is best carried out when the line between teacher and student (or researcher and subject) no longer exists, because such a relationship can more adequately assure full participation of all involved persons. Therefore, Bray et al. believe "research *with* people, rather than *on* them," to be the "defining principle of collaborative inquiry."⁴⁸ Here, each participant is regarded as a "co-inquirer" who shapes the question, designs the inquiry process, participates in exploring the question at hand, and makes and communicates meaning. At the same time, each participant is a "co-learner" (or "co-subject") who brings his or her personal life-world, experience, and insights. Unlike traditional situations in which teachers maintain a distance from students, teachers who are co-inquirers participate fully with students in the inquiry process because they believe "that when [teachers] engage in the experience under investigation, the result is more valid understanding of the experience."⁴⁹

Can the teacher be a "co-inquirer" in a multicultural learning situation? Can the teacher also become a "co-student" who acquires and shares learning? Can the student be seen as capable of teaching? Can the teacher and student be viewed as peers? These are radical questions that challenge traditional teaching practices, in which teachers unilaterally defined what was to be learned, as well as how, when,

and why. Teachers had the control and power to dictate the pedagogy, its process, and its outcome.

In teaching the practice of ministry, not always do I as a teacher have a clear-cut judgment of what is the right or wrong practice. The theological and cultural diversity in my classes is so wide-ranging, the answer to the question of what is right and wrong, if at all possible to determine it, may be answered from within the questioner's life-world. The fusion of horizons resulting from participation in the learning process is not a matter of reconciling differences to produce a "melting pot" of life-worlds nor of arriving at a predetermined destination. Rather, the fusion of horizons illumines the theological and cultural assumptive worlds of all inquirers, thus enabling them to know who they are in relation to the other. In this process, inquirers learn both their relative positions with the other and their absolute status as creatures with the Other.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

I have advocated in this paper that teaching is a complex cultural activity in which all participants in the inquiry process bring their cultural and theological assumptions. These assumptions are not benign but carry power that shapes both the knowledge base and structure. Those who share common, dominant assumptions are given invisible and unquestioned privileges, while those who do not share these assumptions receive invisible and underserved deficits. Self-examination of invisible privileges on the part of teachers is crucial in multicultural teaching. Such self-examination points to the necessity of rethinking the teacher-student relationship as advocated, for example, by Paulo Freire. Collaborative inquiry in which the teacher and student are viewed as co-inquirers has been reviewed to formulate a pedagogical model in the multicultural theological classroom.

The co-inquirer relationship between teacher and student calls for both humility and critical thinking, especially on the part of the teacher. As practicing psychologist Pamela Hays states, "critical thinking skills are essential to humility because they involve the abilities to identify and challenge assumptions (one's own as well as those of others), examine contextual influences (on one's own thinking too), and imagine and explore alternatives."⁵⁰ Hays sees humility and critical thinking in a reciprocal relationship: "While humility opens one to new forms of

learning and diverse sources of knowledge, critical thinking about one's knowledge base, sources of information, and ways of learning, along with constant testing of alternative hypotheses, can help one to stay open."⁵¹ Huston Smith, having examined the world's major religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Islam, Judaism, Christianity, and Aboriginal Australian spirituality), concluded that these religious traditions share three elements of "virtues:"

...humility, charity, and veracity. Humility is not self-abasement. It is the capacity to regard oneself in the company of others as one, but not more than one. Charity shifts that shoe to the other foot; it is to regard one's neighbor as likewise one, as fully one as oneself. As for veracity, it extends beyond the minimum of truth-telling to sublime objectivity, the capacity to see things exactly as they are. To conform one's life to the way things are is to live authentically.⁵²

The teacher who regards oneself as one, but not more than one, in the company of students, underscores what it means to be a co-inquirer in the classroom.

NOTES

1. This paper is partially based on my Work-in-Progress presentation at the annual conference of the Society for Pastoral Theology in Atlanta, Georgia on June 17, 2000.

2. <http://www.avalon.net/~slainte/cardamom.html>.

3. Diane Ravitch, "Diversity and Democracy: Multicultural Education in America," *American Educator* 14, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 16-20, 46-48.

4. Susan Moller Okin, "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?" in *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women*, ed. Joshua Cohen, Mathew Howard, and Martha Nussbaum (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999).

5. Joerg Rieger, *God and the Excluded: Visions and Blindspots in Contemporary Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), x.

6. Pamela Hays, *Addressing Cultural Complexities in Practice: A Framework for Clinicians and Counselors* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2001).

7. An otherwise excellent resource, Yehudi Webster, *Against the Multicultural Agenda: A Critical Thinking Alternative* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997).

8. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra B. Ramos (New York: The Seabury Press, 1970), 57ff.
9. *Ibid.*, 58.
10. Quoted in Paul Connolly, *Racism, Gender Identities and Young Children: Social Relations in a Multi-Ethnic, Inner-City Primary School* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 14.
11. Peggy McIntosh, "White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," *Peace and Freedom* 49; no. 4 (1989): 10.
12. *Ibid.*, 10-11.
13. *Ibid.*, 10.
14. Gilbert Wrenn, "The Culturally Encapsulated Counselor," *Harvard Educational Review* 32 (1962): 444-449.
15. Freire, 150ff.
16. Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1977); and also Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Polity Press, 1990).
17. Connolly, 18.
18. Alan Sheridan, Michel Foucault: *The Will to Truth* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1980).
19. K. Samuel Lee, "Becoming Multicultural Dancers: The Pastoral Practitioner in a Multicultural Society," *Journal of Pastoral Care* 54 (2000):5-7.
20. Robert J. McAllister, "Mental Health Treatment of Religion Professionals," in *Clinical Handbook of Pastoral Counseling*, Volume 2, ed. Robert Wicks and Richard Parsons (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), 219-220.
21. Charles R. Ridley, *Overcoming Unintentional Racism in Counseling and Therapy: A Practitioner's Guide to Intentional Intervention* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995), 6; see also K. Samuel Lee, "A Multicultural Vision for the Practice of Pastoral Supervision and Training," *Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* 20 (2000): 111-123.

22. Ridley, 10.

23. Ridley, 9.

24. Rodney Hunter, "Transformative Ecclesia," *Journal of the Interdenominational Theological Center* 25; no. 3 (Spring 1998): 54-84.

25. John Moody, "Cultural Assumptions about Ministry in CPE," *Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* 17 (1997): 130-133.

26. *Ibid.*, 131-132.

27. Freire, 76.

28. Herbert Anderson, "Seeing the Other Whole," in *Mission Studies* XIV, 1-2, 27-28 (1997), 40-63.

29. *Ibid.*, 48ff.

30. Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion & Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1996), 140ff.

31. *Ibid.*, 141.

32. *Ibid.*

33. Freire, 80.

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Ibid.*

36. Volf, 144.

37. Freire, 81.

38. *Ibid.*

39. *Ibid.*, 81-82.

40. *Ibid.* 82.

41. John Bray, Joyce Lee, Linda Smith, and Lyle Yorks, *Collaborative Inquiry in Practice: Action, Reflection, and Making Meaning* (Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage Publications, 2000).
42. Ibid., 22.
43. Ibid., 22-23.
44. Ibid. 23; cf. Jürgen Habermas's "intersubjective communicative competence" as Gadamer's understanding of "fusion of horizon."
45. Ibid., 24.
46. Ibid., 25.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., 7.
49. Ibid.
50. Hays, 25.
51. Ibid., 26.
52. Huston Smith, *The World's Religions* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), quoted in Hays, 19.

Pastoral Supervision and the Orthodox Slav

Steven Voytovich

A chaplain colleague and I were talking about various cultures and their struggles one day when he suddenly looked at me and exclaimed that surely I was aware that “Slav” came from “slave,” denoting how Slavs were treated in this country! I went home troubled by this, as I had never understood Slavic heritage in this way, although many did experience being treated almost as slave labor in mines and factories upon arriving in this country. This brief exchange brought home yet again the reality of my journey in pastoral supervision as an Orthodox Christian of Slavic heritage. This reality is characterized both by deep exploration from within in engaging chaplaincy and supervisory training without much of a roadmap paved by others before me, and by exploration of interactions with others in this community revealing various degrees of understanding who I am. More than simply one person’s story, what will follow is an attempt to capture the essence of this journey, through personal, theological, and historical reflection as a contribution to cultural and religious dialogue, and some implications for pastoral supervision today. The

The Rev. Steven Voytovich, D.Min. is the CPE Supervisor and Hospital Chaplain in the Pastoral Care Department of Norwalk Hospital in Norwalk, Connecticut. He serves as the CPE liaison for the Orthodox Church of America and is priest-in-charge of St. Alexis of Wilkes-Barre Orthodox Mission in Clinton, Connecticut.

hope is that such a presentation will be of assistance to supervisors and chaplaincy colleagues who interact with Orthodox Christians from immigrant families, as well as encouragement to other Orthodox to engage in this journey.

Let us briefly examine the origins of Slavic peoples, as described by Šárka Hrbkova in his presentation: *The Slavs of Austria-Hungary*. There are two apparent meanings of Slav. The first is “glory,” or the “glorious race.” Evidence ascribes its roots to “slovo,” which signifies “word” or “those who know words.”¹ The Slavs, a vastly diverse people, populated the lands in small communities throughout Russia, west to Prussia (Germany) and what is now Poland, and south to Greece. Slavs settled around the Baltic Sea and the Danube River about 2,000 years before Christ, although it is uncertain whether the cradle is here or near present Balkan territory. Slavic language is among the Indo-European tongues, while Hungarian is part of the Ural-Altaiic, along with Turkish. In Austria-Hungary, Slavs alone populated over twenty different provinces. In 1918, Slavs numbered about 180 million, almost one-tenth of the total population of the world.² They were once a learned people. The first university in central Europe was established in Prague in 1348. Copernik (Copernicus), a Slav, was the first to declare the sun as the center of the universe—the beginning of modern astronomy. Chopin, the great composer and pianist, was also of Slavic heritage.

Here are some examples of how Slavs were understood by Paul Radosavljevich, author of *Who are the Slavs? A Contribution to Race Psychology*, written in 1919. The language here reflects this time period in which the book was written. “The Slav of today in general is strong and prolific, capable of doing, as well as of suffering, anything when his heart is in it; he is at the bottom pious, simple, kind, and loves peace; he is very patient, sober, thrifty, capable of laborious effort, peculiar to an agriculturist life, possessed of great powers of endurance and perseverance, home-loving, devoted to religion and enthusiastic for the ideals of humanity....” “All foreign observers of the Slavs claim that the Slavic character is humane and kindly beyond that of most Western European nations. It has cultivated, by inborn instinct, and under the pressure of historical circumstances, the virtues of patience and resignation to a degree which amounts to a weakness, if a beautiful weakness. Like a child, the Slav is overflowing with understanding and sympathy, but he is not what grown people call practical. Only when the peaceful Slav was placed between two hostile forces (Germans on the west, and the Mongols, Tartars, Turks, and even Great Russians on the east in as much as they were an organized state assuming a defensive posture) he began to differentiate.”³

Radosavljevich goes on to speak of the Slav's deeply personal dependence upon God.⁴

The passage that probably has the most profound meaning for me is a brief description of the Slav from a behavioral perspective. "The behavior of the Slav might be best described and interpreted by the following six most fundamental emotional-volitional or temperamental traits: Slavic melancholy and sadness; Slavic suffering and patience; Slavic love and sympathy; Slavic humility and lack of hypocrisy; Slavic "lack of decision" and fatality; Slavic paradoxes and inclination toward extremes. With the Slav's facile adaptability, his deep-rooted reluctance ever to exhibit surprise, the Slavic mind, behavior, temperament, or character is a quaint admixture of rashness and common sense."⁵ These were all traits I was aware of in my life, yet I never connected them with my Slavic heritage!

In order to fully comprehend what occurred to this once diverse, peaceful, and learned people, it is essential to speak of some historical events that may be unsettling for some who read this article. Before proceeding, these events are raised here in the interest of understanding rather than to put down other nations or peoples. It is my sincere hope that the reader will continue with this in mind and heart.

The cultural climate of Slavic lands was agricultural—small, rural communities known for their diversity as well as for not being highly politically motivated. Two Eastern Christian missionaries, Cyril and Methodius, two brothers of a large Thessalonian family, came to the region of Great Moravia sometime around 860. This was one of the first large organized Slavic states. The Slavs had been regarded by the Byzantine Empire as barbarians. With Methodius' depth of understanding of the Slavs, and Cyril's intellectual prowess, they together created the precursor to the Cyrillic Alphabet, giving these people for the first time their own written language with which to uniquely learn and worship. (It is interesting to note that this happened also as missionaries first came to Alaska and met the Aleut and Tlingit natives in 1794-1860s.) This seed would continue to develop, even after legates came to a number of small Orthodox communities in this region from Latin and Eastern Christian Churches, following the great schism of 1054. Readers may recall that Russia embraced Orthodox Christianity from Constantinople in 988 during the reign of Prince Vladimir. After the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the Church in Russia found itself playing a leadership role in world Orthodoxy.

Sometime later, two bishops—one from Austria-Hungary (Vladimir-Volyn diocese) and another from Poland (Lutzk)—worried about their future in the

Church. They fraudulently received signatures from two other bishops under the pretense of appealing for the rights of the Orthodox in Polish lands. Instead, they appealed to the Polish king and Pope, in the name of their diocese, to come under Rome. In 1596 a council was held at which some joined with Rome as the “Unia,” and others remained under the Patriarch of Constantinople. None of these changes were brought back to the people in these lands, for the hierarchy feared the people. Thus, as far as the people were aware, they remained Orthodox. Services remained in the Eastern Tradition and their clergy could still be married. The significance here is that those in the Unia came to be treated as second-class Christians. They were not seen as equal with the Roman Catholics, but were no longer recognized by the Orthodox. In addition, Germany had designs on these Slavic nations on one side in order to take control of “middle-Europe;” the Mongols, Tartars, and Turks pushed from the East. It is documented historically that, although more Slavs than native Austrians and Hungarians dwelled in these countries, the Germans assisted governments in controlling these peoples. As one might expect, religious and political persecutions erupted and worsened, and education ceased altogether. The once peaceful Slavs in Austria-Hungary and other lands found their living conditions increasingly unbearable, and many decided to immigrate to America. Three of my grandparents were among those immigrants.

When they arrived, these people found that they were no longer Orthodox. Many were misidentified because of their accents, and they found mostly labor-intensive jobs in mines and factories. Some were able to return to their love of agriculture—tending the soil. They settled down in tightly knit groups. Brotherhoods were formed to assist in building church communities. It was to one such group of immigrants from Austria-Hungary in Minneapolis that Fr. Alexis Toth arrived in 1889, sent by his Uniate bishop from the Presov diocese in Hungary. He was refused faculties by the local Roman Catholic bishop. From here, with his background in church history and law, he began to seek out the local Orthodox bishop. On the Sunday of Orthodoxy in 1891, Bishop Vladimir came from San Francisco to reunite the community to Orthodoxy, touching off a movement that spread throughout the United States and Europe. The Unia remains a hotly contested issue between the Eastern and Western branches of the historical Christian Church as witnessed by the reception of the Pope during his recent visits to Greece and Ukraine.

Fr. Alexis endured a dark night of the soul. The promised blessing by the Holy Synod did not come until October 1892. Meanwhile, the parish in Minneapolis became suspicious of his actions and suspended their efforts to

provide intermediate financial support. Bishop Vladimir was recalled to Russia. And finally, his former bishop in Priashev recalled Fr. Alexis back to Europe. He disobeyed this order. Throughout this long ordeal he stood steadfastly by his people, establishing the doorway for their entrance to Orthodoxy and working in a bakery to support himself. A ray of light appeared in March 1892 when Bishop Nicholas was sent to this missionary Orthodox diocese from Russia. It brightened when the Holy Synod communicated their acceptance of the faithful of St. Mary parish in Minneapolis (my home parish). With this acceptance, a salary commenced from the diocese for Fr. Alexis. Almost immediately, similar efforts were underway to establish parish communities in many other parts of the country. The parish in Minneapolis went on to support the first theological school in the lower 48 states.

In reflecting on the immigration of the Slavs to the new land, we can see that Fr. Alexis was a true shepherd to the flock entrusted to him. He was able to maintain a tension between a fastidious search for truth and relationship with Christ, with a tolerance for others. He constantly encouraged his people to learn about their faith, fighting off the ignorance that had been brought on by various levels of oppression. He assisted the faithful in their efforts to build up the Body of Christ and claim their Slavic identity. His was truly a pastoral model. The Orthodox Church in America canonized Fr. Alexis in 1994, and St. Alexis Mission parish community in Clinton, Connecticut, of which I am priest-in-charge, is the first parish community to be named with him as patron!

One last historical event marks the life of the Slavic-Americans, and it relates chronologically almost directly with the foundation and development of the Clinical Pastoral Education movement. The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 ended funding for the Orthodox Mission, which was just getting underway. During the 1920s, when Rev. Anton Boisen, Dr. Helen Flanders Dunbar, Dr. Richard Cabot, and others were founding the CPE movement, the Orthodox Church was struggling for its very survival. This struggle was financial as well as a search for ecclesiastical normalcy as the relatively uneducated faithful looked for connection after all they had endured. Both aspects of the struggle were exacerbated by representatives of the Living Church (an arm of the revolution in Russia whose express purpose was to bring an end to religious life in Russia) who impersonated themselves as clergy, took the property of many churches, and scattered the faithful. One of the real and painful lasting effects of this crisis is that there is not a single, united Orthodox presence in North America. Resolving this situation remains a high priority among the Orthodox in North America.

The Slavs who came to America endured many levels of culture shock, not the least of which involved their being identified as Orthodox Christians. Yet, their own assimilating nature caused them to blend rather quickly into this new cultural milieu, often without coming to terms with all that had happened. As noted above, it was only through the mutual threat from both sides of Europe that the Slavs began to differentiate. Perhaps this is one reason that Slavs feel threatened when they perceive their faith being tampered with in any way. This may be exacerbated by lack of education, as well as by the Orthodox Church's history and lived experience of being in captivity of one form or another. This point is essential, since our ecclesiology is centered on the gathered Body of Christ celebrating the Eucharist. This is a sacramental, historical, and eschatological reality. In this celebration we believe that we taste the reality of Communion between the persons of the Holy Trinity in the Kingdom of Heaven, while still here as part of God's creation. Everything else one is or does is seen through this reality. Combining this ecclesiastical understanding with the history of captivity, it is no wonder that the Orthodox Church has become extremely protective of the gathered community of faithful in the local church!

I would like to consider now, through the lens of a theological image, the more recent impact of CPE supervision on pastoral care in general, and for this Orthodox Christian supervisor in particular. Let us consider Joseph, son of Jacob, and a major figure in the book of Genesis, chapters 37-50. Joseph was a favored son of Jacob, and despised by his brothers for this reason. He was given a dream by God that revealed his brothers, as sheaves of grain, bowing to his sheaf. The image was sufficient to set these brothers into action to assuage the threat Joseph posed. Joseph lived, but was sold into slavery, and came to be the servant of the captain of Pharaoh's guard in Egypt. His wonderful dream was before him, but not yet realized. He was successful in the duties given him, but jailed when falsely accused by the master's wife of attempted rape. Even there he had success, though his dream continued to seem far off, maybe even forgotten.

Let us say that Joseph is visited by a chaplain during his sojourn in the Egyptian jail. An astute chaplain would ask to hear Joseph's story, and note from a family system's perspective that what is happening to him seems to follow generations of family members being called by God to incredible, unforeseen situations and circumstances. Abraham was called to all but sacrifice his son. Jacob, Joseph's father, was assisted by his mother in beating Esau out of his birthright and blessing. The chaplain might wonder, along with Joseph, about the meaning of all these events through the eyes of faith. The theological issues to

consider might include the sense of being called out or sent, forgiveness, and continued faithfulness in deepening adversity. Where is God in all of this?

The chaplain might be overwhelmed by the whole story told by Joseph and might seek out the supervisor. Rather than reinforcing the significance of the chaplain's role, the supervisor explores the feelings of inadequacy expressed by the chaplain in being present to Joseph. The supervisor points out that Joseph is also struggling with his identity and with the place of faith in his unwitting transformation from son of an influential, even dynastic family, to a prisoner in a foreign land. The chaplain returns to Joseph and assists him in working through his grief and struggle to come to terms with his own bondage and changed identity, while leaving intact the hope derived from his dream. Shortly after this encounter, Joseph is called by Pharaoh to interpret his dream, and becomes a valued member of the community.

The supervisor at once attends to the relationship between chaplain and patient (learning problem) and to the relationship between chaplain and supervisor (problem about learning) as suggested by the long standing text on supervision by Ekstein and Wallerstein, *The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy*.⁶ The supervisor works through parallel processes related to inadequacy in order to empower the chaplain to re-engage with Joseph in a meaningful way. As this chaplain and patient relationship is of some duration, the supervisor also engages peers in reflecting upon his work with the chaplain.

It is here that a powerfully reflective question is raised for me by this vignette. My conscious motivation in seeking out supervisory credentials also comes from a sense of calling or being sent. The preparation for this includes both life experience and seminary training. More recently, I have become aware, through insight and prayerful reflection, that my sojourn as an Orthodox priest in the CPE community has often felt like being in a foreign land. What began as a few steps in an extended unit, eventually and quite unexpectedly turned into a pursuit of supervisory training through the encouragement of several key people including my wife and very caring and sensitive supervisors.

While my dream of being a supervisor has remained, the journey has been far from easy. I have at times experienced feelings of abandonment and isolation stemming both from current experiences in this new community and generational pressures, and have found the struggle to lead only to greater depths of bondage to shameful fears and feelings of inadequacy. In addition, I have often felt neither heard nor understood as a Slavic representative of the Orthodox faith, as I appear as the white Protestant male epitomized as controlling the CPE community. I have

also come to understand my institutional chaplaincy role as that of a wanderer in a modern desert, connected to the early monastics in the Egyptian desert, or more recently to those who became hermits in the Russian wilderness. In each setting one struggles with many demons and temptations, emerging in time (if one is not consumed) with something to offer others.

Over time, however, I—like Joseph—began to claim my new identity in this foreign land, becoming more at home both with who I am and finding my place in this community. (By the way, the latter becomes infinitely easier as the former takes hold, thanks be to God.) I not only have become more fully aware of my Slavic heritage, but my Orthodox faith has been both tried and enriched through interactions with supervisors of many other faiths and cultures, and also in ministering to those who have no espoused faith. Even more exciting is the absolutely palpable sense of the dream being realized at long last! Joseph eventually was able not only to welcome and forgive his brothers for their actions, but also to provide sustenance for them when a famine took hold in their land. He had in fact become a bridge between this dynastic family and his new community.

My unfolding experience of a dream finding realization is twofold. First of all, my own experience as a sojourner has offered a substantial depth of sensitivity to participate in an indigenous CPE project in South Korea, inviting new peoples and cultures to embrace the building blocks of clinical training without forcing them to embrace an American model. I have been able to call upon my experience of inadequacy and continuing struggle to invite others to take similar, albeit uncertain steps. I have also been able to genuinely learn from and celebrate their completion of successful steps, even though in countless ways comparatively unique. This helps remind me that no model of clinical training can itself become “the standard” since by its very nature the CPE community includes a diversity of cultures, beliefs, and life experiences. Rather, we can speak of a growing depth of richness as peoples engage one another as experienced at the Seventh International Congress for Pastoral Care and Counseling, held in Accra, Ghana in August, 1994.

The second realization of my dream relates to being sought out and, in some ways, embraced by the Orthodox Church in America as the first ordained and certified CPE supervisor. Several opportunities have been and continue to be offered to me to bring clinical principles and praxis to bear in our Orthodox community. Similarly I look to the day when Orthodox supervisors will add their unique voice and experience to the greater CPE community. In all, I have learned to claim my unique perspective with generous helpings of both prayer (personally, and as parish pastor and supervisor) and consultation. I have seen the sojourner’s

isolation and struggle quietly transformed to fuel greater interpersonal connection and bridging of communities. Similarly, I can now see, in retrospect, how many similar generational Slavic experiences have influenced my steps on this journey. I hope my experience will be helpful to others, as well as role models like St. Alexis who aren't afraid to walk on foreign terrain with faith and confidence.

This leads us to some implications for pastoral supervision today in our increasingly multi-cultural global community. As supervisors, it is important now more than ever to be willing to learn from our trainees, working fastidiously to see from, and work within, their frame of reference, rather than training others to use our own, however well developed and tried it may be. This also represents good modeling of pastoral presence. A rather stark example is offered popularly today in the Borg Collective from the Star Trek series' "Next Generation" and "Voyager." This collective processes all members, and assimilates other "species" it encounters. The assimilation process entails gaining whatever knowledge, technology, and lived experience they have, and turning them into drones exactly like every other drone. The famous greeting uttered to all encountered is: "You will be assimilated. Resistance is futile." Resistance is not something to be broken down. Rather, it is surmounted by relationships that continue to allow each to become uniquely who they are as they sojourn together. The model of Joseph reveals that new and diverse communities can be encountered in foreign lands and unique gifts shared. Joseph ceased neither to be Jacob's son, nor an Israelite, but became at home in a new community. We need to allow space for this to occur with trainees.

It is also important to point out a parallel between Orthodox Slavs coming to this country and the supervisory journey. Slavs will likely encounter and grapple with what has become an almost archetypal experience of differentiation in the midst of bondage and/or oppression in the CPE process, designed to assist trainees in expressing their idiosyncratic selves. The centrality, in Orthodox ecclesiology, of the gathered community in the celebration of the Eucharist continues to assert that relationship to the "other" (neighbor, God, etc.) is an essential part of self-identification, or more specifically one's personhood. This actually bears greater similarity to Asian culture than to American individualism. On the one hand, this can be a gift offered to the greater CPE community in America; on the other hand, it needs to be respected among Orthodox Christians seeking CPE training. In return, Orthodox CPE trainees can embrace their particular pastoral gifts and identity within a greater community setting, whether that is the parish community or in the hospital or other institutional setting. Had St. Alexis not had such a

pastoral foundation, he could neither have endured his dark night of the soul, nor taken on the work of calling the Slavs back to their heritage and community while encouraging them to learn about their faith.

Finally, none of us should be afraid to venture out to foreign lands with those whom we supervise and minister to, although these are sometimes most difficult steps to take. In fact many outside our country have done so much more often than we ourselves have, growing up in this country. These travels (whether or not they cover physical ground) become opportunities to be stretched and transformed. God's hand can be seen working through the lives of many here, yet without fanfare and attention. Our own fruitful experience of integration and transformation is most meaningfully reflected not in our pastoral care and supervision, but freely from within the lives of our patients, congregants, and trainees as we encounter one another in the existential moment—living understanding and praxis of faith.

NOTES

1. Šárka Hrbkova, *The Slavs of Austria-Hungary* (Lincoln, NE: Department of Slavonic Languages and Literature, University of Nebraska, 1918), 8.
2. Ibid., 14.
3. Paul R. Radosavljevich, *Who Are The Slavs? A Contribution to Race Psychology*, vol. 1 (Boston: Gorham Press, 1919), 101.
4. Ibid., 102.
5. Ibid., 365.
6. Rudolf Ekstein and Robert Wallerstein, *The Teaching and Learning of Psychotherapy*, 2nd ed. (Madison, WI: International Universities Press, Inc., 1972), 140.

Cultural Inclusiveness and Positive Empowerment in Clinical Pastoral Education

Patricia A. Wilson-Robinson

When I work with students from different ethnic backgrounds and cultures, I first reflect on myself as an African-American womanist theologian, and I utilize the readings of Howard Thurman. Thurman is one of the primary theologians with whom I resonate on a daily basis with my students. Reverend Dr. Howard Thurman was Dean Emeritus of Marsh Chapel at Boston University and served as Dean of Rankin Chapel at Howard University in Washington, DC. He is known throughout the country as the founder of the Church for the Fellowship of All Peoples in San Francisco, the first interracial, interdenominational church in the United States. I find it a joy and an honor to visit his church on an annual basis. Howard Thurman was also Honorary Canon of the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine in New York City. He was a poet, mystic, philosopher, and theologian.

My students are not surprised when I say to them, “I am not hearing you and you are not hearing me.” We both need a listening ear. Why is it that I don’t hear them? I have come to realize that at times it may be their accents; other times it may

Patricia A. Wilson-Robinson, D. Div. is the Director of the Clinical Pastoral Education Center at Madigan Army Medical Hospital, President of The Racial Ethnic Multicultural Network (REM), and an Associate Minister at Mt. Zion Baptist Church in Seattle, Washington. Dr. Wilson-Robinson, recently promoted to Major, was the first female United States Army Chaplain to become a certified Clinical Pastoral Education Supervisor and the first African-American woman to develop and direct a Clinical Pastoral Education Program for the Army.

be that they are being verbose and lack appropriate listening skills. Many times we fail to hear each other because the students are not focused on the subject that they have been challenged to hear. It is at the here-and-now moment I find myself saying, “Give Me The Listening Ear. I seek this day the ear that will not shrink from the word that corrects and admonishes—the word that holds up before me the image of myself that causes me to pause and reconsider—the word that challenges me to deeper consecration and higher resolve—the word that lays bare needs that make my own days uneasy, that seizes upon every good and decent impulse of my nature.”¹

I ascribe to the each-one-teach-one educational theory. This is an African proverb which means when someone is talking in the group, there is one student who needs to be challenged or empowered. This student is listening and learning, reflecting on the learning contract, which has also been shared with all of their peers. This is congruent with how people learn. Students from various cultures have been able to learn from each other regardless of differences in faith, race, gender, ethnicity, etc.

I worked with a student from Puerto Rico who was quite calm mannered, placed his family in a high priority during his day-to-day responsibilities, and was often not able to get verbatims typed at night due to spending quality time with the family. In addition to that issue, he did not have a working knowledge of the spoken or written English language. I was comfortable allowing him to articulate his verbatims to the group and discovered how well it improved his ability with the spoken language. During his year-long training, he also enrolled in a class, which emphasized the importance of writing English correctly. Upon graduation he had demonstrated progress in both the written and spoken language.

This type of each-one-teach-one approach affirms that people learn according to cultural norms. I feel it is my responsibility at times to challenge the way I do Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) with all my students in order to help them reach their goals and in order to help them reach the objectives in the CPE standards.

I worked with a student who was an outstanding preacher and often, when he presented his verbatim, we could not understand what he was saying. He stuttered, jumbled his words, and was overly anxious. A peer challenged him to present his verbatim orally. The group would confront him not only on his verbatim work but encouraged him to name what was going on with him when they could not understand what he was saying.

We all know that the curriculum and the didactic schedule are important elements in developing our CPE programs. My handbook is complete and given to

the students during the first week of the program. Then I pose the question to the students, “What would you like to see happen this year?” On several occasions, I have had students present didactic seminars or arranged for the group to attend workshops or community programs from which they could benefit. I am open to making the necessary arrangements in the schedule for the students to attend these sessions. Ira Shor says: “A curriculum designed to empower students must be transformative in nature and help students to develop the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become social critics who can make reflective decisions and implement their decisions in effective personal, social, political, and economic action.”² This affirms my right as a supervisor to develop a curriculum while remaining open to student input for learning and moments of action-reflection-action with their peers and me during the year.

“Outcomes for Level II CPE”³ alludes to the positive use of power. I am constantly telling my students that this is probably the first position they will ever have where they can challenge the power of a supervisor or a peer. This is an opportunity to see how persons from other cultures use or do not use their authority. It is a time when I begin to learn from another person’s culture regarding power and authority. I reflect on what my first CPE supervisor, Hallie Lawson Reeves of Saint Elizabeth’s Hospital, said to me: “Pat, what is the SMV saying to you? Then do what the SMV says do (still small voice).”⁴

All cultures may be embraced in a group when we realize that authority is granted to people who are perceived as authoring their own words, their own actions, their own lives, rather than playing a scripted role removed from their own hearts.⁵ I certainly can resonate with Parker Palmer when he states, “I am painfully aware of the times in my own teaching when I lose touch with my inner teacher and therefore with my own authority. In those times I try to gain power by barricading myself behind the podium and my status while wielding the threat of grades. But when my teaching is authorized by the teacher within me, I need neither weapons nor armor to teach.”⁶

Let me share this vignette with you: I had been challenging an African-American female student who was enrolled in the Mount Zion Baptist Church Clinical Pastoral Education program, a parish based ministry in Seattle, Washington. The woman was older than I; had a position of authority in the church and in the community, and carried herself with an authoritative presence. I’ll call her “Mrs. H.” Initially she was not completing the written work for the program but was indeed an active listener and participated in the group process. When I challenged her regarding her incomplete written work, it was in the group. She was

angry, hurt, and disappointed about how I handled the situation. The next day we talked during supervision and she expressed her pain and disappointment in me. I apologized to her and to the group the next day. What did I learn? I learned that I had failed to listen to the authority within (SMV) and I failed to resonate with the authority I felt coming from her. I call it that something within me, “Something Within me that holdeth the reins, Something Within me that banishes pain, Something Within me I cannot explain, all that I know there is Something Within.”⁷

I also failed to reflect back on my theological position of “Give me the Listening Ear.” If I had taken the time to reflect on who this woman reminded me of, I would have honestly acknowledged that parts of her reminded me of parts of me. As a result, I forgot to embrace both the good and the bad. This resulted in my shutting up my authority inside of me during the whole unit of training. Similarly, if we do not respond to the voice of the inward teacher, it will either stop speaking or become violent.⁸ The greatest learning in this experience was when I sat in the stillness and silence and reflected on the statement, “Be still and know that I am God.”⁹ It was in the stillness and silence that I had to admit that I was afraid of her power. “Our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate. Our deepest fear is that we are powerful beyond measure. It is our light, not our darkness that frightens us.”¹⁰ I was afraid of her light and my own light; I was afraid that she was going to put my light out by telling members of the church and community negative things about the CPE program and this would hinder others from signing up for future units of CPE. I realized that “yes, she has a bright light” and “yes, I have a bright light,” and the two lights can make a world of a difference in my learning and her learning about how we use our power.

When we start to embrace this type of authority, we seek to embrace cultural dynamics and learn from the authority of others. We then become sensitive to the authority of our students and help them confront parts of themselves and confront us as supervisors as well as others they may encounter. This student demonstrated competent use of herself in ministry; she was emotionally available in the group and shared several statements about her own life; she had a non-anxious and non-judgmental presence and set clear boundaries in her day-to-day ministry. This was indeed a student of authority. She empowered me to realize that, “authority comes as I reclaim my identity and integrity, remembering my selfhood and my sense of vocation.”¹¹

I often supervise with poetry. An appropriate reading for this situation is called “Myself,” by Edgar Guest. An African-American female educator named Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown, founder of Palmer Memorial Institute in Sedalia, North

Carolina, would recite to her students daily, “I have to live with myself and so, I want to be fit for myself to know. I want to be able as days go by, always to look myself straight in the eye.”¹² Dr. Brown titled the poem “Myself—The Palmer Creed.” This is just a portion of the poem, but the lesson for me here is I want to be able to tell myself the truth and demonstrate to my students’ truth. I believe that in the supervisory relationship one can affirm another culture by establishing trust, and that the truth will set students and supervisors free.

Then there was the pastor’s wife in the group. In my church culture, we call her the “First Lady.” I had some anxiety about even saying “Yes” to the First Lady being in this program. But who in their right mind would turn down the pastor’s wife? The issue of power here is similar to the first vignette. It is another example of the use of power and authority in the African-American church. The African-American church is a unique culture in itself. In this culture you respect the First Lady. She is set aside; she is upheld. I immediately thought this “stuff” would get in the way of our working together. I had reservations, again due to some of my own inner fears.

I prayed about it, and Mrs. B. has been highly respectful of me and her peers. She has worked hard on her own growing edges, met me for supervision in a timely manner, demonstrated the ability to initiate helping relationships, and been a leader in the group for offering appropriate and timely critique. The great news for her is she has been accepted in a year-long CPE residency program in Seattle. This will afford her the opportunity to demonstrate and learn more about her pastoral and personal identity and how to use her authority.

Both of the vignettes above represent for me a paradigm shift from cultural deficit to cultural democracy. Shor suggests that teachers and students are alienated from each other by a hierarchy and a curriculum that establishes the teacher’s authority at the expense of the students’. But empowerment requires their cooperation. They each know things the other must learn.¹³ Empowerment takes place in the Mount Zion Baptist Church program because we respect each other’s authority and we have learned the importance of continuous cooperation in order to make the program work. The students help to develop the curriculum. They attend revival services and write theological papers reflecting on the experience. They attend Sunday services and write sermon evaluation notes. These notes are integrated into their own pastoral and personal lives as well as the lives of those they are called to minister to. The students also attend youth retreats and visit the sick and shut-in members of the church. It has taken me, as the supervisor, and the students to develop the curriculum for this parish-based program. The didactic

presenters have included the pastor, assistant to the pastor, members of the church, community, and myself.

I am writing a book, which is scheduled to be published in 2002. It will include the following:

TWELVE THINGS I'VE LEARNED IN WORKING WITH MULTICULTURAL PERSONS

1. I have learned the importance of looking at each student with reverence according to the manner that Gary Zukav shares in his book, *Seat of the Soul*, and with "God's Eyes" as Dr. John Kenny shared at the 2000 Annual ACPE Conference in Arlington, VA.
2. My first CPE Supervisor and mentor, Hallie Lawson Reeves, said to me, "Pat, you don't need to know everything but you need to know something." I've learned to embrace her statement and share it with my students. Some students may not learn how to type a verbatim the way we are used to seeing one typed; but perhaps they can articulate it and be open to the learning experience from their peers and me.
3. I've learned you cannot compare one cultural experience with another. In 1998-1999, a male African-American student taught me something totally different about preaching than another male African-American student did in 2000-2001.
4. I've learned that many minority supervisors have problems embracing or empowering students from the same cultural background. One should not be afraid to help a person from the same culture to get certified. This type of discrimination hurts more than when it's coming from someone outside of the culture. Remember that somebody helped you.
5. I've learned that if you really want to work with people from another culture, you need to resonate with what I call the three "Cs" which are: be concerned, be compassionate, and be committed to them.
6. I've learned that this is truly the time to do some pastoral reflection in the area of our educational theory: "How do people learn?" The answer should be defined from a perspective of culture as often as possible.
7. I've learned that it is not only important for each student to develop a learning contract at the beginning of each unit, but I, too, must develop a contract for each student even if I do so internally as I work with them.

8. I've learned to stay spiritually centered, whether it is in the midst of a conflict where I am expressing my anger to the students, or just sitting in the stillness and silence listening to the (SMV) as to where we go from here.
9. I've learned the importance of four points from Don Miguel Ruiz: speak with impeccability, don't take anything personally, don't make assumptions, and always do your best.¹⁴
10. I've learned that its okay to pray for my students daily and ask them to pray for me.
11. I've learned the importance of always reflecting on my theorists: Reverend Dr. Howard Thurman, Reverend Dr. Delores Williams, Melanie Klein, Naim Akbar, Ira Shor, and Irvin D. Yalom. I have also learned the importance of reflecting on other theorists in the here-and-now if it will help me with students of other cultures. For example, I have recently embraced Parker Palmer, Don Miguel Ruiz, Paulo Freire, and Beverly M. Nicks of Straight-Talk Enterprises.
12. I've learned to share the power with other persons in the community of faith. I have invited the Chief of the Department of Ministry and Pastoral Care and his Deputy, Staff Chaplains, Doctors, my pastor and his assistant; staff persons in the hospital and community to share in presenting didactics and to share their expertise during CPE case presentations, etc. I have integrated into the program the opportunity for students to also present didactics because of their expertise in certain pastoral care areas. For example, the military chaplains have received training in suicide prevention and the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory.

CONCLUSION

I hope that others will benefit from my sharing these thoughts about my Clinical Pastoral Education experiences. It is when we share our experiences with each other that we can be exposed to different methods that we might choose to incorporate in the CPE experience. As I said earlier, I have learned that the greatest power any of us can rely on is that "Something Within."

NOTES

1. Howard Thurman, *Meditations of the Heart* (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1992).
2. Ira Shor, *Empowering Education Critical Teaching for Social Change* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 16.
3. 2001 ACPE Standards, 252.6.
4. Reverend Dr. Hallie Lawson Reeves, CPE Supervisor and Womanist Theologian, Saint Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, DC.
5. Parker Palmer, *The Courage To Teach* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998), 33.
6. *Ibid.*, 33.
7. National Baptist Publishing Board, *The New National Baptist Hymnal* (Nashville, TN: Triad Publications, 1992), 275.
8. Palmer.
9. Psalm 46:10.
10. Nelson Mandela, the President of the Republic of South Africa from his 1994 Inaugural Speech.
11. Palmer, 33.
12. Edgar Guest, "Myself."
13. Ira Shor, 201.
14. Don Miguel Ruiz, *The Four Agreements* (San Rafael, CA: Amber-Allen Publishing, 2000).

A Cultural Analysis of the Eastern ACPE Region with Implications for the Future

John J. Gleason

INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken with the hope that an assessment of the culture of the Eastern ACPE Region, when posited against understandings of the demands of the wider culture, would suggest directions for the future.

BASIC CULTURAL ASSUMPTIONS

Edgar H. Schein, in *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, lists five areas in which basic assumptions form cultural paradigms.¹ Attention to these areas provides a beginning point for a cultural analysis of the Eastern ACPE Region.

Rev. John J. Gleason, D.Min. is the Eastern ACPE Regional Director and lives in Collegeville, Pennsylvania.

Humanity's Relationship to Nature

How did key members of the four groups which formed the ACPE view the relationship of the organization to its environment: as one of dominance, submission, harmonizing, or finding an appropriate niche? ACPE founders viewed the “product” (clinical pastoral education) as superior. However, in order to “produce” CPE, a supportive environment had to be found and cultivated. Thus, the cultural motifs were conflictual: to provide the best in clinical learning (dominance) one must find an appropriate niche (adaptation) must be found.

The Nature of Reality and Truth

What are the linguistic and behavioral rules that define what is real and what is not, what is “fact,” how truth is ultimately determined, and whether truth is “revealed” or “discovered?” ACPE founders came primarily from within liberal Protestant theology in the United States, which affirms cultural accommodation, a focus on God’s immanence, and progressivism.

The Nature of Human Nature

What does it mean to be “human”? Is human nature good, evil, or neutral? Are human beings perfectible or not? The ACPE founders, again mostly liberal Protestant theologians, operated with a highly developmental theory of personality and did their clinical training assuming that they, their students, and their patients were inherently good and teachable, if not perfectible.

The Nature of Human Activity

What is the “right” thing for humans to do: to be active, passive, self-developmental, or fatalistic? The ACPE founders’ ideal was a blending of being and becoming as being-in-becoming, the underpinning of the action-reflection-action model of clinical pastoral education.

The Nature of Human Relationships

What is considered to be the “right” way for people to relate to each other, to distribute power and love? Is life cooperative or competitive; individualistic, group collaborative, or communal; based on traditional lineal authority, law, charisma, or what? Of three possible emotional coping styles noted by Schein, The Sturdy Battler best describes the typical ACPE founder. The Sturdy Battler copes with anxiety by “actively testing the interpersonal environment, by fighting, competing with, controlling, challenging, and resisting other members and especially authority figures in the attempt to sort out his [*sic*, but accurate] own identity. Such a person

would be labeled as basically ‘counterdependent’ in the group context and as ‘moving against people’ in Horney’s terms.”²²

THE FORMING ACPE AS A EURO MALE LIBERAL PROTESTANT MONOCULTURE

Schein notes that the final and probably most difficult aspect of any analysis of assumptions is the degree to which they become interlocked into coherent patterns or paradigms.³ How then do these five assumption areas fit into an initial ACPE cultural paradigm that addresses the similarities and differences among the four forming groups—Institute of Pastoral Care, Council for Clinical Training, Lutheran Advisory Council, and Southern Baptist Association?

In a recent Guest Editorial in the *Journal of Pastoral Care* (Spring, 1998), I listed a composite of the characteristics of most of the pioneering CPE supervisors. A somewhat expanded list would indicated that they were:

- of European extraction;
- comfortably middle class;
- masculine; professing heterosexuals;
- United States citizens;
- credentialed as Protestant clergy.

Additionally,

- they felt iconoclastic toward perceived repressive elements in Protestantism;
- valued and practiced camaraderie;
- used confrontation as a primary teaching method;
- learned primarily through apprenticeship with mentors in a guild modality;
- carried a substantial reservoir of personal anger;
- were capable of deep caring but inhibited in its direct expression;
- possessed a deep loyalty to the “spirit” of CPE;
- were filled with macho pride;
- identified with the image of the wounded healer;
- were empathic toward the suffering individual in general, and empathetic toward disenfranchised males in ministry in particular;

- valued spontaneity in interactions;
- were informal where possible in social contexts;
- advocated for sexual liberation;
- and brought a psychoanalytic orientation to individual supervision and a humanistic psychological orientation to group supervision.

In short, the forming ACPE was a Euro male liberal Protestant monoculture.

Supervisors trained in the Institute of Pastoral Care (IPC) tradition—which valued the seminary perspective of theological analysis vis-à-vis the psychoanalytic emphasis of the Council for Clinical Training (CCT)—could argue that the above composite is merely that of a CCT Supervisor, not one from the IPC. As one trained in the Deep South in the 1960s—primarily by Southern Baptist Supervisors but under the auspices of a CCT proto-cluster, my bias that the farther one got from the IPC locus in Boston, the more predominant the CCT—is no doubt showing here. However, my experience was that those Southern Baptists effectively balanced the psychoanalytic thrust with serious theological reflection about pastoral care and supervisory work.

Further data that such differences were perhaps more stereotypical than real by the 1960s can be found in an account of the first meeting of IPC and CCT certification committees in 1962. “The split between head and heart was obvious in the stereotypes. (But) the more we talked, the more ludicrous it sounded to ourselves, for we could not pin these impressions on any specific person. We had inherited an oral tradition that said we were different, and we supposed these descriptions fit others but not, in all probability, the persons in that room. Near the end of the meeting, laughing at ourselves for accepting the stereotypes, we agreed to have a joint meeting and an evaluation of some advanced students in order to experience how each organization handled evaluations for certification.”⁴ To sum up, by 1968 the four forming groups were more alike than different, making it possible for them to crystallize into a solidly Euro male liberal Protestant monoculture.

THE EURO MALE LIBERAL PROTESTANT MONOCULTURE IN THE EASTERN ACPE REGION

The first basic assumption forming a cultural paradigm specific to the Eastern ACPE Region was *its essential predisposition toward diversity*. It is interesting to

note that the four groups which formed the ACPE, Inc. in 1968 were represented by four members of the initial leadership team of the Eastern ACPE Region.

1. Edward F. Dobihal, Jr., a CCT Supervisor, became chair of the first regional certification committee.
2. Richard Lehman, an IPC Supervisor, was the first regional chair.
3. Henry Cassler, a founding member of the LAC, was elected as the first regional director.
4. E. Dean Bergen, trained in an SBA center and later to become the second regional director, served as the first vice chair of the regional certification committee.

The second and third regional chairs, LeRoy Aden of the faculty of Lutheran Theological Seminary of Philadelphia and Dan Sandstedt of Lutheran Theological Seminary of Gettysburg, represented a fifth influence, namely that of academic theological education.⁵

Although all of these men were full-blooded citizens of the Euro male liberal Protestant monoculture, the seeds of diversity were planted in that first spring of the Eastern ACPE Region's existence by virtue of their generation's widest possible representation.

In addition to those seeds of diversity, a second region-specific basic assumption should be noted. The Eastern ACPE Region has *a propensity for "firsts" and an accompanying feeling of elitism*. The five states that formed the Eastern Region—Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware (the first state)—included the first and largest city in the United States, New York, with its international leadership in finance and culture. This "firstness" spawned other firsts: the first ACPE office (the CCT suite at 475 Riverside Drive, New York City); the first outcomes-based pastoral research project (Robert Reeves at Columbia-Presbyterian Hospital); the first Jewish supervisor (Fred Hollander, CCT), the first free-standing chaplaincy and CPE contractor (The HealthCare Chaplaincy), the first woman regional director (Joan Hemenway), the first Jewish ACPE supervisor (Jeffery Silberman), the first Jewish regional director (Silberman), the first Islamic Imam chaplain resident (Yusuf Hasan), the first full-time supervisor/researcher (Larry VandeCreek), and the first Buddhist supervisory residents (Judith Wright and Trudi Hirsch).

A third region-specific basic assumption involved downplaying administration, but getting the job done—put more succinctly: *administrative ambivalence*. Henry Cassler, the first regional director, openly derided formal communication, and produced only four newsletters during his five-year tenure

(1968-72). In that mode he sought to expedite the necessary business of the region—certification, accreditation, continuing education, budgeting, and fellowship—with a minimum amount of structure.⁶ Nonetheless that business did get done, often through natural networks of power and communication—in hotel rooms and sometimes over late night poker games, at bars, and in hospitality suites during conferences. Dean Bergen continued that tradition during his tenure (1973-1983), although he began to use the newsletter to express his views and to stimulate thinking. One story about Bergen’s reinforcement of the laid-back leadership style established by Cassler is that he knew each supervisor’s drink preference and faithfully made it available in his conference hospitality suite.

A fourth region-specific basic assumption had to do with inbreeding. A significant number of supervisors trained in the region stayed to practice their profession there and moved only within regional boundaries. The effect was the formation of multiple layers of relationship. When any two Eastern Region supervisors meet, they likely bring with them a complex of previous experiences (and feelings): as training group peer to peer, as supervisor to student, as certification committee member to candidate, as accreditation site visitor to center supervisor, as spouse to spouse, or even as ex-spouses. One effect is that some supervisors who are new to the region report difficulty finding acceptance in this 65-or-so member extended professional family.

THE FIRST “WAVE” OF THE IN-BREAKING MULTICULTURE IN THE ACPE: FEMINISM

In good Jungian shadow-fashion, a feminine presence had exerted itself within the solidly Euro male liberal Protestant monoculture of clinical pastoral training nationally, as much as forty years prior to the formation of the ACPE. Helen Flanders Dunbar, a seminarian, worked as a researcher in the Social Work Department at Anton T. Boisen’s invitation alongside his first training group at Worcester State Hospital in the summer of 1925. Shortly thereafter, she earned B.D., M.D., and Ph.D. degrees and in the early 1930s became the first executive director of the CCT. Although she stayed with Boisen for only one month that summer and never became a CPE supervisor, Dunbar’s forceful leadership charted the course for the CCT throughout the 1930s.

Numerically, however, that early feminine presence was minimal. The first woman supervisor, Mary Louise Long, was certified by the CCT in 1949. The

second, Helen T. Terkelsen, was certified by the IPC in 1960. Only two women, Terkelsen and Florence Lewis (IPC), entered the ACPE in 1968 as full supervisors.⁷

As the number of ACPE women supervisors slowly increased, a women supervisors' study group was formed and adopted a mission statement in 1979. "...We are committed to a common ministry. That ministry is impaired because of the pain and injustice of broken collegiality between women and men. We commit ourselves and challenge our colleagues to join in a prophetic witness with hope toward reconciliation." A Task Force on Women's Issues decided to focus on collegiality between women and men instead of focusing only on women's issues.⁸

The national flashpoint for this first "wave" of the in-breaking multiculturalism in the ACPE was a number of ethical complaints alleging sexual improprieties brought by multicultural students against monoculture supervisors. A significant number of monoculture supervisors saw the newly female dominant Professional Ethics Commission (PEC) as an advocacy group for feminist interests. On the other hand, most multicultural supervisors saw the work of the PEC as the long overdue administration of justice.⁹

THE IMPACT OF THE FIRST "WAVE" IN THE EASTERN ACPE REGION

The listing below indicates a gradual crescendo of women in leadership positions from a flat line at zero from 1968-1972 to the year 1982, when three women chaired committees and Joan Hemenway was elected the first Regional Director in the ACPE.

The first woman to appear on a regional leadership list was Shirley Causey, Nominating Committee, 1973-74. There followed (through 1982): Shirley Causey, Certification Committee, 1975-81, National Certification Committee, 1981, and Regional Vice Chair, 1980-82; Maxine Walaskay, Development Committee, 1975-80, Certification Committee, 1981-82, National Certification Committee, 1982, and Second Alternate, House of Delegates, 1981; Jean Gilbert, Certification Committee, 1978-82, House of Delegates Member, 1979-81, and National Nominating Committee, 1981; Mary Jenkins, Research Committee, 1979-80 and Accreditation Committee, 1982; Joan Hemenway, Accreditation Committee, 1979-82; Delores Pelletier, Standards Committee, 1980-82 (Chair, 1982), and Grievance Pool Member, 1982; Mary Sullivan, Accreditation Committee, 1981; Denise Haines, Development Committee, 1981-82 (Chair, 1982); Theresa Brophy,

Research Committee, 1981-82 (Chair, 1982); Virginia Samuel, Certification Committee, 1982; Janet Labreque, Development Committee, 1982; and Gail Nicastro, Development Committee, 1982, and Second Alternate, House of Delegates, 1982. (Please forgive and report any omissions.)

The regional flashpoint for the shift in cultures centered around persons and personalities. Raymond J. Lawrence, a bright, articulate, and charismatic supervisor, worked in the Southeast, Mid-Atlantic, and Southwest Regions during the 1960s and 1970s. A natural leader, Lawrence embodied in his leadership and supervisory styles the essence of the Euro male liberal Protestant monoculture. In light of the *inbreeding* basic regional assumption, it is significant that his training and a considerable part of his ministry took place outside the Eastern Region. Upon his arrival in New York City in the early 1980s, Lawrence was immediately confronted in regional life by equally bright, charismatic women supervisors, in particular Joan Hemenway and Denise Haines, who were just then assuming power as a part of the multiculture's first "wave."

The result was a sharp, emotionally painful, and very personal polarization within the region that paralleled the more generalized national polarization related to the work of the PEC. An undetermined number of male and female supervisors were sympathetic toward Lawrence, while others, both male and female, stood with the new women leaders. Stereotypic labels were attached to persons on both sides. Both groups made ugly accusations.

Lawrence began to exercise his leadership from the posture of an outsider by publishing a newsletter titled *The Underground Report* (UR). The UR became a national rallying point for members of the increasingly frustrated and angry Euro male liberal Protestant monoculture. UR Editor Lawrence sharply criticized feminism in all of its aspects and pointed out the dulling effects of institutionalization upon the ACPE as it acquired more and more of the characteristics of a maturing organization.

Institutional polarization followed, with the organization in 1990 of The College of Pastoral Supervision and Psychotherapy, Inc. (CPSP), an effort to recover a perceived loss of the CPE spirit. The expressed nature of this spirit was the value of developing and maintaining relationships among CPE supervisors and pastoral counselors. The stated goal of CPSP is to honor personal authority and creativity as opposed to invasive, aggressive, or predatory behaviors (adapted from The CPSP Covenant). The founding and continuing General Secretary of the CPSP is Raymond J. Lawrence. The UR became *Contra Mundum*, an occasional journal

of theological reflection officially separated from and not representative of CPSP and Lawrence was the publisher and editor.¹⁰

SUCCESSIVE “WAVES” OF THE IN-BREAKING MULTICULTURE IN THE ACPE

The limited scope of this study precludes a detailed analysis of the successive “waves” in the In-Breaking Multiculture, including, sexual diversity, ethnicity, Catholicity, other faiths, laity, institutionalization, multiple theories of personality and education, etc. Suffice it to say that the impact of all of these diverse cultures was cumulative and irreversible. With the arrival of that first “wave,” feminism, a powerful shift in culture had begun. This was expressed in the establishment of minority task forces, special interest caucuses, and advisory councils, some later to become networks: Gay/Lesbian (1979), International (1979), Racial/Ethnic Minority (1981), Peace (1984), Military, Buddhist, Parish, and others.

Increasing parity developed between femininity and masculinity, homosexuality and heterosexuality, color and whiteness, multiculturalism and Euro-culture, laity and clergy, Catholics and Protestants, and other faiths and Christianity. With the expansion of ACPE and an increasing number of supervisors and centers, an inevitable (according to classic sociological precepts) institutionalization process was also underway, with more highly developed standards, more formal structures, increasing hospitality, egalitarianism, and a more balanced theory of individual and group supervision integrating psychoanalytic and humanistic psychological traditions.

In the 1990s yet another wave of the In-Breaking Multiculture in the ACPE “broke” at the very boundaries of the organization. A series of meetings with leaders of the Association of Professional Chaplains (APC), the National Association of Catholic Chaplains (NACC), and the ACPE developed a proposal to organically merge these three organizations. At its annual conference in 2001, the ACPE membership unanimously defeated the proposal, but equally strongly expressed its wish to continue to explore ways to cooperate with sister groups in matters that might be more effectively addressed jointly than separately.

THE EASTERN ACPE REGION IN TODAY'S IN-BREAKING MULTICULTURE

What is the impact of the in-breaking multiculturalism upon the Eastern ACPE Region today in light of its cultural basic assumptions: *a predisposition toward diversity, a propensity for firsts and an accompanying elitism, administrative ambivalence, and inbreeding?* A starting point toward answers lies in the consideration of a Strategic Plan which is now in effect.

The Eastern ACPE Region voted in October 1994 to move forward with three strategic priorities:

1. Maintain professional quality (excellence) while enhancing/improving community life.
2. Adapt and strengthen the bases.
3. Develop the innovative and the cutting edge (mission).

(Important note: in other versions of the plan, diversity among supervisors, students, and types of centers was strongly emphasized.)

The first priority was assigned to the Executive Committee, and priorities two and three were given to the Development (now Strategic Planning) Committee for follow-up. Unfortunately, no measurable outcomes toward accomplishment of plan goals were set forth, so progress has been unclear. Perhaps this vagueness, despite a great deal of effort on the part of many in the Region to create the strategic plan, can be at least in part explained by the region-specific basic assumption, *administrative ambivalence*.

On the other hand, the work of the framers of the plan intuitively and powerfully resonates with the first and perhaps deepest region-specific basic assumption: *an essential predisposition toward diversity*. Thus, the three priorities continue to formally represent the regional vision for a productive future.

A multicultural impulse analogous to the one operative at the ACPE level (to explore territory beyond organizational boundaries) led the Eastern Region and its northern counterpart, the Northeast ACPE Region, into conversations about the possible benefits of programmatic cooperation. Beginning with the votes of both regions in 1996 to establish an ExNE task force, a series of meetings took place in which regional histories and expectations, fears and hopes about working together were shared. A consensus emerged that structure should follow mission. Less a matter of organic merger and more one of partnership, the focus became identification of what was already being done together, such as the Seminar on Supervision (SOS), Women Supervising Women Retreat (WSW), and joint

regional meetings. We also focused on what could be done more effectively in partnership, including Accreditation and Certification Committee work, a newsletter, mailing lists, ethics concerns, a website, etc.

Several more joint projects were in fact undertaken, some with clear success and some with mixed reviews. In 2001 the Executive Committees of both regions met in retreat to review the relationship. Discussions were frank and productive. Nine collaborative efforts were identified and critiqued: SOS, ExNE Newsletter, joint fall conferences, a shared web page, the Northeast Supervisory Training Consortium, cross-regional participation in Accreditation and Certification committees, socializing, joint meetings to continue collaboration efforts, and WSW. Concrete confirmation of the relationship's value came with the commitment to jointly sponsor the 2004 ACPE Annual Conference in Portland, ME.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Regional Directors and Regional Chairs, as well as numerous others in the volunteer organization that is the Eastern ACPE Region, have brought varying leadership styles to bear that in hindsight turned out to be just what was needed at the time. The most recent example has been the two-year interim directorship of James Jeffrey. Jeffrey provided a steady, non-anxious leadership presence while the Eastern and Northeast Regions decided whether to proceed together structurally or functionally. Prior to that, the two previously noted charismatic women, Joan Hemenway and Denise Haines, led the in-breaking first wave of the multiculture during the period from 1983 to 1997. This was punctuated by a two-and-one-half-year period representing a second wave of that in-breaking multiculture, namely, the term of Rabbi Jeffrey Silberman. At the outset, administrative caution built trust as the four streams forming the ACPE became one and power became consolidated.

What leadership style is most appropriate for the future of the Eastern ACPE Region, with its unique basic cultural assumptions? The uneasy administrators of the monoculture? The charisma of the women and the rabbi? The steady handed presence of the interim? A signal, if not an answer, comes from the culture-at-large.

When contemporary culture is understood as a kind of school and the complex set of tasks and expectations placed upon us in modern life is seen as the curriculum of that school, most of us are "in over our heads," according to Harvard

educator Robert Kegan. In this view, the capacities of the typical adult mind are understood to be a stage or two behind the necessity of thinking, feeling, and behaving at ever more complex levels of consciousness. Kegan's research shows that from one-half to two-thirds of the adult population appears to have not yet reached the order of consciousness necessary for coping with the demands of the modern world.¹¹ Meanwhile, a postmodern stage is already upon us.

The widely accepted view is that a successful leader in the modern world will be one who crafts and communicates a coherent vision and then recruits people to identify with and own that vision. This is, however, in direct conflict with three postmodern themes which impinge upon leadership: the rejection of absolutes, discomfort with dominance and the exercise of power, and the celebration of difference.¹²

Thus, in the transition from the modern to the postmodern situation, a new and different exercise of leadership is called for, one that provides "a context in which all interested parties, the leader included, can *together* (italics mine) create a vision, mission, or purpose they can collectively uphold." Why? Because however inclusive the modern world leader's vision may be, it is still a "unilaterally constructed one that comes into existence prior to its contact with prospective followers." It is therefore an exercise of dominance and power, more than hints at an absolute, and diminishes difference.¹³

Three of the four basic cultural assumptions of the Eastern ACPE Region are highly compatible with the three postmodern themes just cited. The first and perhaps deepest assumption, *an essential predisposition toward diversity*, is a direct match with "the celebration of difference." *Administrative ambivalence* correlates well with "discomfort with dominance and the exercise of power," and is validated by the recent unanimous vote not to merge with the APC and NACC. Finally, *a propensity for firsts* suggests that the unstoppable rush into the postmodern era can be more readily seen as a leadership challenge in which the Eastern ACPE Region can create its own "honors curriculum" and once again be a pioneer.

NOTES

1. Edgar H. Schein, *Organizational Culture and Leadership: A Dynamic View* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1991), 86.

2. *Ibid.*, 152-153.

3. Ibid., 109.
4. Charles E. Hall, *Head and Heart: The Story of the Clinical Pastoral Education Movement* (Decatur, GA: JPCP, Inc., 1992), 122.
5. Glenn H. Asquith, Jr., *Building Bridges: A History of the Eastern Region of the ACPE* (Privately published, 2000).
6. Ibid., 7-8.
7. John Rea Thomas, *A 'Snap Shot' History of the ACPE, Inc.* (Privately published, 2000), 48-50.
8. Ibid., 49-50.
9. John J. Gleason, Guest Editorial, *The Journal of Pastoral Care* 52:1 (1998): 4.
10. Raymond J. Lawrence, ed, *Contra Mundum: An Occasional Journal of Theological Reflection*.
11. Robert Kegan, *In Over Our Heads: The Demands of Modern Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 3-11f, 188-191.
12. Ibid., 325.
13. Ronald Heigetz and Riley Sinder, Kegan, 321-322.

The opinions expressed in the paper "A Cultural Analysis of the Eastern ACPE Region, with Implications for the Future" are entirely those of the author, John J. Gleason, and not an official position of the Eastern ACPE Region.

A Case Study Method for Theological Reflection in Field Education

Michael E. Connors and Mark L. Poorman

The last half-century has witnessed a remarkable explosion of interest in theological field education and supervised internships for ministry students. Indeed, field education has become an invaluable component of the preparation of women and men for ministry. Its methods and aims, however, continue to be refined through experience and dialogue among pastoral theologians, supervisors of pastoral placements, and leaders of religious formation programs.

In all of its variant models, theological field education manifests the interdisciplinary nature of pastoral ministry itself. The minister feels accountable to the many theological perspectives which form the treasury of the tradition, while at the same time accountable to the people, situations, and institutions which comprise the real-life pastoral milieus. If it is true that “the pastoral theologian must be the most diversely talented of all who work within theological disciplines,”¹ the same is no less true of the minister in the field. Ministry is richly complex in its theological, anthropological and social dimensions.

Michael E. Connors, C.S.C. is Director of the Master of Divinity program and an Assistant Professor of Theology in the Department of Theology at the University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana.

Mark L. Poorman, C.S.C. is Vice President of Student Affairs, an Associate Professor of Theology, and Former Director of the Master of Divinity Program in the Department of Theology at the University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana.

In our experience with both seminarians and lay ministry students in the Master of Divinity program at the University of Notre Dame, we observe that it is frequently in the context of field education that students work most assiduously toward the goal of integrating their studies, their ministry experiences, their theological outlook, and their own identity into a coherent and harmonious whole. The work of integration has a number of discrete moments that go well beyond the classroom and field placement settings. But we have found one of the most useful tools to be the case study method utilized in a seminar context. Through an examination and analysis of their own and others' actual field experiences, students not only learn theological content and hone practical skills, they acquire habits of theological reflection which will endure after the ministerial credential is gained, stimulating continued questioning and growth.

Many diverse methods for utilizing case studies are presently in use. We wish to share a method which we have employed over the last decade that continues to be refined at our institution. This method is rigorous in the demands it makes of students, while at the same time flexible enough to encompass widely different kinds of pastoral situations. Field education seminars based on this case study method have proven to be engaging and challenging for both men and women, lay students and candidates for ordained ministry, and persons of diverse backgrounds and ages.

CHOOSING THE CASE

A well-chosen case is the first step toward ensuring a fruitful seminar discussion. From the very beginning, students are encouraged to be attentive to incidents and unfolding situations in their placements that invite deeper reflection. The need to be on alert for an appropriate case study can itself help to sharpen students' critical awareness in the ministerial setting. A particularly important resource here is the supervisor.² Most good case studies have already passed through the first reflective process which regular field education supervision affords. The supervisor's insights and ability to raise questions and probe issues become part of the student's fund of critical resources in choosing and writing the case study.

Cases can be of two distinct types. The first is a discrete incident or event, such as a meeting, pastoral conversation, liturgical celebration, hospital visit, or

catechetical session. The second type consists of a series of events or body of information which, taken together, forms a pastoral situation. Examples of this type might include a series of parish council meetings, a repeated pattern of interaction with a co-worker or volunteer, or survey data gathered about an underserved population in a parish.

While it must include the concrete details of human life, a successful case does not have to contain high drama. Fairly ordinary pastoral encounters or ongoing situations can provide much food for reflection and discussion. The case does have to contain some complexity or tension. It cannot simply highlight the mundane or beg black-and-white questions, but must challenge both the presenter and other students to think about deeper issues which they are likely to encounter in a variety of pastoral settings and roles. Cases which are ambiguous, in which something went wrong, or in which the presenter erred in some way (or witnessed another minister's failure) often have the most to teach. The case need not have been resolved or reached closure; open-ended situations are perfectly suitable and often preferable.

In considering whether to choose a particular case, students must take considerable ownership for the seminar learning process. They must ask themselves what issues will be of interest to the rest of the class. What will be useful for the group to reflect upon together? These will be issues or challenges that are embedded in concrete circumstances but which also transcend the particularity of those circumstances.

Ordinarily, students choose a case from their present ministry placement. While exceptions can be made to this rule, choosing from a currently lived situation helps to guarantee that the facts of the case are fresh in memory and vital to the student's current interests. Students are encouraged to reflect on potential cases with their supervisors before any writing occurs. The ministry journals that students keep, which are written immediately or very soon after each ministerial session, are instrumental in assisting students and supervisors to assess issues involved in potential case studies. If a case casts the supervisor or someone else whose identity cannot be completely concealed in a negative light, a student must obtain the supervisor's permission before presenting the case in class.

Ultimately the choice of the case is left up to the student. Students do not have to clear the choice with the field education instructor in advance. Although the instructor could veto the student's choice if it appears to be unworkable for the purposes of the seminar, this is highly unlikely and extremely rare. Students are invited to consult with the instructor about the choice if they wish to do so, but such a

consultation would have to be well in advance of the meeting with the instructor (step #4 below), at which time the student presents a fully written first draft of the case.

STEPS IN PREPARING THE CASE

1. In one single-spaced page or less, the student narrates the case as she experienced the events. First, the setting and the roles of the principal actors are described. This is followed by a straightforward narrative of what happened. The author states as simply as possible what was at stake pastorally, and how the case was or was not resolved. Lengthy verbatims are discouraged. Conversations or meetings are summarized, with no more than a few lines of verbatim if necessary. Pseudonyms are used for the personalities involved.
2. In a second page or so, the student analyzes the case from the six perspectives outlined below. In the analytical sections, references to lectures, class discussions, or reading materials for the course (or other courses) are encouraged. The student is actively encouraged to make connections between facets of the case and any and all aspects of the course of study. Usually, the nature of the case or the nature of the student's interest in the case will lead to an emphasis on one or two of these analytical perspectives. However, students are responsible for attending to all six, especially when the method is initially being learned. Students are also free to include additional perspectives beyond these six, but they must explain why and how they find them helpful.
3. Having completed a preliminary draft, the student considers how to lead the seminar session in approaching this case. Although his analysis will have uncovered numerous insights and issues, he chooses one or two sets of issues for the group to focus on. Through the miracle of computer word-processing, those questions, comments, or concerns which the student wants to highlight for discussion are bold-faced so as to be immediately recognizable to the reader.
4. The student holds a thirty-minute meeting with the instructor to discuss the case. The student brings the completed draft of the case to this meeting. Submitting the draft to the instructor in advance can expedite the conversation, but is not necessary. This meeting usually takes place three or four workdays before the day of the class presentation (e.g., on a Friday before a Wednesday

seminar day). The instructor reads the case and comments on its clarity, the precision of the issues addressed, and the depth of analysis. Special attention is given to how the student will focus, shape, and guide the seminar discussion. The instructor often presses the student to clarify expectations and hopes for the upcoming session. Although relatively brief, this one-to-one meeting with a faculty member can be an extraordinary educational opportunity for the student. The value of this encounter is frequently attested by the course evaluations completed by the students at the end of the term. From the instructor this meeting demands concentrated attention, energetic intellectual engagement, and pastoral sensitivity.

5. In light of this meeting and another day or two to consider the issues at hand, the student revises the case into final form.
6. The student makes copies of the case for all of the students in the seminar and for the instructor. These copies are distributed or emailed at least forty-eight hours in advance of the seminar. All seminar participants are expected to have read and reflected on the case prior to the class session.

THE ANALYTICAL LENSES

I. Social Context

This is the sociological lens through which the facts of the case are reflected. The student asks such questions as: How does the social context of this case shape the events? What are the social forces at work upon those involved? How do these forces both inform and limit the field of vision and the actions of the characters in the narrative? This includes the macro-factors that belong to culture and subcultures, anthropology, history, economics, technology, and communication. But it also includes micro-factors peculiar to specific environments, institutions, families, and relational histories. Of particular importance are the structures and ethos of the institutional setting within which the ministerial encounter took place. Students are challenged to assess their own abilities to relate to the social milieu. What kinds of strengths and weaknesses does the minister have in relation to the context? What difference do these factors make in the unfolding of the case?

II. Personality and Character Factors

In accounting for the personal dynamics of the case, the student explains to the group how various traits and character qualities of the persons involved are relevant

to understanding and analyzing the case. The student asks: How are different personalities involved in this case? How does the diversity of personalities shape the case? Using some scheme of analysis, either their own or one drawn from elsewhere, the student is challenged to create a portrait of some of the key people involved in the case by describing a few of the personal traits that come into play in the situation at hand. Students also may be encouraged to employ the language of character ethics—habits, virtues and vices, for example—although we find that most students resist that morally-charged language in favor of the seemingly more value-neutral description afforded by therapeutic terms. Some brief examples drawn from the student's experience of the placement site are sometimes helpful here in creating an appropriate backdrop for considering the case. The student's challenge is to explain to the group how these traits and character qualities are relevant to understanding the case. Depending upon the nature of the case, the case-writer may also need to attend to the narrative structures at work (i.e., to the personal stories being told by the actors).

III. Theological Analysis

Although the entire case method is theological in the broadest sense, in this movement the student seeks to make deliberate connections with the tradition and to the course of theological studies. She or he asks: What theological frameworks and understandings are particularly illuminating in analyzing this case? The case as a whole, or discrete elements of the case, are considered in terms of their theological importance. Issues to be considered include understandings of God and/or Christ; ecclesiology (images/understandings of Church); soteriology (notions of personal and social salvation); beliefs about sin and grace; how the sacraments function in the life of the believer and the life of the Church; the moral life of the Christian, including particular decisions or dilemmas, as well as moral agency, character formation, and moral transformation; the role of Scripture and understanding of revelation; and the history of the Judeo-Christian tradition. Specific connections to doctrines, theologians, and/or texts are encouraged. While these connections may take the form of parallels or analogies between the pastoral situation and the tradition, they may also take the form of further questions.

IV. Spirituality

This lens relates to the ways in which the mystery of the divine Other is experienced or sought in the pastoral situation, and the ways in which the divine-human relationship is conceived, enacted, celebrated, and communicated. The student is to ask: Where do the participants sense the presence of God in this case? Where does the minister discern the activity of God's grace at work here? How is

that grace mediated and experienced? What devotional practices, religious orientations, and styles of spirituality are at play among the people and communities taking part in this case? For example, Rosemary Haughton's distinction between *formation and transformation* can be particularly helpful here.³ The student might reflect upon what is known about the spiritual formation of the people involved, and assess the strengths and limitations of these personal histories. Other questions which might be posed here include: What opportunities for transformation or conversion can be discerned in this case? How were these opportunities realized or neglected? What role does personal and/or communal prayer play in the dynamics of the case or in its comprehensive analysis? While the seminar is not conducted as group spiritual direction, such considerations are well within the scope of this lens.

V. Pastoral Strategies

What distinguishes pastoral praxis from mere *practice* is that the former has a *telos*, an intention or goal. In the fifth movement of case analysis the narrower pastoral questions are posed. How does the student describe and evaluate the pastoral strategies which were implemented in this case, or might be implemented in the future? The author should be able first to lay out in simple fashion her understanding of the immediate pastoral aims in this case. Second, the student considers frankly what "worked" and "did not work" in her efforts to minister in this case, and why and in what measure those efforts met with success, failure, frustration, or no effect. The student can be assisted here by considering the practical theology learned in courses such as pastoral counseling, homiletics, or religious education. The student is particularly challenged to detect any differences between her *stated* theology (the one consciously held and articulated) and her *operative* theology (the one motivating and directing her pastoral actions).⁴ It is stressed from the outset that all of us have some measure of incongruence within ourselves between what we say we believe, or what we want to affirm, and those orientations, convictions, and biases which were learned at an earlier age and continue to have power in our self-understandings and actions. Operative theologies often reveal themselves to us in unreflective moments of surprise, crisis, fatigue, or stress, and such occasions for self-examination can be unpleasant. In no small measure the integrative work of ministerial formation, especially in the context of field education, is the task of closing that gap between our operative and stated theological commitments.

VI. Ministerial Identity Issues

The last lens is the moment for broader self-reflection and realization of growth in the student's own identity as a minister. The student reflects on his own role in this case, asking: What did I learn about myself? What kinds of ministerial identity questions are raised for me by this incident? The student is challenged to articulate how this case affects his emerging sense of self as a minister. The case can be examined for elements which may concern general or specialized competence, skill level or experience, or specific assets and liabilities in the developing ministerial identity. In particular, the student must think about his ability to represent authentically the Christian community in his approach, words, gestures, or actions. Specific issues related to ordained ministry, lay ministry, discipleship, career, or professional ethics may emerge here. While the level of personal transparency among peers cannot be predetermined for a group, students share in the same journey toward an integrated understanding of themselves as both faithful servants and competent professionals at ease in their public roles. The developmental difference in the formation of a ministerial identity among members of the seminar can work to everyone's advantage with the assistance of the facilitator or instructor. With an expression of good will, especially on the part of those with a more mature sense of being a public minister, members of the seminar can benefit from exposure to different stages of growth. Some first-year students, for example, may come to the course with the accrued experience of a highly demanding position such as hospital chaplain, high school teacher, or parish administrator. They may have much to offer to their less seasoned classmates in discussing this particular dimension of the case.

LEADING THE SEMINAR

We devote 45 minutes of each 75-minute class period to discussion of the case study. The case presenter is also the discussion facilitator throughout this time. Students are encouraged from the opening of the course to see group facilitation as one of the most important educational opportunities which the field education seminar presents to them. Although much of the focus of the ministerial experience garnered by students in their placements may be one-to-one in character, the well-trained public minister needs to be equally adept at leading the Church in a variety of group settings. Few students, in our experience, come to our program with much background in the role of designated facilitator of group process.

The presenter begins by giving an oral opening statement (no more than five minutes), using this time to comment on the most salient features of the case, and to highlight the issue(s) the presenter wants the group to focus on for discussion. Next, the presenter invites any clarifying questions from the group. These are requests for additional information about the case or explanation of the narrative or analysis (no more than ten minutes).

Then the presenter opens the floor for general discussion. During this time, the presenter's main job is to keep the group on track and make sure everyone gets involved. Group facilitation, of course, is a delicate art only learned with extensive practice. The presenter is urged to strike two balances as the dialogue proceeds: 1) While she must not dominate discussion, she also must not disappear altogether. Avoiding lengthy responses or defensiveness, the leader continues to let her perspective be known as appropriate. Since even the best groups have a periodic tendency to wander away from the-topic, assertive intervention to refocus the group is essential. 2) She must lead the group in holding the concrete and the theoretical together in creative tension. The leader must get the participants to see and focus on the deeper issues without allowing the dialogue to become too abstract. Most groups will include some persons who have difficulty in seeing the larger issues that transcend the particularities of the case, and others who will resist the concrete and escape into bland generalizations. The leader often has to return again and again to the concrete contours of this case or of the related experiences of group members.

The presenter must bear in mind that the probing and sharing of the seminar discussion is itself the educational experience. Thus, the goal is not necessarily to resolve or fix anything, much less to pass definitive judgment on the actions of the presenter in the case study at hand. Rather, the goal of the discussion is to articulate and clarify theological stances and commitments. The only closure that will usually be possible is to summarize the insights and further questions which the discussion has unearthed. Adroit summarization at the close of the session can be a very useful educational tool for the group, and a skill which will easily transfer to many future group leadership situations. Often the faculty member also makes some concluding remarks about the session. Additionally, within a day or two, the instructor emails the presenter some comments on the session, and invites the student to respond with his own reflections.

As the group matures, learning to listen more deeply to one another and to both shape and be shaped by others, we may hope to touch, however fleetingly, the "golden ring" of group process, a kind of holy convergence of insight that evolves

through real dialogue in which contributions build upon one another and stretch the group toward something far larger than itself. The depth of the educational experience cannot be measured by the degree of agreement achieved. More often we are left with more questions than answers, more awareness of our differences than consensus.

This may be an appropriate time to mention briefly that through the years, we have heard from colleagues that a perennial issue with regard to the field education seminar is periodic skepticism or even cynicism on the part of students as to the value of this educational experience, which is so highly dependent upon group process and discussion. Regardless of the ministry program's articulated stress on required field education as the locus of integrating theology and ministry training, some students find the heavy emphasis on group learning and process to be frustrating, either because of the mode or content of the seminar. Forging understandings and sharing theological perspectives is hard work, and in comparison to other courses with more traditional pedagogies of lectures, exams, and papers, they may find that the demands of real interaction are not worth the perceived outcomes. Our consistent response to this criticism has been that in a Church which is communal in its inception and collegial in its ministry, the arts of listening as well as speaking, sharing truths as well as questions, reaching consensus as well as agreeing to differ, are ones worth learning.

Confidentiality is a cardinal rule of the seminar. The case studies and seminar discussions are never shared outside the group, except with the students' supervisors. Only a clearly shared understanding of the confidential nature of the proceedings encourages group trust to flourish over the course of time. Students are informed from the first day that breaches of trust may be grounds for failing the course.

EXPERIENCE WITH THE METHOD

Ministry students today, even those who wear the same denominational label, are coming from an amazing diversity of backgrounds and experiences. The educator can assume very little in the way of common language, basic understanding of the tradition, or outlook on life. Within this sometimes perplexingly plural, post-modern environment, the case study method proposed here offers possibilities for bridging the gaps and setting a common educational agenda for students. The sixfold structure of analysis directs the student toward a comprehensive approach

to pastoral situations and, ultimately, to the student's own pastoral identity. At the same time, the method implicitly grounds the student in a thoroughgoing respect for the wide range of perspectives brought to the theological table by peers and mentors in ministry.

All students bring certain affinities to parts of the method from the beginning of their studies. Temperament, sociocultural location, family history, and individual interests may incline some students toward certain parts of the method at the expense of others. Students also bring different sets of talents and needs, and all can profit from the method's challenge to complement their natural strengths by developing the full range of analytical skills. The heterogeneous character of each seminar group, while sometimes the cause of difficulty and misunderstanding, proves in the long run to be the group's main asset in the learning process.

Nonetheless, to the extent one can generalize, certain patterns of student approach to the method tend to recur. Many students tend to be initially attracted to two of the six lenses: personality analysis and pastoral strategy. The propensity for these two directions can probably be best understood in terms of pervasive cultural forces in American society today.

For the former, it is clear that various forms of popular psychology are tremendously powerful influences through the media, as well as through our educational institutions and churches. Indeed, as many veterans of theological education and religious formation can attest, the therapeutic paradigm for pastoral training has been predominant in North America for at least thirty years. Since the advent of Clinical Pastoral Education and similar developments in preparation for ministry, pastoral training has adopted some of the tenets of clinical psychology and other allied helping professions. The result has been an increasing comfort among ministers and ministry students with applying a counseling protocol to pastoral challenges. Analysis, diagnosis, techniques, and treatment are often conducted in therapeutic language, and developmental and pathological discourse dominates. The language of sin, grace, and holiness often gives way to notions of neurosis, recovery, and wholeness. Our students, serious about the conduct of ministry and perhaps influenced by their own pastoral mentors, readily assume the language and stance of the counselor. Many are coming to preparation for ministry with some acquaintance with Jungian or Rogerian psychologies, the Myers-Briggs Type Inventory, or the Enneagram. Quite a few have received psychiatric or counseling attention themselves, or have participated in 12-step recovery programs or other self-help groups. Although their knowledge of these systems of thought is often much more superficial than they realize, our students tend to be relatively

comfortable with, even eager about, discussions of personality types and the interplay of those typologies and dysfunctions in the ministry setting.

Similarly, their interest in getting to the strategic level of cases betrays the saturation of our culture in pragmatism. Students often are predisposed to approach theological studies—or at least the pastoral dimension of those studies—with a technological mindset, as if the refinement of pastoral technique into ever more efficient and effective forms is of paramount importance. Not infrequently, premature insistence upon getting to the “bottom line,” the “solution” to the pastoral “problem,” to what “really works,” has to be restrained by the instructor or facilitator. Students may tend to assume that the pastoral goals of an encounter are self-evident, evidencing a need for more foundational discussion about how ministerial “success” might be defined with respect to the case. Repeatedly we find ourselves stressing to students that reflection upon pastoral strategy, while important, must be approached in relation to the other five areas of analysis. At times we even insist that students bracket strategic questions until all aspects of the pastoral data have been more thoroughly explored. This is a way of stressing that reflection on ministry is much more than problem-solving. Focus on technique and programming must relate to a larger vision of the aim of ministry itself, which might be summed up as the “integral liberation” of the human person.

Ironically, second-order questions of strategy and purpose are often neglected or ignored by students. By asking more fundamental questions about the goals of their actions, students can become more aware of the divergence between their *professed* theology and their *operative* theologies. Self-reflection on the discrepancies between the two can be extraordinarily fruitful for students, and even the most integrated among us contain some such inner contradictions.

Among the other four areas, the one that is consistently emphasized the least is social context. It is relatively rare, in our experience, for a student to come with a well-developed set of skills for social analysis. Students are usually able, with encouragement, to identify factors in the immediate institutional environment which are important to consider. But identification of larger factors, on the cultural or economic system level, is generally quite unfamiliar territory. The fascination with the person as the unit of consideration is a result of some of the cultural and individual forces noted above. Although the past half-century has seen advances in methods and theories of social analysis based on race, class, gender, and ethnicity, for example, many students need to be encouraged to include social location in their theological analysis. Questions and topics which have cross-cultural or multicultural implications are often passed over as too complicated or extrinsic to

the “real point” of the case. Systemic factors, such as economic class, may be minimized, and even common events of social history such as the struggle for civil rights and its aftermath need more attention. Granted, these are complex and multivalent areas for discussion, but they can be compelling elements in a comprehensive theological analysis.

Attention to ministerial identity may also be neglected. This is not too surprising, for the work of integrating one’s identity is complex and difficult. Moreover, this is the area that demands the highest level of personal vulnerability, and thus tests the fabric of group trust. Despite overt reticence, we find that just beneath the surface most students are quite anxious about who they are becoming as public ministers, and experience a pressing need to reflect on and share their concerns in an appropriate and safe environment. For programs which train candidates for both ordained and lay ministry, recurring issues center on the conceptual and practical distinctions between the two forms of ecclesial service. We have found that for the most part, tensions which arise in discussions of those distinctions bear fruit for both seminarians and aspiring lay ministers. With encouragement from the faculty, and as personal confidence and group trust build, the quality of analysis and dialogue around identity issues improves, sometimes dramatically.

To the theological analysis of cases students often bring both eagerness and reserve—a great appetite for forging connections between their ministerial experience and their theological studies, but an unskilled clumsiness about how to actually do it. In part this reflects the general cultural reticence about explicitly religious matters. Often it also reflects the fact that students are newcomers to the field of theology and only beginning to gain confidence in their theological competence. Inevitably, questions about the nature of academic theology itself are raised. The study of theology frequently is found to be personally stressful for students, because of its seeming remoteness from pastoral concerns. We encourage students to form even the simplest connections between their studies and pastoral ministry, beginning as early as possible in the program. More sophisticated theological thinking develops as the course of study broadens and deepens. In particular, it is important that ministry students learn to see their roles in relationship to the Christian community. Behind questions of role and authority to speak on the Church’s behalf, deeper connections with christology, soteriology, moral theology, and the theology of grace regularly present themselves for reflection.

The fourth lens, spirituality, was added to our method only more recently. There are at least three reasons for this addition. One is that attention to spirituality evokes the pastoral side of theology, the vital framework within which integration of studies and ministry takes place. It is not unusual for students to report in various kinds of minor faith crises as they struggle to re-evaluate long-held beliefs and devotional practices. Spirituality provides the bridge between acquiring knowledge of the tradition and gaining insight into that tradition's continued relevance and vitality in the pastoral arena. Second, asking students to analyze the dynamics of spirituality at play in cases begins to prepare them for the role of spiritual guide. The wise pastoral minister assists others in discovering the movements of the divine in crisis, in celebration, and in the ordinary affairs of life. The Christian community needs leaders who can speak to the human hunger for personal relationship with God. Third, the discipline of theology itself is today becoming more aware of the ways in which spirituality is a source for theological reflection. The rising subdiscipline of spirituality studies attests to the flowering of this concern. We have found that, with some encouragement, students take to the discourse of spirituality readily. Students want to learn to speak appropriately and publicly about their life of prayer as an integral part of their call to ministry.

CONCLUSION

The method we describe here is obviously a work in progress. It is our modest attempt to bring structure to a process which honors the many tensions which are natural to authentic theological reflection on ministry—the theoretical claims of theology and the practical aspects of pastoral care; the influence of social location and the development of individual persons; the impact of both emotional and cognitive factors; the spirituality of the disciple called by Jesus Christ and the competence of the professional. The method has demonstrated its virtues to us over the years, but perhaps none is more evident than the opportunity for student and faculty accountability in the demanding process of theological reflection.

The six lenses for theological reflection invite accountability from students in meeting the tasks of case construction and group facilitation. Our experience with the method has been very positive in this regard. Once the schema is learned and students are familiar with its use, they seem quite open to the structure—indeed, they are pleased to have it as a rough gauge for the quality of their work. As we

have noted above, the expectation is that students will follow the basic contours of the comprehensive method. For any given case, then, a legitimate criticism by faculty or other students might be that certain lenses are absent or overemphasized. This tends to keep all participants alert to the need to be comprehensive in their theological reflection, and it reinforces the notion that pastoral theology is interdisciplinary by nature.

The lenses also invite faculty accountability in providing students with the tools necessary to use them. We are only now beginning to ask ourselves in a more systematic way about the skill sets we want students to develop through use of this method. Identifying these goals more clearly, and strategizing the further pedagogical means to those goals, is likely to remain an area of further growth and development for us for some time to come. Certainly we rely upon the previous education which these Master's level students bring when they arrive in our program. And, since at least one year of full-time service or ministry is a prerequisite for admission to our program, we look to their experiences of supervised work for a foundation upon which to build. We also depend upon other areas of the curriculum, especially for the sharpening of theological acumen. Seminarians and lay ministry students have distinct formation programs, which contribute greatly to students' evolving ministerial identity and personal and ecclesial spirituality. It is important that all constituent members of a field education course have their own appropriate gatherings to discuss "formation issues" of personal and vocational development. While many religious communities, seminary programs, and lay ministry courses of study offer fully developed formation programs for their candidates, others do not. The result may be a transfer of those concerns to the field education seminar, an unfortunate distraction from the purpose of the class. We believe that it is the responsibility of the faculty and program director to ensure that each student has a place where such a formation agenda may be addressed.

We are aware that some lacunae remain. For example, what resources might we provide students to become more comfortable and adept at analyzing their social situation? Exposure to the Church's tradition of social teaching, to feminist and liberation theologies, and to the theology of inculturation all can be of great assistance. Or how might we make more accessible the depth and breadth of traditional categories of theology—systematics, history, moral theology, scripture, and liturgy, for example—so that students will more readily employ the insights of these disciplines in their analyses? What will the recently articulated methods of spirituality bring to the process, and how might we best incorporate these

contributions without lapsing into complete subjectivity? Creating bridges between the learning of these theological approaches and their use in the field will require sustained and critical attention. It is our hope that the description of this method will be received as a point of departure for further discussion among students and faculty whose critical undertaking is the integration of theology and pastoral ministry.

NOTES

1. Carl Starkloff, "Inculturation and Cultural Systems," *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 285.
2. Regina Coll, *Supervision of Ministry Students* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992).
3. Rosemary Haughton, *The Transformation of Man: A Study of Conversion and Community* (Springfield, IL: Templegate, 1967).
4. Howard W. Stone and James O. Duke, *How to Think Theologically* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1996), 11-24. This distinction parallels the distinction made by Stone and Duke between "deliberative" and "embedded" theologies.

Field Education and Clinical Pastoral Education: Desired Outcomes from the Perspective of Those Making Decisions about Ordination

William Kondrath and James C. Gorman

A variety of constituents have a “stake” in the field education (FE) or Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) experiences of student participants. Among these “stakeholders” are the student herself or himself, the field supervisor or program director, the seminary field education director, and those who are charged with the responsibility of making decisions about the suitability of a candidate for ordination.

Each of these constituents brings unique expectations to the FE or CPE experiences of students, and these expectations influence the variety of judgments they make—about the FE or CPE program; about the evaluations of the students and what to do with them; and about the various roles of field supervisor, seminary field education director, and lay members of the congregation or ministerial setting in the process.

Three of these “stakeholders” are in frequent communication with each other about the FE or CPE experience: seminary field education directors with students and field supervisors, and students and field supervisors with each other. Less

The Rev. William Kondrath, D. Min. is the Director of Field Education at Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where he also teaches pastoral theology. He has extensive experience in lay ministry training and formation. He is a member of the Seminary and Judiciary Committee of the Northeast Region of the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education.

James C. Gorman, S.T.L., Ph.D. has developed and directed a field education program for St. Mary's Seminary College in Baltimore, MD. He has taught in the D. Min. extension program of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Maryland. He has extensive experience in the initial and ongoing formation and training of ordained and non-ordained ministers.

frequently are those responsible for making decisions for the church about ordination involved in these discussions.

Not surprisingly, the literature on FE and CPE reflects this state of affairs. A review of the indexes of relevant journals for the past six years reveals six articles that touch on the concerns of seminary field education directors, two articles that address the concerns of field supervisors, and three articles that focus on students. There are no articles that attend to the issues of readiness for ordination, or the concerns of those making those recommendations.

The purpose of this article is to bring into the conversations about FE and CPE those who make recommendations to the judicatory about the suitability of candidates for ordination. We hope to introduce their expectations and their perspectives into the discussions.

This current study is based on a survey of denominational authorities who have oversight of ministry certification and ordination policies and practices. These authorities (referred to as “decision-makers” throughout this paper) may have interests which differ from the providers and recipients of training, and from those who evaluate their programs from an academic or clinical training perspective. This study is an attempt to determine the function and importance of FE and CPE in the training and evaluation of candidates for ministry certification and ordination from the viewpoint of those making decisions about certification and ordination. As these decision-makers are in the position to require or encourage FE and CPE, directors of FE and CPE would be wise to know and attend to their expectations. Furthermore, because accreditation by the Association of Theological Schools requires FE, but does not require CPE placement, judicatory decision-makers are the sole external authorities requiring CPE placement. Therefore directors of CPE programs should be especially attuned to the expectations of these decision-makers with regard to desired CPE outcomes.

The authors of this paper—both privileged, white, heterosexual males—have been involved in seminary education at several different institutions in both Roman Catholic and Protestant seminaries and divinity schools, as faculty and as Directors of Field Education. As an initial foray into an uninvestigated area, this study did not investigate racial, gender, or sexual identity/reality issues which may result in differences in the expectations regarding FE and CPE. Such differences undoubtedly exist and should be the subject of further investigation.¹

The survey instrument consisted of 11 identical questions asked about FE and then about CPE. It was mailed to 63 individuals identified as people responsible for making decisions about ordination and/or ministry certification for candidates in

New England. Thirty-seven questionnaires (59%) were returned. One of these contained no data; one contained no quantitative data, only comments; one arrived after the data had been analyzed. Thus there were thirty-four usable questionnaires (54%).

Eighteen (53%) of the 34 respondents were female; 16 (47%) were male. Thirty (90%) of the 33 who reported their status were ordained; 3 (10%) were laity. Those responding included: 4 rectors from Roman Catholic seminaries,² representing 322 students³ for ordination; 4 Episcopal diocese,⁴ representing 51 students for ordination; the New England Synod⁵ of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA), representing 56 students for ordination and 42 students for ministry certification; the Ministerial Fellowship Committee⁶ of the Unitarian Universalist Association (UUA), representing 500 students for ministry certification; and 24 Ministry Committees of the United Church of Christ (UCC), representing 127 students for ordination and 85 persons for ministerial certification.⁷ Thus, this survey would represent 556 persons seeking ordination (not counting UUA students) and 612 seeking ministry certification. If one takes into account the fact that UUA certification is required for ordination and that most of those who are certified seek ordination, then this survey represents about 1000 persons seeking ordination.

RESULTS

Are FE and CPE Required for Ordination?

Thirty of 33 respondents (91%) indicate that FE is required for ordination. All Episcopal and Roman Catholic respondents reported that they require FE for ordination. Only three UCC Associations do not require FE. See Table 1.

Table 1. Field Education Required for Ordination^{a, b}

	Episcopalian		Roman Catholic		UCC		ELCA		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	100.00	4	100.00	21	87.50	1	100.00	30	90.91
No	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	12.50	0	0.00	3	9.09
Total	4	100.00	4	100.00	24	100.00	1	100.00	33	100.00

^a The probability of the distribution for the total was 0.0000006. In other words, the probability of obtaining 30 "yes" answers by chance are 6 out of 10 million.

^b The probability of the results from a Chi-Square test for the distribution across denominations was 0.0000513 with 3 degrees of freedom. In other words, the chances of obtaining this distribution across denominations is slightly larger than 5 out of 100,000.

The amount of required FE education varies, but the minimum requirement is normally 9-12 hours per week for one academic year. Many respondents assume that the seminary degree requirements fulfill their expectations. The UUA requires 1,100-hour FE internship for ministry certification, completed over one or two years. The ELCA requires a full-year internship. The evaluation of this internship carries more weight than FE done during an academic year.

By contrast, only 62.5% of the respondents (20 of 32) require CPE. None of the Roman Catholic seminaries require CPE, although one RC respondent reported that some diocese do have such a requirement. Of the Episcopal diocese, only Rhode Island does not require CPE. Sixteen of 23 UCC respondents require CPE. One unit of CPE is a requirement for ELCA ordination in New England as well as for UUA ministerial certification. See Table 2.

Table 2. CPE Required for Ordination^a

	Episcopal		Roman Catholic		UCC		ELCA		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	3	75.00	0	0.00	16	69.57	1	100.00	20	62.50
No	1	25.00	4	100.00	7	30.43	0	0.00	12	37.50
Total	4	100.00	4	100.00	23	100.00	1	100.00	32	100.00

^a The probability of the distribution for the total is 0.0526, or slightly greater than 5 out of 100, and not “significant.” Researchers consider a probability level of less than .05 to be the minimum for statistical significance.

^b The probability for the results of the Chi-Square test for the distribution across denominations was 0.023101 with 3 degrees of freedom.

Desired Outcomes for FE and CPE

Respondents were asked to rank order a list of possible outcomes of FE and CPE. The outcomes included: (a) training in specific ministry skills, (b) development of ministerial identity, (c) opportunity to test ministerial vocation, (d) training in church polity, (e) screening of potential candidates, (f) integration of academic learning with ministerial experience, (g) opportunity for mentoring by ministerial professional, and (h) other.

The results of the rank ordering of outcomes are indicated in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. Ranking of Field Education Outcomes

	Skills Training	Ministry Identity	Test Vocation	Church Polity	Screening	Integration	Mentoring
Mean	4.9091	4.9375	5.0313	1.6333	2.8966	4.8485	4.3226
SD	1.8769	1.4577	1.6941	1.0662	1.8583	1.4169	1.5788
VAR	3.5227	2.1250	2.8700	1.1368	3.4532	2.0076	2.4925
Rank	3	2	1	7	6	4	5

Table 3 indicates that respondents think that FE's most important outcome is to provide an opportunity for students to 'test their ministerial vocation.' Ministerial Identity, Skills Training, and Integration are ranked very closely behind the testing of vocation.

Table 4. Ranking of CPE Outcomes

	Skills Training	Ministry Identity	Test Vocation	Church Polity	Screening	Integration	Mentoring
Mean	4.6333	5.8621	4.5172	1.0909	3.7308	4.3103	4.1071
SD	1.8096	1.6415	1.2989	0.2942	1.6139	1.3914	1.7917
VAR	3.2747	2.6946	1.6872	0.0866	2.6046	1.9360	3.2103
Rank	2	1	3	7	6	4	5

Respondents gave the highest ranking for CPE's expected outcomes to the "development of ministerial identity." This ranking was the first choice of 17 (58.6%) of 29 responding to this question. Skills training, testing of vocation, and integration are ranked slightly lower.

We also asked the respondents to rate the importance of these same outcomes, both for FE and CPE. The possible ratings ranged from 1 ("not at all important") to 5 ("very important"). The results can be seen in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Importance of Field Education Outcomes (All Denominations)

	Skills Training	Ministry Identity	Test Vocation	Church Polity	Screening	Integration	Mentoring
Mean	4.3750	4.3030	4.6970	3.0000	3.6250	4.4545	4.3333
SD	0.6599	0.8833	0.6840	1.1726	1.0701	0.7111	0.7360
VAR	0.4355	0.7803	0.4678	1.3750	1.1452	0.5057	0.5417
Rank	3	5	1	7	6	2	4

Table 5 indicates that decision-makers consider testing of vocation as the most important outcome (score equals 4.6970) of field education. This corresponds to the top ranking they gave to this outcome (Table 3). Church polity is considered to be least important (score equals 3.0000), also corresponding to the ranking shown in Table 3. Interestingly, however, there is a noticeable difference between their ranking and assessment of the importance of church polity. Although those making decisions with regard to ordination, when forced to rank outcomes against each other, rank church polity last, they nevertheless consider it to be *somewhat important*.

Table 6. Importance of CPE Outcomes (All Denominations)

	Skills Training	Ministry Identity	Test Vocation	Church Polity	Screening	Integration	Mentoring
Mean	4.0667	4.4333	4.0333	1.5862	3.9000	4.1333	3.9000
SD	0.7397	0.7179	0.8503	0.8245	1.0619	0.8996	1.2134
VAR	0.5471	0.5299	0.7230	0.6798	1.1276	0.8092	1.4724
Rank	3	1	4	7	5.5	2	5.5

Table 6 shows similar results with regard to the importance of outcomes for CPE. Decision-makers consider ministerial identity to be the most important outcome (score equals 4.4333) and church polity to be the least important (score equals 1.5862). These scores correspond to the ranking they give to the outcomes. As seen in Table 4, ministerial identity (is ranked) first and church polity last. With regard to CPE, however, those making decisions about ordination not only give church polity their lowest ranking, but also give it a very low absolute importance rating. The score of 1.5862 is close to “not at all important.”

There were significant differences between the importance given to the expected outcomes of vocation testing, church polity, and mentoring by those who require FE for ordination and those who do not. As indicated in Table 7, those who require field education consider vocation testing, church polity, and mentoring to be less important than those who do not require field education.

Table 7. Differences in Importance of Field Education Outcomes between Those Requiring and Those Not Requiring Field Education

Outcome	FE Required	FE Not Required	Statistical Significance ^a
Test Vocation	4.6667	5.0000	$p < .01$
Church Polity	2.8333	5.0000	$p < .0001$
Mentoring	4.2667	5.0000	$p < .0001$

^a The Two Sample *t*-Test (assuming unequal variance) was used. One interprets $p < .01$ to mean that the probability of these differences being the result of chance are less than one out of 100. Similarly, $p < .0001$ means that the probability of these differences being the result of chance are less than one out of 10,000. Researchers generally consider a probability of .05 or less as a minimum for statistical significance.

No significant differences were noted between those who *did* and those who *did not* require CPE with regard to the importance of the outcomes they desired.

It is interesting to note here that the individual, personal outcomes (opportunity to test ministerial vocation, development of ministerial identity, skills training, and integration) are ranked more highly than the institutional outcomes (screening of potential candidates and training in church polity). Students might take comfort in the fact that those guarding the gates to ordination value the formational, educational, and personal growth dimensions of FE and CPE more

highly than the use of these programs as tools for screening candidates or indoctrinating them in church polity.

From an institutional viewpoint, those making the decisions about ordination seem to be willing to make the more institutional issues subservient to issues of personal development when it comes to the role of FE and CPE. That is to say, there seems to be more emphasis on the use of FE and CPE for personal development and role formation than for turning out loyal institutional servants.

From the perspective of the authors, these results confirm our experience that a critical concern of decision-makers in the churches is the formation of ministers who are able to exercise the *role* of an ordained person. A role has behavioral and normative dimensions. Certain skills are needed to exercise a role, but so also is an ideology and a set of values that give meaning and importance to the behavior.⁸ It has been our observation that those charged with ordaining ministers are interested in ordaining individuals who are able to perform the behavioral requirements of the role *and* embrace ministerial values.

Use of FE and CPE Evaluations by Ordination Decision-makers

Table 8 shows that 88 percent of decision-makers (29 of 33 responding) have access to FE evaluations. Table 9 indicates that 90 percent (27 of 30) have access to CPE evaluations. The only exceptions are 4 (of 23) UCC churches that don't have access to FE evaluations and 3 (of 22) UCC churches that don't have access to CPE evaluations. It is possible that these churches have not requested those evaluations.

Table 8. Access to Field Education Evaluation by Decision-makers^a

	Episcopal		Roman Catholic		UCC		Other		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	100.00	4	100.00	19	82.61	2	100.00	29	87.88
No	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	17.39	0	0.00	4	12.12
Total	4	100.00	4	100.00	23	100.00	2	100.00	33	100.00

^a The probability of the distribution of the total is 0.000004766. The probability of the results of the Chi-Square test across denominations is 0.019513 with 3 degrees of freedom.

Table 9. Access to CPE Evaluation by Decision-makers^a

	Episcopal		Roman Catholic		UCC		Other		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	4	100.00	2	100.00	19	86.36	2	100.00	27	90.00
No	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	13.64	0	0.00	3	10.00
Total	4	100.00	2	100.00	22	100.00	2	100.00	30	100.00

^a The probability of the distribution of the total is 0.000004. The probability of the results of the Chi-Square test across denominations is 0.0202 with 3 degrees of freedom.

Given the extensive access to these evaluations, to what extent are they used in making decisions regarding the suitability of individuals for ordination? We asked respondents the extent to which they use the FE and CPE evaluations in determining the suitability of a candidate for ordination. Possible responses to these questions ranged from: “not at all” (score equals 1) to “to a very great extent” (score equals 5).

As shown in Tables 10 and 11, respondents report a slightly greater use of CPE evaluations (mean = 3.55) than FE evaluations (mean = 3.23) in determining the suitability of a candidate. On this scale of the extent of use, a score of 3 represents a response of “somewhat” and 4 represents a response of “to a great extent.” Denominationally, UCC decision-makers rely on FE reports the least, and Episcopal decision-makers rely on CPE reports the least, although the differences were not statistically significant. No statistical difference was noted between those who *did* and those who *did not* require FE and CPE in the extent to which they actually used these evaluations.

Table 10. Extent to Which Field Education Is Used in Decisions
Analysis of Variance: Single Factor

SUMMARY						
Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance		
EP	4	13	3.2500	0.2500		
RC	4	16	4.0000	0.6667		
UCC	23	69.5	3.0217	1.2381		
Other	2	8	4.0000	0.0000		
Total	33	106.5	3.2273	1.0795		
ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	4.5563	3	1.5188	1.4687	0.2436	2.9340
Within Groups	29.9891	29	1.0341			
Total	34.5455	32				

Table 11. Extent to Which CPE Evaluation Is Used in Decisions
Analysis of Variance: Single Factor

SUMMARY						
Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance		
EP	4	13	3.2500	1.5833		
RC	2	8	4.0000	2.0000		
UCC	21	74	3.5238	0.7619		
Other	2	8	4.0000	0.0000		
Total	29	103	3.5517	0.8276		
ANOVA						
Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Between Groups	1.1843	3	0.3948	0.4488	0.7203	2.9912
Within Groups	21.9881	25	0.8795			
Total	23.1724	28				

Action Taken When a Negative Evaluation Is Received

Although many ordination-bound students fear that a negative evaluation from FE or CPE could sink their chances of being ordained, Table 12, indicates that there is little evidence to support this fear. Given the opportunity to check as many as seven likely responses to a negative FE evaluation, 88% of the respondents (30 of 34) reported that they would discuss that evaluation with the student. Seventy-nine percent (27 of 34) reported they would seek further information from the FE supervisor. Seventy-four percent (25 of 34) reported that they would consult the seminary field education director. Only one UCC respondent reported that the student would be terminated. The probability of the distribution among these likely responses was significant at the .00001 level, but no significant difference was noted among denominations. Moreover, no significant differences were found between those who did and did not require FE.

Table 12. Likely Responses to a Negative Field Education Evaluation (Number of Responses)

	EP	RC	UCC	Other	Total
Ignore if all else is positive	0	0	2	0	2
Discuss with student	4	3	21	2	30
Seek further information from supervisor	4	4	17	2	27
Request a meeting with student and supervisor	0	2	10	0	12
Consult seminary field education director	4	3	17	1	25
Request further field education at another site	3	2	8	2	15
Terminate student	0	0	1	0	1

Analysis of Variance: Two-Factor Without Replication (Proportions)

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Ignore	4	8.67	2.1675	18.79223
Discuss	4	366	91.5	139
Seek	4	374	93.5	169
Request Mtg.	4	93	23.25	728.9167
Consult	4	299	74.75	416.9167
Request Another	4	260	65	816.6667
Terminate	4	4.35	1.0875	4.730625
EP	7	375	53.57143	2589.286
RC	7	350	50	1458.333
UCC	7	330.02	47.14571	1140.344
Other	7	350	50	2500

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	39391.12	6	6565.187	17.54185	0.00000125	2.661302
Columns	145.4143	3	48.47144	0.129513	0.94131	3.159911
Error	6736.654	18	374.2586			
Total	46273.19	27				

In response to negative CPE evaluations, 79% (27 of 34) would discuss the evaluation with the student (see Table 13). Sixty-five percent (22 of 34) would seek further information from the CPE supervisor. Only one UCC respondent reported that the student would be terminated. The probability of the distribution among these likely responses was significant at the .001 level, but no significant difference was noted among denominations. Moreover, no significant differences were, found between those who *did* and *did not* require CPE.

**Table 13. Likely Responses to a Negative CPE Evaluation
(Number of Responses)**

	EP	RC	UCC	Other	Total
Ignore if all else is positive	0	0	3	0	3
Discuss with student	4	1	20	2	27
Seek further information from supervisor	3	1	17	1	22
Request a meeting with student and supervisor	2	1	9	0	12
Consult seminary field education director	1	1	7	1	10
Request further CPE at another site	1	1	8	2	12
Terminate student	0	0	1	0	1

Analysis of Variance: Two-Factor Without Replication (Proportions)

SUMMARY	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
Ignore	4	13.04	3.26	42.5104
Discuss	4	311.96	77.99	1285.76
Seek	4	223.91	55.9775	559.5887
Request Mtg.	4	114.13	28.5325	466.5809
Consult	4	130.43	32.6075	140.9962
Request Another	4	184.78	46.195	1307.912
Terminate	4	4.35	1.0875	4.730625
EP	7	275	39.28571	1428.571
RC	7	125	17.85714	148.8095
UCC	7	282.6	40.37143	911.9197
Other	7	300	42.85714	2023.81

ANOVA

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	P-value	F crit
Rows	18474	6	3079.001	6.440933	0.000928	2.661302
Columns	2819.581	3	939.8605	1.966085	0.155243	3.159911
Error	8604.657	18	478.0365			
Total	29898.24	27				

While these results may seem like common sense, it is important to have quantitative confirmation that decision-makers hardly ever ignore negative FE or CPE evaluations. They will discuss these evaluations with students and seek more information from the supervisor or seminary. At the same time, judicatory decision-makers do not use these negative evaluations in isolation or make decisions based solely upon these evaluations. One would hope that this finding would lower the

anxiety of students and help them to focus on the learning available in the setting.

Comparison of Likely Responses

We have taken the totals from the far right columns of the upper half of Tables 12 and 13 and re-presented them in Table 14, in a way that compares the likely responses to a negative FE evaluation with the likely responses to a negative CPE evaluation.

Table 14. Comparison of Likely Responses to FE Evaluation and Likely Responses to CPE Evaluation

Likely Response	FE/CPE	No.	%	Statistical Significance of Differences^a
Discuss with student	FE	30	88	Not Significant
	CPE	27	79	
Seek further information from supervisor	FE	27	79	Not Significant
	CPE	22	65	
Consult seminary field education director	FE	25	74	$p < .05^b$
	CPE	10	29	
Request further FE/CPE at another site	FE	15	44	Not Significant
	CPE	12	35	
Request a meeting w/student and supervisor	FE	12	35	No Difference
	CPE	12	35	
Ignore if all else is positive	FE	2	6	Not Significant
	CPE	3	9	
Terminate the student	FE	1	3	No Difference
	CPE	1	3	

^aChi-Square test, 1 degree of freedom

^bChi-Square = 6.62377 with 1 degree of freedom

An interesting finding may be noted in Table 14. Decision-makers are more likely to take some action in response to a negative FE evaluation than they are in response to a negative CPE evaluation, particularly to discuss with the student, to seek further information from the supervisor, to consult with the seminary field education director, or to request further FE/CPE at another site.

It is perhaps easiest to understand that decision-makers would more readily contact the seminary field education director about a negative FE than about a negative CPE evaluation (the one difference that is statistically significant), since seminary field education directors are more likely to have direct oversight and greater knowledge of FE supervisors than of CPE supervisors. What is noteworthy is that decision-makers are also more likely to discuss a negative FE evaluation with a student, seek further information from a supervisor, or request that the student engage in another placement.

At least two possible explanations can be offered for this finding. On the one hand, decision-makers may assume that CPE evaluation data are indisputable or, at least, less discussible because of the clinical nature of CPE; or they may assume that further discussion or placement would not yield new learning or evaluative material. On the other hand, decision-makers may feel that it is easier to speak with a FE supervisor or request a further FE setting because FE is more understandable and more a part of the ecclesiastical or ministerial system with which they are familiar.

While the data cannot support the conclusion that decision-makers value FE evaluations more highly than CPE evaluations, it is clear that they are slightly more likely to take further action after a negative FE evaluation than after a negative CPE evaluation. They will discuss these evaluations with students and seek more information from the supervisor or seminary. At the same time, judicatory decision-makers do not use these negative evaluations in isolation or make determinations based solely upon them.

Our findings may also help all those involved in FE and CPE to “unpack” several dimensions of student anxiety about FE and CPE evaluations, so that this anxiety may be more effectively addressed. It is the experience of the authors that students are more anxious about CPE evaluations (especially negative, or potentially negative, evaluations) than they are about FE evaluations. Our observations of students have led us to postulate several reasons for this more intense anxiety: students view a negative CPE evaluation as a more direct judgment (almost clinical) of their personal maturity and emotional stability; a negative CPE evaluation comes from a clinical professional who is perceived to be an unchallengeable expert outside of the church system and a negative CPE evaluation has no offsetting positive data (such as an evaluation from one’s own faith community) that a negative FE evaluation might have.

As noted earlier in Table 4, decision-makers rank ministerial identity, skills training, and vocation testing as the most important outcomes of a CPE placement. These are hardly clinical expectations having to do with personal maturity and emotional stability. Students’ knowledge of this should minimize their anxiety about the CPE evaluation. It should also be helpful for students to know that the vast majority of decision-makers do not consider the CPE supervisor to be an unchallengeable expert. Rather, they indicate that they would seek out additional information in the face of a negative CPE evaluation.

Finally, the one action for which there is a significant difference between decision-makers’ response to a negative FE evaluation and their response to a

negative CPE evaluation is consultation with the seminary field education director. They indicate a greater likelihood of consulting with the seminary field education director after a negative FE evaluation. There may be a relationship between this difference and the lower level of student anxiety about field education. In other words, because the seminary field education director functions more frequently as a “broker” between a negative FE evaluation and the decision-maker, students are anxious about these evaluations. As a “broker,” the field education director can be the filter of the evaluation data, offering additional interpretation to the decision-maker from her or his knowledge of the student and of the field setting. The FE director may also be able to function as a bridge between those inside the church system with which the students are familiar (the decision-makers) and the perceived “outside professionals” (the CPE supervisors). This position as a bridge between the church system and the “clinical” system might enhance the seminary field education director’s ability to interpret a CPE evaluation and help the student relate this information to the concerns of decision-makers. This may keep a discussion about a negative CPE evaluation focused and productive. Thus, a more frequent introduction of the seminary field education director into these conversations might lower the level of student anxiety about CPE evaluations.

Lay Input in Field Education and CPE Evaluations

Given the increasing rhetoric about, or expressed commitment to, the role of laity in the formation of ministers and leaders of the church, do ordination decision-makers receive input from lay persons in the FE and CPE evaluation process, and how important do they consider this information? Table 15 indicates that somewhat less than half of the respondents (41%, 14 of 34) reported receiving information from laity in the FE evaluation process.⁹ Only one respondent (3%) reported receiving information from laity in the CPE process.¹⁰ Yet when asked “how important do you consider (would you consider) information from lay people if available,” respondents consistently reported that that such information is “quite important” regarding FE and “somewhat important” regarding CPE.¹¹

Table 15. Lay Input Received for Field Education and CPE Evaluations^a

	Field Education		CPE	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	14	41.18	1	2.94
No	20	58.82	33	97.06
Total	34	100.00	34	100.00

^a The probability for the distribution for FE was 0.081024. The probability of the distribution for CPE was 0.00000002.

One might conclude that ordination and certification decision-makers would take input from laity into account if this were available, but that neither they nor the supervisors have consistently found a mechanism to provide such information. This discrepancy between the desire for the information and its alleged importance, and the failure to obtain it, might be described as a disconnect between the “espoused theories” of the decision-makers and their “theories-in-use.”¹² One might note that both the espoused importance of lay input and its availability to decision-makers is greater with regard to FE than with regard to CPE. It would appear that the nature of FE lends itself more readily to lay input.

One might also postulate that the decision-makers’ higher ranking and reported importance of FE (vs. CPE) as a setting for testing one’s vocation¹³ might have to do with the involvement of lay or non-professional input in the field education setting and the opportunity to receive feedback from precisely those sorts of persons with whom one will work after ordination or certification. Theologically, in so far as one understands the testing of vocation as a mutual process—one that involves laity as well as the candidate, training professionals, and decision-makers—FE appears to function more appropriately than CPE in this regard. However, much work remains to be done to improve the involvement of laity in the feedback and evaluation process of both FE and CPE.

CONCLUSIONS

Those making decisions regarding ordination see clear differences between FE and CPE. They are more likely to require FE (91%) than CPE (62.5%). Their primary desired outcome regarding FE is an “opportunity to test ministerial vocation,” their primary desired outcome for CPE is the “development of ministerial identity.” Ordination decision-makers see both FE and CPE primarily as opportunities for personal development and socialization into the role of ordained minister as opposed to denominational or institutional engagement or acculturation. The clusters of expected outcomes for both FE and CPE reveal a concern for the development of the behavioral skills and the normative values that comprise the role of an ordained minister.

Decision-makers claim to have equal access to FE and CPE evaluations. In determining the suitability of a candidate for ordination or ministerial certification,

they use CPE evaluations slightly more than FE evaluations. In both cases the extent of their use falls between “somewhat” and “to a great extent.”

Decision-makers take seriously negative FE or CPE evaluations. However, they do not use these negative evaluations in isolation or make decisions based solely upon these evaluations. They discuss these evaluations with students and seek more information from the supervisor or seminary field education director. Furthermore, decision-makers are more likely to take further action in response to a negative FE evaluation than in response to a negative CPE evaluation. They claim not to use these evaluations as screening tools.

There is a discrepancy between desire for lay input in the evaluation process and its availability. Decision-makers claim that the input from lay persons in the evaluation process is “quite important” for FE and “somewhat important” in CPE. Yet only 41% report receiving information from laity for FE, and only 3% report receiving lay input in CPE.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are directed to the various players in the ministry education and training drama: FE and CPE program directors, ordination decision-makers, students, and CPE supervisors.

Directors of FE and CPE Programs

Directors of FE and CPE programs should examine the goals of their programs in light of the desired outcomes articulated by those with decision-making authority regarding ordination and ministry certification. Since FE is required in most seminary programs and CPE is not, it is more incumbent upon CPE programs to know the desired outcomes of decision-makers. FE will continue to take place because of requirements by the Association of Theological Schools and the requirements of individual seminaries and divinity schools. One might argue that the recommendation or requirement of CPE by decision-makers may depend to a greater extent on whether decision-makers perceive that CPE programs are continuing to provide the desired outcomes they wish.

Directors of FE and CPE programs and ordination decision-makers should collaborate in establishing better mechanisms for input into the evaluation process by lay persons or non-professionals.

Decision-makers

Decision-makers need to clearly communicate the extent to which they consider FE and CPE evaluations in making decisions about ordination and ministry certification, especially given the high anxiety that students express about evaluations. Moreover, decision-makers should more clearly convey to students their policies and practices regarding negative evaluations.

Given the extremely low scores regarding the importance of denominational polity as an outcome for FE, decision-makers should consider whether denominational culture and polity are being adequately taught in other places of ministerial preparation or whether they are undervaluing the denominational learning in FE settings. Ordination decision-makers are responsible for ensuring that students are adequately trained in church polity and have an appreciation of denominational culture. This study reveals that decision-makers ascribe low values to knowledge of church polity as an outcome for FE and CPE. One might conclude that they either presume students have learned or are learning church polity and denominational culture elsewhere (e.g., home parish, seminary classroom, denominational formation program) or that such training is of little importance.

Students

Students should know that the vast majority of ordination decision-makers do not act unilaterally on a negative FE or CPE evaluation. Instead they seek out additional information when they receive a negative evaluation of a student.

CPE supervisors

CPE supervisors should recognize the potential role of the seminary field education director as a “broker” who can lessen the anxiety of students about evaluations, thus enhancing the possibility that students will see the setting as a place of learning and growth.

Seminary field education director

Finally, the seminary field education director might be in a position to increase the amount and quality of discussion between CPE supervisors and decision-makers who require CPE. The more CPE evaluations are understood and valued by decision-makers, the more likely decision-makers are to recommend or require CPE for ordination.

NOTES

1. It was the original intention of the authors to distinguish between participants in FE and CPE who were seeking ordination and those seeking certification as lay professionals. Responses from the survey indicated that certification was variously interpreted by respondents, probably because of differences in denominational polity. This made interpretation of the data about certification of lay professionals problematic. Accordingly, this article restricts its focus to students seeking ordination.

2. The seminaries were: St. John's Seminary, Boston, MA (100 students), Weston Jesuit School of Theology, Cambridge, MA (70), Pope John XXIII National Seminary, Weston, MA (70), and St. Mary's Seminary and University, Baltimore, MD (82). St. Mary's Seminary was included because many Roman Catholic Diocese in New England send their students to this seminary and a portion of those students participate in a CPE program in New England. One should note that Roman Catholic seminaries tend to set the FE and CPE requirements for ordination. Bishops generally adhere to the vote of the seminary authorities regarding the suitability of an individual for ordination.

3. "Student" was used consistently in the survey instrument because it corresponds with the practice of both seminary field education programs and CPE programs. Denominations vary in their terminology for those seeking ordination and ministry certification.

4. Maine (21 students), Massachusetts (11 students), Rhode Island (9 students), and Western Massachusetts (10 students). The Diocese of Connecticut responded after all the data had been analyzed. The Maine, Rhode Island and Western Massachusetts figures appear to represent all those in the ordination process. The Massachusetts figure represents the number entering the process in a given year.

5. This appears to represent all ELCA students in New England.

6. The Ministerial Fellowship Committee sets a national policy for ministry certification and tracks all UUA students in the United States. Students must receive ministerial certification from this office before seeking ordination in a local context. For this reason, responses regarding ministry certification are tantamount to ordination responses from other denominations, although not everyone who is certified is ultimately ordained.

7. UCC respondents consistently interpreted ministerial certification to mean re-certification for those already ordained. The high number of UCC respondents and the relatively low number of students represented (except for the Metropolitan Boston Association) points to the decentralization of decision-making regarding ordination in the UCC. UCC respondents included: 7 Connecticut Associations representing 35 students for ordination and 46 persons for certification; 5 Maine Associations representing 10 students for ordination and 5 persons for

certification; 6 Massachusetts Associations representing 70 students for ordination and 47 persons for certification; 5 New Hampshire Associations representing 11 students for ordination and 20 persons for certification; and 1 Rhode Island Association representing 9 students for ordination.

8. Everett C. Hughes. *The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers on Work, Self and the Study of Society* (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971).

9. Episcopalians reported receiving no lay input regarding FE; 75% of RC, 37.5% of UCC, and 100% of ELCA and UUA reported receiving lay input.

10. Only one RC respondent reported lay input regarding CPE evaluations.

11. On a scale of 1 to 4, with “somewhat important” = 2, and “quite important” = 3, FE scored 2.73 and CPE scored 2.32. No significant differences among denominations were noted.

12. See Chris Argyris and Donald A. Schön. *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1996), 13.

13. See Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6.

The authors gave a presentation of the data in this study in a workshop at Northeast Bi-Regional Fall Conference of ACPE in Pawling, New York, on October 26, 2000.

Theology Of Hospitality: A Theological Theory for the Supervision of Clinical Pastoral Education Students

Dorothea Lotze-Kola

EXISTENTIAL AND ESSENTIAL REALITY

My theology is modeled after Paul Tillich's method of correlation.¹ I see correlation, however, to be a two-way movement, in which not only the existential human experience becomes the question and God, as the essential reality, the answer to that question, but also vice versa: God poses the essential questions to which we humans need to find an existential answer. This method of thinking implies that there are two spheres that are equally real and interconnected. Tillich describes God as the "ground of being."² Because human beings by birth leave their essential unity with God and enter into existential reality,³ human ways of asking about and knowing God require mediation through elements of phenomenological and experiential nature. These elements can be described as "symbols."⁴ Symbols are more than signs. Signs stay within the existential reality. Symbols participate in the essential reality they are representing. Symbols, then, need to be transcended and interpreted, so that they can be recognized and understood as symbols that hold essential reality. Everything created has the potential to become a symbol and to reveal the essence of God, the creator, as the "ground of being." In Christ, who entered our existential conditions, God is able to overcome human estrangement.⁵

Dorothea Lotze-Kola, M.Div., is an Associate Supervisor of ACPE for the North Atlanta Tri-Hospital CPE Center at St. Joseph's Hospital of Atlanta in Atlanta, Georgia.

As the essential reality, God restores creation to its original essential wholeness in recreating a “New Being,” which manifests itself as existential experiences of increasing awareness, freedom, relatedness, and transcendence.⁶

I. ESTRANGEMENT AND THE “NEW BEING”

In the following reflection, I will describe two theological symbols. First, I will focus on the existential human experience of becoming a stranger as a symbol for human estrangement. Second, I will reflect on hospitality as the experience of “New Being” and as a symbol for wholeness.

The experience of becoming a stranger is inherent in every human story. The experience of birth itself is the experience of loss of paradise and a symbol for our estrangement from the essence of our being. Life is filled with *Angst*,⁷ as the awareness of wholeness and bliss of our essential state of being is lost. Individually and collectively, human beings are constantly confronted with experiences of estrangement, alienation, and fragmentation. The yearning and longing of all creation is to be mended, to be reunited with the “ground of being,” and to be made whole again.⁸

The Exile Experience, the Exodus, and God’s Law of Hospitality

The people of Israel often experienced exile. In bondage in Egypt, they became strangers and wrestled to keep their identity and their relationship with JAHWE. Israel’s theology was based on an attempt to find theological meaning in the Babylonian exile experience. Some of Israel’s prophets interpreted this exile as punishment, and God as judging his people.⁹ The exilic prophets, though, were able to see God’s redemptive efforts even in Israel’s exile existence.¹⁰ They proclaimed that God wanted to redeem Israel and lead the people out of exile once again. Through the Exodus experience, Israel’s view of God changed in essential ways. God’s goal was not Israel’s destruction but their rebirth as a nation. Israel was led back to the Promised Land. They rebuilt the temple. They integrated their exile experience of estrangement into their identity as God’s people. This is one of the reasons that the Torah calls Israel to care especially for strangers. Their experience of being strangers in a foreign land was meant to enable them to connect with those who were exiled in their midst. The golden rule of the Jewish tradition was to love God and to love neighbor, including the stranger.¹¹ The Exodus was God’s

liberating and reunifying act of grace and the reason God required the people of Israel to protect and provide for the strangers among them.¹²

Jesus: The Stranger in Our Midst

In the New Testament, this exile story was expanded and transcended in marvelous ways. Not only did Jesus, the Christ, expand the message of God's love to all strangers who were not part of Israel. In even deeper ways, this Jesus became the embodiment of the stranger among us. Jesus connected with the estranged, the disoriented, the lost, and the broken. In reconnecting with them, he participated in their existential estrangement. In symbolic and healing acts, Jesus brought people back to wholeness—physically, spiritually, and emotionally. Jesus interpreted these experiences of healing as part of God's kingdom that was present among us. These radical words and symbolic acts became the ultimate threat to an established religiosity that tried to keep the stranger out of the religious realm. When Jesus' testimony of God's kingdom as a new reality became too threatening, he was crucified. His death on the cross was supposed to eliminate the strangeness that had come with him. It was supposed to make people forget about him, about his teaching, and about his existence. Yet those who were connected with Jesus, and who first witnessed his death, also witnessed a powerfully transforming "New Being" taking over their hearts and lives. Their awareness of God's very essence changed forever. One symbol that captures this new reality is the Trinity as a threefold understanding of God.

God as Hospitable Community

Tillich points out that the symbol of the Trinitarian community can serve as a theological norm because it describes "New Being" in Christ.¹³ He postulates the analogy between the essential reality and the basic structure of life as the basis for the Trinitarian understanding.¹⁴ Juergen Moltmann also sees the Trinity as a symbol that enables us to understand the impact of Jesus' existence on the very essence of God. The Trinitarian symbol interprets the monotheistic image of God in a revolutionary threefold way. God reveals Godself as loving community.¹⁵ God is unity in diversity. God, the creator, identified fully with Jesus, the Christ, who identified fully with the existentially estranged creation. In that chain of loving identification, God's very nature and essence was transformed. The Spirit of God, as the recreating, reconnecting, and healing breath of God (in Hebrew, *ruach*), united the creator God through Jesus, the Christ, with the estranged creation and made it whole again. The Spirit of God, as the third person of the Trinity, is the energy that holds and bears the tension that diversity in unity brings about. God's

Spirit is the Spirit of Hospitality, which is able to host diversity and hold opposites. It is an energy of acceptance and free communication—distinguishing, yet mending; embracing, yet differentiating; clarifying, yet loving. The Holy Spirit is the female, recreative energy in God, which is birth giving, nurturing, and befriending, bringing forth wholeness. This new reality as recreated wholeness is captured in the biblical symbols of rebirth and resurrection. In the Hebrew story, the Exodus experience served as the symbol for God’s recreative power. Moltmann describes the Trinitarian community as a hospitable unity, able and longing to reunite itself with the estranged creation. Wholeness is the movement of integrating the estranged creation into Godself. As God’s essential nature is unity in diversity, it holds the promise and hope for creation to become part of that unity and for wholeness in all its diversity.¹⁶

The Spiritual Community as Co-Creating Context for Hospitality

This described “New Being” in Christ has broad sociological and ecclesiological implications.¹⁷ If this is the new reality, we need to postulate the oneness of all of humanity. We need to create ways to practice the unity in our diversity. This new reality reveals the universality of our human existence and invites us to connect, to forgive, and to be forgiven. The church is symbolically named “the body of Christ,”¹⁸ which is another symbol that calls us to embrace the strangeness and brokenness in our own communities and in the world around us. As hospitable community, we are called to be open to the Spirit of Hospitality so that healing and integration can take place. The spiritual community, including the CPE community, is meant to be a place where the “New Being” can be experienced and practiced.¹⁹ We are promised to receive and to be received by the Spirit of Hospitality as we minister and supervise, learn and teach, serve and are served on our journey.

II. THE LACK OF HOSPITALITY

When a community lacks the spirit of hospitality, its estrangement will become manifest. The biblical New Testament theology describes estrangement with the term *sin*.²⁰ As a German, I am aware of my own nation’s shadows and the collective unconscious of my sinful German history. To eliminate the stranger was the brutal sinful reality during the Hitler regime. Hitler and the Nazis killed millions of Jews, homosexuals, and handicapped or mentally ill people in an effort to build the *Dritte Reich*.²¹ A purified *Arische Rasse*²² was planned to reign over all other races and

nations. Germany will always have to be aware of this collective sin and to learn from it. Never again should racism and genocide be able to cause such terrible and horrifying destruction. Especially as a German theologian, I will always have to hold my theology accountable to *Auschwitz*.²³ My life, my theology, and my practical work as a pastor and supervisor will have to be aware of these shadows of my collective past and to be accountable for it.

Given the background of my country's history, I am very aware of any culture's potential to sin. The American history and collective unconscious still struggle with the issue of slavery and with the genocide of the native Americans. In my work as a CPE supervisor, I need to be aware of collective and individual sin and feelings of guilt. Guilt, fear, and intolerance hold prejudice and injustice in place. The question of justice and forgiveness need to be raised in any CPE group. It is very likely that social issues such as racism, sexism, ageism, or classism, will come up during a CPE unit, as students encounter a diverse patient population. It can be especially fruitful when CPE group members themselves offer a wide spectrum of diversity. Feelings of anger, pain, and fear, the experience of prejudice, miscommunication, and strangeness all help to address these collective and individual shadows that cloud human relationships. CPE has the chance to offer a healing environment, where prejudices are experienced and overcome, feelings of guilt and shame are expressed, and forgiveness and respect for diversity are practiced.

III. HOSPITALITY AS AN EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLE

Clinical Pastoral Education participates in God's continuing recreational process. It contributes to the movement of both patients and students from estrangement to wholeness, which often results from a hospitable experience of community.

The Experience of Becoming a Stranger and the Stranger Within

The clinical context of pastoral care confronts us with existential experiences of estrangement: crisis, loss, disorientation, *Angst*, a new and strange environment. All of these are things that patients in the hospital deal with. CPE students have similar experiences, as they begin the new and strange journey of becoming pastoral care providers. When entering a new role and a new environment, students feel as if they are strangers, without their familiar environment. They feel displaced and go through similar emotions of disorientation that a foreigner has when entering a new country for the first time. Also, most of the students discover parts

of themselves that they did not know before, which is often a shocking or surprising discovery for them. We may call it their shadow, unconscious, estranged side, suppressed memories, or feeling world. However we name it, both patients and students are becoming strangers. Strangers to themselves and others—estranged from the familiar, the comfortable, and the known—they are entering the unknown and unfamiliar as if entering a foreign land.

Mutual Hospitality

The CPE methodology needs to be aware of and to work with the *Angst* that both students and patients experience. Students are filled with anxiety as they are strangers to each other and to the supervisor. Supervisors need to get in touch with their own existential *Angst* and with their anxiety about not yet knowing how to work with a new group of students. There needs to be room to voice and walk through the *Angst* in order to integrate and befriend it as part of the educational journey. The following example of pastoral care demonstrates how the Spirit of Hospitality creates the ability to become aware of feelings of *Angst* and estrangement. It shows how acceptance can set the care seeker and care giver free, how pastoral care can assist in admitting and transcending *Angst*, and how it can restore community in a healing way.

K, a female CPE intern, could not sleep while on call. She felt lonely, restless, and intimidated by the darkness of the night. In supervision, K was learning not to avoid her feelings. She therefore chose to accept and be with her strange and uncomfortable feelings while on call and not avoid them by walking the hospital floors looking for work as she had done previously. At 3 a.m., K was called to see an older male patient who sat desperately at the side of his hospital bed. The nurse had not been able to comfort him, as he was disoriented and in pain. The strange environment, the new dependency situation, and *Angst* seemed to keep this man from sleeping. K sat down and made eye contact to be on the same level with the man. She listened as the patient bemoaned his loss of independence and his pain. After finding words for his feelings, the patient was finally ready to admit that he needed help to lie down. With the nurse, K helped the patient to lie down and assisted in educating him about how to self-medicate against pain. K then asked him if she could sit with him while he slept. The patient worried at first that he would be a burden, yet he permitted her to stay with him. Hospitality was taking place as patient and chaplain waited together for the light of the new morning. In integrating her own feelings of estrangement, K was able to be hospitable to this patient's feelings. As both embraced their vulnerability and fear, they formed a healing community of mutual hospitality.

Befriending the Stranger and the Estranged in Mutual Hospitality

On my personal CPE journey, I experienced hospitality in the presence of several supervisors. They accompanied me on my journey. In their pastoral presence I could talk about my Angst and my experiences of loss and grief. In the beginning I learned about healthy boundaries and my right of “privacy,” which became a symbol for individuation for me. I also worked through conflicts with my supervisors. With the help of (at that time) unconscious transference, I actualized the conflicts I still had with my internalized parental objects. Awareness and consequently healing were taking place, as I learned to identify my issues and find words and symbols for my conflicts. In dialogue with my supervisors, I found the object constancy I needed to embrace the painful and suppressed parts of my story. My supervisors were able to host my transference and work hospitably with me. The experience of conflict resolution assisted me in finding alternative ways of responding. It opened the door for me to new ways of relating and helped me tremendously in my ability to be truly present with patients and families. CPE has been and is a continuing journey and invitation for me to always seek the “New Being” in my own life. It means to always be open for increased awareness, more freedom, conscious ways of relating, and the ability to transcend the existential reality while teaching and ministering to others.²⁴

In my practical CPE training, I learned that, as chaplains, we are strangers who enter people’s bedrooms and private spheres. As a German, in the beginning of my CPE training in the United States, my being a stranger was very obvious due to my foreign accent. The patients and family members would ask me about it, which was probably a way for them to connect with me and ease possible uncomfortable feelings that meeting a stranger entails (a feeling that they probably would have had even if an American chaplain had come in). I learned that my being a stranger was not a weakness but a strength. It became a way to connect with patients and family members. The unconscious was made conscious as people, in meeting me—a stranger—often got in touch with their own existential situation of being in a strange place. Their disorientation in the hospital and their vulnerability in illness or crisis were touched as they connected with me, someone who was obviously not from this country. My searching for words and my accent showed my humanness, my vulnerability, and my search for new orientation. When patients became hospitable to me, they often let me into their own experience of becoming a stranger, and into their feelings of being misplaced, disconnected, and insecure. My very existence as a foreigner became a symbol and the basis for my ministry. I

have come to understand this to be mutual hospitality, through which we grow to a place of being known.

IV. HOSPITALITY AS THE ESSENCE OF SUPERVISORY WORK

As an ACPE Supervisor, hospitality means that I respect each student as a different personality and adjust my supervisory style accordingly. It means that I learn my students' language and become familiar with their images, symbols, and stories.²⁵

The following example shows how hospitality became a reality with S, a female CPE intern. S entered CPE with intense grief from just having lost her first church assignment. Other people had told S that CPE would bring her healing, yet she did not believe this and was suspicious about the psychological elements of CPE. She felt that she was in exile, yet CPE was her only choice at the time, if she wanted to stay in ministry. While S provided caring ministry to patients, she expressed her anger and resistance in many verbal and nonverbal ways in supervision and in the group. I gave S adequate space to express her feelings while interpreting them at times. I was hospitable in spending much time listening to her story and mirroring back what I heard and experienced from her. I was surprised when S offered to pray at the end of our fourth individual supervision session. It seemed that prayer was S's language. It reminded her of home, of her lost role as a pastor, of the familiar. Two sessions later when S had shared her grief with me once again, I offered to pray. I responded hospitably to her need to hear her own language. I offered to be her pastor, a companion, which was something that she had missed during the last months of her ordeal. After my intercessory prayer for her, our relationship changed. S began to allow me to supervise her. She entered into a learning alliance with me. Yet first I had to host her grief and be hospitable to her existential situation. I went to where she was and did not try to make her adjust to where I was. In taking the time to get to know her feeling world, her language, and even to understand and respect her resistance, I was able to find a creative way to connect with her. Becoming S's pastor was the door to also become her supervisor.

At other times I have not been able to offer what students needed to be able to stay in the strange land of CPE. In one of the intern groups, two students dropped out within the first ten days. Their fear and disorientation were too great to allow them to stay. Although I walked alongside them, as Jesus accompanied the two frightened disciples on their way to Emmaus,²⁶ these two students were not able to

invite the strangeness into their lives and learn from it. To be hospitable as their supervisor meant, at that time, to let them go after exploring their reasons. The students got the opportunity and space to find out that they were not yet ready to travel into the foreign territory of CPE. Even this experience can hold further learning opportunities. Hospitality in the case of these two students meant to respect their decision and to accompany them out of the house of CPE without slamming the door on them.

V. HOSPITALITY AS A TRANSCENDING EXPERIENCE

The concept of hospitality helps me in three aspects of supervising. First, it helps me to honor the diversity of my students, while also being aware of our common humanity. Second, it challenges me to see the strength in people's weakness. And third, it keeps me from idealizing the group work we do in CPE. The theological goal of CPE cannot necessarily be to agree with each other, to always reach a level of comfort or to find homogeneous familiarity. While closeness and intimacy grow within CPE groups, the reality of diversity is not denied. It will be uncomfortable at times for CPE students and supervisors to meet and to be together, yet the theological concept of hospitality invites us to see a deeper unity in our diversity. It transcends our differences and places us into a community of strangers. We at least get a chance to get to know and to respect each other.

As a unique, existential way of learning, CPE acknowledges the strangeness in life and allows it to be. And in that space of hospitality, connections between strangers are made, diversity is acknowledged, and the universality of experiences is celebrated. Hostility and forgiveness take place, newly enlarged perspectives emerge, and strangers meet companions on the way. As the disciples in the Emmaus story, it might be that we become companions and hosts for each other, including patients, students, and supervisors. When companioning happens, we become Christ for one another. On the CPE journey, like the journey to Emmaus, liberation will take place in unexpected ways and in surprising encounters. Often the meaning of an encounter will unfold much later. Sometimes CPE students and supervisors can experience God's healing and recreating presence and community among them. Then the universality of human existential estrangement can be felt, shared, and even celebrated. Held and inspired by God's Spirit of Hospitality, we celebrate the love of the unlovable, the inclusion of the marginalized, the healing presence with the fragmented, and the resurrection out of brokenness. "Since the

basis of their [followers of Jesus] true home is no longer kinship or a common history and culture, but grace, they are less in need of familiar places and customs to stabilize their individual and corporate identities. They can become pilgrim people, finding new companions in their life-journey from every race and nation and from every social stratum.”²⁷ This kind of theology knows that we are all deeply connected beneath our differences. Parker Palmer writes: “This is what Jesus called for—hospitality...without demanding that they [the sick, hungry, and imprisoned] become our friends or grateful allies, but hospitality in simple recognition of our unity with them, a unity which is both human and divine...the very root of the word hospitality (*hospes*) means both host and guest—the two are really one.”²⁸ Mutual hospitality begins when we transcend our differences and see beyond what separates us. Then we will truly learn how to minister and how to teach and learn in the awareness of God’s new reality of unity in diversity.

NOTES

1. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology I* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 62.

2. *Ibid.*, 156.

3. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 4. Tillich talks about the leap from man’s essential nature to its distortion in existence. In order to understand any distortion, one must know its undistorted or essential character. “Existential” is a term that describes the nature of finitude. “Essence” is that which makes a thing what it is (*ousia*). “Essence” as the true and undistorted nature of things is the basis of value judgements. Tillich I, 203.

4. *Ibid.*, 239.

5. Tillich II, 68. “In the state of estrangement, the relation to the ultimate power of being is lost.” Tillich describes estrangement also with the categories of sin, unbelief, hubris, and concupiscence. *Ibid.*, 44-55.

6. *Ibid.*, 231. According to Tillich, the reality of the “New Being” is experienced as a process with four principles: increasing awareness, increasing freedom, increasing relatedness, and increasing transcendence.

7. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 34. “Through Soren Kierkegaard the word *Angst* has become a central concept of existentialism. It

expresses the awareness of being finite, of being a mixture of being and non-being, or of being threatened by non-being. All creatures are driven by anxiety; for finitude and anxiety are the same." But in human beings "freedom is united with anxiety." One could call the human freedom "freedom in anxiety" or "anxious freedom," (in German, *sich aengstigende Freiheit*).

8. *Romans 8: 22,23*: "For we know that up to present time all of creation groans with pain, like the pain of childbirth. But it is not just creation alone which groans; we who have the Spirit as the first of God's gifts also groan within ourselves, as we wait for God to make us his sons [and daughters] and set our whole being free."

9. *Amos* and *Hosea* were two prophets who preached God's law and judgment as a consequence of Israel's sin.

10. *Ezekiel* and *Isaiah* were exile prophets who proclaimed God's willingness to redeem, God's love and thoughts of grace.

11. *Leviticus 19:18*: "Do not take revenge on anyone or continue to hate him, but love your neighbor as you love yourself. I am JAHWE."

12. *Deuteronomy 10: 19*: "So then, show love for those foreigners, because you were once foreigners in Egypt."

13. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology III* (Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1963), 283.

14. Tillich I, 238.

15. Marilyn Roberts Washburn, *The Contributions of Juergen Moltmann's Theology to a Theology of Health and Healing* (Emory University dissertations (Ph.D.), 1992), 81. "God who is in his very self community and a wealth of different relationships"... "This socially open companionship between people is the form of life that corresponds to God....The concept of perichoresis, which is a community concept, is better than the assumption of a duality in God, as a model for the bisexual image of God on earth."

16. Juergen Moltmann, *God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 223-224 and Juergen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom: the Doctrine of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

17. Tillich III, 150. "The Spiritual Community is also spiritual in the sense in which Luther often uses the word, that is 'invisible', 'hidden', 'open to faith alone', but nevertheless real, unconquerably real."

18. *Romans 12:12,13*: “Christ is like a single body, which has many parts; it is still one body, even though it is made up of different parts. In the same way, all of us, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether slaves or free, have been baptized into the one body by the same Spirit, and we have all been given the one Spirit to drink.”

19. Tillich III, 151. For Tillich “the Spiritual Presence had the effect of uniting different individuals, nationalities, and traditions and gathering them together for the sacramental meal.”

20. Tillich II, 46. The term *sin* in this paper is not used as a moral category. Moreover, *sin* is a relational term. It describes the abuse of freedom as the demonic possibility of estranging creation from itself, from each other and from God, the creator. Sin is “the state of estrangement from that to which one belongs—God, one’s self, one’s world.”

21. The *Dritte Reich* (Third Empire) was a term that described Hitler’s vision of having Germany reign over other countries and become the dominant force in world policy.

22. *Arische Rasse* (Arian race) described Hitler’s ideology of an “ideal race” that is of purely German/Northern European origin. Hitler himself denied his own non-Arian ancestors.

23. *Auschwitz* has become a symbol for the Holocaust as the name of an especially cruel KZ (*Konzentrationslager*/ Concentration camp).

24. Tillich, 231. See Note 6, Tillich’s understanding of the “New Being.”

25. Henry J. M. Nouwen, *Reaching Out: The Three Movements of the Spiritual Life* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 72. “The paradox of hospitality is that it wants to create an emptiness, not a fearful emptiness, but a friendly emptiness where strangers can enter and discover themselves as created free; free to sing their own songs, speak their own languages, dance their own dances; free also to leave and follow their own vocations. Hospitality is not a subtle invitation to adopt the lifestyle of the host, but the gift of a chance for the guest to find his own.”

26. *Luke 24: 13 ff.*

27. Thomas W. Ogletree, *Hospitality to the Stranger* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 7f.

28. Parker Palmer, *The Company of Strangers* (New York: Crossroads, 1991), 69.

Learning through Play, Dialogue, and Conflict: An Educational Theory for the Supervision of Clinical Pastoral Education Students

Dorothea Lotze-Kola

INTRODUCTION

“Clinical Pastoral Education” involves three dimensions of learning. The “Clinical” dimension is learning based on the practice of pastoral care in a clinical context. The “Pastoral” dimension includes the development of pastoral identity and competence and identifies it as a spiritual endeavor. “Education” means that students commit to learning when they enter the program. To accomplish this learning, students need a facilitating environment. The supervisor serves as host and facilitator, always standing in the dialectic tension of offering hospitality while holding students accountable for their work within the clinical system and for their own learning process. Learning itself is fundamentally a relational process that develops in dialectic tension between freedom and structure, trust and anxiety, play

Dorothea Lotze-Kola, M.Div., is an Associate Supervisor of ACPE for the North Atlanta Tri-Hospital CPE Center at St. Joseph’s Hospital of Atlanta in Atlanta, Georgia.

and conflict, experience and reflection, and then experience with the experience and reflection on the reflection.

To highlight the particularity of my educational theory, I will first talk about my educational vision of CPE as play and cross-cultural learning based on my biography. I will then introduce the work of D. W. Winnicott, who sees learning as playing. CPE students are adult learners who enter a transitional space of potential play. It is left to be seen for each student how much playfulness is possible and if the facilitating environment will become a trustworthy environment. However, even if certain students do not find access to their ability to play, Donald Schön's educational theory—relational learning—offers a complementary model to that of Winnicott. Schön sees learning taking place in dialogue between supervisor and student. His pragmatic-reflective method is aimed specifically at professional development and sees the supervisor more as “coach” and less as Winnicott's “good enough mother.” Each student needs a different style of relational engagement with the supervisor. As students deal with their anxiety related to this experiential and relational way of learning, their unconscious defenses get activated. Wilfred Bion's group theory is based on the students' defensive “basic assumptions.” He informs my supervisory practice in the group context. His theory guides me in working with those unconscious reactions and integrating them into the learning process. I will use a concrete example to show how I use these theories in the CPE learning process with students. Additionally, I will talk about the evaluation process in light of my educational theories, and I will end with a concluding statement.

PLAYFUL AND CROSS-CULTURAL LEARNING—A BIOGRAPHICAL FRAMEWORK

My personal childhood experiences have become a symbol for me of how learning happens under the best conditions. Learning as a child was equal with playing. As I grew up in a small town parsonage in Germany, my facilitating environment was nature and my family. Parks, forests, and a huge parking lot between our parsonage and the church building surrounded our home. I would play daily with my three siblings and up to ten neighborhood kids. We would explore our limits by jumping, running, and roller-skating. We would create fantasy worlds and we would role-play. Life was filled with creativity and imagination. Learning happened unintentionally through experience and in relationships. Learning was playing. The

crucial facilitating conditions for playing were the parsonage and my mother as my home base. When I needed something, I would run inside, and there would be a parental presence. This assurance made playing possible. Returning home after playing, we would tell our mother about our experiences. Fights and conflicts were processed, victories celebrated, and declarations made about how the next day would be spent. Our learning was play and playing was how we learned.

At the age of nineteen, I began to open my heart and mind to different cultures, languages, and lifestyles. Once again, my family and friends were home base that gave me increasing courage to explore more, learn more, and encounter life in its diversity. Traveling became another form of playfully engaging life. My life expanded continuously. As I had internalized my home base, I began to trust that I would keep my identity even when living in another culture. My learned openness to diversity made me decide to live permanently in the United States. My life is enriched by a cross-cultural marriage and by my work in a multicultural environment. Reflecting on my personal learning story, I treasure CPE as a home base and as transitional space for cross-cultural¹ learning. As a German supervisor, I want to be cognizant of and to sensitize my students to cross-cultural respect and awareness. My vision of learning is that it will become transformational and informed by “a spirit of intellectual (and spiritual and emotional [my addition]) openness that celebrates diversity, welcomes dissent, and rejoices in collective dedication to truth.”²

D. W. WINNICOTT’S THEORY OF LEARNING AS PLAYING

In this section, I will explore Winnicott’s theory of how humans learn and relate it to my own experience. The place where learning happens is often seen as either in object relationships or in the inner life of the individual. Winnicott offers a third concept. Learning as play and as cultural experience according to him happens in the intermediate zone, in a transition space. This third area “is a product of the experiences of the individual person (baby, child, adolescent, adult) in the environment”³ that is safe enough. Winnicott’s theory implies that not only children, but also adults learn and develop best through play in transitional spaces.

I am using the terms “facilitating environment” and “good enough mother” to describe this intermediate and potential space. The good enough mother mirrors the child and engages in a playful form of communication.⁴ This transitional space leaves room for transitional objects.⁵ The mother engages in the illusionary

omnipotence of the child, as if the child has created the transitional object. If the mother can play, the child has the experience of magical control. The confidence in the mother makes an intermediate playground. The child assumes that the person who loves is reliable and available, and continues to be available when remembered even after having been physically absent. This loving person is felt to “mirror” and reflect back what happens in the playing,⁶ which is necessary for experiences to come together for the child. This mirroring takes time, yet it is crucial in aiding the individual to come together and exist as a unit; not as a defense against anxiety but as expression of the “true self” as “I am, I am alive, I am myself.”⁸

The mother’s task is to gradually disillusion the child of her omnipotence and that of the child. Through mirroring and gradual disillusionment, the child finds her or his identity that enables engagement in cultural experience.⁹ Winnicott indicates that adults learn and play verbally in their choice of words, in the inflections of their voice, and in their sense of humor. Only with play is communication possible, as we use our whole personality when we play. “Playing means becoming an ‘original poet’ and finding the familiar in the unfamiliar.”¹⁰ This is often the case in CPE.

As a CPE supervisor, I see myself as an educator who facilitates the students’ learning through a process of reciprocal play. The environment of individual supervision and of the CPE group at its best becomes a transitional space for students. The group serves as a playground and container for the group’s learning through playing. Playing as learning in the CPE context means processing and working things out in play and finding transitional objects. All papers that students write resemble such transitional objects,¹¹ in that they reflect the experiences that connect subjective experience with objective relationships. In individual supervision, for example, the students practice how to playfully use such a transitional space as they present weekly transitional objects (e.g., verbatims, journals) to the supervisor. The supervisor mirrors back to the students in the function of a “good enough mother” and gradually also disillusiones the students. This experience, naturally, involves frustration.

A more challenging form of learning occurs when students offer transitional objects (e.g., verbatims, self-evaluations) to the group. The feedback offered by peers is the necessary mirroring that the students need to learn more about themselves. As students praise each other’s strengths, they touch on original feelings of omnipotence. As they point out each other’s weaknesses, they trigger

feelings of disillusionment. As a “good enough mothering” object, I try to keep the balance between enough safety and acceptance and enough challenge and distance.

A limitation of Winnicott’s theory is that not every student has the capacity to trust enough for reciprocal play to be possible. Also, not every learning issue is necessarily a playful matter. At times there are very serious issues and emotions involved that need to be addressed and worked through. In those moments, I need to draw on theories that include conflict and that leave room for other ways of relational engagement.

D. SCHÖN’S THEORY OF THE REFLECTIVE PRACTITIONER

The theory of Donald Schön seems to balance the weaknesses of Winnicott’s approach. Like Winnicott, Schön is also relational, creative, and imaginative, but he focuses more on the cognitive reflecting-in-action dynamic of an adult learner. His theory requires a certain level of trust as well, but the supervisory serves more as a “coach” and instructor than as a “good enough mother” object. Schön sees learning as a dialogue between coach and student and as a reciprocal chain of reflection-in-action. The coach and student engage in a combination of telling and listening, as well as demonstrating and imitating. “Questioning, answering, advising, listening, demonstrating, observing, imitating, criticizing—all are chained together so that one intervention or response can trigger or build on another.”¹²

Schön describes a four level “ladder of reflection.” CPE students “design” as they engage pastorally in relationships in the clinical context. Their description and reflection of this “designing” is done in verbatims and journals and together with the supervisor.¹³ The fourth—or “meta”—level is where coach and student engage in reciprocal “reflection on reflection on description of designing.”¹⁴ Student and coach dialogue in a reciprocal learning process that moves back and forth among the four levels. As supervisor and coach, I need to learn ways of showing and telling that will relate to the peculiar qualities of the student before me. I need to learn how to assess a student’s particular difficulties and potentials, and test how the student responds to my interventions.¹⁵ The student in the supervisory relationship needs to learn operative listening and reflective imitation. As students reflect on their own “knowing in action,” they also listen to and make sense of the supervisor’s comments.¹⁶ Afterwards, the students return to their clinical areas to practice and “design” again as pastoral care providers. They increasingly become

professional practitioners as they go out and encounter certain types of situations again and again,¹⁷ and then come back to dialogue, describe, and reflect with their coaching supervisor and with their peer group.

LEARNING IN GROUPS: W. BION

As students engage in dialogue with their peers, the peer group becomes the second facilitating environment for CPE students' reflection-in-action. Wilfred Bion's paradigm suggests that any educational group-as-a-whole is a phenomenon, a process in response to authority and group survival. He describes how each group consists of two groups: the conscious "work group"¹⁸ and the subconscious "basic assumption group."¹⁹ The high anxiety within a small group context stems from the scars and wounds from a person's dependency period in early life. One could say that the first eighteen months of life are acted out in the group. Each student has her or his own valency²⁰ in responding to anxiety. Students bind their anxiety in compensatory behavior. The three main responses to anxiety are dependency, pairing, or fight/flight reactions.²¹ Splitting, projecting, and projecting, and projective identification are other means of not having to feel one's ambivalence and anxiety.²²

The group task is to become aware of the basic assumptions and to experience their impact on the group. As the basic assumption group surfaces, anxiety reactions and conflicts between group members and the group leader occur. As group leader, I am often the recipient of the students' projections. In wondering with them about their behavior, in playfully unmasking it, or in confronting it, I give those projections back to the students. In consciously working through basic assumptions and projections, the working group emerges. Students experiment and slowly build trust that their "ego" can be activated in the midst of dealing with their basic assumptions. The working group's constant theme and task are staying connected and creating a distinct entity.

The group leader becomes the container and consultant, assisting the individuals and the group-as-a-whole to become self-reflective. The leader also supports the learning that the energies of the basic assumptions do not have to threaten or overwhelm the group. As conflicts are lived through as a consequence of surfacing basic assumptions energies, the group learns to identify and work with them rather than suppressing them. On the other hand, the basic assumptions group

should never get completely disconnected from the work group task, which would mean group regression. As supervisor, I need to engage the students on an “ego” level, so that they become curious about the anxiety reactions acted out in group. As the group’s trust grows in allowing the basic assumptions to be experienced and integrated, the group members have these basic energies available to work as an educational working group. Another of my tasks as supervisor is to go through a disillusionary process with the students. As I disappoint the students as the group leader, I need to hold the students’ aggressive feelings and keep contact with them without reacting. As I hold the students’ aggressions and do not personalize them, the group members test my boundaries and those of the group. As the group becomes a safe container for learning, students try to negotiate their role in the group. Through all of this the working group emerges, and the group members do not need me as much in my leading function as they did in the beginning.²³

The strength of Bion’s group theory is that it sharpens my awareness of how primary relational conflicts get reenacted in the context of the group. Bion’s theory balances and complements Winnicott’s and Schön’s theories, which focus more on the individual learner. However, I am also aware of the limitations of Bion’s group theory. Based on my theology of mutual hospitality and on my deeply relational theories of personality and learning, I maintain that only a small percentage of the supervisor’s interventions need to be group ones. Their purpose is only to remove some obstacle that has arisen to obstruct the progress of the entire group. I do not agree with Bion that everything in the group happens based on authority issues.²⁴ The danger of Bion’s leader-centered interpretations is that they may result in a leader-centered group. I see it as problematic when the group leader’s sole or even chief procedural task becomes group interventions. I am also cautious of Bion’s tendency to anthropomorphize the group. In my opinion and practice, the CPE group supervisor has the vital function of role modeling and participating in relational learning, in addition to interpreting the group-as-a-whole.

PRACTICED APPLICATION OF THE THEORIES

I now want to give a concrete example of how I use the theories in my practice with students. The group that I want to focus on has six group members—one male and five female students. They are all European-American and between 24 and 55 years of age. Ann²⁵ is a 55-year-old former Catholic nun. She left her order about ten

years ago. She now lives with a partner and has held a statewide management position at a Christian organization for several years. Early in the group process, Ann discovers that she is the oldest and that most of her peers are theologically more conservative than she is. She begins to feel like an outsider. In individual supervision she mentions her fear when being vulnerable and her need for self-protection and emotional withdrawal. She admits to having thought about quitting the process.

Ann's peers learn about her sexual orientation during the beginning phase of storytelling, which causes personal and theological issues for two Southern Baptist students, Debby and Tom. After sharing her personal story, Ann openly addresses the tension that exists between Southern Baptists and the gay community. Tom immediately denies his identification with his denominational group and express full acceptance of Ann.

Debby, however, is frustrated about Tom's adapting behavior. She is disturbed and confused about Ann's sexual orientation, especially as the both originally come from large Roman Catholic families. Debby chooses to not reveal her thoughts and feelings in the group. In individual supervision, Debby confesses her strong feelings about Ann's lifestyle. Because of her own judgmental feelings, Debby states that none of her peers would ever be her friends. In a strong transference toward me, she adds that only I as her supervisor understand her. While Ann is wrestling with the feeling of being rejected, Debby wrestles with her attitude of rejecting.

My supervisory response in individual supervision is to take Schön's approach in listening to Ann's concerns. I coach her in asking questions and in making her reflect on her hints of possibly leaving the program. I wonder aloud about her disillusionment and need for protection. I ask Ann to describe and reflect on what she would gain by leaving the group and the program and what she would lose. After Ann listens and responds to my questions and allows some feelings to surface, I invite her to take her concerns to the group.

In individual supervision with Debby, I take Winnicott's approach in inviting her to role-play with me: "Imagine I am Ann. Tell me how you feel and engage me around your issues. What questions do you have for me?" As we practice, I invite Debby to bring her issues to the group as well.

I assess that Debby and Ann have already reached the point of identifying their issues and owning their primary feelings. Their challenge will now be to engage each other and the group around their differences and disillusionment. Their task is to expand their risk-taking from individual supervision to the group context.

As they use individual supervision as a “home base” and me as a practicing relationship, the group context can become another transitional space where anxieties and conflicts are experienced and worked through.

In individual supervision with Tom, I use both Schön and Winnicott as I try to assist him in accessing his feelings and also reflecting on his background. I ask him: “How do you think and feel about the Southern Baptists’ response to the gay community? What is your greatest fear and what is your hope of being with Ann in a peer group?” As he dares to access his thoughts and feelings with me, his next step of learning will be to engage in the group’s dynamic. As Tom risks encountering conflict and possibly getting disillusioned, he will learn more about himself and the others in the group. This goes for all group members.

BION, WINNICOTT, AND SCHÖN APPLIED TO GROUP SUPERVISION

In the context of this specific group, I see the need for three supervisory functions at three different times. First, with Bion, I will have to contain the group’s anxiety, which I do in setting boundaries.²⁶ As a group consultant, I will need to monitor the group’s process-as-a-whole and comment on certain group phenomena. Second, with Winnicott, I will at times need to mirror the group members’ feelings and assist them in engaging each other through conflict and hostility. And third, with Schön, I will need to become the group’s coach in assisting them in reflecting on their (inter-) actions.

So far, the three students I have mentioned are confronted with their basic assumptions while the other three group members seem to remain uninvolved and in the background as spectators. I will need to pay attention and see if their passivity is based on projective identification. They might be engaging in an avoidance strategy of not having to feel their own anxiety, but letting the other three students express their feelings for them. I will need to practice optimum frustration in naming the avoidance as a group phenomenon, and thus challenge the three others to also face their anxieties and join the group’s process.

The individual students of the group have only developed a trusting relationship with me. They still need me to be their “holding environment.” I assume that this is the reason they do not yet choose to project feelings of aggression or anger on me. It seems, though, that Ann has become the recipient of projection, which heightens her anxiety level in the group. She responds first with

fight (bringing up the conflict between gays and fundamentalists) and later with flight (thinking about quitting the program). Tom's anxiety shows in his compliance and dependency reaction (denying a difference in opinion between Ann and himself). Debby binds her anxiety in two ways—first by splitting and second by trying to pair up with me as group leader. She is then frustrated that neither Tom nor I will pair up with her in her projection toward Ann.

In a later group session, Ann and Debby have a short but sharp interaction that is not immediately resolved or worked through. The whole group decides to flee the conflict. As I have so far mostly chosen a relationally involved stance with the group, I am now in danger of unconsciously getting entangled in basic assumptions and in the “group flight.” Upon reflection, I decide for supervisory intervention. I see the need to utilize Bion's theory and become the group's consultant. I bring the conflict up in wondering aloud about it as a group phenomenon. As I am offering myself as a container, the students accept my invitation and successfully work through the conflict. Learning takes place as each of the six group members reflects on his or her feelings and reaction to what happened. As the group works through its basic assumptions, it takes a step toward being a working group. As the group painfully works through conflict, they move toward group cohesiveness. At the same time the diversity of the students has become a more conscious reality.

EVALUATING THE STUDENTS' LEARNING PROCESS

My criteria for evaluating students are based on the concept of learning as a process in relationship and on a holistic understanding of learning.²⁷ As supervisor, I try to do the admission interviews myself, which serves the student and myself as an initial assessment of the student's particularities and possible strengths and weaknesses as a learner. The unit begins with the students developing their learning goals as initial self-assessment. These are then discussed and mutually agreed on in the context of supervision. The two main questions in this negotiation are: “What are the student's learning goals and what are the student's learning needs?”

The next step are one of the most important tools in the evaluation process is the learning covenant between supervisor and student. Different expectations on both sides need to be assessed relatively early into the educational process and constantly renegotiated. In reviewing the students' learning goals and learning

covenants, I continuously assess the students' learning process. The students evaluate their own learning process as well. They write mid-unit evaluations that share their learning needs and goals with the group. The group then holds the individual students additionally accountable in their learning processes.

In my final supervisory evaluation, I summarize my assessment and describe each student's style of learning. I evaluate the student's relational behavior at the beginning, during, and at the conclusion of the unit, as well as in individual supervision, the group, and self-reported ministry interactions. I also look for certain outcomes. What were the student's level of involvement and quality of educational work as well as their quality and relational effectiveness of ministry? I take the student's own learning evaluation (the mid-unit and final evaluation) and agree or disagree with the student's self-assessment. Finally, I re-assess the student's learning needs. In a way, I am repeating the initial diagnostic phase now at the end of the CPE unit. This assessment of the students' learning strengths and growing edges can become the springboard for the student—and for a possible future supervisor—to continue with the learning process.

CONCLUSION

Although Ann, Tom, and Debby are all European-Americans, they become aware of their diversity (in sexual orientation, age, and religious affiliation) and engage in "cross-cultural" relationships. They struggle with the tension between the Southern Baptist denomination and the gay and lesbian community. CPE becomes a container and a facilitating environment for the sometimes painful process of "cross-cultural" learning. Students gradually learn from each other as conflicts arise, fueled by their anxiety, prejudices, assumptions, and different moral and theological values. My hope as CPE supervisor is that students will learn to stay in relationship despite their differences and learn from each other. I also hope that they will let this increasing cross-cultural awareness inform their work as pastoral care providers. Even as I am aware of my educational vision, I also realize that our human estrangement limits our capacity to accept and love each other and ourselves. However, there will be moments when God becomes incarnate as inclusive community.²⁸ There will be encounters with patients, supervisors, and peers, where God as "unity in diversity"²⁹ will inspire students to speak up and find their counter-cultural and prophetic voice. My educational goal for CPE students is

that they play, imitate, and struggle to find their pastoral identity and competence on the border of cultural values and spiritual truth.³⁰

NOTES

1. I am using the term “cross-cultural” in the broadest sense of the word. One needs to make an intentional effort in learning to “cross over,” to connect with, and learn from someone who is different.

2. bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* (New York: Routledge, 1994). hooks emphasizes that the important initial stage of transformation is “that historical moment when one begins to think critically about the self and identity in relation to one’s political circumstance,” 47. I agree with the author in that multicultural learning is not only something to celebrate, but can also be painful. “There can be, and usually is, some degree of pain involved in giving up old ways of thinking and knowing and learning new approaches,” 43.

3. D. W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (New York, Tavistock Publications, 1986), 107.

4. *Ibid.*, 48.

5. The transitional object is not an internal object (which is a mental concept), nor is it outside control as the real mother is. The use of the first “not-me” possession gives room for the process of becoming able to accept difference and similarity, *ibid.*, 6. The child experiences a paradox that needs to be accepted, tolerated, and respected in that the child feels omnipotent and thinks it created the object while it is being given to the child, *ibid.*, xii. The term transitional object and transitional space describes the infant’s journey from a purely subjective to objectivity, *ibid.*, 6.

6. *Ibid.*, 47.

7. D. W. Winnicott, *The Maturational Processes and the Facilitating Environment* (New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1986), 141-149. The true self is the central part of a person that is powered by instincts. The “Id-satisfaction” becomes a very important strengthener of the ego, the true self. Only the true self can be creative and feel real. The true self appears as soon as there is any mental organization of the individual at all and it means little more than the summation of sensori-motor aliveness.

8. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality*, 56.

9. D. W. Winnicott, *Home Is Where We Start From* (New York: Pelican Books, 1986), 36. As the child develops a high degree of trust in the potential space between child and the mother, “health can be shown to have a relationship with living, with inner wealth, and, in a different way, with the capacity to have cultural experience.”

10. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality*, 38.

11. I am using Winnicott’s concept of the transitional object playfully. I do not so much look at the function of the transitional object, which is to keep the child emotionally connected to the mother. However, I am using the term transitional object in the CPE context in its process character, as the child combines subjective feelings with an object and thus is able to integrate and learn to distinguish inner and outer reality.

12. Donald Schön, *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987), 114.

13. In supervision, the students have an experience with the clinical experience in a mutual learning process.

14. Schön, 115.

15. Students also learn in dialogue with the supervisor to reflect on their reflection.

16. Some of the more challenging interventions are Clarification, Confrontation, and Interpretation. See Personality Theory Paper.

17. Schön, 118.

18. Donald Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983), 60.

19. Joan E. Hemenway, *Inside the Circle: A Historical and Practical Inquiry Concerning Process Groups in Clinical Pastoral Education* (Decatur, GA: Journal of Pastoral Care Publications, 1996), 155. “The organized or Work (W) group is characterized by structure and organization, its ability to cooperate and engage in the necessary rational mental activity to accomplish a goal and learn through experience (reality).”

20. Ibid. “The unorganized or Basic Assumption (BA) group forms out of a ‘pool’ into which ‘anonymous contributions are made, and through which the impulses and desires implicit in these contributions are gratified.’ It is a closed system in which leadership is idealized and set roles are established to meet unconscious needs.”

21. Wilfred R. Bion, *Experiences in Groups* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1961), 116. Valency means the individual's readiness to enter into combination with the group in making and acting on the basic assumptions. If a person's capacity for combination is great, Bion speaks of high valency, if small of a low valency.

22. Bion, *Experience in Groups*, 93. Splitting means that "the individual, supported by the group, tries to keep the goodness of the group isolated from its badness." Winnicott, *Home Is Where We Start From*, 72. Projection and Introjection are mental mechanisms that "constitute the main relationship of the individual to the world." See Personality Theory Paper, Note 19, regarding "projective identification."

23. This part of Bion's theory resembles Winnicott's idea of how a transitional object functions. The group supervisor serves as a transitional object and the group will need him or her increasingly less for its functioning. Winnicott describes this process as the "good enough mother" disillusioning or "weaning" the child, which I transfer symbolically to my task as CPE supervisor in the group context.

24. Irvin D. Yalom, *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1975) Chapter 5. I am agreeing here with Yalom who informs my critique of Bion.

25. This name and the other two students' names have been changed to protect their identity.

26. Setting boundaries in Bion's theory means keeping the group time or setting basic group norms.

27. With "holistic" I mean learning in several dimensions: relational, emotional, cognitive, experiential, and in community, as I addressed with the help of the three earlier introduced theorists.

28. See "God as hospitable community," in my Theological Theory Paper.

29. Ibid.

30. Paul Tillich, *Auf der Grenze: Aus dem Lebenswerk Paul Tillichs* (Stuttgart, Germany: Evangelisches Verlagswerks, 1962). Paul Tillich claims that all theological reflection needs to take place "auf der Grenze" (on the border) between culture and religion.

Personality from an Object Relations Perspective: A Personality Theory for the Supervision of Clinical Pastoral Education Students

Dorothea Lotze-Kola

THE RELATIONAL AND THE SPIRITUAL DIMENSION

Once a person is born, that person discovers his or her identity through primary relationships. The way a person is received and responded to determines how this person will receive and respond to the world and form secondary relationships. As a person grows up, certain fixations¹ might occur during the maturational process. These fixations influence and limit a person's relational abilities. However, an awareness of the spiritual dimension of life can lead to an awareness of a deeper relational capacity within every human being, which is essential. We can think of this quality as "already in us, an imprint of wholeness and divinity that is fully encompassing, but we must also see it as a 'potentiality striving to become realized in us.'"² It is this essential human relational capacity that gives hope and affirms a person's potential for maturation and wholeness beyond the existential (and often not good enough) primary relational experiences.

I. PSYCHOLOGICAL BIRTH—A RELATIONAL PROCESS

This theory paper applies Margaret Mahler's³ and Donald W. Winnicott's⁴ object relations theories to the CPE setting. Object relations theory is based on a deeply

Dorothea Lotze-Kola, M.Div., is an Associate Supervisor of ACPE for the North Atlanta Tri-Hospital CPE Center at St. Joseph's Hospital of Atlanta in Atlanta, Georgia.

relational principle of growth and maturation and builds on intricate relationships, which we have within us. The terminology in object relations theory is somewhat different from classical psychoanalytic terminology. For example, an *external object* is a person, a place, or thing that is invested with emotional energy; an *internal object* is an idea, fantasy, or memory pertaining to a person, place, or thing; and the term *Self* refers to conscious and unconscious mental representations that pertain to one's own person. Someone viewed by an outside observer is not a *Self*, but a person. An *object relations unit* is a *Self*-representation and an internal object connected by a drive or affect. When the distinction between *Self* and object in an *object relations unit* is unclear, it is called a *Self-object*. The ego is an abstraction denoting the mental functions of differentiation, integration, balancing, and organizing in the realms of perception, memory, cognition, emotions, actions, and the demands of conscience. "It is the perceiver within the perceiver, which we can never know."⁵

The Phases and Subphases of the Psychological Birth of the Human Infant

In theological terms, the process of the psychological birth could be described as a journey from being at home ("symbiosis"), to becoming a stranger ("separation"), to mutual hospitality ("interdependence and object constancy").⁶ According to Mahler's theory, a child's growth takes place in an orderly sequence, with more differentiated and integrated structures and functions emerging from more crudely organized structures and functions. The first phase of a child's life is *Normal Autism (0-1 month)*, where objects are irrelevant and the child seems to remain in a psychological shell. The next phase is *Normal Symbiosis (2-6 months)*, where the child develops an emerging awareness of *Self* and object, often the mother, and begins to form two poles of the dyadic unity. The third phase is divided into three subphases which a child has to master on her or his way to *Separation and Individuation (6-24 months)*. In the *Hatching Subphase (6-10 months)*, the child becomes increasingly aware of the mother as a separate entity. In the *Practicing Subphase (10-16 months)*, the child's motor and cognitive skills increase, allowing the child to run off from the mother, as if the world is all hers or his. In a growing awareness of his or her own separateness and helplessness, the child enters the *Rapprochement Subphase (16-24 months)*, in which the child moves forward and backward, separates from and returns to the mother, demands independence and is yet dependent. As the rapprochement phase resolves, the child shows an increased confidence in the mother's continued loving presence despite her occasional absences. This ability marks the fourth phase of the child's psychological birth, which is the development of *Object Constancy and Individuality (24-36+ months)*.

The ability to retain an image of the mother as primarily gratifying but also frustrating is called emotional object constancy. The child develops a more stable and complex sense of individuality along with this increasingly stable sense of the object.⁷

Intrapsychic and Interpersonal Mechanisms That Remain Throughout Life

It is very interesting to see that the observations of infantile phases and subphases are paralleled by intrapsychic and interpersonal mechanisms that can be observed as people grow and change. These interpersonal mechanisms play a major role in the CPE learning process. Students get to know themselves better as they understand how they establish their sense of *Self* in relation to peers, supervisor, staff, patients, and families. There are striking parallels between the interactions of students with their supervisor and the behavior of healthy children in relation to their parents. One goal of the CPE training is the student's increased capacity to differentiate *Self* from object and to integrate good and bad experiences.⁸ As children develop, so also adults start out with the less refined mechanisms (e.g., projection, introjection, splitting, idealization, and devaluation), and develop more complex mechanisms (e.g., projective identification and transitional object formation). The most highly developed mechanisms are object constancy and mature identification. Although these mental functions can be placed on a continuum from less to more mature, none of them disappears from our psychological repertoire.⁹

The CPE process assists students in identifying their use of intrapsychic and interpersonal mechanisms, with the goal of developing more differentiated forms of relating. CPE students begin to explore their personal psychological birth process and their psychological maturation process. Only then can unresolved relational conflicts and fixations be worked through. This work is done in individual supervision and in the context of the CPE group. It is important that students learn to identify their relational issues rather than remaining unconscious about how they relate and trying to solve their unresolved issues in current relationships, including patients and family members. Becoming a mature and integrated pastor means becoming differentiated and consciously working through developmental issues that would otherwise negatively influence one's ministry and pastoral relationships. Supervisory and group work in CPE offer "corrective emotional experiences"¹⁰ that enable students to mature and move away from developmental fixations. The therapeutic dimension of CPE serves and nurtures its educational function, as it liberates and teaches students to become better differentiated and more mature persons and pastoral care providers.

II. PSYCHOLOGICAL MATURATION—A RELATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Any theory is only as good as it proves to be in practice. That is why I now want to develop my personality theory in the context of a specific example. While focusing on the concrete, I am constantly aiming at the general application of my personality theory.

Tim¹¹ was a 34-year-old white male CPE intern. He was the youngest of three children, and both of his parents worked when Tim was two years old. Tim's earliest memory was of an accident that happened when his two older siblings were supposed to watch him one afternoon. Tim wandered off and nearly lost one of his fingers in a machine in the basement. Tim wrote in his autobiography: After that accident, "I developed a need to be better than my brother and sister, and I had a deep desire to prove myself worthy of people's love." Another existential message that Tim gained from this accident was: "I am not worth paying attention to. I need to make it on my own."¹²

In his CPE group as well as in his pastoral care encounters, Tim often seemed to check out of conversations. He would be physically present, but mentally and emotionally absent. Tim wrote in his final evaluation, "I allowed others to dominate the conversation and as a result I withdrew"... "in this group, I often had needs and waited to see if others would meet those needs rather than taking care of myself and making sure that my needs were met." Tim initially had difficulties being with and listening to patients. He seemed preoccupied with his own needs and feelings, such as tiredness or anxiousness. Reflecting on me as his supervisor, Tim wrote in his final evaluation: "The first couple of weeks I thought that my supervisor was too emotionally detached and that I would never get to know her. I experienced my supervisor as being cold and withdrawn outside of group and that frustrated me."

Analysis of Tim's Developmental and Relational Issues

At the age of two, Tim must have been in between Mahler's rapprochement phase and the development of object constancy. Due to his parents' frequent absence and the traumatic accident, Tim seemed to have developed a deep ambivalence about individuating. His dependency needs and protection needs were not adequately met. Tim seemed to force himself to be independent, while mistrusting his parents after having experienced them as not "good enough."¹³ He began to compete with his older siblings, and thus lost a sense of community with them. He tried to get his needs met through proving to be successful. In missing the experience of object constancy, he remained fixated in the rapprochement phase. His stance toward life became one of forced self-dependency and ambivalent object relations with parents

and siblings. Tim's ways of relating in the CPE context paralleled his childhood experience. He began CPE trying to prove that he was competent and independent. Because Tim did not trust others with his feelings or needs, he kept them to himself. When visiting patients, Tim seemed unable to deal with patients' feelings. He seemed to lose the distinction between other persons and himself. Patients became a *Self*-object for Tim, more so than an object. In the patients' feelings and needs, Tim tried to find himself. Instead of being able to care for and listen to patients, he became easily overwhelmed and seemed preoccupied with his own need to be cared for, something he could not consciously allow himself. As another way of establishing himself in relationships, Tim tried to prove himself as a hero in front of the staff in order to gain their approval. He then often over-functioned or became triangulated between patients and staff.

The Relationship Between Student and Supervisor

As a CPE supervisor, I provide a background onto which the student projects his or her fantasies of internal *Self*- and object images, which is called *transference*. It is my job to identify and interpret the transference and projections as elements of the student's internal life. I need to be aware that while the student has transference toward me, I also remain a real object and person and that my actions or interactions have implications for the students. The students take in my personal characteristics as their supervisor through introjection and identification. Winnicott describes these relational aspects as "the container and the contained," as "facilitating environment," and as "good enough mothering."¹⁴ While the students have unconscious transference, the supervisor deals with countertransference.¹⁵ Object relations theory has defined the latter as the supervisor's unconscious (and then made conscious) emotional response to a student. As such, countertransference may be a valuable clue about what kind of feelings a student tends to bring out in others. As a supervisor, I need to know my *Self* well and to be differentiated enough to be able to discern what the student brings to supervision and what I as the supervisor bring to it. Tim brought out in me the feelings of wanting to take care of him, though he distanced himself in the beginning. He also tried to please me, which activated some impatience in me. I realized that he reminded me of a man I dated when I was in my early twenties. When I became conscious of my personal emotional involvement, I could differentiate myself and be truly present with Tim.

The Supervisory Art of “Hospitality” and “Challenging”

There are two ways in which the CPE supervisor attends to students. Both are meant to support students emotionally and to help them cognitively to overcome developmental fixations.

The first part of the necessary supervisory stance is the art of hospitality. As I held Tim in my attention, I sensed that he had experienced a chronic failure in parental presence and empathy, which seemed to contribute to his low self-esteem. I hoped that Tim might be able to overcome some of this history by my offering a “facilitating and holding environment.”¹⁶ I mirrored his feelings¹⁷ and attended to them respectfully and empathically. Because of Tim’s ambivalence toward his parental internal objects, I respected his distancing behavior and tried to titrate the closeness between us according to what his need seemed to be. Titrating the closeness¹⁸ involves entering into a student’s object world sufficiently to establish meaningful contact. Once such contact is achieved, the supervisor can gently help the student to clarify *Self*-other confusions and to develop a better idea of oneself in relation to other people. Both student and supervisor utilize positive projective identification, which can play an important role in their working relationship. As Tim’s supervisor, I tried to project my own *Self*- and object-images of a worthy and lovable human being onto Tim, who presented himself as less than worthy to be loved and cared for. I tried to influence him by treating him as that worthy and lovable person as I wanted him to learn to see himself. In so doing, I was engaging in positive projective identification.¹⁹ After a few weeks in which Tim tried to prove his independence and competence, he began to trust me enough to share feelings of fear, shame, and inadequacy. Tim began to allow his dependency needs to be known, and called this “the scared little boy” inside of him.

These hospitable aspects of supervision must be combined with the second supervisory stance, which consists of techniques and interventions that promote insight²⁰ and growth in a more challenging way. These techniques include clarification, confrontation, and interpretation, which facilitate the student’s growing awareness of *Self* as having a coherent identity, with both strengths and weaknesses. They also assist the development of a fuller and more consistent appreciation of others.²¹

Clarification in supervision can come from the interpretation of intrapsychic and interpersonal mechanisms. With Tim I tried to draw parallels between his early childhood experience and present-day behavior. To assist with clarification, I as the supervisor must also set limits without accepting either the student’s idealized or devalued projections as my own. Though Tim saw me as “emotionally detached”

for the first half of the unit, I was sure about my consistent emotional availability, which helped me to become aware of Tim's transference toward me.

Confrontation can be a necessary supervisory intervention. My personal style of confrontation with students is empathic yet clear. Negative transference and acting out, as well as scapegoating in the group setting, need to be confronted by me as the supervisor. Students engage in projective identification as they attribute aspects of *Self* and associated feelings onto me as supervisor or onto their peers. They then attempt to control these feelings in the other person(s). The supervisory task is to stay connected with students while clarifying the *Self*-object distinction and to assist students in claiming their feelings as their own. When Tim saw me as "emotionally detached" and "cold," he might have been projecting his own distancing behavior onto me. His fear of not being known might have been behind his expressed fear that he would never get to know me as his supervisor. Over the course of the unit I tried to point out his behavior and feelings to Tim and assisted him in claiming and integrating his feelings without having to project them onto others.

Interpretation is a helpful skill for pointing out connections and communicating observations that might assist students in gaining deeper insight into possible reasons for their behavior. For example, I interpreted Tim's need to behave like a hero as a way to compensate for his insecurity in his new role as a chaplain. While interpreting, I was very intentional to be non-judgmental and to value all of Tim's feelings and needs. This was a way for me to model (*Self*-)acceptance, which was meant to help Tim to "be-friend" his feelings and claim and integrate his needs. Over the course of the unit, Tim began to talk about his shortcomings and needs in supervision and in the group.²²

Object Relationships Between CPE Group Members

Primary object relational dynamics are not only lived out in individual supervision, but also in the group setting. Conflicts with dependence, differentiation, and interdependence are lived out, as students try to work through unresolved family issues. The group can serve as a fertile ground for a student's maturational process. In addition to parental issues, sibling conflicts (e.g., rivalry) may be lived out in the group context as well.²³ As Tim began to trust me as a constant object and learned to allow his needs and feelings to surface, he also became more trusting toward his peers. Temporary regression often serves as a way of reliving a certain phase of development that has not been successfully resolved. For example, during the final evaluation session, Tim regressed in talking about his "scared little boy" inside who needed a hug. Allowing a temporary regression, he asked the group for what he

needed. Another group member responded and provided Tim with a hug and accepting words. Later in that same session, Tim was able to give his peers constructive and critical feedback. In acknowledging and integrating his inner “scared little boy” with dependency needs, Tim matured and became able to differentiate and to access his interdependent adult *Self*. Tim’s relational skills with patients improved noticeably as well. He began to be present without having to prove himself. He learned to better differentiate his own feelings from the emotions of patients. As his trust in others and his self-esteem grew, his need to live out of his grandiose *Self* decreased.

III. SPIRITUAL RE-BIRTH²⁴—A TRANSCENDING RELATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Building on Winnicott’s idea of transitional objects and phenomena, Ana-Maria Rizzuto sees God as a special type of object representation. God is created from representational materials whose sources are the representations of primary objects. “As a transitional object representation God is always potentially available for further acceptance or further rejecting....The psychic process of creating and finding God—this personalized representational object—never ceases in the course of human life.”²⁵ Rizzuto’s book, *The Birth of the Living God*, describes how the child’s and the adult’s sense of self is consciously, pre-consciously or unconsciously affected by the representational traits of the individual’s private God.

As an example of the psychic process of creating and finding God, I want to describe how Tim’s emotional development was closely linked with his spiritual development. Once Tim became more emotionally available, he discovered relational learning to be spiritual and theological learning as well. As his supervisor, I affirmed his interpretations and witnessed how some relationships with patients had a symbolic quality and were deeply spiritual for Tim. One encounter in particular became something like a birthing experience for him. On one of his last days in the hospital, Tim visited a female cancer patient who tried to feed herself, although she felt weak and had a tremor in her hand. As he offered to support her, she accepted. When Tim took on the supportive role of a primary object, he discovered what “serving“ and “good enough mothering” means. He assisted the woman as she was eating, but did not take over. She allowed herself to be dependent on him, yet Tim did not hinder her in her own attempts. Tim was engaged in a successful rapprochement practice.

Reflecting on his experience, Tim found a deeper spiritual meaning in this encounter. The cancer patient had modeled an alternative way of resolving Tim's primary life struggle, which had been to be independent at any cost. In responding to the patient the way he did, Tim got in touch with the essential truth that God is patient and empowering, as Tim was able to be with the patient. In supervision, Tim tearfully shared his discovery and was able to integrate it. Tim's God representation was "updated" and changed through an emotionally corrective experience. This is only one example of Rizzuto's central thesis, with which I agree, "that God as a transitional representation needs to be recreated in each developmental crisis if it is to be found relevant for lasting belief."²⁶

SUMMARY

Tim's case shows how relational and spiritual learning are intertwined. The CPE learning process can happen on several relational levels simultaneously. Through establishing trusting relationships, students learn more about their psychological birth experience and their maturational process. They learn to identify their feelings and needs as well as their fixations and issues in relationships. In a hospitable and facilitating environment, students are able to have emotionally corrective experiences. These corrective experiences also happen through spiritual and symbolically significant encounters. When the deepest, essential dimension of a student gets involved in this maturational process, as in Tim's experience, the God image and God object presentation changes and grows. This growth happens as a spiritual birth experience and as a gift. Supervisory methods or techniques can only support and encourage; they cannot create this crucial element of learning. It is a moment in students' spiritual development when their relationship with God is re-born. As the students' relationship with God heals and grows, their ministry to patients and family members will reach new depths. They gain an increased ability to care for others and walk through conflict with them, as developmental and spiritual fixations are loosed. Ambivalence and mistrust are transformed into a deepened trust of others, *Self*, and God.

NOTES

1. Salvatore Maddi, *Personality Theories* (Pacific Grove, CA: The Dorsey Press. 1989), 69. At each stage the child must receive the optimal blend of gratification and frustration if fixations and developmental problems are to be avoided.

2. Sue Monk Kidd, *When the Heart Waits: Spiritual Direction for Life's Sacred Questions* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990), 51.
3. Margaret S. Mahler, E. Pine, and A. Bergman, *The Psychological Birth of the Human Infant* (New York: Basic Books, 1975).
4. Donald W. Winnicott, *The Maturation Processes and the Facilitating Environment* (New York: International Universities Press, 1965).
5. N. Gregory Hamilton, *Self and Others: Object Relations Theory in Practice* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1996), 29.
6. See Theology theory paper, *Theology of Hospitality*, Estrangement and the New Being, 1-2.
7. Hamilton, 57. Hamilton is based on Mahler, 1975.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., 119.
10. The term "Corrective emotional experiences" means that a person has an external relational experience that influences the internal object world in a positive and liberating way.
11. The student's name has been changed to protect his identity.
12. The student's quotations can be found in his autobiographical application materials and in his final evaluation documents from January 2000.
13. Michael St. Clair, *Object Relations and Self Psychology. An Introduction* (Belmont, Canada: Wadsworth, 2000), 66f. St. Clair describes Winnicott's concept of the good enough mother and the good enough environment.
14. Hamilton, 203.
15. Ibid., 235. "Countertransference was originally defined as the analyst's unconscious, infantile reaction to a patient. Freud considered it as something to be eliminated. In recent years, Object Relations theorists have recognized countertransference as an increasingly useful therapeutic tool."

16. St. Clair, 66.

17. D. W. Winnicott, "Mirror-role of Mother and Family in Child Development," In: *Playing and Reality* (New York: Basic Books, 1971), 111-118. "The mother conveys a mirroring frame of reference to which the primitive self of the infant adjusts. From these circular interactions emerge the characteristics of the child's personality. If the mother's mirroring is unpredictable or hostile, then the child has an unreliable frame of reference to check back to. This can disturb the child's self-esteem." St. Clair, 85.

18. Hamilton, 197.

19. Hamilton, 200.

20. *Ibid.*, 206. "Insight means a conscious and unconscious advance in self and object integration and differentiation. It is the bringing together of different feeling aspects of the self in relation to others in new and meaningful ways."

21. *Ibid.*, 234.

22. *Ibid.*, 233. "Patients [students] will soon enough become open about their own shortcomings, including grandiosity, if they feel the therapist [supervisor] values them."

23. One of the limitations of Mahler's and Winnicott's Object relations theory in the context of CPE becomes evident at this point, as it does not deal with the complex relationships of a family. My personality theory therefore needs to be complemented by Family systems theories, which assist in capturing the complex dynamics within CPE groups. See: Murray Bowen, *Family Therapy in Clinical Practice* (New York: Basic Books, 1986) and Edwin H. Friedman, *Generation to Generation* (New York: Guilford Press, 1985).

24. See *Theological Theory Paper: Theology of Hospitality*, God as Hospitable Community. The "Re-birth" motive is introduced as a symbol for the New Being in Jesus, the Christ.

25. Ana-Maria Rizzuto, *The Birth of the Living God. A Psychoanalytic Study* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), 179.

26. *Ibid.*, 209. "Each developmental stage has transitional objects appropriate for the age and level of maturity of the individual...God...if updated during each crisis of development, may remain so [a suitable object] through maturity and the rest of life."

Differentiated Solidarity: A Theory and Theology of Pastoral Supervision

Sarah M. Rieth

The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree, and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree.¹

Gandhi wrote these words to teach the practice of active nonviolence as a means of conflict resolution and as an antidote to violence. His words echo one of my own deepest commitments and are also a centering point for me in my work as a supervisor of pastoral counseling and pastoral care. The teaching and supervising of pastoral counseling and pastoral care is like careful seed-planting and nurturing, and the tree is the strong, grounded, fruitful pastoral counselor or pastoral care provider. Gandhi's words show the power of supervision as the isomorph² of therapy, and that real growth occurs when the means and the end are congruent.

My methodology of pastoral psychotherapy, supervision, and pastoral theological reflection uses a person's own experience as the starting place. Thus my own experiences in supervision are not only germane but are also the starting point for my offering theory and theology of supervision.

Sarah M. Rieth, D. Min. is a Pastoral Therapist and Supervisor for Methodist Counseling and Consultation Services in Charlotte, North Carolina.

MY JOURNEY FROM SEMINARIAN TO PASTORAL SUPERVISOR

Because of where I am in the history of the church and the history of pastoral counseling, I have had a number of negative experiences that have undergone healing and transformation. Much of my own early journey to this point in time has been one without maps and with some “seed nurturers” who had serious limitations in authenticating what they were teaching. As the first woman candidate for priesthood in my diocese, I entered seminary in 1974, before the Episcopal Church ordained women to the priesthood. I encountered great resistance to my vocation and experienced the kind of harassment and misogynist treatment that Carroll Saussy calls “gender/sexual abuse.”³ There were few women role models for me at that time. My pastoral counseling training took place in an AAPC-approved training center that is now out of business, in great part as a consequence of the sexual misconduct and other ethical boundary violations on the part of supervisors. I have worked in counseling centers where multiple relationships, violations of confidentiality, and other boundary violations were a norm. At times I was considered a troublemaker when I attempted to address these ethical problems through the proper channels. Yet I am not a “moral police officer.”⁴ I have experienced the temptation of erotic countertransference with clients and supervisees, and I know the sacrifice and discipline involved in maintaining my fiduciary role with those persons.⁵

These difficult situations have helped shape me as a priest, therapist, and supervisor. I have also been shaped and blessed by the healing presence of some gentle and wise seed nurturers on the journey. Through all of these relationships and experiences, and others as well, the mystery of God’s healing power has been made known within my own heart, as my early destructive experiences were transformed to become usable in my work as a therapist and supervisor. And they all provide significant motivation for my work as I grow in my desire to empower others and to teach and supervise and model an authenticating healing presence.⁶ This paper explains how, as a supervisor, I empower, teach, and authenticate healing presence.

My journey to this place has been one of differentiating myself and my practice of ministry from most of my earliest supervisors, while receiving and integrating those aspects of what they taught me by word and deed that are both life-giving and ethical. My seminary professor, James Ashbrook, frequently said, “Everything is usable.” This is a wise maxim for pastoral care, for pastoral

counseling, and for supervision. But it is more than that: it is a profound theological truth about the way God works in life. Although much of my own formation took place in environments where ethical boundary violations occurred as a matter of course, it has truly all been usable in the same way that vegetable trimmings and grass clippings can be added to a compost pile to create fertilizer for a new generation of plants. Helping that “new generation of plants” to grow and thrive is my work as a supervisor.

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

My primary psychological orientation is object relations, synthesized with systems theory.⁷ I came to value object relations early in my work as a pastoral counselor, when I saw many survivors of sexual abuse for psychotherapy. I was curious about why people who had been profoundly abused and traumatized are so attached to the abuser. With object relations I found a set of concepts that both enabled me to understand how this happens and to feel deeper empathy for the suffering and resiliencies of the client. I found that object relations and systems theories could be in meaningful dialogue with a life-giving spirituality for survivors of sexual abuse, and, this enabled me to learn how to assist survivors to build and internalize new objects and images of God.⁸

The self^p-in-context¹⁰ is the stance I take both as a therapist and as a supervisor. I have been influenced by the teaching of Otto Kernberg, Edwin Friedman, and the work of the Stone Center. The self-in-context is a way of understanding object relations in terms of both internal objects and external objects. It is a way of integrating both individual and systems perspectives. That is, each person in the room brings all of his or her own internal object relations to interact with every other, thus affecting the transference and countertransference chain reaction. And it takes seriously the depth and richness of social contexts, in which the client, therapist, and supervisor “live and move and have [their] being.”¹¹

In this paper, I will discuss the differentiated self-in-context of the supervisor in solidarity with the supervisee. This parallels and models the differentiated self of the therapist/pastoral care provider in solidarity with the client/patient. Essential to the self-in-context approach is the awareness of countertransference and parallel process, which are rich sources of information for the supervisor/therapist/pastoral care provider about what the supervisee/client/patient is experiencing; what needs

to be taught; what needs to be modeled; what needs to be healed; what boundaries need to be established; and what needs to be transcended.

While the term “countertransference” has numerous meanings¹² depending on a therapist’s theoretical orientation, I see countertransference as the full range of responses the supervisor/therapist/pastoral care provider has to the supervisee/client/patient. Equally essential to supervision from a self-in-context perspective is the awareness of parallel process, that is, the unconscious and mysterious way that the dynamics in the therapeutic or pastoral relationship are replicated in the supervision relationship. My job is to train the supervisee to transform intense affect to empathy, to work with parallel process in a way that is empowering to the client/patient, and to empower the supervisee increasingly to be able to self-supervise.

THE MYSTERY OF GOD’S PRESENCE IN LIFE

The self-in-context from a spiritual perspective may be seen in the profound work of Blaise Pascal, whose description of the “two infinities” has touched my life deeply. As a teenager in search of meaning, Pascal’s words opened me and led me to know and seek the mystery of God’s presence in all of life.

Nature is an infinite sphere whose center is everywhere, whose circumference is nowhere...Let man, coming back to himself, consider what he is in comparison with what is; let him consider himself as lost in this out-of-the-way corner of nature; and from this little cell in which he finds himself lodged (I mean our universe) let him learn to appreciate at their true worth the world, the kingdoms, the cities, and himself. What is man within the infinite?...But to present to him another marvel just as astonishing, let him seek in what he knows the most minute things. Let a mite offer him, in the minuteness of his body, parts incomparably smaller, limbs with joints, veins in its limbs, blood in its veins, humors in that blood, drops in those humors, vapors in those drops; then dividing these last things, let him exhaust his powers of imagination...I want to show him within that object a new abyss...an infinity of universes...Whoever will consider himself thus...suspended...between these two abysses of the infinitely great and the infinitely small,...will tremble at the sight of these marvels; and I believe that, his curiosity changing into marvelment, he will be more disposed to contemplate them in silence than to seek them out with presumption.¹³

Now as an adult I find Pascal's words helpful of as I seek the holy in all relationships, trust being held by God's power through the vicissitudes of life, and work with the two infinities with supervisees.

A seminal part of my theological understanding of the ministry of supervision is based in Jesus' farewell discourse in the Gospel of John. Jesus gives his followers hope that there is a real relationship, a real connection between him and them, a real presence despite physical absence, distance, or differentiation. He says, "On that day you will know that I am in the Father, and you in me, and I in you" (John 14:20, NRSV). And, "I made your name known to them, and I will make it known, so that the love with which you have loved me may be in them, and I in them" (John 17:26, NRSV). There is mutual indwelling, mutual object constancy. God's love is isomorphic with Jesus' love, just as Jesus' love is the isomorph for those who follow and love him. "By this [meaning love] we know that we abide in him and he in us, because he has given us of his spirit" (1 John 4.13, NRSV). One might also imagine this passage as a suggestion that the Trinity is an image of differentiated solidarity in the three aspects of God. It, too, is an image of the mutual indwelling—we live in God and God lives in us and through us. This is how I believe the seed becomes the tree.

As a supervisor and as a therapist I strive to authenticate that real presence, and to create an environment that is hospitable to growth, one in which the wholeness of the supervisee and his or her concerns may honestly and safely be brought into the consulting room. Growth, a deepening of roots, growing and deepening of role identity, and flourishing into full pastoral and therapeutic identity are facilitated when the supervisor brings that internal disposition of real presence to the supervisory relationship. Growth, deepening, and flourishing are goals in themselves, but this internal disposition of the supervisor also models for the therapist how to be a non-anxious,¹⁴ real presence with clients. My hope is that our relationship may come to dwell within the supervisee as a means of grace and strength.

MULTIPLE CONTEXTS FOR SUPERVISION¹⁵

My supervision work within the scope of my independent practice includes individual supervision for both beginning and seasoned pastoral counselors, individual consultation with clergy and lay pastoral care providers, group

supervision with health care chaplains in my diocese, and supervision of our diocesan Ethics Committee.

John R. Compton diagrams and discusses the “clinical diamond” of supervisor, supervisee/counselor, client/counselee, and agency/institution.¹⁶ As a pastoral supervisor and therapist in independent practice,¹⁷ rather than in a pastoral counseling center or clinical training program, the institutions with which I interact and to which I am accountable are my diocese and the AAPC. The interlocking hierarchies and systems in which I offer pastoral supervision have provided me with a three-dimensional image of the “clinical diamond” transformed into what I call “clinical rock salt.” By that I mean that as we look at but one corner of Compton’s clinical diamond, a pastoral counseling agency may have accountability within a number of systems: for example, a religious denomination or institution, the American Association of Pastoral Counselors’ Institutional Accreditation Committee, and the Samaritan Institute. The agency may also be accountable to various state and national agencies regarding a therapist’s licensing, an agency’s insurance reimbursements, mental health standards of practice, mandatory reporting of child abuse, and so forth. The supervisory relationship takes place within this broad matrix of relationships. The supervisor, therapist, and client are all impacted by these interlocking “diamonds” which in my mind’s eye look like the adjacent and ever-widening connected and differentiated crystals in rock salt.

METHODOLOGY AND USE OF SELF

My supervision methodology is sensitive to where the supervisee is developmentally, theoretically, and temperamentally, in order to join with the person and serve as a catalyst for further growth from the foundation of his or her current stage of development. I use insights from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), based on the work of Jung, to join with supervisees and understand their strengths, personal styles of interaction, learning styles, blind spots, and less developed functions. The MBTI also enables me to understand my own countertransference challenges.¹⁸ My experiences as a woman priest, as a person in specialized ministry who works with survivors of sexual abuse,¹⁹ as a priest serving a congregation of deaf people, as a pastoral counseling supervisor of a lesbian feminist separatist²⁰ and of a group of lay persons and ordained deacons providing health care ministry have all taught me about life on the margins. They have also

deepened my faith and love of Jesus as I have identified with the integrity of his ministry, his ministry to marginalized persons, and his identity as a marginalized person himself.

Yet I have an ambivalent relationship with the margins. I enjoy certain privileges as a white, hearing, educated, middle-class woman priest of the church; this is a position of power in our culture. While my ministry on the margins has been rich, I cannot offer it without also being in a position of power. I confess that at times I want less solidarity so that I can be closer to the center of things and have more money, more recognition, and more prestige than I have on the margins. Yet I am able to see situations more clearly by being on the margin. It is easier to see and give voice to the bigger picture when one has enough distance from the center of things to see it in perspective. Life closer to the margins than to the center also affords me a certain spiritual freedom, which stimulates within other people such responses as resentment, envy, and inspiration to go and do likewise.

Life on the margins has been formative in developing my methodology of pastoral counseling and supervision. "Differentiated solidarity" is the term I have coined to describe my role and presence with clients and supervisees. It is an incarnational model that allows for both connection and appropriate distance in the supervisory relationship. It means that as a separate and unique individual²¹ I "side with" the person in his or her experience, theoretical orientation, and goals. It means that I meet the person as a unique and holy individual, and strive to understand as fully as possible the context of the whole person without becoming enmeshed in the person's life.²² It means that I have a partnership based on helping others utilize and develop their own natural healing power and meet their goals in order to "make [the] fullest contribution to one's own life as well as to the lives of others."²³ It means that I am a reliable and good enough²⁴ object for others. It means that I intentionally "take in" other persons through identification, empathy, and imagination, without swallowing them, enmeshing with them, or distancing them. It means that the persons I supervise are real objects in my own life, and I am prepared to give to and learn from these persons.²⁵

Differentiated solidarity as a supervisor means assuming a posture of liberation designed to free what is in bondage. I stand with others to help them become free of the internal and external strictures and structures which oppress, conceal, shame, bind, keep unfree, or otherwise restrict freedom.²⁶ Pastoral counseling is a process of helping to liberate a person's voice,²⁷ body, intellect, creativity, inner wisdom, God images, spirituality, and other expressions of self, while also safeguarding the process so that the freeing takes place within

appropriate boundaries. Supervision is isomorphic with psychotherapy; it frees a person to provide pastoral counseling and pastoral care that is liberating; it supports the therapist to develop his or her own particular style within the standards of practice; it instructs and models the responsibility of maintaining both relational connection and appropriate boundaries within which to exercise that freedom.

Differentiated solidarity is a posture which helps to create an environment in which persons accused of sexual misconduct in the church are treated with dignity and fairness. The response team looks not only for patterns of behavior which are indicative of sexual misconduct, but also for the person's unrecognized needs for healing. The team does not triangulate with the accused against the accuser and victims, and stays open to ways the person might try to shade, conceal or distort the truth. This posture helps to create an environment in which persons who accuse others of sexual misconduct, and congregations affected by the allegations, are treated with dignity and fairness, while not triangulating against either the accused or persons who colluded with misconduct.

Despite mutuality in the supervision relationship, there is also a hierarchy and power imbalance within the relationship. Supervisor and supervisee are colleagues in ministry, with the supervisor having a broader and deeper base of knowledge and experience to offer the supervisee in the realm in which the supervisee is seeking to grow. The supervisor has an evaluative role because of his or her earned and conferred power and authority to supervise. In terms of confronting supervisees about difficult issues such as ethical problems or therapeutic errors, it is the differentiated aspect of *differentiated* solidarity that enables the supervisor to do that. The *solidarity* aspect is what calls the supervisor to confront in a way that does not shame or humiliate but only enables the learning and growth process to continue. The means and the end must be congruent.

In the following example I show how I offered a "differentiated solidarity" approach to supervision that enabled a woman exploring her vocation to a ministry of pastoral care and counseling to claim and live into her authority and power. It shows how I supported her to develop her own style of pastoral caregiving even though it was different from my own.

A, a lay Roman Catholic lesbian social worker, entered a training program for pastoral care, contracted with me for supervision, and for her pastoral care project she created a spiritual care group for women wrestling with issues of forgiveness. In therapy she had experienced much healing from early trauma in her life, and she had wrestled with what forgiveness means in her own life. Although her church (local and institutional) does not offer her an opportunity to provide pastoral care, she experienced support in supervision to differentiate

herself from the church's definition of her role. She took her place by creating that place for herself. While some of what she created was not what I would have done in that situation, for example, using resources from Native American spirituality with resources from the Christian tradition, it was a true expression of her own spirituality and it worked for the women in the group. She created a hospitable environment for women both like and different from herself, she offered the kind of ministry she felt called to, and that enabled her to be in differentiated solidarity with middle-aged and elderly heterosexual women who are spiritual seekers.

She is now offering the group again to a different group of women, and is discovering the deep need women have for this kind of healing work in a group and the real place she has in offering this kind of pastoral care. She chairs the liturgy commission of her parish, while also openly developing a network of care for lesbians, gay men, bisexual and transgendered persons in her rural county.

THE PROCESS OF SUPERVISION

The *sine qua non* of the supervision relationship is building a trusting relationship with the supervisee. "We first make contact...through our emotional responses and empathic listening."²⁸ Empathy within a pastoral supervision relationship creates the environment in which the supervisee may feel free to bring his or her questions, anxieties, mistakes, dilemmas, and successes. It also models for the supervisee the way he or she will respond to the client/patient.

In this example I show the importance of creating an environment in which a trusting relationship between supervisee and supervisor may develop, and how that is isomorphic with the psychotherapy the supervisee offered.

B, a lesbian feminist separatist beginning therapist was assigned to see me as her supervisor by her graduate school professor. The agency where I worked was affiliated with a church-related organization. She was appropriately anxious as any new supervisee is, but with an added layer of anxiety and guardedness because of her sexual vocation. She was afraid of judgement and religiosity being imposed on her by a pastoral counselor. It was essential that in the relationship-building phase she experience safety and no shaming so that she could pursue her goal of becoming a psychodynamic psychotherapist.

She was able to gather her courage early to disclose her identity and separatist expression of her sexuality to me so that we could look together at how that might impact her work in our relationship and with her clients. She entered personal psychotherapy in order to protect her clients from the unhealed

wounds of her own life, and worked hard to “recycle” what was modeled for her in supervision relationship for her clients.

Early in the supervision relationship it is important to find out what “dwells” within the supervisee—what goals, experiences, assumptions, knowledge, empathy, and internal objects, including images of God, dwell within the person that can make the person reactive or kind.²⁹ It is a time of assessing what the supervisee’s learning needs are and where the person is developmentally in terms of professional skills, theoretical orientation, and role identity.

Equally essential is developing a clear contract for the supervision relationship so that the parameters and expectations are clear. With a pastoral counselor or pastoral care provider at any level of competence who is engaging in an ongoing supervision relationship, this period of assessment and contracting can take several weeks or months. While that period is obviously reduced when a pastor or clinician comes for a one-time consultation, it is still an essential aspect of providing supervision. I work with the supervisee to develop a contract that is clear about the purpose of supervision. It also addresses expectations of the supervisee, including the presenting of cases, schedule, fees, duration, termination, conflict resolution, and evaluation of the supervision. This work helps to create a safe and stable frame in which supervision can take place, and it models for the supervisee how to develop clear boundaries around role and expectations with the client.

Supervision is not only a privilege; it is also a responsibility that carries potential liability.³⁰ The supervisor is responsible for both teaching and modeling an ethical way to practice psychotherapy and pastoral care, and for instructing supervisees about the standards of practice. There are potential legal ramifications for the supervisor knowing what dwells within the supervisee. The oversight function of the supervisor is oriented towards “the welfare of the client and the learning of the supervisee.”³¹ “Pastoral counseling supervisors can be sued for permitting supervisees to counsel beyond their competence, for allowing supervisees to counsel beyond the competence or training of the supervisor, and for not reporting ethics violations by supervisees to AAPC.”³² The legal issues here are based in the ethical mandates to protect those who are vulnerable and to do no harm, as well as in the need to protect the supervisor’s self-interest.

Not all supervisees are willing to grow, change, and mature. Not every supervisee is willing to explore the issues and adhere to standards of clinical and ethical professional practice. When this becomes a pattern, it is often necessary to terminate the supervisory relationship.

The importance of a supervisor being a role model cannot be underestimated. This occurs not only by serving in a role, not only doing the work and doing it well, but also by authenticating through word and action what I am teaching by using the authority and power of my role to be a healing presence and a person with both empathy and appropriate boundaries.

The next example demonstrates my teaching the standard of practice and appropriate boundaries so that the therapist could use her power and authority appropriately and practice psychotherapy ethically and in a way that did not expose her, her supervisor, or her agency to legal liability.

In supervising B, a beginning therapist who is a morbidly obese lesbian feminist separatist with enmeshment issues in her personal life, I was challenged to differentiate myself from my agency in which there were many enmeshed and multiple relationships, poor boundaries, and no appropriate paperwork expectations. I was the only therapist who kept client notes and I was considered by my colleagues on staff to be rigid about this standard of practice issue. I supervised the therapist's long-term work with a female client diagnosed as having Borderline Personality Disorder and with a male alcoholic client with marital and other relationship problems.

It was important for the therapist to learn to keep appropriate client notes, keep the boundaries of the therapy relationship intact (meeting time frames, after-hours phone sessions, etc.), and about appropriate standards of practice. I needed both to differentiate myself from the norm of the agency and join with her in her goal to become a therapist.

I helped her see the importance of differentiating herself enough from the lesbian feminist separatist community, where the model was to work as a collective with no overt hierarchy and little awareness of maintaining certain boundaries, so that she could develop appropriate boundaries as a therapist and be a healing presence with both male and female clients.

As a supervisory relationship solidifies and develops, supervision from a self-in-context perspective shifts to paying more attention to transference, countertransference, the managing of projective identification, parallel process, developmental process, cognitive learning issues, and integration of spirituality with psychotherapy or pastoral care. Throughout the duration of the supervision relationship I am attentive to the supervisee's current stage of development and competence.

In terms of my own use of self as both therapist and as supervisor, I have benefited the most in supervision, consultation, and my own therapy from attending to countertransference in the relationship.³³ I believe that attention to countertransference in supervision is where Gandhi's words about the means and

the end hold the potential either to authenticate a healing presence or to corrupt the healing presence.

In the following example I tell of how I worked with a supervisee's countertransference and the problems it was creating for the therapy relationship.

C, a pastoral counselor in training, worked with a woman who had an abusive boyfriend. The counselor provided support for the woman and encouraged her to break away from the violent relationship. The client was able to leave the boyfriend and set up her own apartment with her children. The counselor had the opportunity to preach at a church that usually gives a substantial donation to the agency where the counselor worked. In her sermon the counselor used the example of the woman who was empowered to leave the abusive relationship. Several months later the counselor brought that client situation to supervision again because the client had returned to live with the abusive boyfriend. The counselor was so devastated and felt so betrayed by and angry with the client that the counselor had not returned two phone calls from the client.

In supervision I provided cognitive input about the cycle of violence,³⁴ and helped the counselor to reflect on how to assist the client in breaking out of the cycle. I also helped the counselor explore her feelings of betrayal. The counselor needed to feel and appear competent,³⁵ she needed to "market" her agency positively in the community, and she felt embarrassed that she had apparently failed in this situation. She was able to reflect on her countertransference to see how she needed the client too much for herself and was in danger of taking it out on the client. She identified her own ambivalence with and loyalty to people who had been abusive of her. After supervision she reconnected with the client and was able to be more present and patient to the client's therapy process.

In the next example I use my own knowledge of the supervisee's skills, style, and temperament, as well as my own knowledge about sexual misconduct, to support a client to take seriously her countertransference as a source of important information about the person to whom she was ministering.

D, a health care chaplain with wealthy elderly persons, found herself feeling suspicious of an 80-year-old male resident of the facility where she ministered. Although she had had four units of CPE she had not learned much about using countertransference in the pastoral relationship. She felt depressed and overwhelmed that she was not "loving" enough with the resident. She was able to verbalize her sense of hopelessness, and the group offered empathic support to her.

Since her feelings about him were uncharacteristic of her responses to people, I encouraged her to pay attention and honor those feelings without taking it out on him. There had been some gossip that he had accidentally groped the young

woman who cleaned his apartment. But the gossip about the man seemed to have been dismissed because of some institutional blind spot about rich old men not being capable of abuse. I referred the group to the DSM-IV diagnostic category of paraphilia called “frotteurism,” and they saw how the man’s behavior matched that diagnosis. Several months later the resident of whom she was suspicious was arrested twice for sexually assaulting women at his church. The chaplain’s countertransference was a source of truth; she knew before she knew. I encouraged the chaplain to trust more fully in her own intuition as a means of using herself to be effective with her patients.

Group supervision can be an ideal setting in which to address certain kinds of supervisory issues and to teach about the restoration of relationships, sexual misconduct within institutional systems, and the integration of psychotherapy or pastoral care and spirituality. In the following example I am aware of the individualized aspect of the supervision within the group context. I meet a supervisee where she is, assess her learning goals, and work with the parallel process of self-in-context—both the chaplain and the patient—towards developing a solution to the interpersonal problems in the group. In addition, in group work I also must assess the skill levels of the other members and provide both didactic and role-play learning opportunities for the group.

E, a 78-year-old Episcopal nonstipendiary deacon, served as a part-time hospital chaplain. She brought to the supervision group an encounter she had with a patient who expressed hostility toward her roommate in the presence of the roommate. The roommate responded in kind. The chaplain and the other health care chaplains all felt stuck in terms of how to respond to the pastoral situation. The chaplain felt like she was a teenager with her unpleasant mother.

The most anyone in the group could offer in terms of a concrete solution was to cut the visit short or say “There, there, girls.” Each was trained in CPE in an individualistic model of pastoral care, and none was trained to think systemically and relationally. Most of them brought a fair amount of conflict avoidance to their role and they felt afraid to use the power of their role to enter into the conflict creatively. Their role as deacons and lay persons offering pastoral care in a diocese replete with clericalism added a layer of “What do you know? You are only a deacon/woman/lay person,” to these internal structures.

In our group supervision I suggested the chaplain observe while various members of the group engaged in a role-play about using the conflict in the relationship between the roommates to be a truly pastoral presence and to help create a more peaceful and healing environment for the roommates. In the role-play the chaplain offered support and care to each person and tried empathically to understand each person’s complaints. Her patient was lonely and resented the

roommate's many visitors; and yet she preferred to be alone. The roommate resented the patient for having a chaplain visit her. When each experienced the chaplain caring for her and heard the chaplain acknowledge the strain of living together at the hospital, the tension melted and they were able to negotiate a way of being together more comfortably. In addition, the chaplain offered to contact the chaplain of the roommate's denomination so that she could receive more pastoral care.

The group members were amazed by the power of engaging and using the context to help resolve relationship problems.

The diocesan ethics committee which I chair serves as a resource for our diocese by providing trained, compassionate, and committed persons to do investigation and to provide pastoral care to individuals and congregations affected by allegations of sexual misconduct in the pastoral relationship. We function as a peer group and regularly do role-playing to hone our skills; to work through the nuances, biases, and challenges involved in these situations; and to increase our sensitivities to all of the people and diversity of perspectives involved in allegations of misconduct. We must be prepared to interview in evaluative but nonjudgmental ways both people making accusations of sexual misconduct by a religious leader and the people against whom accusations are made. In this group, and when I train other sexual misconduct response teams, much teaching and learning happens through doing role-plays. The value of role-playing may be seen in the comment by an ethics committee member who had played a flute and piccolo in the United States Marine Band. He said that doing role-plays is like practicing "The Stars and Stripes Forever." "You practice, practice, practice, and then, when your time comes to play that song at the White House, you as the piccolo player step right up into the situation, anxious but confident that you have done this before and can do it again when it really matters."

The role-playing enables team members to feel more able and confident in interviewing both accusers and accused persons when an allegation of sexual misconduct in the church is being investigated. But the role-playing does much more than enable the "soloist" to feel prepared. Instead, the self is "in context." The role-playing enables the group to work together as a team, to learn with one another without ego needs being on the line at every moment and to work with one another's strengths and honor one another's vulnerabilities, so that together we may be in differentiated solidarity with the healing needs of the diocese, be a healing presence, and provide nonviolent conflict resolution for congregations.

CONCLUSION

A colleague called me to refer her client to me for group therapy. She spoke of the difficulties she experiences as a social worker in obtaining from the managed care system the treatment she believes her clients need. She is frequently frustrated by managed care systems' "recipes" for positive outcomes in therapy. She wants to help the client break free of the "recipe" orientation so the depth of her long-term wounds may be healed. She believes that the client would most benefit from two types of therapy: individual and group. She also believes that the client would benefit from having two therapists, herself and me, who would be empathic with the client's suffering and would help her build on her strengths. "Ah," I said, "so the 'recipe' that will really help this woman is one where the quality of relationship is valued as a crucial factor in healing."

The quality of the relationship is a crucial factor in effective supervision and in effective healing psychotherapeutic and pastoral relationships. This is another way of describing differentiated solidarity. It is the way I practice psychotherapy and it is what I teach, supervise, and model.

Pastoral supervision requires intentionality, skill, and empathy on the part of the supervisor to assist the seed to become the tree. But the quality of the supervisory relationship transcends a formula or "recipe" and is outside the total control of the supervisor and supervisee. The Creator of the mystery of life's infinities, who is in differentiated solidarity with all of creation, loves the seed into becoming the tree.

NOTES

1. Mahatma Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*, ed. Anthony J. Parel (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 81.

2. "Choosing the term 'isomorphism,' systemic supervisors have focused on the interrelational and structural similarities between therapy and supervision, rather than on the intrapsychic parallels." Janine M. Bernard and Rodney K. Goodyear, *Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision* (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1992), 63. Chapter 4 (p. 61-88) of Bernard and Goodyear contains an excellent discussion of how supervision is the isomorph of therapy.

3. Carroll Saussy, *God Images and Self Esteem: Empowering Women in a Patriarchal Society* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 106.

4. This is a projection I have often experienced. Chairing the AAPC Ethics Committee, Eastern Region, and chairing my diocesan Ethics Committee, has meant tolerating the projection while also demonstrating by word and action that I am evaluative without being judgmental. This parallels my experience with a pastoral counseling supervisee whose personal style was judgmental and didactic and at times alienating both to me and her clients. I had to find a way to be evaluative without being judgmental, didactic while maintaining connection, while also accepting that some of that was her own personal style that no amount of supervision was going to change.

5. In fact, those experiences make me better able to work with individuals and systems facing similar dilemmas or affected by sexual misconduct.

6. As Barry Estadt says, supervisors must “[attempt] to relate to the students as they would have students relate to their clients.” Barry Estadt, “Supervision: From Technician to Artist,” in *Pastoral Counseling*, eds. Barry K. Estadt, Melvin C. Blanchette and John R. Compton, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1991), 51.

7. A great strength of systems work is attention to context and matters of difference, such as race, class, gender, sexual orientation (or, as I prefer to call it, “sexual vocation”), ethnicity and culture, age, physical health or illness, handicapping conditions, religious heritage, theoretical orientation, and power.

8. This is the work of my D.Min. thesis. Sarah M. Rieth, “Torn Colors and Threads of Grace: Spiritual Healing for Survivors of Sexual Abuse” (D.Min. thesis, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School/Bexley Hall/Crozer Theological Seminary, 1994).

9. My view of the self comports with that of Jill Savege Scharff and David E. Scharff, who state that “the term self...[refers] to the combination of ego and internal objects in a unique, dynamic relation that comprises the character and gives a sense of personal identity that endures and remains relatively constant over time.” Scharff and Scharff, *The Primer of Object Relations* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1997), 7.

10. This is not unlike Janet L. Surrey’s “self-in-relation,” (“The Self-in-Relation: A Theory of Women’s Development,” in *Women’s Growth in Connection: Writings from the Stone Center*, eds. Judith V. Jordan, Alexandra G. Kaplan, Jean Baker Miller, Irene P. Stiver and Janet L. Surrey [New York: Guilford Press, 1991], 51-66). I prefer the term “context” because for me it connotes a depth of reality both in terms of personal history and internalized objects, current relationships, and the interlocking hierarchy of systems in which one lives. It is also the term I prefer because I picture Han van den Blink jumping up to the blackboard in my first D.Min. seminar, drawing a circle, and saying, “This is the context wheel. Okay, what are all of the possible aspects of the context of this pastoral situation?” van den Blink is quoted as saying that empathic relationships always occur in a context that is “the total environment in which we are

and which is in us.” Margaret Z. Kornfeld, *Cultivating Wholeness: A Guide to Care and Counseling in Faith Communities* (New York: Continuum, 1998), 55.

11. Acts 17:28, NRSV. Matters such as race, gender, economic class, sexual vocation, and handicapping conditions (for example, chronic mental illness or deafness) profoundly affect a person’s experience of the self, others, and systems; and these in turn affect the supervisory relationship. For example, a male pastor from an economically and emotionally privileged family contracted with me for supervision to help him minister more effectively with his parishioners in a poor congregation that had experienced sexual misconduct by one pastor and the psychotic breakdown of another pastor. These experiences were beyond the realm of the supervisee’s experience and he found it difficult to be empathic with their experience. Joseph A. Heim addresses some of the thickness of experience which affects supervision in his excellent chapter titled “The Social Justice Issues in Supervision,” in *The Art of Clinical Supervision: A Pastoral Counseling Perspective*, eds. Barry Estadt, John Compton and Melvin C. Blanchette (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1987), 262-274.

12. Bernard and Goodyear (84-88) have a rich discussion of the categories of supervisors’ countertransference which gets at the thickness of experience of the self-in-context. Quoting R.B. Lower (“Countertransference Resistances in the Supervisory Relationship,” *American Journal of Psychiatry* 129 [1972]: 156-160), they state that “Lower (1972) suggested that supervisors’ countertransference might be categorized into four areas: (1) general personality characteristics, (2) inner conflicts reactivated by the supervision situation, (3) countertransference reactions to the individual supervisee, and (4) countertransference reactions to the supervisee’s transference,” 85.

13. Blaise Pascal, *Selections from The Thoughts*, trans. and ed. Arthur H. Beattie (New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1965), 4-5.

14. “Differentiation means the capacity of a [person] to define his or her own life’s goals and values apart from surrounding togetherness pressures, to say ‘I’ when others are demanding ‘you’ and ‘we.’ It includes the capacity to maintain a (relatively) nonanxious presence in the midst of anxious systems, to take maximum responsibility for one’s own destiny and emotional being. It can be measured somewhat by the breadth of one’s repertoire of responses when confronted with a crisis. The concept should not be confused with autonomy or narcissism, however. Differentiation means the capacity to be an ‘I’ while remaining connected.” Edwin Friedman, *Generation to Generation: Family Process in Church and Synagogue* (New York: Guilford Press, 1985), 27.

15. There is a broad range of supervisory contexts and a broad range of supervisory responsibilities of which I am aware. I use a number of texts as references in my work. An outstanding comprehensive volume on the work of clinical supervision is Bernard and Goodyear, ob. cit. I rely on Kornfeld, 1998, for a comprehensive text on pastoral care and counseling, and on Estadt, Compton and Blanchette’s volume as a resource on pastoral counseling supervision.

Sheldon Cashdan's book, *Object Relations Therapy: Using the Relationship* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1988) is an excellent resource on object relations. Two excellent resources on supervision from a systems perspective are Thomas C. Todd and Cheryl L. Storm, *The Complete Systemic Supervisor: Context, Philosophy, and Pragmatics* (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1997) and Cheryl L. Storm and Thomas C. Todd, *The Reasonably Complete Systemic Supervisor Resource Guide* (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1997). A solid text on group work is Irvin D. Yalom, *The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy* (New York: Basic Books, 1980).

16. John R. Compton, "Supervisory Formats and Evaluation Procedures," in Estadt, Compton and Blanchette, 54-55.

17. See Florence W. Kaslow, "Seeking and Providing Supervision in Private Practice," in *Supervision and Training: Models, Dilemmas, and Challenges*, ed. Florence W. Kaslow (Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, 1986), 143-158.

18. Some of the texts that undergird my understanding of this Jungian approach to temperament, dominant and shadow functions, and learning style are as follows: David Keirseay and Marilyn Bates, *Please Understand Me* (Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Books, 1978), Isabel Briggs Myers and Peter B. Myers, *Gifts Differing* (Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1980), Roy M. Oswald and Otto Kroeger, *Personality Type and Religious Leadership* (Washington: Alban Institute, 1988), Chester P. Michael and Marie C. Norrisey, *Prayer and Temperament: Different Prayer Forms for Different Personality Types* (Charlottesville, VA: Open Door, 1984), and Naomi L. Quenk, *Beside Ourselves: Our Hidden Personality in Everyday Life* (Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing, 1993).

19. Some texts I rely on in my work with survivors of sexual abuse include Judith Lewis Herman, *Trauma and Recovery* (New York: Basic Books, 1992) and James Newton Poling, *The Abuse of Power: A Theological Problem* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991). The following texts, along with Herman and Poling, support my work with congregations traumatized by sexual misconduct by religious leaders: *Restoring the Soul of a Church: Healing Congregations Wounded by Clergy Sexual Misconduct*, eds. Nancy Myer Hopkins and Mark Laaser (Collegeville, MN: Interfaith Sexual Trauma Institute, 1995) and Marilyn Peterson, *At Personal Risk: Boundary Violations in Professional-Client Relationships* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1992).

20. Lesbian separatists, as I understand it, prefer not to have any relationships with men, for reasons of healing, identification, and expressing anger and resistance against patriarchal culture.

21. See Dr. Margaret Kornfeld's excellent discussion of the role of differentiation in empathic relationships (Kornfeld, op. cit., 52-56).

22. As Martin Buber said, “When one says You, the I of the word pair I-You is said, too...The basic word I-You can only be spoken with one’s whole being.” Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1970), 54.

23. Bernard Loomer, “Two Conceptions of Power,” *Process Studies* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1976): 30. Loomer’s essay contrasts unilateral power with what he calls “relational power.” The use of relational power rather than unilateral power is what enables “seed” (Gandhi) to become a “tree” (Gandhi). To “make [the] fullest contribution to one’s own life and the lives of others” is what Loomer calls a person of great “stature” (Loomer) or “size” (Loomer), 26-32.

24. “Winnicott uses the term “good enough mothering” to refer to the waxing and waning of nurturance that describes normal mother-child interactions.” Sheldon Cashdan, *Object Relations Therapy: Using the Relationship* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1988), 36, citing D.W. Winnicott, *Playing and Reality* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1971), 11.

25. Loomer states that relational power is “the ability both to produce and to undergo an effect,” Loomer, 17.

26. I remember hearing that the sculptor Michelangelo said, “There is an angel in this rock that wants to come out.”

27. Here I use the word “voice” both literally and metaphorically to denote the way one expresses one’s true self.

28. Kornfeld, 51. Kornfeld calls listening empathically and then being empathic “an art that takes practice and patience. It involves: Managing your own feelings....Understanding others...by learning the language of their experience...Getting information about them not only from what they tell you through their words, feelings, body language, and the language of their unconscious, but also from listening to your response to them; Checking your understanding with them so you can correct distortions and misconstructions you make...,” 54. Cashdan calls this “emotional linking,” that is, “[communicating]...that the [person’s] feelings are shared and appreciated.” Cashdan, 87.

29. This correlates with Stage 1 of the supervisory process as delineated in Barry K. Estadt’s chapter titled “The Core Process of Supervision” in *The Art of Clinical Supervision: A Pastoral Counseling Perspective*, 13-37).

30. Kornfeld, 85.

31. From the AAPC “Supervision Standards of Practice”, p. 1. This document can be downloaded from AAPC’s website: www.aapc.org.

32. Kornfeld, 86.

33. See Note 13. I am most affected by countertransference that falls into Bernard and Goodyear's category 1 (general personality characteristics) and category 3 (countertransference reactions to the individual supervisee). Using Myers-Briggs Type Indicator categories, I am a strong Feeling type, and as an Introvert I hold my feelings within and do not feel as comfortable "extraverting" my feelings. Peer supervision, supervision of supervision, and ongoing personal psychotherapy enable me to work through my strong feeling responses to my clients and supervisees so that I can then balance Feeling with Thinking. Category 2 (inner conflicts reactivated by the supervision situation) and 4 (countertransference reactions to the supervisee's transference) cause me to engage my Thinking function with Feeling earlier in my processing of these kinds of countertransference responses.

34. By "cycle of violence" I mean here Lenore Walker's "Cycle Theory of Violence," which she introduces in her book, *The Battered Woman* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979). Walker's cycle of violence refers to the pattern of three phases: 1) the buildup of tension, 2) the explosion, and 3) the honeymoon in a battering relationship. This cycle theory has been critiqued and refined by R. Emerson Dobash and Russell Dobash in *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy* (New York: Macmillan, 1979). A "two infinities" approach to the cycle of violence looks at the cycle in a couple relationship within the context of 1) the intergenerational transmission of abuse and violence within the family (discussed by Ellen C. Herrenkohl, Roy C. Herrenkohl and Lori J. Toedter, "Perspectives on the Intergenerational Transmission of Abuse," *The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research*, eds. David Finkelhor, Richard J. Gelles, Gerald T. Hotaling and Murray A. Straus [Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1983], 305-316) and elsewhere, and 2) the human need within the collective unconscious to find a scapegoat to resolve conflict within the community. James Williams discusses this theory of Rene Girard in his volume, *The Bible, Violence, and The Sacred: Liberation from the Myth of Sanctioned Violence* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991). This concept is also discussed in Robert Hamerton-Kelly's book, *Sacred Violence: Paul's Hermeneutic of the Cross* (Minneapolis: AugsburgFortress, 1992).

35. Bernard and Goodyear have an excellent discussion of this and other issues supervisees bring to the supervision relationship, in Bernard and Goodyear, 73-84.

***Listening for the Soul: Pastoral Care and Spiritual Direction Reviewer.* Jean Stairs, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.**

Jean Stairs clearly identifies the lost art of the care of souls in theological education, clinical pastoral education, and by those in pastoral care. She sets out “a vision for soulful pastoral care” within the faith community. Throughout, Ms. Stairs invites those in pastoral care to “hear the soul into speech,” to listen for the “presence, or absence of God in the soul, the area of our lives where meaning is created.” She accomplishes her goal through a format of method, reflection on personal enhancement, spiritual exercises, and communal practices. She draws on scripture, other religious traditions, and a wide range of disciplines.

Chapter One is a solid treatise on the art of listening and attending to the rhythms of life that foster centeredness in God and connections with self, neighbor, and the world. Chapter Two enhances listening by moving the reader to form a lifestyle of contemplation—seeing from the underside and the outside. This contemplation is strengthened by the caregiver’s upholding of the practice of hospitality, Sabbath-keeping, and simplicity, which is examined expertly in Chapter Four.

Chapter Three challenges pastoral practitioners to hear crisis moments beyond moments of intervention and into the spiritual rhythms of death and resurrection themes that evoke the spiritual role of pastoral care. Growing through loss into hope is vital to soulful pastoral care within the community.

Unlike many similar books, children’s spirituality is discussed in Chapter Six. Chapter Six is carefully offered to the faith community, which often focuses solely on adults and overlooks children and youth. Our children and their growth (or lack of it, as shown by social realities) are the barometers of the soul of churches, the expression of our faith in action.

Chapter Five, “Soul Companions: Listening for the Soul in Daily Life and Work,” and Chapter Seven, “Toward Complementarity: Pastoral Care and Spiritual Direction” are dear to my heart. The author explores the importance of soul companionships—individual and communal—within the clergy and lay ministry of the Church. The development of the ministry of pastoral care is the heart and soul of the author’s work in the recovery of the ministry of the Church. The author, unaware of the book I have written about the art of spiritual companionship (which includes a training module), has captured some key elements in the ministry of lay and clergy in building companionship relationships. Her own experience as minister demonstrates the worth and value of this ministry.

This book serves as a valuable guide for those in pastoral care and for those interested, as committed brothers and sisters on the quest for God, in reclaiming the care of souls. It clearly sets before the reader the challenge to evoke the Spirit within each of us.

Listening For the Soul invites all to be companions on the journey. It is a carefully written and sensitive book calling us to the spiritual direction of our lives. I am pleased to have a companion author in my efforts to revitalize the ministry of the care of souls.

Barbara Sheehan, S.P.
ACTS Urban CPE Program
Chicago, Illinois

Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry

The Goals of the *Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* are to preserve and extend the field of supervision and training in ministry formation through the written word; to encourage potential authors to become published contributors; and to enrich and expand our understanding and practice of supervision and training in ministry by including new participants and perspectives in our critical reflection on this work. Only articles related to these goals will be considered for publication.

Author Guidelines Authors should submit four copies of their manuscript. It should be type-written, double-spaced. Notes should be indicated with superior numerals; the notes themselves should be placed at the end of the text. Articles should not exceed twenty pages. A cover sheet should show the title of the article, the author(s) name, title, institution, and location. Omit name(s) of the author(s) from the body of the manuscript. Include a brief abstract. Authors whose articles are accepted for publication will be asked to supply a copy of the article on diskette (any IBM-compatible format).

Feature Sections Each issue of the *Journal* contains a number of feature sections as well as general manuscripts and a symposium. We especially welcome manuscripts for the feature sections: **Learning Vignettes** are brief (one to two page) accounts of supervision or learning. **ACPE and AAPC Theory Papers** Candidates for Associate Supervisor (ACPE) or Diplomate (AAPC) are invited to submit their supervisory theory paper. A panel of readers reviews these papers and one or two outstanding papers are selected for publication in each issue. **International Section** Reports of supervision and training in ministry from nations other than the United States are especially invited. **D.Min. Paper** Authors of D.Min. theses addressing issues in supervision and training in ministry are invited to submit their papers for possible publication. **Book Reviews** are always welcome. **Field Education** Theological field educators are encouraged to submit manuscripts to this new section.

Professionals from other areas of ministry, such as spiritual direction and other professional disciplines, are encouraged to submit manuscripts that are relevant to the journal's goals stated above.

Advertising space is available. Contact the Editorial Office for rate information. Camera-ready copy is required.

Editorial Office All editorial correspondence should be addressed to: Paul Giblin, Institute for Pastoral Studies, Loyola University of Chicago, 6525 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, IL 60626, phone (773) 508-2431, fax (773) 508-2319, email pgibli@luc.edu.

Business Office Address all subscription, back order, change of address, and other business correspondence to Journal of Pastoral Care Publications, Inc., 1549 Clairmont Road, Suite 103, Decatur, GA 30033-4611, (404) 320-0195, FAX (404) 320-0849.