Adaptive Action as a Form of Reflective Practice in Pastoral Leadership

Mary E. Hess

We are living in a world that is permeated by digital media. Even in the most rural parts of the United States, people have access to sophisticated devices that can stream video. We are also living in a world that, at least in the United States, is awash in competing stories. We no longer agree on the facts of our situation, and, as Michael Wesch has pointed out, we are struggling to make sense of our lives in the midst of context collapse.[1] These contrasting and contending realities are entangled with each other. That is, the emergence of widespread broadband digital media has led to a corresponding flattening of traditional authority structures, and with that flattening has come a shift to personal evaluation based on the experience of authenticity.[2] One key challenge, however, is that what "feels authentic" to one person can at the same time "feel manipulative" to another. Without shared context and at least some willingness to be in real dialogue, authenticity becomes a poor substitute for authority, and we arrive at a place where one person's "fake news" is another person's authenticated journalism.[3]

Mary E. Hess is a professor of educational leadership at Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota. Email: mhess@religioused.org.

Complex adaptive systems

The challenges of such a moment are more realistically defined as "complex" rather than simply "complicated." Will Allen, who seeks to draw distinctions between "complicated systems" and "complex adaptive systems," describes the contrast between the two in this way:

Complicated systems (such as sending a rocket to the moon)
- Formulae are critical and necessary
- Sending one rocket increases assurance that the next will be okay
- High levels of expertise in a variety of fields are necessary for success
- Rockets are similar in critical ways
- There is a high degree of certainty of outcome

Complex adaptive systems (such as raising a child)
- Formulae have limited application
- Raising one child provides experience but no assurance of success with the next
- Expertise can contribute but is neither necessary nor sufficient to ensure success
- Every child is unique and must be understood as an individual—relationships are important
- Uncertainty of outcome remains[4]

Complex adaptive systems are all around us, but it is perhaps only recently that scholars and practitioners have begun to perceive them. Cathy Davidson argues that digital media have disrupted our taken-for-granted views of the world so abruptly that we can finally perceive what has been occurring—her book is titled *Now You See It*—and thus begin to consider our responses to these shifts.[5] Scholars of complexity, however, are quick to note that responses require discerning not only the disruptions but also the varieties of change we are moving through.[6]

Eoyang and Holladay draw on complexity science literature to identify three kinds of change:

- static: when an object is moved from one place to another (bounded, low-dimension linear spaces)
- dynamic: motion along a smooth course to end up at a predictable point (some open boundaries, more factors, causality is messy)
- dynamical: complex change that results from unknown forces acting unpredictably to bring about surprising outcomes[7]

It is this last kind of change, the infelicitously named "dynamical" form of change, that I believe so aptly describes the reality many of us are inhabiting as we seek to improve leadership formation in various ministry settings. What does it mean to lead in the midst of complex change that occurs because of unknown forces acting unpredictably to bring about surprising outcomes? In some ways, I believe, or at least hope, that this is what pastoral leaders in the Christian context have been doing all along as we attend to discerning the movement of the Holy Spirit.

Allen draws some very specific implications for leadership from this comparison of complicated to complex adaptive systems:

Complicated systems

- Role defining—set job and task descriptions
- Decision making—find the 'best' choice
- Tight structuring—use chain of command and prioritize or limit simple actions
- Knowing—decide and tell others what to do
- Staying the course—align and maintain focus

Complex adaptive systems

- Relationship building—work with patterns of interaction
- Sense-making—interpret collectively
- Loose coupling—support communities of practice and add more degrees of freedom
- Learning—act/learn/plan at the same time
- Notice emergent directions—build on what works[8]

I believe that there is much within the practices of Christian community that aligns with Allen's description of leadership within complex adaptive systems. Still, the literature on leadership in ministerial contexts has led

many of us to expect that if we define roles well, if we find the best choices, if we prioritize, and if we align ourselves to our mission and focus, we will do well. These are, as noted above, characteristics of leaders in *complicated* systems. But we find ourselves today in the midst of complexity, caught up in systems that can only be described as *complex and adaptive*.

Still, consider the ways in which Allen writes about leadership in complex adaptive systems. He prioritizes relationship building and collective interpretation and makes continual learning a key element of such leadership. I find a similar argument in a book published years ago by Scott Cormode, *Making Spiritual Sense: Christian Leaders as Spiritual Interpreters*.[9] I, too, have made similar arguments in much of my writing.[10]

At the heart of the learning challenge is the art of developing reflective practice. Anita Farber-Robertson outlined a framework for doing such learning in a small book published by the Alban Institute nearly twenty years ago, *Learning While Leading: Increasing Your Effectiveness in Ministry*.[11] Many other scholars have also offered ideas for entering into this kind of practice.[12] I wish I could say that I am surprised by the degree to which these ideas have been marginalized within theological education, but, like any increasingly anxious system, those of us within the theological academy and our partners in active ministries have found ourselves rushing to technical solutions rather than facing the adaptive challenges head on. Those involved in reflective practice in 2017 and beyond need to consider very carefully what is emerging in the literature of adaptive action.

Adaptive action

"Adaptive action" builds from the work of Heifetz and others who first wrote about discerning the differences between "technical challenges," which have clear outlines and direct action prescriptions and require specific forms of skilled intervention, and "adaptive challenges," which have messy boundaries and confusing dilemmas and often require active adaptation on the part of all involved to reach some degree of conclusion.[13]

I have found these distinctions particularly helpful in a world that includes Brexit in the United Kingdom and the Trump administration in the United States. We are in a place where many of our preconceived understandings have been dramatically upended, a time in which there is no longer consensus about what constitutes reality, and a period in which it is

very difficult to predict what comes next. While the concept of "adaptive challenge" is useful in the context of such confusing and chaotic processes as we begin to acknowledge our dilemmas, it is the further question of how we should adequately respond to such challenges that forms the heart of the work of adaptive action theorists.

Just what is "adaptive action"? Eoyang and Holladay define it as "conscious influence over self-organizing patterns," which "requires an intentional process for seeing, understanding and influencing the conditions that shape change in complex adaptive systems."[14] Here is where pragmatic ideas related to how we go about building relationships, sensing meaning, and supporting collective interpretation become so essential. In particular, the task of perceiving patterns is an essential element of this kind of work. Further, the underlying "conditions" and "processes" of a given system are highly relevant factors in this form of leadership.

Adaptive action is a form of leadership that recognizes that organisms—and the institutions that emerge within, among, between, and across them—are self-organizing. That's a challenging statement to make to people, including many theological educators and pastoral leaders who prefer to see themselves as "leading" change, as being the primary casters of visions and definers of roles. In many ways, it is a recognition that leaders can, at best, influence the conditions of change and perhaps influence the patterns that are emerging. And, indeed, that is how theorists of adaptive action and dialogical organizational development articulate the role of leaders. At the heart of the practices of adaptive action is attention to how one "stands in inquiry" so that one is able to spot patterns.[15]

Standing in inquiry is, I imagine, a practice that many of us seek to support in our work of reflection, particularly in supervision. One of the patterns emerging in this arena in leadership literature is that the advice from various authors regarding how one "stands in inquiry" is quite similar. For instance, Eoyang and Holladay identify six practices:

- know your "stuff," but remain open to and actively engaged in learning more
- be comfortable with ambiguity and the vulnerability of holding questions
- ask questions more than you give answers
- turn judgment into curiosity
- turn disagreement into mutual exploration
- turn defensiveness into self-reflection[16]

Parker Palmer describes five "habits of the heart" that he believes are necessary:

- an understanding that we are all in this together
- an appreciation of the value of otherness
- an ability to hold tension in life-giving ways
- a sense of personal voice and agency
- a capacity to create community[17]

The final example is the list of "deconstructive propositions" offered by Lisa Lahey and Robert Kegan:

- There is probable merit to my perspective.
- My perspective may not be accurate.
- There is some coherence, if not merit, to the other person's perspective.
- There may be more than one legitimate interpretation.
- The other person's view of my viewpoint is important information to my assessing whether I am right or identifying what merit there is to my view.
- Our conflict may be the result of the separate commitments each of us holds, including commitments we are not always aware we hold.
- Both of us have something to learn from the conversation.
- We need to have two-way conversation to learn from each other.
- If contradictions can be a source of our learning, then we can come to engage not only internal contradictions as a source of learning but interpersonal contradictions (i.e., "conflict") as well.
- The goal of our conversation is for each of us to learn more about ourselves and the other as meaning makers.[18]

The pattern emerging in these lists includes the need to recognize one's internal perceptions and to do so in relationship within community. There is also a shared sense of knowledge as contextual and relational, not to mention affirmation of the necessity for inquiry more generally. So, how does adaptive action theory offer pragmatic support for leadership that takes this kind of inquiry seriously? It does so in part by noting that patterns can be shaped—influenced, nudged, quieted, enlarged—through attention to what Eoyang and Holladay refer to as "containers" of meaning.[19]

Reflective practice using containers of meaning

A container is something that "holds parts of the system together close enough and long enough that they will interact to create a new pattern."[20] The stories we tell ourselves and each other are an example of one kind of "container." Eoyang and Holladay note that one way to "change the container" that holds similarities together is by making it larger or smaller, by breaking up specific containers, or perhaps by introducing smaller ones.

Here I would point to the very rapid change that has coalesced in recent years through the use of hashtags in digital social media. For the past four years, the hashtag #blacklivesmatter has been at the heart of a powerful social movement that engages police misconduct and accompanying issues in the criminal justice system. I will not go into that example further (I have written about it elsewhere[21]), but the impact and strength of response to that one small piece of code has been seen worldwide. As I write this article, we are in the midst of another similar set of dynamics that have coalesced around the hashtag #metoo, which was actually first used in 1997 by Tarana Burke to call attention to sexual assault.[22]

In both of these instances, widespread and ongoing abuses that support institutionalized forms of oppression had long gone unremarked and without public judgment. The advent of digital social media, particularly Twitter (created in 2006), created a much larger container that made it possible to bring similarities together. Stories of abuse and harassment flooded public consciousness, and suddenly our awareness—and, perhaps more importantly, our inability to discount the pervasiveness and similarity of these stories—has prompted strong action to bring abusers to account.

We are only in the early stages of both of these movements—the Movement for Black Lives and the upwelling of a new wave of feminist action—so it remains to be seen whether a pattern of listening to those who have been marginalized and oppressed will become a new norm. My point in this article is that enlarging the container for these stories prompted a new coalescence.

Breaking larger containers up into smaller ones can also be an effective way to influence change. Consider what it means to break up the container of "whiteness" into smaller containers—explicit racism, white privilege, white fragility, white activism against racism. The system of white supremacy in the United States, at least, benefits from "whiteness" being an unexamined category that recedes from view for white people. "Color blindness" is

one such container, a story that is attractive to people who benefit from sys-
tems of white supremacy and white nationalism because it allows us (I am
one such person) to ignore racism. As is often noted, a fish does not see the
water in which it swims. So, too, the social construction of race in the United
States creates containers within which white people do not need to see our
race but through which—like a clear glass wall—we can put other people
into various containers of race.

Breaking up that container, however, and making clear that one can
be aware of one's own conferred dominance—and thus resist it—creates a
different set of stories to inhabit. Suddenly I am more interested in acting in
solidarity with others who not only see race as a social construction but who
want to take embodied action against its maintenance. I do not want to in-
habit the container of white privilege or even the container of white fragility.
I want to be in the midst of a community that embodies justice, that seeks
to live into the beloved community. I become interested in seeing race and
in finding patterns of practice that weave justice for all. Here, the poets, the
artists, the musicians, and the storytellers become key advocates and archi-
tects. And here, biblical stories of justice, of compassion, of solidarity with
the *anawim*, of God's graced kenosis into the world to lift up whole-hearted
love become containers that empower and a pattern woven into Creation
that uplifts, enfolds, and nourishes this way of being.[23]

Adaptive action argues that, along with enlarging or decreasing a con-
tainer, it is also possible to shape the conditions of change that influence
patterns by changing the differences that are present. This may be done by
incorporating new ones, for instance, or by excluding old ones from the cur-
rent container, or by ignoring or newly focusing on differences that exist
within the current container.

I could use many examples here, but perhaps in my own life the most
effective such changes have come from increasing the kinds of difference
that are present in a given container. I have served on the faculty of an Evan-
gelical Lutheran Church in America seminary in the upper Midwest of the
United States for the past seventeen years. Our school, Luther Seminary in
St. Paul, Minnesota, grew out of streams of immigration, primarily from
Nordic countries. When I first began my service on this faculty and people
learned that my family has Danish heritage, I was frequently asked if I was
part of the "happy Danes" or the "sad Danes." That was an important dis-
tinction once upon a time but one of which I was utterly ignorant. Also, peo-

ple used the term "mixed marriages" to refer to marriages between a Norwegian and a Swede (both Lutheran, of course). The container of Lutheran identity at my seminary was built out of stories that were largely Nordic, or at least largely western European. Without going into inappropriate detail, I would note that this degree of focus on what were in many cases fairly minor differences did not lead to a robust embrace of diversity but rather too often to destructive and fairly petty conflicts.

Over the past two decades, the Lutheran church has grown dramatically, with most of its growth happening on the African continent. The largest churches (in this case, I am defining churches by national borders) are the Mekane Yesus Lutheran Church in Ethiopia and the Tanzanian Lutheran Church.[24] As our seminary has begun to draw students from that continent, the differences present in our student body have become more vibrant and marked. This shift has been all to the good. When the differences present are minor, it can be easy to focus on them. When the differences are major, there is more pressure to find at least some common ground. That dynamic can support the fading of specific pettiness. It is also a concrete example of how increasing or adding differences to the container that is the global Lutheran church has supported a pattern that embraces "tensegrity."[25]

It is crucial to note, however, as sociologists are quick to point out, that the kind and amount of difference that is added to a container of meaning matter. Sociologists may not agree on the precise amounts necessary, but most of us involved in theological education are keenly aware that being the token person of color, the token woman, or even more so the token woman of color is generally not enough to shift a pattern. Here again, digital media can have a crucial impact since they are containers of meaning that have somewhat more liquid boundaries and can carry stories into settings where they were previously banned.

Authority, authenticity, and agency in contemporary settings

Indeed, scholars note that there are three dynamics shifting dramatically within our cultural contexts through digital media: how we understand authority, what we mean by authenticity, and how we experience agency. To return to where I began in this article, we are inhabiting an era in the United States in which digital media have largely flattened authority. Specific structural roles—which are one kind of container—carry less au-

thority than in previous eras. Professors, for instance, are no longer grant-ed immediate credibility by virtue of their employment in an institution of higher education. Pastors are not granted the same level of social authority as in the past simply by virtue of wearing a clerical collar. Even presidents cannot claim unquestioned authority, no matter how much they might long to do so. In the swirl of competing stories, of "fake news" and "commercial news" and blogging platforms and Facebook, persons must find their own way through the competing thickets of meaning making.

For many of us, the path through these thickets is marked by our ex-perience of authenticity. We have come to rely more and more frequently on the container of meaning that is shaped by our own personal experiences. How authentic is a particular story? Have we had a similar experience? Do our friends and colleagues affirm the experience? Such criteria often lead to the dilemmas within which we find ourselves. Few of us, for example, have had any experience in legislative work, so how are we to evaluate what is authentic or not when it comes to legislative action? Compromise, which un-til very recently was at the heart of any kind of shared governance, is now viewed by many with alarm and perceived as invalidating identity. Another example would be that the news reports I find credible are "fake news" to other people, and the news other people consume reads as pure propaganda to me. We are inhabiting different containers of meaning.

For many people, our current president has authority because he is viewed as being deeply authentic. I find it fascinating and deeply disturbing that his authenticity is founded upon his violating social norms with impu-nity. Indeed, his ability to proclaim that he is authentic rests largely upon his willingness to violate those norms, which he persists in claiming are irrel-evant or problematic examples of "political correctness" rather than shared public norms. He is not only breaking a specific container of meaning, he is destroying it. What is truth in that experience? Is it his voice recorded on a tape? At one moment he claims it is; at another he claims it is not.[26]

Adaptive action does not offer a simple solution to these thorny dilem-mas, but it does point to a set of practices that can be learned and practiced over time. As noted above, these practices include relationship building, col-lective sense-making, and other kinds of experiential and engaged learning. Four pedagogical modes that support these processes in particular can be—and often already are—used in supervision in ministry: case study develop-ment, double-entry journaling, immunity mapping, and digital storytelling.

There is not room in this short article to demonstrate all four of these modes, but I will point to some particularly helpful resources for each.

Pedagogical modes for reflective practice in complex systems

Case study development has long been in use in ministry education, both in theological classrooms as well as in the more specific form of a case that has been labeled a "verbatim" within clinical pastoral education. Two resources that I find particularly helpful here are the Pluralism Project at Harvard University, which has developed a robust collection of very thoughtful cases that explore issues that arise in our civil society, public life, and religious communities.[27] Cases are a specific kind of "container" of meaning, and well-written studies such as these from Harvard often invite "exchanges across containers" that can shift patterns. If you are familiar with case study learning, you might try challenging your own practice by engaging some of these cases with colleagues.

I find documentary films to be another very useful form of case study in the process of collective interpretation and sense-making. Much of my work takes place in institutions and settings that are largely white, so I am continually needing to find resources that can "break up the container" of whiteness into a more differentiated and justice-seeking space. Films I frequently use include *The Color of Fear* by Lee Mun Wah, *A Time for Burning* by William Jersey, *Race: The Power of an Illusion* produced by California Newsreel, and *Traces of the Trade* by Katrina Browne. All of these films are documentaries that challenge existing containers of meaning, and invite new patterns to emerge and coalesce. There are, of course, many other such films. The Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion has a robust and easily searchable database that includes links to lists of films.[28]

Double-entry journaling is another very fruitful practice used by people seeking to engage in adaptive action. In contrast to basic journaling, double-entry journaling is a specific practice for supporting "meta-reflection," or reflection upon reflection. It essentially invites reflective engagement with the specific containers of one's personal experience. Here, the work of Dannelle Stevens and Joanne Cooper is very helpful.[29] Their book *Journal Keeping* gives multiple examples of this kind of journaling and in particular offers pragmatic advice for teachers who want to create space for

their students to be truly vulnerable and open in their journals. Stevens and Cooper have a lovely example of how to help students create an index that supports meta-reflection without having to submit an entire journal to a teacher. In this way, a learner can be truly open and honest in a journal knowing that no one need ever see it besides themselves and yet still be held accountable for doing the work of journaling.

"Immunity mapping" is another specific practice. This one was developed by Lisa Lahey and Robert Kegan and is explained beautifully in a number of their publications.[30] I have found the four-column chart they offer (and make available for free in pdf format on their website) an exercise that my students readily can participate in, even without having read much of the background theorizing. By supporting reflection on underlying assumptions and providing prompts for asking good questions about those assumptions, particularly shining a light on ways in which those assumptions might fuel competing commitments, Lahey and Kegan have created a process that supports a rich stance of personal inquiry and highlights pattern sensing.

Finally, digital storytelling is a "workshop-based participatory media practice focused on self-representation" first pioneered by StoryCenter[31] and subsequently engaged by teachers and adult learners throughout the world. I have written about digital storytelling as a form of faith formation and regularly use exercises from the practice with pastoral leaders.[32] In some ways, the name of this practice is a bit misleading because it is at heart a practice of shared storytelling, with digital media being only one element of the process. Nevertheless, part of what is so compelling about it as a practice within adaptive action in religious communities is that it creates a structured space in which to explore—often creatively and even playfully—how one understands one's own relationship to transcendence, and it does so within a gathered community that then celebrates the "sharing out" of such stories into the world (the point at which its digital aspect becomes most relevant). Here I would highlight the example of the Episcopal Story Project of Minnesota, which has created an entire web of digital stories of Episcopal community members, thus embodying a far-reaching and diverse vision of what it can mean to be Episcopalian in Minnesota.[33] This site invites "standing in inquiry," not simply within the Episcopal Church but indeed far beyond it, and in doing so offers a container for that identity that promises that the more diverse the knowers, the more robust the knowing.

Returning to where I began in this article, we are inhabiting a period of time in which complexity is ascendant and digital media are so entangled within that complexity that change "results from unknown forces acting unpredictably to bring about surprising outcomes." As reflective practitioners, we can and must bring all that we know about "standing in inquiry" to these challenges, trusting that the Holy Spirit will sustain us in our unknowing.

NOTES

1   Michael Wesch, "YouTube and You: Experiences of Self-Awareness in the Context Collapse of the Recording Webcam," in *Explorations in Media Ecology* 8, no. 2 (2009): 19–34.

2   Mary Hess, "Loving the Questions: Finding Food for the Future of Theological Education in the Lexington Seminar," in *Theological Education* 48, no. 1 (2013): 69–89.

3   Renee Hobbs, "How Digital Media Alter Concepts of Authority and Expertise: Understanding "Fake News," Slideshare presented to Italian journalists, March 10, 2017, accessed December 11, 2017, https://www.slideshare.net/reneehobbs/how-digital-media-alter-concepts-of-authority-and-expertise-understanding-fake-news.

4   Will Allen, "Complicated or Complex—Knowing the Difference Is Important," February 3, 2016, accessed December 11, 2017, http://learningforsustainability.net/post/complicated-complex/.

5   Cathy Davidson, *Now You See It: How the Brain Science of Attention Will Transform the Way We Live, Work and Learn* (New York: Viking, 2011).

6   Gervase R. Bushe and Robert J. Marshak, eds., *Dialogic Organization Development: The Theory and Practice of Transformational Change* (Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2015).

7   Glenda H. Eoyang and Royce J. Holladay, *Adaptive Action: Leveraging Uncertainty in Your Organization* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2013), 62.

8   Allen, "Complicated or Complex."

9   Scott Cormode, *Making Spiritual Sense: Christian Leaders as Spiritual Interpreters* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006).

10   Mary Hess, "Mirror Neurons, the Development of Empathy, and Digital Story Telling," *Religious Education* 107, no. 4 (July-September 2012): 401–14; Mary Hess, "Learning with Digital Technologies: Privileging Persons over Machines," *Journal of Moral Theology* 4, no. 1 (Winter 2015): 131–50; Mary Hess, "And the Word Went Viral: Finding God at the Intersection of Scripture and Popular Media," in *America: The Jesuit Review* (July 21–28, 2014).

11   Anita Farber-Robertson, *Learning While Leading: Increasing Your Effectiveness in Ministry* (Bethesda, MD: Alban Institute, 2000).

12   For a robust reading list, see the footnotes in Mary E. Hess and Stephen D. Brookfield, eds., *Teaching Reflectively in Theological Contexts: Promises and Contradictions* (Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing, 2008).

13   Ronald A. Heifetz, *Leadership without Easy Answers* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1994). His later books are also relevant.

14   Eoyang and Holladay, *Adaptive Action*, 30.

15   Eoyang and Holladay, *Adaptive Action*, 32.

16   Eoyang and Holladay, *Adaptive Action*, 39.

17   Parker Palmer, *Healing the Heart of Democracy: The Courage to Create a Politics Worthy of the Human Spirit* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2011). A lovely set of reflections by Palmer on these habits is available on the Center for Courage and Renewal's website: http://www.couragerenewal.org/habitsoftheheart/.

18   Lisa Laskow Lahey and Robert Kegan, *How the Way We Talk Can Change the Way We Work: Seven Languages for Transformation* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2001), 141.

19   Eoyang and Holladay, *Adaptive Action*.

20   Eoyang and Holladay, *Adaptive Action*, 27-29.

21   Mary Hess, "Pursuing Racial Justice in the US: What Religious Educators Need to Learn from the #BlackLivesMatter Movement," ISREV publication series, forthcoming. Preprint version is available in the Luther Seminary digital repository: http://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty_articles/.

22   "Tarana Burke," *Wikipedia*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tarana_Burke, accessed December 11, 2017. For more on this issue, see "The Silence Breakers," *Time Magazine*, December 6, 2017.

23   Mary Hess, "White Religious Educators Resisting White Fragility: Lessons from Mystics," *Religious Education* 112, no. 1 (Winter 2017): 46–57.

24   The best quick list of this data is actually available from Wikipedia (which contains appropriate citations). "Lutheran World Federation," *Wikipedia*, accessed December 11, 2017, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lutheran_World_Federation.

25   Architect R. Buckminster Fuller coined the term "tensegrity"—"tension" + "integrity"—to describe the most stable architectural structures, ones that hold competing forces together with respect to their individual integrities.

26   Maggie Haberman and Jonathan Martin, "Trump Once Said Access Hollywood Tape Was Real. Now He's Not Sure," *The New York Times*, November 26, 2017, accessed December 11, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/28/us/politics/trump-access-hollywood-tape.html?_r=0.

27   "Case Study Initiative," The Pluralism Project, Harvard University, accessed December 11, 2017, http://pluralism.org/casestudy/.

28   *The Color of Fear* (http://www.stirfryseminars.com), *A Time for Burning* (http://www.lutheranfilm.org), *Race: The Power of an Illusion* (http://newsreel.org/video/race-the-power-of-an-illusion), *Traces of the Trade* (http://www.tracesofthetrade.org). The Wabash Center for Teaching and Learning in Theology and Religion (https://www.wabashcenter.wabash.edu/resources/).

29   Dannelle D. Stevens and Joanne E. Cooper, *Journal Keeping* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2009).

30   Lahey and Kegan, *The Way We Talk*. Also see "Exploring Immunity to Change Online," Minds at Work, accessed December 11, 2017, http://mindsatwork.com.

31   StoryCenter, https://www.storycenter.org, accessed December 11, 2017. Some may know this organization by its previous name, the Center for Digital Storytelling.

32   Mary Hess, "Digital Storytelling: Empowering Feminist and Womanist Faith Formation with Young Women," in *Media, Religion and Gender: Key Issues and New Challenges*, ed. Mia Lövheim (New York: Routledge, 2013), 169–82.

33   Episcopal Story Project, accessed on 11 December 2017, https://mnmission.wordpress.com/author/episcopalmn/.