Collaborative Generativity:
The What, Who, and How of Supervision in a Modern/Post-modern Context

Joretta L. Marshall

Providing and receiving supervision has been an integral part of the vocational life of many pastors, teachers, and pastoral care specialists. Reflecting upon what we think we are doing in the context of supervision and how our commitments are embodied in the process are central to the trustworthiness of our work. For example, when I accepted a teaching position at an institution with an accredited American Association of Pastoral Counselors (AAPC) pastoral counseling training center, I was immersed into individual, group, and didactic teaching and learning in a new way. The first semester for which I was fully responsible for supervision at the center provided an opportunity to work with three student-clinicians who clearly self-identified as "narrative pastoral counselors." The students were thoughtful, theologically diverse, and emerging pastoral theologians.

A Scenario from Supervision

Informed by post-modernity (with varying degrees of commitment to its tenets), one afternoon in group supervision we embarked on a conversation about a client who had come to the center and appeared to be under the in-

_____
Joretta L. Marshall, MDiv, MA, PhD, is a Diplomate and past president of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors and is Professor of Pastoral Theology, Care, and Counseling at Brite Divinity School, 2855 South University Dr., Fort Worth, TX 76129 (Email: j.marshall@tcu.edu).

fluence of marijuana or alcohol. The student-clinician was committed to the client's agency, aware of other mitigating complexities of the case (including a history of substance abuse and a recommendation from a doctor in the client's country of origin to use marijuana to help with an attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder diagnosis) and noted the lack of systemic support given that the client was living in a country not of his origin.

As we discussed the case, subtle differences began to emerge among us that reflected the theological and clinical diversity within the group. One student, a pastor and emergency room nurse from the Nazarene tradition, wondered what the ethical implications were of allowing the person to leave the building and drive home if he was, indeed, impaired. The student-clinician presenting the case, post-modern in commitments and a part of the Alliance of Baptist tradition, was committed to the agency of the client and felt it important to follow the client's lead, opting not to pursue the alcohol/marijuana usage. She was joined by the third student who embodied post-modernity as an ordained United Church of Christ pastor and who agreed that it would be an abuse of the clinician's power to insert one's own perspectives into the process, thereby taking away the agency of the client. Shaped by my own post-modern modernity, I wondered aloud about what the clinical and theo-ethical implications were of working with someone (and receiving payment for that work) when that person was not fully present in terms of emotional and cognitive capacities. I was also invested in exploring what was theologically at stake in the case.

Together we explored obligations to codes of ethics, conflicts between our theo-ethical assumptions and clinical practices, and musings about any "risk management" issues within the larger institution in which we sat. How does one attend to agency in clients and still raise ethical and clinical questions or concerns that challenge that agency? How does one discern new counter-narratives in the midst of theo-ethical and moral stances that sometimes conflict with one another? How does one avoid the modern clinical trap of "diagnosis and treatment" as a primary mode of response and what does this imply about the pastoral nature of our work? Underneath all of this were the multiple understandings about what it means to be a "pastoral" counselor who holds theological perspectives about human creatures and what it is we think we are doing in the context of our work as clinicians and theologians.[1] This particular situation parallels supervisory experiences in multiple contexts. The questions and concerns raised above are not unique to those who are training as pastoral counselors, but are met

by supervisors and supervisees, student-pastors, chaplains, clinicians, and local church caregivers. In this article I will reflect on three aspects that offer a particular perspective on supervision: the "what" or the intentions of supervision (what is it we hope happens through supervision and why); the "who" of supervision (who is in the room, literally and figuratively) and the "how" of supervision (what kinds of processes and theories help us invite others into their own best selves as pastoral caregivers, specialists, and counselors).The metaphor that guides me in this process is that of "collaborative generativity." Although the reflections in this article arose out of a particular pastoral clinical context, the principles articulated here have applications for other contexts of pastoral supervision.

The "What" or Intention of Supervision

Commitments to three underlying values—pastoral theological methods, teaching and learning theory, and a commitment to engage post-modern perspectives[2] in pastoral work—provide a base for supervision that is collaborative and generative. Before turning to these three values a quick definition of the term "collaborative generativity" is helpful.

The word "collaborative" is used quite often in our contemporary world to signal that people work alongside one another in some way, often indicating a hope to move away from more autocratic or hierarchical ways of being. Drawing upon a particular understanding grounded in the philosophical work of clinicians who self-identify as "collaborative therapists," the word "collaborative" refers to "clinical work [that] is based upon mutual agenda setting and a fundamental trust in clients' ideas about what is best for them. It includes holding a client's views in the highest esteem and using them as the cornerstones of our work with clients."[3] To be collaborative is more than working alongside; rather it suggests a particular stance that values genuine engagement with the other. "Generativity" suggests that something that would not have been possible without such mutual dialogue is constructed in the process. Collaborative supervision values the knowledge and agency of the supervisee, as well as of the supervisor, and recognizes the generativity of language and meaning that is co-constructed.

Pastoral Theological Method is Central
Collaborative generativity becomes a guiding metaphor for supervision in that it suggests something about the qualities and intentions that are hoped for in the shared work. The three underlying commitments noted at the out-

set of this section provide a way to develop this metaphor. First, a commitment to pastoral theological method remains central in this model of supervision by building on dialogical engagement between *praxis*, theories, theologies, ecclesial traditions, and lived experiences. The primary goal is not to "teach" someone to be a pastoral caregiver, but to provide a space for generative pastoral theological dialogue that invites new or altered constructions about self, other, theory, theology, and community.[4]

Supervision becomes a place where the art and craft of pastoral care takes shape as persons (supervisees and supervisors) open themselves to theological wisdom evidenced in the lives of clients, parishioners, patients, colleagues, peers, supervisors, and communities. Returning to the scenario with which this paper began, collaborative generativity that intentionally engages pastoral theological method means reflecting not only on therapeutic elements of a case, but diving into theological and ethical constructions in our reflection. How does knowing this client change the supervisee's theological understanding of what it means to be created in the image of God? Or, how does our mutual conversation and dialogue together generate new theological understandings of accountability and community? How does our collaborative work in group supervision challenge each one's theological assumptions about the agency of God and the agency of humans? These are the kinds of pastoral theological generative questions that emerge in dialogue together.

Nurturing Generative Learning

Second, a commitment to teaching and learning guides the embodiment of collaborative generativity.[5] The question that drives this perspective on supervision is not, "what it is that I think I am teaching through supervision," but, "how do I nurture the kind of relational space that allows for critical and generative learning to take place?" Four sets of specific teaching and learning strategies become important: developing relational qualities; enhancing the agency of the supervisee; engaging critical and post-modern skills; and encouraging an openness to self-reflection and life-long supervision. Each of these will be explored in greater detail in the final section of this article as I address the "how" of supervision.

Teaching and learning theory that focuses less on the offering of knowledge and more on the development of critical perspectives[6] or the post-modern concept of "not-knowing" allows for something new and generative to emerge. When the focus in supervision remains only on the transmission

of knowledge from supervisor to supervisee there is less opportunity for a new wind to blow into the room. Collaborative conversations are less invested in diagnosing someone or discerning the most appropriate intervention, and more interested in wondering together about what we might learn (about ourselves, about human beings, about God, about relationality) in the context of mutual conversation. This shift in focus moves away from teaching people about psychotherapeutic, or theological, Truths and more toward acknowledging an awareness that we do not know our clients, parishioners, students, or patients in any complete way, nor do we know what is "best" for someone else.

The Contribution of a Post-modern Perspective

The third underlying commitment of collaborative generativity includes a philosophical commitment to pastoral methods and work that lean toward engaging more post-modern perspectives. While I value and appreciate modern psychodynamic theory that was part of my training (and hence is present in my supervision in some way), I am more interested in what gets generated in the intersection of modernity and post-modernity. Maintaining a more post-modern philosophical stance in supervision allows for greater possibility and creativity and suggests that pastoral work is not something learned and applied to people; rather it is a way of being that encourages speaking and exploring *with* a person "in the moment."[7]

The art and craft of pastoral supervision is more than just learning tools and gaining knowledge; it is practicing, reflecting individually and in the context of colleagues and supervisors, changing one's mind theologically and clinically, and engaging in discourses that hope to eventuate in freshness about theological and pastoral commitments. In the scenario from the beginning of this paper, collaborative generativity shows up not only in our wrestling with what the student-clinician ought to do, but in our wondering about the gifts and vulnerabilities of the client with whom she is working, the theo-ethical persuasions that are present in the clinician's work and in her peers and the client, and in the co-construction of language and meaning that occurs in the context of dialogue and relationships. The overall goal is not singularly that of making good pastoral caregivers, but of collaborating with pastoral theologians (students, colleagues, supervisors, and others) who embody in their work a perspective that engenders the liveliness of open and wondering theological commitments.

The "Who" of Supervision

On the one hand, it is clear "who" is engaged in supervision: the supervisee and the supervisor. On the other hand, in a collaborative approach it is important to value the multi-relational connections that are present in every encounter with other individuals, such as ecclesial traditions and judicatories, theologies and theories, communities, and lived experiences. A collaborative approach is less invested in the hierarchy of supervision (which does not mean that hierarchy disappears) and more interested in exploring the multiple ways in which people are in relationship with one another. I would like to explore briefly two sets of relationships in this context: Supervisees/supervisors and the learning community.

Supervisees and Supervisors

The word supervision has often been synonymous with training or mentoring.[8] Note that the word supervision (while not being the best word but an adequate one for talking about the activity to which we refer) is defined as an "overseer." They go on to suggest that, "[a] supervisor is one who can cast a detached yet concerned and compassionate eye over the landscape of counseling practice and, in so doing, can often pick out the detail that hovers at the supervisee's peripheral vision and which is not always clearly seen."[9] Moving toward a more collaborative approach, the question becomes, "How can practitioners [and] therapists create the kinds of conversations and relationships with their clients [and with one another] that allow all participants to access their creativities and develop possibilities where none seemed to exist before?"[10]

A fundamental assumption in collaborative supervision is that those with whom we work—clients, communities, supervisees—bring their own "local knowledge" to the dialogue and that the process of mutual inquiry contributes to the construction of new knowledge. The term "local knowledge" reflects "knowledge, expertise, truths, values, conventions, narratives, etc.—that is created within a community of persons (i.e., family or work team; classroom or board room) who have first-hand knowledge (i.e., unique meanings and understandings from personal experience) of themselves and the situation…"[11] Collaborative generativity assumes that such local knowledge is to be valued, honored, and explored—rather than diagnosed and understood—in order that new options might be imagined. Maintaining a "not-knowing" stance is essential to supervision, as one remains less clear about what the outcome of a particular supervisory hour or

experience ought to be. This does not mean that there are no goals, nor does it mean that conversations are to roam randomly. Rather, it suggests that a peculiar patience allows for new things to emerge that are not planned or imagined.

Not knowing the outcome of work with a particular supervisee invites everyone's knowledge and wisdom into the space of supervision. As a supervisor, I bring the knowledge of my own social location as a post-modern-leaning-modern pastoral theologian, church-related and yet on the edge of much of my tradition, partnered lesbian, and a pastoral counselor trained in object-relations and interested in collaborative and narrative theory alongside queer theory. My goal is to invite forth the wisdom and knowledge of the supervisee without denying that I have things I want students to encounter and learn from a theological and/or practitioner's perspective. The supervisee brings the richness of life experiences as well, including what it feels like to sit in the room with a particular client or parishioner. Yet, none of us knows precisely what is "best" for the other, even though we may have leanings based on the wisdom of theory, theology, and experience. The supervisor and supervisee each bring something to the relationship which ultimately changes both as language is discovered and meaning is co-constructed.[12]

The Richness of Diversity

Because this collaborative stance values different kinds of experts (as opposed to sole reliance on the authority and knowledge of the supervisor), conflicting and competing perspectives arise in the process of supervision, such as those encountered in the scenario with which this paper began. It is precisely this diversity that adds richness and texture to the work of supervision and to the development of pastoral caregivers. Within a collaborative model, such differences are not to be resolved, but engaged in order that something new comes from them.[13] In the opening scenario, it was clear that I did not know what was right for this student-clinician and her client; what I did know, however, was that together we generated more perspectives, options, and possibilities than the student and I might have done alone. In addition, my own expertise in the room encouraged me to raise questions and to explore theo-ethical-clinical possibilities that might not have been present without a seasoned clinician.

Anderson and her colleagues suggest that "withness thinking" is one way to imagine the kind of relationship that I am describing. "'Withness

thinking' is a dynamic form of reflective interaction that involves coming into contact with another's living being, with their utterances, with their bodily expressions, with their words, their works."[14] Hierarchy—while still present—no longer functions as the primary dominant power in the room and, instead becomes a structure of relational accountability that can make a way for openness and honesty. As Orlans and Edwards note in their chapter, "A Collaborative Model of Supervision," such supervision emphasizes "the learning of *both* supervisee and supervisor…A truly joint venture with regard to learning within the supervisory relationship calls, in our view, for a transparency in the process, and for explicit attention to be paid to the developing relationship."[15] My own goal is not to "mold" students in my image of what a good pastoral counselor is, but to encourage the development of their best resources in this endeavor. That does not mean that I do not have "learning goals" or "outcomes" that I think important for a pastoral counselor. What I am suggesting is that I want to take the gifts and insights of supervisees as seriously as I consider my insights or those of other theologians and theoreticians.

Learning Communities

A second set of relationships that are significant in the context of pastoral supervision might best be called, "learning communities." London and Rodriguez-Jazcilevich, suggest that,

> The goals of a collaborative learning community include: (a) to access every members' creativity and resources and foster the kind of environment in which each participant feels comfortable, open, and part of the conversations, and (b) to create spaces and relationships in which each person has a sense of freedom and belonging, spaces in which everyone can voice their ideas, ask questions, and express concerns, without feeling blamed or judged.[16]

Such learning communities include the multiple partners who are actually present in the room, as well as those who are metaphorically present (including clients past and present, other supervisors in the program and beyond, institutional partners, ecclesial traditions and connections, theorists and theologians, and others who are more invisible). Three aspects of these learning communities assist in the development of collaborative generativity.

First, learning communities embody multiple diversities that bring richness and new meanings to conversations. As noted earlier, the best teaching and learning occurs, not simply when there is openness to diversi-

ty, but when there is a deep appreciation and valuing of the various ways in which we are different from one another. The question to be asked is: "How might our differences offer us freshness as we work with others or as we think about God?"[17]

Second, learning communities are marked by varying levels of training and experience and enhance collaborative generativity in the moment. I am often struck, for example, by how the novel questions of newer clinicians generate rich reflections that those of us who are more seasoned have taken as assumptive truths. Discovering ways to enhance shared learning and growth as pastoral theologians and caregivers becomes part of my responsibility as a supervisor in the learning community.

Third, learning communities extend beyond the individuals in any particular group. As a supervisor, I assume that others in the room draw upon persons, theologies, and theories outside of themselves and ones with which I am not familiar. Encouraging others to share what they have come to know offers greater possibilities in enhancing our collective gifts and mitigating our individual limitations.

Supervision becomes more generative as I trust that the supervisees with whom I work have thoughts and theories that can have an impact, not only on their particular clients, but ultimately on the field of pastoral theology and pastoral counseling. As McNamee notes, we recognize "knowing as constructed in our conjoint activities with others—in what people do together. Here, conversation suggests a 'turning' together."[18] This turning together in collaborative work rests less on individual knowledge and more on learning communities as places for engendering collaborative generativity.[19]

The "How" of Supervision

Four specific strategies assist in crafting a generative collaborativity in the context of supervision: developing supervisory relationships that are transparent and relationally accountable; enhancing the agency of the supervisee; increasing skills reflective of a more post-modern approach; and encouraging openness to self-reflection and life-long supervision in both the supervisor and supervisee.

A Transparent, Relational Accountability

Two relational qualities important in collaborative generativity are transparency and relational accountability. Transparency is used in both narrative and collaborative approaches to, "define a moral position concerning

the therapist's determination to be genuine in relating to persons and to avoid a top-down or professionally distanced stance."[20] Noting differences in power, attending to "inner conversations" and appropriate disclosures about what the supervisor is thinking in order to make our thoughts "public"[21] and being clear about the boundaries and structures of our relationships remain central to supervision. Open curiosity, for example, about how supervisees interpret, understand, or challenge the power or the concerns of the supervisor opens all up to learning from the process of mutual critical thinking or differences of opinion.

Remaining relationally accountable to the various partners in supervision maintains stances that minimize abusive power-over experiences with supervisees and enhances the development of mutual relationships in light of power differences that are real. Mutual inquiry and curiosity about the perspectives of others assists in creating meaning and co-constructing new language and new visions for what we are about as pastoral theologians and caregivers. For example, I want to engage students in ways that parallel how they might engage clients or parishioners by honestly addressing differences in power and working toward mutual conversations from which everyone learns. Clarity about how we move through disagreements with one another or how we hold one another accountable for power helps to avoid an "idealized" version of collaborative work that assumes that everyone's voice carries equal weight in the context of supervision. Genuine collaborative inquiry is risky and it takes time and energy in order to be clear about how power is being engaged in our work together. The use of reflecting teams and other strategies provide unique ways to listen intentionally to supervisees, and for supervisors to reflect openly with one another in front of supervisees.[22]

Enhancing the Agency of Supervisees

As noted earlier, the development of the student-clinician's agency is important in supervision. "Self-agency refers to a sense of competency or ability to perform or take action, to have choices, and to participate in the creation of choices. Self-narratives can create identities (meanings) that permit or hinder a sense of self-agency."[23] I do not know what vocational journey will emerge for a supervisee, or what theoretical and theological language they will adopt as "theirs." As I companion with them in supervision, a part of my role is to offer various perspectives and options from which they might choose.

Exploring diverse perspectives, methods, and clinical stances provides opportunities for supervisees to shape their pastoral care in the context of a community of others. In the process, my hope is that supervisees begin to find ways of being that are congruent with their theo-ethical understandings and, yet, open to self-critique and the hermeneutic of suspicion about their own perspectives. Wosket and Page speak of a tension for those who educate by suggesting that one of the questions for supervisors, "is how to promote healthy and creative skepticism in their trainees while delivering a model of supervision that promotes sufficient confidence and personal conviction to enable novice supervisors to embark on the daunting journey of accompanying and assisting counselors who are often in difficulty with their clients."[24] Narrative counselors, Freedman and Combs, provide a list of questions that are helpful in the process of evaluating theories, practices, or methods. These include such things as how does a theory "see" persons; does it invite people to see the therapist or themselves as experts on themselves; do questions lead in generative or normative directions?[25]

Another strategy for enhancing self-agency in supervisees occurs as we pay attention to transformations in supervisees and articulate together changes that occur. In the process, self-transformation becomes a resource for transformation in others. Anderson suggests that, "[b]y transformation, I refer to the continual newness in our lives such as knowledge, expertise, meaning, identity, and futures that are inherent in inventive and creative aspects of language."[26] Building on the notion of generativity, it is clear that people continuously unfold and evolve in the context of relationality. Hence, relationships between supervisor-supervisee, between colleagues and peers, and between written literature and lived experience provide venues for dialogue that becomes transformative in various ways to each person in the room. As Anderson notes, attention to "'transforming' permits me to be ever-mindful of the fluid nature of language. It also permits me to be helpful: to appreciate that human beings are resilient, that each person has contributions and potentials, and that each person values, wants, and strives toward healthy successful lives and relationships."[27] Transformation in self and other becomes central to collaborative generativity.

Engaging and Attending to Skills

A third set of strategies focuses on particular practices and skills needed for pastoral and clinical encounters. Part of the role of supervision is to help others (including myself) reflect systematically on the kinds of practices that

enhance a client's or parishioner's experience of pastoral care. There are multiple skills to be honed in a responsive-active listening-hearing model.[28] Included in these are such things as building the capacities for theological reflection and construction, relational skills, the integration of psychotherapy and theological anthropology, analysis of social construction and bio-psycho-logics, and more. Facilitating reflection on the small and important ways that meaning is constructed contextually through specific acts of care becomes an important practice in supervision. Drawing upon reflecting teams, peer observations, theological and theoretical reading assignments and conversations, group reflections, experiences and reflections on those experiences, and other strategies assist in the development of skills.

Self-awareness and Commitment to Ongoing Growth

A fourth set of strategies in supervision are those that promote ongoing self-reflection and encourage life-long supervision and learning. The more that pastoral caregivers know their own narratives and have a sense of the meanings they make about their lives, the more accessible and present they will be to others with whom they offer care. While I am not interested in supervision that is really counseling in a different form, I am interested in assisting students in identifying the things that arise from their own personal stories and journeys that might get in the way of others, as well as the strengths that arise from those narratives.

The art of pastoral care requires an integration of head and heart, knowledge and skills, reflection and doing that invites one to be authentic and honest. Peer and group supervision invite people into conversations and discourses that encourage honesty and compassion in ways that are important for growth as pastors and caregivers.[29] Supervision that is collaborative and generative will pay attention to opportunities that invite everyone (including the supervisor) into a fuller sense of their own narrative and a fuller sense of making meaning out of their own lives. Additionally, the group component of our supervisory process continues to be important as supervisees receive feedback from one another, engage in conversations that are rich, and find communities of colleagues that support their ongoing work.

Conclusion

Supervision for pastoral counselors is distinct in its content, but not in the commitments that one might bring to any supervisory process. Living a col-

laborative life as a supervisor in any context invites us to draw upon the intentional wisdom of colleagues and peers, supervisee and others, and to engage in new learning and language. Collaborative generativity recognizes that supervision is a dynamic and life-enhancing process not only for the supervisee, but for the supervisor. Reflecting critically on the what, who, and how of supervision offers new insights into models that can assist in the crafting of generative contributions for pastoral supervision.

NOTES

1. A special word of thanks goes to the students and colleagues with whom I work. Jason Hays, Genny Rowley, and John Thexton were participants in this particular story. In preparation for this paper, they read and reviewed my account of the story and offered insight and feedback into the paper. I am also indebted to colleagues at Brite (Nancy Gorsuch, Christie Neuger, and Nancy Ramsay) and elsewhere who offered feedback for this paper (Duane Bidwell, Ruth Ann Clark, Evon Flesberg, Ardith Hayes, Andy Lester, Ronald McDonald, and Han van den Blink).

2. Although there are multiple definitions of post-modernity, I will draw specifically upon the work of collaborative theorist, Harlene Anderson, who notes that post-modernity is defined by, "a family of concepts that have developed among scholars within some social science and natural science disciplines that call for an ideological critique—a questioning perspective—of the relevance and consequences of foundational knowledge, meta-narratives, and privileged discourses, including their certainty and power for our everyday lives." Harlene Anderson, "A Postmodern Umbrella: Language and Knowledge as Relational and Generative, and Inherently Transforming," in Harlene Anderson and Diane Gehart, eds., *Collaborative Therapy: Relationships and Conversations that Make a Difference* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 8. Anderson's post-modernity commitments include attention to multiple forms of knowledge including the valuing of "local knowledge," an attention to the social construction of language and meaning and to multi-authored narratives, as well as an awareness of the importance of relationality and agency. Ibid., 7–19.

3. Sally St. George and Dan Wulff, "Collaborating as a Lifestyle," in Anderson and Gehart, eds, *Collaborative Therapy*, 406. St. George and Wulff note that the primary elements of collaborative work are: valuation (not evaluation), acting mannerly, attending to the little things, critical self-reflection (including less diagnostic labeling), community (building neighbors), creative actions on multiple levels (Ibid, 407–418).

4. My concepts here are similar to those articulated by multiple pastoral theologians and clinicians. See Pamela Cooper-White, "Thick Theory: Psychology, Theoretical Models, and the Formation of Pastoral Counselors" in Duane R. Bidwell and Joretta L. Marshall, *The Formation of Pastoral Counselors: Challenges and Opportunities* (Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Pastoral Press, 2006), 47–67; Carrie Doehring, *The Practice of Pastoral Care (*Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2006); Larry Kent Graham and Jason C. Whitehead, "The Role of Pastoral Theology in Theological Education for the Formation of Pastoral Counselors" in Bidwell and Marshall, *The Formation of Pastoral Counselors,* 9–27; Christie Cozad Neuger, *Counseling Women: A Narrative Pastoral Approach* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001); and Loren Townsend, "Theological

Reflection and the Formation of Pastoral Counselors" in Bidwell and Marshall, *The Formation of Pastoral Counselors*, 29–46.

5.   In teaching and learning theory, I find most helpful the work of Stephen D. Brookfield and contributors from an edited volume by Mary Elizabeth Hess & Stephen D. Brookfield, eds., *The Power of Critical Theory: Liberating Adult Learning and Teaching* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005); Mary Elizabeth Hess, *Engaging Technology in Theological Education: All That We Can't Leave Behind* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005); Mary Elizabeth Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield, eds., *Teaching Reflectively in Theological Contexts: Promises and Contradictions.* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company, 2008).

6.   Brookfield, *The Power of Critical Theory.*

7.   Harlene Anderson and Diane Gehart, "Preface," in Anderson and Gehart, eds., *Collaborative Therapy*, xvii–xiii.

8.   Val Wosket and Steve Page, "The Cyclical Model of Supervision: A Container for Creativity and Chaos," in Michael Carroll and Margaret Tholstrup, eds., *Integrative Approaches to Supervision* (Philadelphia, PA: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2001), 20.

9.   Ibid., 13.

10. Harlene Anderson, "Dialogue: People Creating Meaning with Each Other and Finding Ways to Go On" in Anderson and Gehart, eds., *Collaborative Therapy*, 34.

11. Harlene Anderson, *Collaborative Practices in Organization, Therapy, Education and Research Contexts.* Paper presented at the Social Construction Relational Theory and Transformative Practices Conference, Sarasota, FL, September 2008, 8.

12. Ibid., 15.

13. Harlene Anderson, "The Heart and Spirit of Collaborative Therapy: The Philosophical Stance—A 'Way of Being' in Relationship and Conversation," in Anderson and Gehart, eds., *Collaborative Therapy*, 47.

14. Lynn Hoffman, "The Art of 'Withness': A New Bright Edge" in Anderson and Gehart, eds., *Collaborative Therapy*, 69.

15. Vanja Orlans and Dagmar Edwards, "A Collaborative Model of Supervision," in Carroll and Tholstrup, eds., *Integrative Approaches to Supervision*, 45.

16. Sylvia London and Irma Rodriguez-Jazcilevich, "The Development of a Collaborative Learning and Therapy Community in an Educational Setting: From Alienation to Invitation," in Anderson and Gehart, eds., *Collaborative Therapy:*, 238.

17. Nancy Ramsay's article on teaching and learning and difference is instructive as she notes the various ways in which race and culture are present. Nancy J. Ramsay, "Teaching Effectively in Racially and Culturally Diverse Classrooms," *Teaching Theology and Religion* 8 (vol. 1): 18–23. See also the following article: Maxine Dennis, "An Integrative Approach to 'Race' and Culture in Supervision," in Carroll and Tholstrup, eds., *Integrative Approaches to Supervision*, 145–154.

18. Sheila McNamee, "Relational Practices in Education: Teaching as Conversation," in Anderson and Gehart, eds., *Collaborative Therapy,* 314.

19. Sheila McNamee notes four resources for collaborative educational models: avoiding abstract positions, privileging narrative forms, fostering community, and blurring the boundaries between classroom and "life." The latter does not mean blurring the boundaries between client and clinician, or supervisor and supervisee, but reflects that collaborative teaching recognizes that what one "learns" in the classroom has an impact not only on clinical work, but on life.

20. Martin Payne, *Narrative Therapy: An Introduction for Counsellors*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2006), 174.

21. Anderson, *Collaborative Practices in Organization, Therapy, Education and Research Contexts*, 16.

22. Various reflecting processes are noted in Harlene Anderson and Per Jensen, eds., *Innovations in the Reflecting Process* (London: Karnac Books, 2007). My colleague, Christie Neuger and I have worked some with this approach with our student-clinicians as well as with one another in supervisory consultation and supervision of supervision.

23. Anderson, "A Postmodern Umbrella," 17.

24. Wosket and Page, "The Cyclical Model of Supervision: A Container for Creativity and Chaos," in Carroll and Tholstrup, eds., *Integrative Approaches to Supervision*, 18.

25. Gene Combs and Jill Freedman, *Narrative Therapy: The Social Construction of Preferred Realities* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996).

26. Anderson, "A Postmodern Umbrella," 10.

27. Ibid., 11.

28. Anderson, "Dialogue," 33–41.

29. Val Wosket and Steve Page identify stages of integration as: learning phase (starting training; imitation of experts; consolidation); the unlearning or integrating phase (exploration; integration; individuation). Wosket and Page, "The Cyclical Model of Supervision: A Container for Creativity and Chaos," in Carroll and Tholstrup, eds., *Integrative Approaches to Supervision*, 20.