

Ministerial Formation through the Lens of Suffering: A Theological Reflection on Trauma-Sensitive Pedagogy

Sung Hee Chang

The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear.

—Antonio Gramsci¹

We are living in times of *crisis*. Among other things, two deadly viruses painfully and convincingly remind us of this fact. First, the threat of the COVID-19 pandemic makes the word crisis a constant in our daily discourse. We have learned that the novel corona virus neither respects borders nor discriminates between people. No one is safe from it. It has devastated the livelihoods of millions of people all over the world and traumatized many. Second, we have also learned that the old social virus called racism is still alive and threatens to rupture the social fabric of the United States. The concept of race is a social construct, and yet the power of racism is real. Racism is trauma (“an agent, force, or mechanism that causes trauma,” *The Merriam-Webster Dictionary*). And it never dies. Many people of color are in danger of retraumatization. The question before those of us who are engaged in ministerial formation is: How do we help or,

Sung Hee Chang is associate professor of supervised ministry and director of Supervised Ministry and Vocational Planning at Union Presbyterian Seminary, Charlotte, North Carolina. Email: schang@upsem.edu.

Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry

ISSN 2325-2847 (print)* ISSN 2325-2855 (online)

* © Copyright 2021 *Reflective Practice: Formation and Supervision in Ministry*
All Rights Reserved

to put it better, empower those sufferers in our midst who are traumatized and/or retraumatized so they can survive the crisis?

No doubt our survival in times of crisis depends on the way we cope with a crisis. Without much consideration of the meaning of crisis, however, some people argue that *any* crisis can and should be managed by identifying the threats we face and developing effective methods to deal with them. But is *every* crisis manageable methodically if not mechanically? Is ministerial formation in times of crisis all about developing crisis management skills? I do not think so.² Furthermore, some Pollyannaish people (“Every cloud has a silver lining”) even claim that a crisis means not only danger but also opportunity (based on the popular misunderstanding of the Chinese word for crisis: 危機, *wēijī*) and contend that we can and should turn challenges into opportunities. I am afraid that there is a certain amount of wishful thinking in this. For a crisis, in a real sense, is *a cloud that has no silver lining*.

Victor Mair, a seasoned Sinologist, debunks the danger of our “muddled thinking” based on “this spurious proverb” and the resulting “potentially perilous, fundamentally fallacious theory” (crisis = danger + opportunity). He asks us not to blame this proverb on the Chinese.³ If we want to, I think we should blame John F. Kennedy for its popularization and some unlearned missionaries to China for its introduction into our everyday discourse. As a matter of fact, the meaning of the Chinese word *wēijī* is simply a dangerous moment. There is no room at all for the understanding of crisis as a good time for advancement or progress, i.e., opportunity. “In a crisis,” Mair says sarcastically, “one wants above all to save one’s skin and neck! Any would-be guru who advocates opportunism in the face of crisis should be run out of town on a rail, for his/her advice will only compound the danger of the crisis.” As he sees it, if there is any grounds for the aspect of opportunity in the etymology of the word crisis, we would do better to study the Greek word *krisis* (κρίσις), which means, in Hippocratic-Galenic medical usage, “a turning point in a disease; sudden change for better or worse.”⁴ My point is that we should acknowledge that traumatized people in times of crisis are in need of clinical attention and care. Without knowing what stage of disease they are in, we cannot serve them realistically.

In this article, I reflect on the significance of *trauma-sensitive pedagogy* to serve people who live with trauma in times of crisis. Most of all, I would like to recognize the fact that the peculiar term “trauma-sensitive,” in place

of the well-accepted term “trauma-informed,” is here used to refer to “*educational* practices and approaches that are intended to cultivate a safe learning environment and mitigate the impact of trauma symptoms on student learning.”⁵ This does not necessarily mean that trauma-sensitive pedagogy is different from and independent of the trauma-informed practices that assume a *clinical* understanding of trauma and its impact on people. No doubt, the former heavily relies on the latter. As Jennifer Baldwin argues in her book *Trauma-Sensitive Theology*, “The most pressing concern for our era is the prevalence of trauma exposure and response at both clinical and sub-clinical intensities.”⁶ It is my conviction that we should be well versed in the concept of trauma as we develop a trauma-sensitive (or trauma-informed or even trauma-invested) pedagogy.⁷

In this regard, I think the words quoted in the epigraph of this article are noteworthy. They help us understand how a crisis traumatizes a person and what the traumatized person suffers from. The morbidity that Gramsci here refers to is a medical condition or, more precisely, *the condition of suffering from a disease*. And the disease (or dis-ease) comes from the fact that a crisis *is* the interregnum, namely, the transition period between the rule of one government (the old order) and that of the next (the new order). What is most at stake in the interregnum is safety; crisis and its impact on people (trauma) primarily concern their physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual stability. Traumatized people’s fear of and suffering from *losing the old order and not yet having a new order* is so real and disruptive that they can no longer feel safe and stable in the interregnum. And what is worse, this painfully uncomfortable period of uncertainty, anxiety, stress, or even trauma in the face of adversity could even continue indefinitely. For, as Gramsci puts it, “The old is dying and the new *cannot* be born.”

In times of crisis, traumatized persons hear this depressing, hopeless message and helplessly live by it. In other words, traumatized people are so “undone” in times of crisis that they are not able to imagine being “re-done” with a new world, a new self, and a new God—with a new meaning of life.⁸ One might object and say that the following words of Paul are the counter-message of the Christian faith: “When anyone lives in Christ, the new creation has come. *The old is gone! The new is here!*” (2 Cor. 5:17 NCV). Yes, it surely is. But can those who are undone by a crisis and forced to live with trauma hear the good news when they believe that “the new cannot be born”? This is the question that we must ponder regarding ministerial for-

mation in an era of trauma. My contention is that it will be very difficult if not impossible for them to hear the message of the Christian faith unless we declare that “*understanding trauma* is not just a kind of secondary issue—it is rather the most central event of our faith,”⁹ as Serene Jones puts it in the introduction to the second edition of her groundbreaking book *Trauma and Grace*.

UNDERSTANDING TRAUMA AND THE TRAUMATIZED PERSON

What exactly is trauma and who actually is the traumatized person? Among diverse definitions of trauma, I would like to use the following definition: “*a distinct type of suffering* that overwhelms a person’s normal capacity to cope.”¹⁰ Here, the capacity to cope not only concerns a person’s ability to change and adapt as a result of experience (brain plasticity or coping skills) but also entails the basic human ability to think, feel, communicate, relate, imagine, and above all be fully present. The Greek word *trauma* means a wound or a hurt or an injury—originally physical but now understood to be also psychological, emotional, and spiritual. The traumatized person is wounded and suffering in body, mind, soul, and spirit. Trauma or traumatic wounding occurs when a person experiences a crisis event that is detrimental to and debilitates their body, mind, soul, and spirit. It is a suffering from the wounding *effects* of the person’s experience of a potentially harmful event or a set of events. It is “the *response* to an experience(s) not the event experienced.”¹¹ The felt impact of traumatic wounding on the person’s body, mind, soul, and spirit is so damaging and chaotic that they cannot function as a “normal” human being. Their personal integrity or wholeness is threatened and sometimes even shattered. Notably, trauma forces the traumatized person to unlearn what they have so far learned for the safety and flourishing of life and to learn their demoralizing incapability, helplessness, and hopelessness. The problem for the traumatized person is that this overwhelmingly new, real, and questionable self-knowledge is very hard to unlearn, with the result that they often do not know what to do with their life.

Those of us who are not traumatized have a temptation to *pathologize* traumatized persons and to *privilege* the experience of nontraumatization over that of traumatization.¹² We take implicitly if not explicitly the us-versus-them approach (“We are OK and they are not OK”), even when we address the pandemic of trauma both in the church and in the world. We of-

ten call people who live with trauma “trauma victims” rather than trauma survivors, denying their agency. Accordingly, to learn to live with trauma in our “normal” church and world means to learn to accept disability and to live with stigma. Since not all persons who experience the same potentially traumatic event(s) get traumatized, we tend to think of trauma as a personal weakness and, knowingly or unknowingly, blame the traumatized person (“What’s *wrong* with you?”) rather than care for them (“What has *happened* to you?”). To understand trauma and the traumatized person, we do not need this deficit-focused approach, which simply isn’t fair and doesn’t help. Whether traumatized or not, we all are doing the best we can with what we have in the moment. As Jennifer Erin Beste writes, “Overall, research findings suggest that blaming victims for posttraumatic symptoms is not only erroneous but also contributes to [i.e., exacerbates] the vicious cycle of traumatization.”¹³ We should not make assumptions and put negative labels on traumatized persons. Rather, we need and should be willing to see things through the lens of their suffering (trauma) and attempt to destigmatize disability and mental illness.

It goes without saying that the traumatized person is too disabled, temporarily or permanently, partially or fully, to function as a “normal” person—particularly with the damage of the executive functions (working memory, mental flexibility, and self-control) of their brain, which is critical to learning, located in the prefrontal cortex. And what is worse, the traumatized person lives like a being trapped in the past with no way out; that which once traumatized the person can come back again and again, like flashbacks in a horror movie, to haunt and incapacitate them. For example, an uninvited and unpredictable reminder (“trigger”) makes a person with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) recall the past trauma, relive it, and, consequently, be retraumatized by it in the present moment. The painful reality of being traumatized is that there is no going back to the pre-trauma state as long as the traumatic wounding keeps coming back. In this regard, trauma can be defined as “the suffering that does not go away” or “the suffering that remains.”¹⁴ Like the background music of the 2017 war film *Dunkirk* that plays during the entire movie, trauma “obscures everything and is constant”¹⁵ in the life of the traumatized person.

How would you feel if you lived with the *ongoing aftereffects* of traumatic wounds that remained in you and did not go away? You would feel that you are not only undone but also *done*. Feeling powerless, disoriented, left

behind alone, and utterly tired, you would think that your life is meaningless. You would be tempted to give up—even stop going to church and ask God, “Why me?” Nevertheless, because of your faith, if not in spite of it, you would become a contemporary Job and break the seven days of silence to curse the day of your birth (see Job 3:1ff). You know that Job’s three faithful friends, who silently remained with the suffering Job, played the role of his compassionate companions until they followed suit. They should have not opened their mouths to retraumatize their suffering friend. What they did not know at that time was that in his crisis “Job needed a sounding board, human ears to absorb his lament.” “When we suffer,” as medical scientist Dianne Komp points out, “we all need sounding boards.”¹⁶

As I see it, what the traumatized Job needed was (and still is) not just a sounding board but also a sound or a voice or a language or, more precisely, *the lament*, which Claus Westermann called “*the language of suffering*; in it suffering is given the dignity of language. It will not stay silent!”¹⁷ I think that the Nobel Laureate Samuel Beckett might have had in mind the *impasse* of the traumatized person who is suffering in voluntary and/or forced silence when he ended his book *The Unnamable* as follows: “Where I am, I don’t know, I’ll never know, *in the silence you don’t know, you must go on*, I can’t go on, I’ll go on.”¹⁸ How can contemporary Jobs be empowered to break their silence and tell their stories of incomprehensible and unnamable suffering?

TRAUMA-SENSITIVE PEDAGOGY AND FOSTERING RESILIENCE AND COURAGE

Before we address this question of telling stories of suffering, let us turn to those who promote trauma-sensitive pedagogy in the primary and secondary education setting. They start with the awareness that traumatized students live in a constant crisis or survival mode, always ready to fight, flee, or freeze, and that if students are not in the learning mode, they won’t be able to learn. They humbly admit that they are no substitute for clinically trained counselors, social workers, and psychologists and that they cannot undo what happened to traumatized students. And yet they boldly argue that they can provide students, both traumatized and non-traumatized, with a safe, stable, consistent, trustworthy, and collaborative learning environment (or “learning community”) in which all teachers, students, and staff step outside their comfort zone, stop labeling or categorizing traumatized students on the basis of their assumptions, and are sen-

sitive to and supportive of the needs of traumatized students. And what is more important, they believe that traumatized students can continue to learn *only if* we educators change our understanding of learning and reconceptualize teaching. It follows then that our understanding of trauma can and should lead to a new understanding of learning and teaching.

In this new understanding, the job of educators is not so much teaching students as helping them learn. Some educators suggest that the traditionally acclaimed fundamentals of education, i.e., the three Rs (reading, writing, and arithmetic) should be supplemented with three new Rs (relationship, responsibility, and regulation). They argue that the underlying foundation for the development of these transformational learning principles is *empathy*. Empathy, which is the ability to recognize, understand, and share the feelings (and thoughts) of another, is “a learnable—and therefore teachable—*skill*.”¹⁹ Other educators go further than empathy and advocate compassionate teaching. For them, compassion is not merely a necessary skill; rather, it is “the *process* of recognizing suffering and the motivation to relieve suffering.”²⁰ Furthermore, some educators even talk about showing grace, which “isn’t our natural response.”²¹

Notably, these trauma-sensitive teachers who are empathic, compassionate, and graceful are not so much concerned with the narrative of the traumatic event (“the language of suffering”) over which they have no control as with the *effects* of the traumatic event on traumatized students and their *responses*, which they can observe and work on. They are concerned with transforming the way teachers respond to students’ (mis)behaviors and influencing the way students respond to stress. Based on the best available clinical research on trauma, they attempt to help traumatized students attain awareness of their stress response and teach them positive ways of responding. They model appropriate ways to manage their own stress, emphasizing the use of the “upstairs brain” (the cerebral cortex, reason) rather than the “downstairs brain” (the limbic system, emotions).²² They proactively do the detective work of reading what causes a stress response (“the trigger”) in traumatized students in order not to retraumatize them. As they reach out to traumatized students, they are creative enough to think outside the box and wise enough not try to put square pegs into round holes. It is commendable that they cultivate positive relationships with traumatized students (“relationship-focused teaching”) and meet them where they

are and acknowledge their skills, habits, strengths, and needs (“strengths-based teaching”).

By cultivating a safe learning space (or environment or community), trauma-sensitive pedagogy aims at fostering *resilience* among students. Resilience is a person’s capacity to cope with a crisis and trauma. It is the ability to recover from difficulties or return to the pre-crisis state. How then can we foster resilience when our “safe” space is not safe enough to address the trauma narrative? As clinical social worker Kawal Ulanday aptly puts it, “Whenever we provide a *safe space for things to come out*, it is the beginning of trauma being transformed. *Trauma not transformed is transmitted.*”²³ I concur with Robert Schreiter that to foster the trauma-transforming or healing resilience, we should do at least the following things: “Language has to be recovered as a vehicle for processing [traumatic] experience, the tyranny of past [traumatic] events that freezes us in an unending past and that blocks out the present and the future must be overcome, and a sense of meaning and a framework for right behavior must be restored.”²⁴ This leads us back to the contemporary Jobs’ need for a language of suffering.

Perhaps *the language to be recovered* or the trauma narrative is a subject beyond secondary education and should be addressed in the higher education setting, including theological education, where trauma is taught and studied. Some researchers warn that teaching trauma-related content is “a risky teaching” due to the re-traumatization and secondary (vicarious) traumatization the trauma narrative could provoke among students and that “teaching trauma is not the same as trauma-informed teaching.”²⁵ As we try to understand and teach trauma in seminary and church settings, trauma-sensitive pedagogy reminds us that we are committing ourselves to “practicing courageous risk-taking” that creates and sustains “an environment that neither dismisses suffering nor denies the possibility of growth and transformation.”²⁶ Even though there would be fear about recovering the language of suffering (Claus Westermann’s term) in seminary and church settings, trauma-sensitive pedagogy continues to foster resilient and courageous learners such as the protagonist (played by Will Smith) in the movie *After Earth* (2013), who says, “Danger is very real, but fear is a choice. We are all telling ourselves a story.”²⁷

TRAUMATIC FAITH AND THEOLOGICAL FIELD EDUCATION

Are we who work in seminary and church settings willing and ready to care for traumatized people and listen to their trauma narratives? Like the novel coronavirus and the racism virus, *trauma is a pandemic* and does not discriminate. As Kristin Souers writes, “No one is immune: trauma occurs everywhere, in all populations and circumstances, at every socioeconomic level, across ethnic and cultural lines, within all religions, and at all levels of education.”²⁸ Believe it or not, traumatized people are all around us, even in the church. The problem for theological education in general and theological field education in particular, Baldwin argues, is that “the church, in its *ignorance* of traumatic processing [or trauma process], is too often a place of misunderstanding and re-traumatization.”²⁹

Trauma-sensitive pedagogy helps by addressing this very problem, but now is the time for trauma-sensitive theology to step up and serve for, like it or not, “Trauma interrupts and reframes faith.”³⁰ Theologically speaking, we who live in an era of trauma are called to understand trauma, reread the Bible through the lens of trauma, and reimagine the Christian faith. Serene Jones argues that “understanding trauma not only helps deepen our understanding of Scripture, but also is essential to the task of theology today.”³¹ This is to say that understanding grace as well as trauma enhances our theological imagination. As in the lyrics of the song “At the Foot of the Cross,” written by Kathryn Scotts, “Where *grace and suffering meet* . . . / Where I am made (where *I am made complete*),”³² we find what Jones calls “traumatic faith,” the real faith of Jesus Christ rediscovered through the lens of suffering. As she sees it, *the central story of the Christian faith* is the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ, *a story of trauma and grace* (trauma + grace), and “theology’s task is to re-narrate to us what we have yet to imagine,” i.e., to see and show “a glimpse of grace at work in the interstices of imagination.”³³

Among the many things that we can imagine in the empathic, compassionate, and graceful process of reimagining our faith through the lens of suffering, I would like to refer to three fundamentals of traumatic faith that are constructed as a response to trauma: (1) a life out of control, (2) a cruciform healing, and (3) a big enough grace. Stanley Hauerwas writes in his theological memoir that what he learned from living with his mentally ill wife was “how to live when you are not in control of your life.”³⁴ Deanna Thompson writes in a theological reflection on her living with terminal ill-

ness that she learned that “healing in Christ is always cruciform.”³⁵ And Jones finishes her theological study on trauma and grace with a vision of salvation “in the here and now”—“to stand courageously on the promise that grace is sturdy enough to hold it all—you, and me, and every broken, trauma-ridden soul that wanders through our history.”³⁶ Traumatic faith helps us let go of control and let God be God, see beyond our suffering and care for others who suffer, and have the courage (“grace under pressure,” Ernest Hemingway) to take the risk of hope. To put it in the words of Thompson, this faith helps us “reframe the power of the trauma” and be “encompassed by a larger story of hope in the more of life, both in this world and in the beyond.”³⁷

Before I end this article with some practical strategies for trauma-sensitive pedagogy for theological field education, I would like to emphasize the theological importance of doing “pause and reflect” with compassionate companions (sounding boards) in a safe learning space with the following words often attributed to Victor Frankl: “Between stimulus and response there is a space. In that space is our power to choose our response. In our response lies our growth and our freedom.”³⁸ The space referred to here, to be rediscovered through the lens of trauma (and grace), is not only a personal inner space of theological reflection but also our common space of theological conversation. We should make sure that the learning space in theological field education is safe and that students continue to be committed to understanding trauma and reimagining Christian faith in their lives. In this safe learning space, our first service to others is listening to them (Dietrich Bonhoeffer) or becoming a sounding board for them, and we are invited “to wait patiently, proceed relationally, and seek collaboration.”³⁹

Here are my suggestions for trauma-sensitive practices in theological field education:

1. Make sure that students take at least the introductory pastoral care/counseling course that includes trauma study before they start an internship and help them identify “gaps in their preparedness” that should be addressed during the internship.⁴⁰
2. “[Resist] retraumatization through strengths-based teaching”⁴¹ and “engage [students] collaboratively by inviting them to write their own learning objectives in addition to the ones in the syllabus.”⁴² Be flexible in your expectations about and requirements of learning objectives. Receive students’ feedback and suggestions for the modification of assignments and offer students alternative assignments when needed.

3. Cultivate a safe learning community where students do an interdisciplinary study of *historical trauma* and listen to trauma narratives and learn about intergenerational transmission of trauma.⁴³ Keeping in mind that teaching/learning trauma could cause re-traumatization and secondary traumatization, use available trauma-informed resources and provide information on self-care.
4. Practice mindfulness with a simple and regular spiritual discipline together with the students. As Han van den Blink notes, "Brief, repetitive prayers can be such a powerful way to keep the thinking part of the brain engaged, when flooded with emotion, and thereby achieve some distance from overwhelming affect."⁴⁴

NOTES

- 1 Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks, Volume II, Notebook 3* [1930] (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), 32–33.
- 2 According to the recent annual, nationally representative survey by the American Psychological Association, most people do not think every crisis is manageable. See Rebecca Ruiz, “America Is So Stressed Out, It’s Time for More Than Coping Skills,” Mashable, October 21, 2020, <https://mashable.com/article/covid-stress/>.
- 3 Victor H. Mair, “How a Misunderstanding about Chinese Characters Has Led Many Astray,” Pinyin.info, <http://pinyin.info/chinese/crisis.html>.
- 4 Mair, “How a Misunderstanding,” italics added.
- 5 Patricia A. Jennings, *The Trauma-Sensitive Classroom: Building Resilience with Compassionate Teaching* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2019), 3, italics added.
- 6 Jennifer Baldwin, *Trauma-Sensitive Theology: Thinking Theologically in the Era of Trauma* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018), 157.
- 7 I am not sure whether a change in nomenclature would make this pedagogy stronger if not holier, but the author of a recent book on the subject claims that *trauma-invested pedagogy* is “a philosophy, a way of life, and *the thing* that brings everything else together.” Kristin Van Marter Souers with Pete Hall, *Relationship, Responsibility, and Regulation: Trauma-Invested Practices for Fostering Resilient Learners* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2019), 27. Her collaborator also states, “We’re in the business of unconditional love and unyielding support [for all our students].” Pete Hall, *Relationship, Responsibility, and Regulation*, 50.
- 8 For the concept of being undone and redone, see Willie James Jennings, “Foreword: Undone and Redone,” in Deanna A. Thompson, *Glimpsing Resurrection: Cancer, Trauma, and Ministry* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2018), ix–xiii.
- 9 Serene Jones, *Trauma + Grace*, 2nd ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2019), xii, italics added. This book was first published in 2009.
- 10 Christopher G. Frechette and Elizabeth Boase, “Defining ‘Trauma’ as a Useful Lens for Biblical Interpretation,” in *Bible through the Lens of Trauma*, ed. Elizabeth Boase and Christopher G. Frechette (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 3, italics added.
- 11 Baldwin, *Trauma-Sensitive Theology*, 25, italics added.
- 12 Baldwin, *Trauma-Sensitive Theology*, 76–79.
- 13 Jennifer Erin Beste, *God and the Victim: Traumatic Intrusions on Grace and Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 7–8, 127 (quotation).
- 14 Shelly Rambo, *Spirit and Trauma: A Theology of Remaining* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 15.
- 15 Jones, *Trauma + Grace*, 189.
- 16 Dianne M. Komp, *Why Me?: A Doctor Looks at the Book of Job* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 47.

- 17 Claus Westermann, "The Role of the Lament in the Theology of the Old Testament," *Interpretation* 28 (1974): 31, as quoted in Frechette and Boase, "Defining 'Trauma' as a Useful Lens," 12, italics added.
- 18 Samuel Beckett, *The Unnamable*, ed. Steven Connor (London: Calder, 2010), 134, italics added. This book was published in 1953 in French and in 1958 in English.
- 19 Souers, *Relationship, Responsibility, and Regulation*, 69, italics added. See also pp. 65–71.
- 20 Jennings, *The Trauma-Sensitive Classroom*, 131, italics added.
- 21 Souers, *Relationship, Responsibility, and Regulation*, 175. For the GRACE Model developed by Zen Buddhist teacher Roshi Joan Halifax, see Jennings, *The Trauma-Sensitive Classroom*, 155–57.
- 22 Jennings, *The Trauma-Sensitive Classroom*, 31–33. See also "Dr. Dan Siegel's Hand Model of the Brain," August 9, 2017, YouTube video, 8:15, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f-m2YcdMdfw>.
- 23 Kawal Ulanday, italics added.
- 24 Robert J. Schreiter, "Reading Biblical Texts through the Lens of Trauma," in Boase and Frechette, *Bible through the Lens of Trauma*, 196.
- 25 See Neill Harrison, Jacqueline Burke, and Ivan Clarke, "Risky Teaching: Developing a Trauma-Informed Pedagogy for Higher Education," *Teaching in Higher Education* (2020), doi:10.1080/13562517.2020.1786046; Janice Carello and Lisa D. Butler, "Potentially Perilous Pedagogies: Teaching Trauma Is Not the Same as Trauma-Informed Teaching," *Journal of Trauma and Dissociation* 15, no. 2 (2014): 153–68.
- 26 L. Callid Keefe-Perry and Zachary Moon, "Courage in Chaos: The Importance of Trauma-Informed Adult Religious Education," *Religious Education* 114, no. 1 (2019): 33, 35.
- 27 Souers, *Fostering Resilient Learners*, 134.
- 28 Souers, *Fostering Resilient Learners*, 23.
- 29 Baldwin, *Trauma-Sensitive Theology*, 3, 12 (quotation), italics added.
- 30 Darryl W. Stephens, "Trauma-Informed Pedagogy for the Religious and Theological Higher Education Classroom," *Religions* 11 no. 9 (2020): 449.
- 31 Jones, *Trauma + Grace*, xiv. For trauma hermeneutics, see Boase and Frechette, *Bible through the Lens of Trauma*.
- 32 Italics added. For the full lyrics, see Kathryn Scott, "At the Foot of the Cross," Musixmatch, <https://www.musixmatch.com/lyrics/Kathryn-Scott/At-the-Foot-of-the-Cross>.
- 33 Jones, *Trauma + Grace*, 21, 22.
- 34 Stanley Hauerwas, *Hannah's Child: A Theologian's Memoir* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 156.
- 35 Deanna A. Thompson, *Glimpsing Resurrection: Cancer, Trauma, and Ministry* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2018), 140.

- 36 Jones, *Trauma + Grace*, 165.
- 37 Thompson, *Glimpsing Resurrection*, 161.
- 38 Jennings, *The Trauma-Sensitive Classroom*, 122. Frankl did not actually write these words. The quote may have been inspired by a passage in a 1963 article by Rollo May. See "Between Stimulus and Response," Quote Investigator, <https://quoteinvestigator.com/2018/02/18/response/>.
- 39 Eileen Campbell-Reed, "Pandemic Pedagogy: Improvising Our Practices of Teaching," *ATS Colloquy Online* (April 2020), <https://www.ats.edu/uploads/resources/publications-presentations/colloquy-online/pandemic-pedagogy.pdf>.
- 40 For the "gaps" in the preparation, see Thurisca Kovinthan Levi, "Preparing Pre-Service Teachers to Support Children with Refugee Experiences," *Albert Journal of Educational Research* 65, no. 4 (2019): 285–304.
- 41 Donna Goodwin, "Trauma-Informed Pedagogy: Rethinking the Use of Graduated Instructional Prompts in Inclusive Physical Education," *Palaestra* 34, no. 2 (2020): 45.
- 42 Jennifer W. Davidson, "Beyond Trigger Warnings: Towards a Trauma Informed Andragogy for the Graduate Theological Classroom," *Review and Expositor* 117, no. 2 (2020): 254.
- 43 See Zuleka Henderson et al., "Putting Practice into Practice: Addressing Historical Trauma, Mistrust, and Apprehension in Research Methods Courses," *Journal of Social Work Education* 52, no. 1 (2016): 69–78.
- 44 Han van den Blink, "Trauma and Spirituality," *Reflective Practice* 28 (2008): 40.