ACPE THEORY PAPER

Clinical Pastoral Education as Adventure Background

Karen Hutt

PREFACE

I am the oldest of three children born to George and Shirley Hutt of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. We lived in West Philadelphia on a closely-knit block of laborers, housewives, activists, doctors, artists and entrepreneurs. My parents both viewed themselves as "Striving Negroes," intent on contributing to the uplift of themselves and the race. We later moved into a Jewish neighborhood near the Main Line. My mother stayed at home and attended to the early educational needs of her children. In what was to become one of the most hopeful times for Black people in American history, I was infused with the values, language, and energy of "the movement:" I was a "movement baby."

My family, like our neighbors, embraced the potential change this movement would bring. Everyday something was happening that had never happened before—and I was a witness. This was the era of "the first Black:" my father was the first Black engineer at Campbell's Soup, and later the first Black on the School Board. My mother attended the first class of the community college opened in 1965, and I was the first colored child to desegregate the schools in the 4th district of Philadelphia. We were "model Negroes," educated by the best schools and engaged in our community.

Over time, the multiple liberation movements that entered our home took hold to create systemic changes in our family. The civil rights move-

Karen Hutt is Associate CPE Supervisor/Pediatric Chaplain with Fairview Health Services at the University of Minnesota Medical Center, West Bank, 2450 Riverside Ave. S., Minnesota, MN 55454 (Email: revkarenhutt@gmail.com).

ment propelled my father into politics. The gay rights movement made it possible for me to come out as a lesbian to loving parents that were fully supportive. Then, finally, the women's movement made it possible for my mother to take action and apply the lessons of Betty Freidan to her life and seek a divorce from my father who had become completely consumed in his work and power. I was profoundly sad that my parents' love disappeared as they overreached the limits of their creativity to solve their problems. However, I also enjoyed the independence and self-sufficiency that my parents' divorce provided. Conveniently, coming out as a young teen at that time with accepting parents gave me considerable freedom to be adopted by the emerging gay community of 1972, which provided a parallel family that offered me guidance and support.

My activities and interests defy easy explanation. In my professional life as a science educator, entrepreneur, museum exhibit developer, and Unitarian Universalist minister, I have sought to facilitate understanding among diverse populations, create opportunities for empowerment, and contribute to the development of deeper, more powerful human relationships. This has led me to Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) supervision, where my call to journey with others is clear and audible. The submission of these papers is a joyous moment in which the creative impulse that I call God is apparent, urging me to contribute to the greater understanding of relationships; to nurture the creative impulse within selves and souls.

Using a concept that grew in popularity after World War II, the landscape architect C. T. Sorensen created a new playground with whatever junk was available; today, there are many Adventure Playgrounds in the same style all over the world. There is no equipment as such; instead, kids are confronted with boards, spare tires, telephone poles, nails, ropes, old pianos, and lots of mud. It is a place of imaginative surrender. The freedom is liberating, but it's also demanding, requiring initiative and risk-taking. Children have to assess risks, learn to work collaboratively and assert themselves, their feelings, and ideas. The following papers contain an approach to supervision, theology, education, and personality that reflects the activities of an Adventure Playground. The central image of construction on the playground informs my constructivist orientation to CPE. It is my hope that you will experience me on these pages as a supervisor who believes that the Adventure Playground that is CPE can be attained through creative improvisation, warmth, flexibility, and an adequate dose of structure and organization.

EDUCATION THEORY

Theoretical Beginnings

Every morning, I walked in the opposite direction of my friends. As my neighbors walked toward schools that guided them into single-file lines and rewarded them with letter grades for getting the "right answer," I took the El across Philadelphia to a school where there were no lines to control us and no grades to evaluate our progress. From middle through high school, my parents placed me in schools that were open, experiential environments constructed to maximize creative enthusiasm among students and teachers. Every day, I found an adventurous intellectual playground that made it fun to learn and discover new things with others. As a product of the Open Classroom Movement, I was encouraged to think critically in educational communities. I have remained committed to experiential education and the power of transformative, situated learning environments. I believe that everyone can learn and that language is at the center of active learning, for which the primary goal is for individuals to find meaning and develop one's human capacity. Knowing that I am responsible for my own learning[1] led me to Unitarian Universalism, where I have been encouraged by our Principles and Purposes to be responsible for the development and articulation of my own theology. In addition, my personal narrative is made comprehensible by a constructivist view of my life journey.

Theoretical Influences

In CPE, the constructivist view is particularly favorable for the self-directed adult learner who has the ability to take, pick, and choose information and experiences to construct the trajectory, focus, and depth of their learning. The social constructivist school, including such theorists as Vygotsky and Lave and Wegner,[2] holds that learning is constructed through social interactions and discourse in which meaning and knowledge are dialogically made. Vygotsky focuses particularly on language and meaningful interaction as the means to knowledge development. His approach is less symmetrical than Piaget's theories of assimilation and accommodation[3] and as-

sumes that learning takes place first socially, then internally. For Vygotsky, isolated learning cannot lead to true cognitive development because knowledge is co-constructed, always involving more than one person. Likewise, the situated learning theory of Lave and Wegner depends on collaborative social learning environments.[4] Since the clinical environment requires students to revisit their internal stories and scripts and articulate them to both themselves and others, the open, engaged process of constructivism is particularly compatible with learning.

Educational theorist Jerome Bruner also believes that learners construct new ideas and concepts based upon existing knowledge.[5] For him, generative social learning communities should be designed to facilitate extrapolation, encouraging students to construct new meaning and potential for practical applications out of the given information in a situation. Bruner theorizes that people learn in a "spiral" of "spurts" and "rests," wherein creative "spurts" occur and certain concepts "click" and are understood. These "clicks" have to be massaged before others are incorporated, or before there is movement to construct a more in-depth understanding of the internal and social forces stimulating these new understandings.[6] Bruner also asserts that learning must be concerned with the experiences and contexts that make the student willing and able to learn, because those who demonstrate readiness to learn are more likely to be motivated to weave their past knowledge with new experiences.[7] Like Vygotsky and Lave and Wegner, Bruner's learning theories have influenced my practice with students in the clinical setting where students must make decisions about how to engage their knowledge base and learning experiences in multiple environments.

Theory in Practice

Students learn when they are ready and motivated to claim and explore their current assumptions and consider new approaches to familiar and unfamiliar settings and concepts. Students do this in conjunction with the information, patterns, and systems they have already developed to make viable choices in specific contexts. For example, a student may begin a CPE unit with a well-developed position that prayer must be an integral part of any pastoral visit. After knowledge has been constructed (student discovers there are patients and peers for whom prayer is an afterthought in a pastoral visit), a student who is ready to learn chooses to validate that knowledge through testing (student tries to pray with an atheist and is rebuffed). The

motivated learner can then choose to apply this new constructed knowledge in a context of their choosing (student elects to asks patients if prayer is a part of their tradition and learns that a deeper connection is made when she asks this question). The learner now sees the potential results of a new method and learns that they can hold onto their own understandings about prayer while developing pastoral competence.

This performative, improvisational nature of clinical pastoral education requires students to constantly assess what they know about themselves and others from experience, yet be fully available for the unveiling of greater self-awareness and socio-cultural understandings. While didactics, psychological inventories, and instructional training can provide a framework for pastoral care, the uncharted process of the action-reflection-action model pushes students to hypothesize potential realities that are constructed through intra- and interpersonal relationships rooted in the nuances of language, culture, and social location. In my practice with students, I have created a model that illustrates how students learn utilizing Bruner's spiral image.[8] While Bruner's spiral is content-oriented, my educational spiral is process-based. The first revolution of my spiral is affirmation of the learning self that the student presents. If J has had a life of object/subject-based learning experiences, I must accept that this student's learning background may influence her approach to learning in a setting with a strikingly different pedagogy. Without an affirmation of the learning self, students may present more resistance and anxiety about learning in a clinical setting.

The second revolution on my learning spiral is the recognition of cultural context. For example, if P was the only person of color in Euro-American schools and is slow to express her learning self because of her fear of racial judgment, I must recognize that this previous experience may impact her learning in an all Euro-American environment. Bruner says, "Learning and thinking are always situated in a cultural setting and always dependent upon the utilization of cultural resources."[9]

The third revolution of my spiral is the process of co-collaboration between educator and learner. Together we create environments, exercises, and activities filled with constructivist learning opportunities. In this environment, a student engages these options, experiments, problem-solves, and makes choices. The process of learning entails moving around ideas, past stories, and new objectives while "trying on" new ideas and hypotheses. There is also a sharing of authority through the mutual acceptance of responsibility. When U was establishing his goals in the unit, he wanted

to explore the impact of his body language on people. We developed a se-ries of experiments with random people in the hospital to ascertain how he was presenting himself to others. This collaboration between us created a shared meaning about a process and the events that followed. U learned that the facial grimace he presents to patients and peers is an expression that is more often described in the experiments as "judgmental." U realized that this look is the look that he experienced from his father when he came home from work each day as a child. He also learned that initial meetings were filled with more fear than he had previously considered.

As students become more comfortable with moving through this non-hierarchical spiral of learning, they rest at the fourth revolution for reflec-tion as they realize they are experts in their own learning and can assess how useful this new knowledge is for them to pursue their goals and in-terests.[10] It is on this part of the spiral that learners experience the "clicks" of learning.[11] I invited Z, a student doing his second unit of CPE, to revisit his approach to learning in his first unit in which he did not fully embrace the clinical method. Z saw that he had distanced himself from learning and thereafter sought to challenge himself by focusing his process on the reflec-tive revolution of the spiral. Z wanted to identify the parts of his life story that had suppressed his curiosity about others, limiting his ability to take the risks needed to learn in an experiential environment.

Ultimately, when a student is motivated to validate their learning ex-perience, then these reflections become the framework for the final revolu-tion in the spiral, meaning-making. As the student deconstructs their pre-vious assumptions about themselves and begins to develop new language and competencies, they are developing the dialogical tools to make mean-ing for themselves as they integrate their belief systems and personal sto-ries. They begin to ask new questions about themselves that guide their continued learning. J asks, "How has my Catholic school education served me, and how has it been an impediment for my creative thinking?" P asks, "What is the difference between overt racism and internalized racism?" U asks himself, "How have my relationships with my adult children been im-pacted by a body language I have copied from my father who I worshipped and feared?" Z, in his second unit of CPE, begins to ask, "Am I better suit-ed for a prophetic ministry within the church or a pastoral ministry in the community?"

It is the crafting of these questions that provide students with the next steps of discernment—learning and integration. In my theory of supervi-

sion, students learn when they repeatedly utilize the spiral process, moving back and forth between revolutions, constructing new realities, beliefs, and principles that are applicable to their real life situations. While there are a myriad of reasons that students may resist learning, my version of the spiral provides markers designed for them to "place their resistance" on the revolutions where they are most recognizable and operative. For instance, some students do not believe that they are capable of learning because they have had educational experiences that denigrated their intellectual capabilities— this usually becomes apparent on the first revolution of the spiral when a student presents their learning story. Others are afraid to try new things and struggle to think critically, becoming immobilized and frustrated. This often surfaces through some aspect of their social location and cultural context within family and community. Some adult students have limited imagination and lack the confidence or self-esteem to approach the material without playing over "old tapes" about their capabilities. These students are often afraid that the act of deep reflection raises too many ambiguities that may challenge or endanger their theological or personal worldview.

My theory approaches these issues in two ways. First, the student/supervisor must recognize and name when the student is exhibiting a behavior associated with anxiety or resistance, i.e., confused thinking, inability to listen, withdrawal, anger, frustration, etc. Secondly, in individual supervision, we place this anxiety and resistance on the student's process spiral. The student decides how much space this behavior inhabits in their process and how bold its words and description should be. We explore the narrative and social function of the resistance in an effort to discern what role it has in that person's story. For example, K is a learner who believes "getting the right answer is learning" and responds favorably to the most traditional assignments and didactics. He was precise in his care, but functioned in a controlled zone in his pastoral visits. Recognizing this, I proposed that he consider the words chaos, ambiguity, and uncertainty in exercises designed from his personal story. Since K was unashamed and forthright in his description of himself as a "former batterer" (revolutions #1—affirmation, and #2—recognition) and had climbed a steep learning curve of reflection and meaning-making to change his behavior, I knew he was ready to learn.

During individual supervision, K and I co-created a game that led to a series of experiments that quantified different aspects of his current behavior and the behaviors that he was attempting to develop. Using a scientific method with which K was comfortable as an engineer, K "tried on" a walk

into the pastoral care world of ambiguity. The moments during the awkward silences, the stumbling words and chuckles during his reflection, were "clicks" for K. He shared with peers that "juxtapositions (revolution #3, co-collaboration), experiments, and mystery" were not a part of his story and vocabulary. He resisted these words but he felt the exercises were inviting him to dabble in this world "where there are no right answers" long enough to learn and construct something new that served his learning goals.

<div align="center">Theory Critiqued</div>

In supervision, I have encountered students seeking clinical "truths of CPE" that can be uniformly applied in their relationships with patients and families. Since constructivist learning theories believe that every individual learner's knowledge/truth/experience has equal legitimacy, a student who believes in the ultimate authority of the Bible and God may be disturbed by constructivism because it acknowledges no objective authority. For a student who thinks they learn best through behavioral training and regurgitation of facts to obtain specific skills, constructivist approaches may be less directive than they would desire. Given this, constructivism has both philosophical and operational limitations for some students.

In *The Good The Bad and the Ugly: The Many Faces of Constructivism*, D. C. Phillips says that the ugly side of constructivism is its over reliance on epistemological relativism of both the individual and their social contexts.[12] Phillips and others theorize that knowledge is transmitted from person to person as opposed to idiosyncratically through individual discovery of knowledge. The central criticism of constructivist theories is relativism: that objective truth is abandoned for equal truths, thus leaving students interested in evidence based learning outside of the learning process of constructivism. Students who view the CPE process as imparting a defined knowledge base that is confirmed empirically may not be responsive to constructivist methodologies. For these students, I employ a process that addresses the dissonance and discomfort a student may experience. In this approach I first present a factual challenge (What can we learn about patients from objective measurements?); secondly, an evidence challenge (What evidence have you gathered from lectures, books, observations about the claims you are making about patient needs?); thirdly, a pragmatic challenge (How does your knowledge work with patients?); and finally, the social challenge (In discourse with peers, how does your knowledge present itself?).

As I further critique my theory, I am reminded that when a student rejects my spiral learning revolutions, I am reminded of the cognitive load theory of Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark,[13] which suggests that the free exploration of a highly complex environment may generate a "heavy load" that is detrimental to clinical learning. "Beginning learners do not have the necessary skills to integrate the new information with information they have learned in the past...a better alternative is guided instruction to produce more immediate responses to information than unguided approaches along with longer term transfer and problem-solving skills."[14] The ironic challenge for the constructivist supervisor is to resist viewing the multiplicity of constructivism as the only operative paradigm. It is essential that the constructivist practitioner remember that the diversity and particularity of learners must be respected in order for them to develop knowledge, truths, and to create meaning. If a constructivist learning theory is truly reflexive, it must make room for students to have diverse experiences on the adventure playground of learning.

Theory for Groups

In my practice, I experience the evolving human needs of students as the driving force behind their behavior in a group. The theory is articulated in the Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation (FIRO) developed by William Schultz.[15] He asserts that an individual's orientation towards others can be evaluated in three essential postures of interpersonal relationships rooted in human needs. The first need is for inclusion, or having a place to belong; to be noticed and accepted. This is evident during the initial stages of the group's development as they engaging in polite small talk, seeking broad points of connection.[16] Some students have a high need for inclusion and others have a low need which results in different behaviors.[17] Next, there is the need for control—to have a voice and exert influence. Students with a high need for control compete for air time, assume positions of authority, and act as opinion influencers. Those with a low need for control may become frustrated with the group's structure and resist authority. Finally, there is the need for affection/openness in the form of emotional attachments with other group members. Students with a high need for affection/openness demonstrate concern for others in the group, tend to be flexible and accommodating, and share their feelings with ease and authenticity. Those with a low

need for affection/openness can see this behavior as "touchy-feely" and may find themselves dissatisfied with this level of openness.[18]

While Schultz's theory is useful for understanding the needs of humans and the various manifestations and degrees of those needs, it is limited by his focus on fixed motivation. What Schultz did not answer when he presented this theory in 1958 is the evolution of these human needs for affection, inclusion, in a postmodern world. In 1984 Schultz altered his theory and demonstrated a shift in his thinking in his book *The Truth Option*,[19] where he argues that we demonstrate our level of openness in a group based on contextual psychosocial relationships. This move from fixed intrinsic markers for human needs, caused Schultz to explore the multiple dimensions of openness, understanding choices that individuals make in groups which are influenced by self-concept, feelings of significance, competence, and lovability.

Learning in a clinical environment requires a willingness to learn. This willingness is stimulated by individual motivation. I am motivated to witness and engage students in the evolving adventure of personal and relational wholeness. My goal in supervision is to provide multiple opportunities for students to exercise openness in relationships with themselves, their patients, and their peers to further their learning.

NOTES

1.   Unitarian Universalist Association, *Our Beliefs and Principles*, accessed March 20, 2014, http://www.uua.org/beliefs/index.shtml.

2.   Jean Lave and Etienne Weger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation—Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive and Computational Perspectives* (London, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 132–280; Lev Vygotsky, *Educational Psychology* (Moscow, Russia: Institute of Psychology Press, 1026).

3.   Jean Piaget, *Selected Works* (New York: Traylor and Francis, 2009).

4.   Lave and Weger, 78.

5.   Virginia Richardson, *Constructivist Teacher Education: Building New Understanding* (London: Falmer Press, 1997).

6.   Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960), 167–212.

7.   Jerome Bruner, *Towards a Theory of Instruction* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), 27.

8.   Ibid., 62.

9.   Ibid. 76.

10. Malcolm Knowles, *Self-Directed Learning* (Chicago, IL: Follett Press, 1975).

11. Jerome Bruner, *Towards a Theory of Instruction*, 75.

12. D. C. Phillips, *"The Good, The Bad and The Ugly: The Many Faces of Constructivism,"* *Educational Researcher* 24, no. 7 (1995): 5–12, accessed online March 20, 2014, http://ocw.metu.edu.tr/pluginfile.php/9155/mod_resource/content/1/1177059.pdf.

13. Paul Kirschner, John Sweller, and Richard E. Clark, "Why Minimal Guidance during Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist Discovery, Problem Based Experiential and Inquiry Based Teaching," *Educational Psychologist* 41, no. 2, (2006): 75–82, accessed March 20, 2014, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1.

14. Ibid., 78.

15. William Schultz, *Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958).

16. Ibid., 321.

17. Ibid., 56.

18. William Schultz, *The Truth Option* (New York: Ten Speed Press, 1984), 93.

19. Ibid., 82.

PERSONALITY THEORY

Theoretical Influences

The personality theories that are most congruent with my life story and theory papers are associated with the broad community of constructivism. Within that community, there are two major schools of psychological theories. There is the personal constructivist school which emphasizes the personality's capacity for meaning-making, agency, and ongoing revision of personal systems of knowing across time, including behavior, choices, and values. Those thinkers rooted in the personal perspective have argued that each of us subjectively constructs a private understanding of the world. This theory is best expressed by George Kelly, who uses the metaphor of person-as-scientist to highlight that individuals have a one-of-a-kind operating system, or personal construct system, that provides them with a map of the world and one's place in it. These constructs also provide structures

of meaning and guide behavior "to inquire, to self-invent, and shape one's life." Kelly's fundamental postulate is that all processes are realized by the ways a person anticipates events, and people construct and maintain their systems to regulate how they encounter these events. However, Kelly does not believe that our constructs are fixed; rather, there are always some alternative constructions available to choose from in dealing with the world. "No one needs to paint themselves into a corner; no one needs to be completely hemmed in by circumstances; no one needs to be the victim of biography."[7] Kelly's theory goes on to utilize a complex constellation of grids, corollaries, networks, and charts that suggest that individuals choose to live with constructs that are useless, but well-worn, in addressing feeling distress and frustration. He asserts that by utilizing a scientific method, persons can jettison patterns and constructs that do not serve them well and thus reinvent their constructs to adapt to change.[8]

By contrast, those from a social or relational perspective contend that the ways we understand ourselves are primarily communal products, constituted via the dynamic interplay of culture, language, and ongoing relationships. Kenneth Gergen, psychology professor at Swarthmore College, argues in *The Saturated Self: Dilemmas of Identity in Contemporary Life* that there is no one "self," but a multiplicity of "selves." Gergen has a generative approach to understanding persons, seeking to examine the way people generate meaning and selves, rather than looking at the structure of things, ideas, and selves. He believes that through co-action we come into being as individual identities, but the process remains forever incomplete.[9] At any moment there are multiple options, and self-identity remains in motion. Gergen says, "Virtually all intelligible action is born, sustained, and/or extinguished within the ongoing process of relationship." Gergen is known for his comment "I am linked therefore I am" as an answer to Descartes' famous "I think, therefore I am." From this standpoint, there is no isolated self or fully private experience;[10] rather, we exist in a world of co-constitution. We are always "emerging from relationship: "we cannot step out of it, and even in our most private moments we are never alone." Gergen has done much to challenge traditional psychology, demonstrating that mental processes are not so much "in the head of a person" as in their relationships. As a result, individual change for Gergen—at any level—requires a shift of life conditions and relationships, or confluences: physical and socio-cultural contexts must shift or be shifted if we want to make individual change possible.[11]

My supervisory practice attempts to "bridge the gap" between personal and social psychology within constructivism. Both Kelly and Gergen provide me with the intellectual fuel needed for my supervisory reflection. To inform my supervisory interventions, strategies, and assessments, I rely on the practical work of Hazel Markus (possible selves theory) and Steve de Shazer and Insoo Kim Bergand (solution-focused brief therapy) who serve as guides with the personhood scenarios that students present. Possible Selves Theory is an extension of self-concept theory[12] that believes that if we want to change behavior, than we need to change our self-concept. Possible selves are projections about the future that are rooted in students' present and past. An individual is free to create any variety of possible selves, yet the pool of selves derives from the categories made salient by the individual's particular socio-cultural and historical context and from the models, images, and symbols provided by the individual's immediate social experiences. Both positive and negative possible selves reflect what students have come to believe are actually possible for them.[13] Possible selves thus have the potential to reveal the inventive and constructive nature:

Possible selves are the ideal selves that we would very much like to become. They are also the selves that we could become and are afraid of becoming. The possible selves that are hoped for might include the successful self, the creative self, the rich self, the thin self, or the loved and admired self, whereas, the dreaded possible selves could be the alone self, the depressed self, the incompetent self, the alcoholic self, the unemployed self, or the violent self.[14]

The interdependence between self-concept and motivation are highlighted as students develop their clinical learning goals. Often the goals students seek to explore are related to the possible selves that clinical education emphasizes (i.e., formation of their pastoral selves, their pastoral identity, and their pastoral competence).

Solution Focused Brief Therapy (SFBT) is a practical, goal-driven model, which places its emphasis on clear, concise, realistic, goal negotiations for greater self-understanding and change.[15] The SFBT approach assumes that all adults have some knowledge of what would make their life better, even though they may need some (at times, considerable) help describing the details of their better life. The approach does not focus on the past, but instead, focuses on the present and future, assuming that students already possesses the minimal skills necessary to create solutions. It requires the supervisor to use respectful curiosity to invite the student to envision their preferred

future and then, together with the supervisor, start attending to any moves towards this future, whether these are small increments or large changes. To support this, questions are asked about the student's story, strengths and resources, and exceptions to the problem.[16]

I find this short term-focused approach with students helpful in assisting them to identify and focus their personal goals quickly. By helping students identify the things that they wish to have changed in their functioning system, I am able to assist them in constructing a concrete vision of a preferred future for them. I help students identify a time in their current life that has brought them closer to this future, and to examine what has been different on these occasions. By bringing these small successes to their awareness and helping them to repeat the successful things they do when the problem is not there or is less severe, the supervisor helps the student move towards the preferred future they have identified.[17]

Theory in Practice

Constructivism takes the position that the stories we experience and live out are informed by the variety of ways we have of making meaning of our lives. I collaborate with students using constructivist methods to help reveal the meanings behind the words—the deeper themes between the lines of the stories students tell themselves and us about their personhood agenda. This collaborative alliance is an egalitarian (non-authoritarian) contract that distributes the responsibilities for change. Although the student is the primary change agent, the supervisor brings respectful curiosity, clinical expertise, and a vested interest in the change process. The student and I recognize that this collaborative process will likely produce resistance, distress, and emotional disturbance. These feelings are considered necessary components of significant human change and, to this end, emotional awareness and expression are both honored and promoted. I want students to explore their possibilities, strengths, personal resources, and resilience as they seek the promises inherent in lifelong change. In dialogue with students, I am primarily concerned with assessing the viability of their personal creations, choices, and behaviors as opposed to their validity. To do this, I utilize a diversity of practical constructivist techniques that are specific to the individual student.[18]

M is a European American male pastor who is in his first call at a suburban Lutheran church and doing his first unit of CPE. He presents in individual supervision with a concern regarding his lack of assertiveness. He

demonstrates a self-awareness about himself and indicates that while cognizant of this behavior for years, he is beginning to see his limited assertiveness as hindering his relationships in the group and with patients and families. In my practice with M, I am inspired to recognize "M as the scientist" of his own reality and ask him to describe the construct of non-assertiveness and its function in his life. Then we explore the feelings, images, and metaphors for non-assertiveness. M then begins to claim that his lack of assertiveness sometimes serves him well because he is very patient and listens well. I asked M to do some "scaling"[19] to explore when this problem has been the worst or the least significant. I asked M, "Using the metaphors, feelings, and symbols you selected to describe this lack of assertiveness, what is stopping you from moving in the direction you seek on this scale?" M identifies the feeling of fear and uncertainty. I then ask M to place his fear and uncertainty on the scale and to explore what it would take to move one point on the scale. M then describes a series of minute changes in his tone, posture, and handshake that would indicate to him that he has moved on the scale. M is starting to embody an assertive possible self and construct the change that he wants to become as he envisions "a more powerful self." M then goes on to construct a series of responses (based on the "embodiment feeling") for situations that have required "a more assertive M to show up." We then explore these responses and look at the strengths and resilience, alongside the fear and resistance that M is bringing to each situation. In particular, M says using his firmer handshake reminds him at the beginning of an interaction that he "is more powerful and capable than I usually feel." M is constructing a new possible self that will serve him well. He is making the link between self-concept, motivation, and action-learning about himself.

B shares that he is HIV-positive during individual supervision. When asked why he shared that fact with me, he says that he wants to have an "honest relationship with me." I ask if he desires an honest relationship with his peers. He says no because he has chosen to live his life as a closeted gay man and any association with HIV might cause people to think that he is gay. I ask what his life is like with two constructs of himself operating side by side. B says that at times it is difficult, but goes on to identify strengths (great church family and a supportive partner) and resources (HIV support group and CPE group) as places where different parts of him can be "fed." Aware of this student's multiple identities, my intervention is to ask "miracle questions:"[20] "What would it be like if you woke up tomorrow morning and all of a sudden the two worlds you live in were no longer two worlds but one?

When you wake up how would you know that this had happened and how might your concept of yourself/selves change? How would it serve or not serve your life functioning?" After being startled by the question, B shares that the Black church would have to stop "hating gay people, and since that will not happen, it doesn't not serve me to entertain a question like that." B then connects his response to one he has received from a patient when he asked a "miracle question" to get that patient to imagine a future story moving from the hospital to rehab. The connective tissue B demonstrated supports Markus' theory about possible selves: "Possible selves are linked to the dynamic properties of the self-concept—to motivation, to distortion, and to change, both momentary and enduring experiences, thus the pool of possible selves derives from the categories made salient by the individual's particular socio-cultural and historical context.[21] B continues to be comfortable with his choices and pursues an investigation of churches that might welcome him because,"One day I want to pray holding my partner's hand." This question about the "miracle" sparked his imagination enough to desire an experience with a new construct that would integrate his faith and family.

Critical Purchase

The constructivist view of personhood is highly subjective as it emphasizes the self-organizing features of individuals and operates on the principle that human beings understand themselves primarily through interpersonal and social interactions. Some students are not comfortable with this approach because it does not promote self-understanding through a chart of measurable behaviors; there is no set trajectory from despair to joy or from confusion to clarity. For example, during individual supervision, a student balks at the idea of exploring multiple realities and identities within her that may be causing her to be uncomfortable "in her own skin." She associates multiple identities with disorganization of her thoughts and finds it threatening and overwhelming to consider that this may be normative, or even life-giving. In order for this student to learn about herself, she believes she needs an outside, material reality that can be used as a reference point, or standard, to measure her internal world. In this case, it is certainly reasonable to assist this student in constructing some objective measures that she identifies as potentially beneficial to her personal evaluation. Similarly, for students who are attracted to understanding themselves through the Myers-Briggs or Enneagram models, the constructive work in my supervision may require

me to utilize these tools as a "personality barometer" in assessing students' understanding of themselves.

Another major critique of constructivist psychology is that it fails to significantly account for aspects of the self, embodiment, materiality, and power. This proposes a unique tension that I must remain aware of in my supervision of students for whom language and discourse about themselves may be inadequate. Paying attention to these critiques and the multiplicity of alternatives strategies will aid in bringing attention in individual supervision to embodied factors (abusive incidents), material constraints (financial, geographic), and power (patriarchy, racism) that cause resistance and disorientation for students. Solutions for students in CPE are no more than alternative reality. Explanations, hypotheses, and theories, and second-order realities only have significance for students if they create bridges to practical results that are wanted.

Ultimately, it is the results that count. Clinical supervision requires that the student/supervisory relationship utilize all that is available and at times scavenge through familiar ground with persistence, steadiness, and creativity to look again and again from multiple angles using appropriate lenses. When this is in process, together we explore the evolution of the "living human document" with empathy and insight.

NOTES

1. I have no theological meta-narrative or absolute formulation that constructs a singular symbolic system for guiding humans. I do not believe that I need a God who is a conscious agent or designer to have a spiritual experience, sustain my moods, or guide my spiritual or moral life. Rather, I believe that biological evolutionary processes and the constant self-creativity of human cultures are the prime movers of the human project. These beliefs inform my supervisory practice, which is grounded in the theology and ethics found in the principles and purposes of Unitarian Universalism.

2. Susan Elias and Jeffery *Elias, Curiosity and Open-mindedness in Open and Traditional Classrooms* (Charlotte, NC: Psychology Within Schools, 1976), 13.

3. Hubert Hermans, *The Dialogical Self: Positioning and Repositioning in a Globalizing Society* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 44

4. Kenneth Gergen, *An Invitation to Social Constructivism* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers, 2000), 17.

5. Ibid., 76.

6. Ibid.,195.

7. George Kelly, *What book?* (New York: Norton Press 1955), 11.

8. Ibid., 222.

9. Kenneth Gergen, *Realities in Relationships* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 217.

10. Kenneth Gergen, *Social Constructivism in Context* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers 2001), 20.

11. Kenneth Gergen, *The Saturated Self* (New York: Basic Books 1991), 86–175.

12. D. E. Hamachek, *Encounters with the Self* (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1995).

13. Hazel Markus and Paula Nurius, "Possible Selves," *American Psychologist* 41, no.9 (1986): 954–969.

14. Ibid., 954–956.

15. Steve Shazer, *Clues: Investigating Solutions in Brief Therapy* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1988).

16. Ibid., 40–63.

17. Insoo Kim, *More than Miracles: The State of the Art of Solution-Focused Brief Therapy* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2007), 35–132.

18. Robert Niemeyer, *Constructivist Psychotherapy* (New York: Rutledge Press 2009), 33.

19. Kim, 76.

20. Markus, 967.

21. Ibid., 964.

❧

THEOLOGY THEORY

My Big Bang

I left the Jehovah Witnesses at age 14 and, with the encouragement of my parents, I spent my Sundays in museums or libraries on a quest to understand my environment, my existence, and my purpose in the context of the incredible societal and cultural evolution of the 1970s. By 16, I had come to fully embrace evolutionary science theories as the belief system that could best hold my questions, creativity, and optimism regarding the earth and the human condition. My spiritual world became rooted in my life experiences and the desire to be in relationship with the many creative options humans

have developed to address my life's challenges.[1] While anthropologically engaged in these religious impulses, however, I never believed in a revelatory creator with the supernatural power to guide and control the spirit of human beings or events. Instead, I believed that our ability to choose, care, commune, and create made us religious.

Theortical Orientation

I wholeheartedly agree with Religious Naturalist Loyal Rue when he describes religion as "an attitude toward life:"[2] the idea is not to latch onto a superhuman personality or to "get to heaven," but to discover how to be fully human in this life. I have no theological meta-narrative or absolute formulation that constructs a singular symbolic system that guides humans. I do not believe that I need a God who is a conscious agent or designer to have a spiritual experience, sustain my moods, or guide my spiritual or moral life. Rather, I believe that biological evolutionary processes and the constant self-creativity of human cultures are the prime movers of the human project. These beliefs inform my supervisory practice, which is grounded in the theology and ethics found in the principles and purposes of Unitarian Universalism.[3]

In my non-creedal tradition, individuals articulate their theologies based on their own experiences and orientation to the universe. Unitarian Universalist theologian Susan Pangerl calls this process the "constructive task of continuously envisioning our evolving theologies."[4] The processes that have catalyzed the evolution of my own theology include my own story of family disintegration, social adventurism, anthropological studies, scientific investigation, and a love for human diversity that is lived out in my daily life.[5]

Ultimately, I experience God or the Sacred when I witness or participate in the creative process. Critical postmodernists have developed language for this conception of God, and I find my theology particularly well articulated by Harvard theologian Gordon Kaufman, who redefines God as creativity[6]—connecting the idea of God to the scientific understanding of cosmic and biological evolution.[7] "Thinking of God today as *creativity* instead of *Creator* enables us to bring theological values and meanings into connection with modern evolutionary thinking," Kaufman argues. In this framework, God is not a person or a moral agent, but rather the process of "serendipitous creativity" in the universe. Although I find Kaufman's vocabulary for the divine to be very helpful in articulating my own theology, since God is not a personal metaphor for Kaufman (or me), this position

can be problematic in supervision with a student whose faith includes a relationship with a God. Such a student may resist the concept of God as serendipitous creativity because such a theory negates their direct experience with religious metaphors and symbols. This potential for alienating more traditional theists is a limitation of Kaufman's theology and of the humanist strands of my Unitarian Universalist tradition.

However, my tradition and theology also leave room for others' differing experiences of God. While my concept of God may not be a personal one, I understand that personal relationships with the divine are persistent through all cultures. Therefore, I try to get to know the foundational stories of my students in supervision—what they believe, who they understand themselves to be, and how their life experiences play into their theologies. As I journey with students, I assess how these base narratives interact with the multiphrenic[8] clinical stories they are experiencing. This helps me to ascertain where we might find the creative space to walk together in spite of differing theological stances. While my theological understanding of God as creativity might not be helpful or acceptable to my students for *their own* use, it provides *me* with the open-mindedness and responsiveness to enter into authentic relationship with my students even across what seem like chasms of difference.

Supervision

Students are defined and shaped by past experiences, present choices, future goals, and relational contexts; including their relationship with any ultimate religious reality they may have chosen for themselves. Yet within the CPE process, students' long-held religious beliefs and current social locations are often challenged as theological constructs and lived clinical experiences mingle to create new meanings and conflicts. For example, when J, a Black middle-class Missionary Baptist pastor, meets a poor Black patient who has just had an abortion, he has to negotiate the tension and ambiguity of a tradition that abhors abortion and a duty to care for the real patient he meets, who elicits compassion from him because she is his daughter's age.

In the clinical and group experiences, these conflicting narratives can encourage students to broaden their communities of mutual understanding and support. My goal in supervision is to create space for that theological creativity, where clinical and group experiences become the "playground" for experimentation, risk-taking, and adventure. My challenge as a CPE supervisor is to help create a playground that is generous enough for

scriptural see-saws, theological swings, and slides toward multiple ultimate realities. Throughout this adventure, students should feel that their belief systems are being both affirmed and stimulated to increase their capacity to reflect, change, and adapt as needed. As students watch patients adapt to life-altering conditions, I want them to explore the dynamism of change as they create relationships with patients, peers, and supervisor. My clinical goal is that students pay attention to the incongruent processes that pick at the web of theological constructs[9] that have shaped them.

CPE is a process that intentionally disorganizes received ways of thinking and does not always lead students on linear paths. As a student experiences pain with a supervisor and says, "Ouch, that hurts!" the idea of "silent suffering that has been that student's life script"[10] may be disorganized. As a result, that student might explore a range of pain thresholds and discover new understandings of suffering. Since some CPE students are Christians whose pre-modern, modern, and postmodern symbols provide a significant resource for their orientation to human life, students should not be challenged to "give them up," but rather to put them in relationship with real "here and now" experiences that are authentically constructed.[11] I want all students to learn to identify, articulate, and affirm how their theological experiences and traditions enable them to do the work of pastoral care while being true to their unique identities.

For example, M—a devout lay Catholic woman—discovered during the unit that she was deeply wedded to the liturgy of the Church, but not its doctrine regarding the role of women. The first time she ever expressed this was with women clergy from Protestant denominations in her group. As a supervisor, when it was her turn to lead worship for the group, I encouraged her to create a liturgy in which women had a more prominent role. Here, my theology encouraged imagination and creativity within the context of her faith tradition. This type of imaginative reconstruction helped to further M's goal to define what path she might take in her church's future.

In their group experience, I encourage students to connect seemingly unrelated experiences and relationships to create new frameworks that juxtapose their theological premises. My theology and supervisory practice compel me to set aside preconceptions, critical judgment, and experiential caution to create theological relationship with students that are filled with imagination and creativity. I seek to help them find value and relevance in the distillation of many theological and philosophical points of view. This

task is spiritually enriched by the courage to say "yes" to the unfamiliar, the new, the created.[12]

Assessment and Intervention

G is very clear about his identity as a Christian. He comes from a family of ministers in the Baptist tradition, has led mission work in Rwanda and Bible studies with homeless men in an urban shelter, and lives in an apartment building of young adult Christians. G's Christian voice was clear and firm, filled with determination and doctrine. At the same time, a less-certain ethical voice that was prophetic and oppositional to the church was also emerging in him. He brought both voices to his clinical work, wanting patients to pray more and rely on God, while also yearning to confront the injustices associated with the poverty that caused these patients to suffer.

My Unitarian Universalist principles and purposes influenced my assessment and guided my interventions with G. I believe that authority comes not just from creeds and religious tradition, but from direct life experience.[13] Thus, I encouraged G to let both voices live in communion as he created a generative relationship between them. I observed G's increasing ability to do this in one experience with a Pagan patient who offered to do a prophetic reading of his life. Before, G shared, he would "probably not have talked to people who were not Christians," and said, "I know what scripture says about sorcery and card reading...but still I recognized this as an experience I would have never had except here in the diversity of this hospital." Although the voice of his tradition still spoke to him, he was able to also listen to his own inner voice, which enabled him to be present to the creative spirit present in this interaction.

As G realized that how a care-seeker receives pastoral care is inextricable from their social location, ethnicity, class, age, and culture, he went deeper with this Pagan patient and was able to be in creative communion with her as she shared the traumatizing abuse she had experienced. G was able to connect and hold her humanity closely without being repelled by her belief system. G noted that it was in ambiguity and mystery that he was able to "find some connection for me to care for her." My supervisory approach with G was guided by what my Unitarian Universalist tradition considers to be the primary source of religious authority: "Direct experience of that transcending mystery and wonder, affirmed in all cultures, which moves us to a renewal of the spirit and an openness to the forces which create and uphold life."[14]

CRITICAL PURCHASE

A frequent criticism of Unitarian Universalism is that it does not provide the inspirited, salvation-oriented experiences that are traditionally recognizable as "religious." It is also a class-bound denomination of largely European-American, upper middle-class, highly-educated liberals and progressives with churches clustered closely around universities. We are often described as "few but fit:" a categorization that highlights our penchant for elitism that can be self-satisfied by privilege. Because I am aware of this shadow side of my religious culture, I strive to intentionally widen my cultural and religious horizons as a Unitarian Universalist clinical supervisor. I am committed to exhibiting a well-developed practice of cultural humility, which impels me to have direct, authentic experiences with many traditions and faith communities beyond the confines of the CPE seminar.[15] When accompanied by this kind of intentional praxis, Unitarian Universalism is overwhelmingly compatible with the goals and outcomes of the clinical pastoral education experience because our faith is extremely inclusive with room for the theist, the atheist, the Buddhist, and the religious humanist.[16]

My major commitments as a Unitarian Universalist supervisor are to continue my willingness to have a change of heart, maintain an ethos of care and compassion, and cultivate an ethic of acceptance. My theology holds that there are multiple paths to life's biggest questions, and therefore I believe CPE supervision should validate, provoke, and inspire purposeful and meaningful dialogue across barriers of theology and tradition. Above all, a Unitarian Universalist CPE supervisory theology should be useful, helping students lead their lives in ministry in the most fulfilling and satisfying ways possible, pushing them to realize their human potential to the greatest extent possible. It should facilitate valued and cherished relationships within which the spirit of human agency allows hope and faith to be reborn again and again. In other words, the end goal of a Unitarian Universalist CPE theology is the actualization of human potential.

However, such a theology must deeply consider how suffering is related to actualization. As a Black person who has experienced suffering on both the personal and societal scales,[17] I know that it is an inherent part of the human condition, from the physical suffering of disease, to the emotional suffering of loss, to the social suffering of alienation, to the political suffering of racism, to the economic suffering of poverty. Because my theology is naturalistic, however, I am less concerned with theodicy and the metaphysi-

cal origins of suffering than with the lived realities and results thereof. I believe that suffering cannot be theologically explained, nor is it to be sought after and celebrated. Rather, suffering is theologically useful in that it can be understood as the ground out of which human creativity and cultural potential spring to life. In the midst of the chaos and uncertainty and pain of suffering, both the cancer patient facing death and the CPE student working through a new revelation can seize the spiritual agency required to continue the most important "biohistorical impulses"[18] of human existence: to adapt, survive, and thrive in spite of suffering and oppression.

In this context, I believe understanding God as serendipitous creativity can be a liberatory enterprise. While feminist theologians like Sally McFague have pointed out that hierarchical conceptions of God/human relations are detrimental to the liberation of marginalized people,[19] Kaufman argues that the concept of God as serendipitous creativity can serve to dismantle the oppressive potential of a more vertical concept of the divine.[20] In other words, *Divine Creativity* is more egalitarian than any *Divine Creator*. For me, Divine Creativity is the place at which lives come together from the margins to intersect at the center. Allowing such a conception of God to influence my practice of supervision can be liberatory for students who have experienced oppression and limitations to their human potential because I attempt to empower students to move more fully into relationship on multiple levels.

My own life experience has been one of being on the margins; therefore, I have compassion for the experiences of others who inhabit those less-than-central places of the world.[21] I believe that divine creativity occurs whenever lives intersect, my supervisory practice is about inviting students to come toward one another and toward their patients to the place where they can engage deeply and meaningfully with each other and with God. For a student like H, whose religious narrative consists primarily of Biblical literalism, it may be difficult for her to accept any theological premise that is not rooted in Scripture, the divinity of Jesus, and Christian tradition. Kaufman's rejection of a God as a "superbeing" who directs the universe[22] would likely be disconcerting for H. For her, a self-constructed theology that reflects her direct experience without the guidance of tradition would be without merit.

This poses an interesting challenge for me as a supervisor when H displayed a "separate from the world" behavior in the group that isolated her from the community of her peers. Within her tradition, H's rather rigid belief structures serve to orient her to the biohistorical culture in which she lived. Dismissing her reality would not further her relationships with the

supervisor or her peers; rather, I affirmed her reality and offered opportunities for that identity to be in a creative relationship with others who provided her with opportunities to interpret, reconstruct, judge, and assess the hermeneutic value of her integration into the group. Here, my goal was to invite her to engage her own familiar theological symbols in a new way that brought her into relationship with others, thereby challenging her to "come in" from the margins without asking her to discard the structures that make her feel secure. I invited H to engage the familiar symbol of Jesus: not the other-worldly Christ, but the Jesus who lives in community and preaches of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. My theology supports this coming of the "Kingdom" as a creative, constructive process, in which Jesus illustrates that our evolution towards the Kingdom is not a completed act. Jesus, in this conception, can inspire us to be more humane through an emphasis on love, faith, and hope in our relationships—and in H's case, in relationship with her peers. I encouraged H to explore the behaviors and values Jesus displayed through crossing boundaries of ethnicity, gender, and power that furthered her relationships with her peers in building the Kingdom of God here on earth and in the group.

The creative and humanistic construction that is my theological and philosophical orientation is well matched to the empiricism of Anton Boisen[23] who, like Kaufman, created models, metaphors, and symbols that express humankind's "best understanding of life" based on real contextual particulars of the human condition rather than theological formulas. Boisen wrote, "religious experience is rooted in the social nature of man and arises spontaneously under the pressure of a crisis situation. We frequently find the sense of contact with the ultimate reality to which we give the name of God. This means a new awareness of the individual's continuity with society at its best."[24] This understanding grounds my supervisory practice firmly in the tradition of social communitarians that is evident in the principles and purposes of my Unitarian Universalist faith.[25]

NOTES

1.   After my parents' divorce, my mother went to live in the Virgin Islands to pursue her education and my grandmother returned from Hawaii to assist my father in caring for us. I left for college a couple of years later and my father suddenly died of a massive heart attack during my third year of college, a year later I was unable to concentrate on my studies and dropped out of college to seek meaning in the world of work. I had only the most cursory understanding of what these family traumas would mean to my development as a parent, a partner, and professional but it marked the beginning

of understanding that close relationships can be severed, people can leave, and a father can die before he had a chance to know himself and his family.

In the past four years, it has been easier to wonder and guess about the whereabouts of my family than actually go and seek them out. It was more comforting to know nothing and to live in that empty distant space that has characterized my family dynamics for many years.

2.   Loyal Rue, *Religion is Not about God: How Spiritual Traditions Nurture our Biological Nature and What to Expect When They Fail* (Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers Press, 2006), 6.

3.   There are seven principles which Unitarian Universalist congregations affirm and promote: 1) the inherent worth and dignity of every person; 2) justice, equity and compassion in human relations; 3) acceptance of one another and encouragement to spiritual growth in our congregations; 4) free and responsible search for truth and meaning; 5) the right of conscience and the use of the democratic process within our congregations and in society at large; 6) the goal of world community with peace, liberty, and justice for all; 7) respect for the interdependent web of all existence of which we are a part. Unitarian Universalist Association, "Our Association: UUA Governance and Management: Bylaws: II Principles and Purposes, C-2.1 Principles," accessed March 20, 2014, http://www.uua.org/uuagovernance/bylaws/articleii/6906. shtml.

4.   Susann Pangerl, "Thinking our Doing: Pastoral Theological Reflections Reconsidered," *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health* 10, no. 3 (2008): 249–261.

5.   I have an eclectic background in anthropology, environmental science, museum exhibit development, multicultural education, outdoor education, social play, entrepreneurialism, and ministry. I sought to live my life openly as a student, a lesbian, an activist, a global Black, a spirit-filled justice-seeking member of multiple communities. It is only through my multifaceted participation in the world that I know am living. I have come to know myself by actively structuring activities and experiences to create an engaged life.

6.   Gordon Kaufman, *In the Beginning—Creativity* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsberg-Fortress Press, 2004), 45, 62. Karen Hutt, Theology Position Paper, May 1, 2011.

7.   Ibid., Kaufman, 76

8.   Karen Hutt, "ACPE Theory Paper: Clinical Pastoral Education as Adventure Background," *Reflective Practice* 34 (2014): 225–251; see Personality Position Paper, page 244 this volume, for a definition and discussion of "multiphrenic."

9   Gerald Corey, *Theory and Practice of Group Counseling* (Belmont, CA: Thompson Higher Education Press, 2008), 325.

10.   John Dewey, *Art as Experience* (New York: Perigee Books, 1934), 284.

11.   Luci Shaw, *Breath for the Bones: Art, Imagination and Spirit,* (New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2007).

12.   Unitarian Universalist Association, www.uua.org.

13.   Ibid.

14. Larry Cohen, Vivian Chavez, and Sana Chehimi, *Prevention is Primary: Strategies for Community Well Being* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2010), 99.

15. Unitarian Universalist Association, www.uua.org.

16. Ibid.

17. James Cone, *God of the Oppressed* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Press 1997).

18. Kaufman, *In the Beginning*.

19. Sally McFague, *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Theological Language* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1982).

20. Kaufman, *In the Beginning*, 53.

21. This refers to an acknowledgement that I live on the margins of many identities simultaneously. African America, lesbian, upper middle class, multi-career, Unitarian Universalist religious naturalist.

22. Kaufman, *In the Beginning,* 97.

23. Anton Boisen, *Religion in Crisis and Custom: A Sociological and Psychological Study* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955).

24. Ibid.

25. Unitarian Universalist Association, www.uua.org.