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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: NEIGHBOR-LOVE, CLASS, AND MARGINS

Class stratification is becoming more prominent in the United States. Poverty is increasing, the middle class is collapsing, and wealth is increasing among the top 1% of the population (Gilbert, 2003; Weber, 2010). Pastoral theologians and caregivers committed to neighbor-love and social justice need theoretical resources that increase understanding of the character and complexity of class. This understanding should inform pastoral theological construction and praxis. The following cases provide a glimpse into life lived at a class margin.¹

Beth describes herself as an African American woman in her mid 50s. Her mother and father separated after her father molested a sibling. Her mother became a single parent head of household working as a housekeeper for a wealthy family. Beth dropped out of high school in order to take a job and support her younger siblings when her mother’s health failed. She did not finish her GED, which she describes as a failure on her part. She worked in the housekeeping industry until health complications rendered her unemployable. She has been a client at a shelter for over a year and has intermittently participated in the shelter’s work program. Currently, she does not participate in the program and sleeps on a mat. Beth describes a daily rhythm of getting up at 6 a.m., leaving the shelter, finding food, finding safe space during the day, dealing with the “drama” on the streets, and returning to

¹ The cases represent two of the six persons interviewed for this study. The names and identifying data have been changed.

² I use Pierre Bourdieu’s definition of habitus here, indicating an internalized schema of preference associated with a particular social space. Social space is Bourdieu’s preferred term for ‘class.’ See chapter 4.

³ Neighbor-love is love directed toward ‘others.’ For the purposes of this
the shelter in the late afternoon in order to eat, shower, and secure mat space. When asked what she hopes for Beth said, “I just don’t know. I just can’t see how things will change.”

Frank describes himself as a single white male in his early 30s. Frank has been intermittently homeless since he was 18. After graduating high school Frank left home due to an alienated relationship with his stepfather. He has stayed intermittently with friends, girlfriends, and distant family. Frank has served various lengths of time in jail and ‘has a record.’ Frank currently sleeps under a table in downtown Fort Worth and panhandles for cash. He has some experience with shelters but prefers to stay on his own away from the “violence on Lancaster.” Frank utilizes missions for food and clothing services. Frank hopes to save enough money to move to another state where he hopes to get back on his feet with the help of some friends and a past girlfriend. Frank describes homeless living as “surreal” or “not real” whereas he hopes to get back to “real life—life with a job, a home, a wife and maybe some kids.”

The core of this study asks, “How might attending to the habitus\(^2\) of persons marginalized by their class location inform Wesleyan-holiness understandings of neighbor-love\(^3\) and offer new constructions of neighbor-love with implications for pastoral practice?” By drawing upon the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu, a particular trajectory within the Wesleyan-holiness tradition, and the lived experiences of persons dwelling in an economically and educationally marginalized social space, this study engages a critical correlative

\(^2\) I use Pierre Bourdieu’s definition of habitus here, indicating an internalized schema of preference associated with a particular social space. Social space is Bourdieu’s preferred term for ‘class.’ See chapter 4.

\(^3\) Neighbor-love is love directed toward ‘others.’ For the purposes of this dissertation the term neighbor is used to designate persons participating in this study who experience intergenerational poverty and lack of formal education. Neighbor-love then indicates love directed toward this particular population.
The goal of this dissertation is to arrive at a construction of neighbor-love and recommendations for pastoral practice that account for class’ complex impact on persons at a margin.

Chapter Organization

Pastoral theological dissertation research usually arises out of the interest and history of the researcher. Therefore, this chapter begins with an account of how class came to matter to me. I then present key concepts for this study, a rationale for constructing theology and practice informed by a margin, and a brief literature review on neighbor love and class within pastoral theology. The chapter concludes with an outline of this dissertation.

How Class Came to Matter to Me

As a young seminarian in the Wesleyan-holiness tradition I was drawn to the emphasis upon neighbor-love particularly as it related to interactions with persons who experienced disenfranchisement. Prophetic texts in scripture and exemplars from church history combined to ignite and fan a flame of special concern in me for the widow, orphan, and alien in the land. I was proud of the early Nazarene movement that modeled this concern through ministry with the poor. However, as the Nazarene movement became more established it experienced a social migration from being composed of predominantly poor and working-class persons to becoming a denomination of skilled and educated persons dwelling in middle-class social space. The migration coincided with a shift in focus

4 I will discuss the nature of critical correlative conversations (Browning, 1987) and emancipatory correctives (Chopp, 1987) in chapter 2.
away from the marginalized. I was not comfortable with this shift and wanted to make a
difference by working with those who experienced the social vulnerability associated with
poverty.

My first ministerial assignment involved working with a mission church in Denver. This church and mission provided food, clothing, and educational training for persons who
dwelt at or below the poverty line. During this time I became aware of significant friction
between my own way of navigating the social world and those with whom I worked. This
friction invited questions related to the social assumptions or worldview that I carried and
the assumptions and worldview the persons with whom I ministered carried. Seminary had
not given me a sociological lens with which to identify, name, and negotiate difference
related to class. Further, I was not equipped to name and negotiate theological differences
that resulted from diverse ways of making meaning that I later would come to associate
with assumptive worldviews related to class. However, class as a theoretical and practical
lens for ministry mattered to me largely because I was already committed to an
understanding of neighbor-love.

The theology of neighbor-love that I had developed during my seminary years
invited me to a particular theo-logic informed by theological and cultural assumptions. This
logic was a golden-rule logic informed by an ethical commitment to treat others as I would
want to be treated. The logic assumed similarity rather than diversity. However, when the
other is very unlike me what does it mean to treat another as I would want to be treated, to
do or not do to another as I would want done or not done to me? How do I love the other
when the other has a distinct assumptive worldview that I do not share? These questions
invited a return to the academy in order to explore the intersection between theology and
cognate disciplines that would help me develop a thicker appreciation of difference, neighbor-love, and correlate pastoral practices.

Since my return to the academy I have come to appreciate neighbor-love’s complexity. There is a burgeoning body of literature related to Christian understandings of love. For example, Garth Hallett (1989) argued that while a commitment to love is central to Christian theology, a sustained philosophical treatment of neighbor-love is missing. Hallett provides a typology that reveals six rival and ‘incompatible’ historical Christian perspectives of love directed toward neighbor. His and other analyses of love invite further questions related to the philosophical, social, and contextual underpinnings of love and by extension neighbor-love. Their combined insight emphasize the continued need for sustained and critical attention to neighbor-love within Christian theology as a whole and in pastoral theology in particular.

The field of pastoral theology provides a way to nuance our understanding of neighbor-love. The discipline takes seriously the lived experiences of persons as a source for theological construction. Therefore, lived experience should serve as a primary source for a critical engagement of neighbor-love. This dissertation is built on a pastoral theological method that engages lived experience, theology, and cognate disciplines in a mutually critical conversation in order to invite a process of deconstruction and reconstruction. The method concludes with the construction of new theory and practice

---

5 See the literature review on ‘love’ to follow.
6 While pastoral theology is interested in the historical, philosophic, and systematic accounts of neighbor love within Christian tradition, its unique contribution to the conversation consists in its constructive nature that utilizes lived experience as a normative theological source (Jennings, 1990; Ramsay, 2004).
7 Pastoral theology’s emphasis on lived experience as a normative theological source presents unique challenges that will be addressed below.
that is appropriate for the context of pastoral ministry. A pastoral theological perspective influences both my formulation and my engagement of the question.

My interest in the subject matter and my formation of the research question are informed by my life and ministerial experiences, my faith formation within a particular tradition, my education, and finally, my participation in a particular scholarly guild.

**Key Concepts**

In the following section I present key concepts in order to invite the reader into the conversation. I elaborate on these concepts in the body of the dissertation. The concepts are neighbor-love, power, difference, and class.  

**Neighbor-Love**

Love of neighbor, or neighbor-love, is complicated by its constitutive components. Love alone is difficult to define as many historical and contemporary thinkers have demonstrated (Nygren, 1953; Williams, 1968; Hallett, 1989; Post, 1990; Jeanrond, 2010; Oord, 2010). However, when neighbor joins love as a modifier, the challenge of defining the term becomes more complex. The term neighbor grounds constructs of love in contextual, historical particularity. Universal, antiseptic constructions of love give way to the messiness of love directed to a particular neighbor. Hence, specific neighbor-love in contrast to general love invites engagement with the concrete realities of a neighbor—an ‘other’ who is both similar and dissimilar to the lover and whose dissimilarity complicates constructions of love.

---

8 It is important to note that these concepts are part of ongoing academic discussions about neighbor love, power, difference, and class. Thomas Oord (2010) well describes discussions related to love. Lynn Weber (2010) and Wijeyyesinghe & Jackson (2012) present ongoing discussions regarding intersectional theory and analyses of power and oppression.
The Wesleyan-holiness tradition regards scripture as an important authoritative source for theological construction. The Gospel of Luke is informative in establishing an understanding of neighbor (Luke 10:25ff). Luke reframes the question “who is my neighbor?” by asking “who was a neighbor to the man who fell among robbers?” I read the parable to suggest that Christians are to be neighbors to persons suffering from oppression and, as a corollary, persons suffering from oppression are neighbors to Christians.

This dissertation identifies as neighbors those intergenerationally poor and uneducated persons who receive care from mission contexts. The concrete experiences of these neighbors inform this dissertation’s construction of neighbor-love. Hence, neighbor-love is complicated by the particularity of the analyzed lived experiences of a specific group of neighbors.

What does it mean to love and, by extension, what does it mean to love your neighbor? These questions are vital to a Wesleyan-holiness tradition. Wesleyan-holiness theologians Mildred Bangs Wynkoop (1972) and Thomas Oord (2010b) trace the centrality and origins of love in John Wesley’s thought. While some traditions focus on other themes, Wesleyan theology in general and Wesleyan-holiness theology in particular emphasize how love is connected to care of neighbor. Thus, constructions of love directed toward neighbor, or neighbor-love, inform theology, practice, and pastoral care within the Wesleyan-holiness tradition.

\[9\] For example, God’s sovereignty and God’s glory.

\[10\] Attention to the construction of neighbor-love can also be important to traditions for which love may not be central but is still an expression of Christian commitment to ethical pastoral care.
I define neighbor-love as collaborative action with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, to promote overall well being.\textsuperscript{11} Hence, neighbor-love involves collaboration with an “other,” one who is both like and unlike the lover. Neighbor-love, informed by deliberate empathy (a concept developed in chapters 5 and 6) asks the question, “How does my neighbor prefer to be loved?”

This dissertation rests on the assumption that any theological construction of neighbor-love reflects the social locations of those who are given the authority by their tradition to define the term. Hence, theology is a social construction. Likewise, and more specifically for purposes of this dissertation, in the last 20 years pastoral theology has utilized a postmodern critique to analyze the ways that power and knowledge, or constructions of knowledge, are related to social locations and discursive practices (Neuger, 2004, 66ff). This critique invites attention to the norms, assumptions, and worldviews of persons with and without access to symbolic capital (i.e. the power to define terms) and the way these factors influence operative theologies that impact ministerial practice. Hence, any pastoral theological conversation about neighbor-love as a guiding norm for practices must take into account such issues as power and social location.

\textbf{Power}

For purposes of this dissertation, I define power as the ability for a person to achieve her/his intention in a given situation.\textsuperscript{12} However, since humans exist in a complex network of social relations power is complicated by the social systems in which persons

\textsuperscript{11}Chapter 5 introduces my emphasis on deliberate empathy and Chapter 6 expands the definition.


participate. Power is amplified or diminished in complex relations between a person’s social location, context, and social systems that nuance access to power. Therefore, a person’s ability to achieve her/his intention is not simply a matter of personal agency. Systems of power and oppression constrain agency, or the ability to act.

Systems of oppression are the result of social struggle in which one group historically and contingently gains control over another group. The dominating group gains control over the forms of capital and ensures continued privileged access by establishing hierarchical social systems.

Bourdieu, whose work will ground much of the social theory used in this dissertation, uses the terms symbolic capital and symbolic violence to address the above dynamic (1991, 1992). Groups struggle for symbolic capital. Symbolic capital involves the power to establish understanding of normativity and deviance. Symbolic violence occurs as social groups forget the struggle for symbolic capital and accept the result as non-contingent. The contingent meaning resulting from a struggle becomes “taken for granted.” Oppressive social structures depend upon symbolic violence to perpetuate and reify contingent constructions of knowledge that ensure privileged access to other forms of capital. These hierarchical social systems use difference as a means to perpetuate oppression. This dynamic ensures augmented power for dominant groups and diminished power for the oppressed groups.
Difference

By difference I mean a set of appreciable characteristics by which access to power is augmented or diminished by oppressive social systems.¹³ Humans participate in social systems that discriminate according to difference. These differences are context specific and often have to do with race, gender, orientation, and class analyses although other factors may prove salient in different contexts. Social location, or social identity, refers to the combination of these factors of difference, experienced simultaneously by persons. Hence, difference, social location, and systems of oppression intersect to augment or diminish power.

Recent research suggests oppression associated with difference is best conceptualized as intersecting systems of oppression (Ramsay, 2013; Weber, 2010; Hill Collins, 2007). Rather than adding together categories of oppression, intersectional theory suggests oppression is best understood by looking at the dynamic interplay between systems of gender, race, sexual orientation, and class because the systems continually inform each other. Further, humans experience social systems simultaneously.¹⁴

The question remains: “How can we benefit from an intersectional analysis without negating or undermining the complex and particular character of each system (Dill and Zambrana, 2009)?” Persons experience systemic oppression simultaneously due to their multi-faceted social identity. However, each system contains its own complex, particular, and contextual character. This dissertation contributes to the intersectional discussion by

¹⁴ I do not experience my whiteness apart from being male, heterosexual, and class-informed.
focusing on class in order to explore its character more fully. Still, it notes opportunities to attend to the intersection of other systems.15

Class

There are multiple definitions of class and each definition draws on a social theory that informs and frames engagement of the topic. 16 Following Bourdieu (1984, 1990, 1998), ‘class’ signifies stratified social spaces that govern access to material, social, and symbolic capital. These spaces are systematically predisposed to favor certain classifications, or groups, and disadvantage others. I define class as a location within social space that governs access to material, cultural, social, and symbolic capital.17

Bourdieu’s theory, which will be explored in chapter 4, provides an avenue for investigating perceptions, preferences, and actions associated with a marginalized class. However, it will be helpful here to provide an introduction to a particularly salient aspect of Bourdieu’s theory as it relates to class as a category of difference.

15 For purposes of pedagogy, intersectional theorists suggest an incremental framework for teaching intersectional theory. Goodman and Jackson (2012) ask, “How can we expect students to grasp the complexity of how multiple identities overlap and interrelate when they have a limited understanding of racial identity or are focused on only one dimension of identity and social oppression?” In response to this dilemma they recommend a developmental approach. The approach begins with a single identity (race) and then looks at the intersection between another identity (gender) and race. The process progresses to a full intersectional focus that attends to the co-construction of oppression through the four systems (Goodman and Jackson, 2012).

16 Social theory began with broad, sweeping, macro-analytic theories and has undergone many critiques that, beginning with Weber, initiated a concurrent emphasis on micro-analysis. A sampling of classic theorists could include: Karl Marx, Herbert Spencer, Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, and George Herbert Mead. Contemporary theorists could include: C. Wright Mills, Michel Foucault, Dorothy Smith, Jürgen Habermas, bell hooks, Pierre Bourdieu, and Stanley Aronowitz. For accessible introductions to contemporary social theorists see Bailey and Gayle (2003), Anderson and Kaspersion (2000), Giddens (1987), Morrow and Torres (1995), and Tucker (1978).

17 Bourdieu understood capital as accumulated labor. Capital exists in material, cultural, social, and symbolic forms. I address Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology and key terms in chapter 4.
**Bourdieu's habitus.** Bourdieu’s concept of habitus is a helpful heuristic lens for analyzing difference associated with class. Bourdieu observed that class gradations correlate with a wide array of cultural preferences evidenced in music, clothing, eating habits, language, and bodily gestures. Bourdieu analyzed these preferences and contended that they were the means by which social stratification reproduces itself. He termed the socially acquired internalized schema of preferences, habitus—a system of dispositions, worldview, or acquired schemes of perception and classification as to what is preferred.18

Habitus impacts meaning making and practices by providing persons with rules, roles, goals, and perception of what is possible in a social interaction. Bourdieu used the metaphor of game to name the rules, roles, goals, and stakes involved in social interactions. Habitus grants perception of particular games. If one’s habitus does not include a feel for a particular game one will likely see the actions as absurd, or might not even be able to recognize that a game is taking place—being unable to recognize the stakes, rules, and strategies being played out before them. Habitus provides people with a “common sense” perspective of social space, social interactions, and orienting values in the social world in which they live (Bourdieu, 1990a).

Bourdieu is not the only scholar to note the complexities of class. bell hooks (2000c) approximates habitus as she attempts to develop a thicker description of class; she quotes Rita Mae Brown: “Class is much more than Marx’s definition of relationship to means of production. Class involves your behavior, your basic assumptions, how you are taught to

---
behave, what you expect from yourself and others, your concept of the future, how you understand problems and solve them, how you think, feel, act” (p.103). This thicker appreciation of class correlates with Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* and invites attention to the ways that differences associated with class influence perception, meaning making, and action in the social world.

**Relating Key Concepts to the Guiding Question.**

The emphasis on constructions of neighbor love, attending to a postmodern critique of knowledge, power, difference, and the importance of appreciating the complexities of class and its impact on ministry at a margin inform the guiding question of this dissertation:

How might attending to the *habitus* of persons marginalized by their class location inform Wesleyan-holiness understandings of neighbor love and offer new constructions of neighbor love with implications for pastoral practice?

**Constructions Informed by a Margin**

Generally pastoral theology embraces a commitment to social justice. This point of view invites attention to the ways that power and social location function in privileging certain perspectives, or discourses of knowledge, while marginalizing other perspectives; this view corresponds to the prophetic tradition within Scripture (Graham, 1995). The prophetic tradition emphasizes God’s caring concern and advocacy for the disenfranchised or the foreigner, widow, and orphan—those persons who experience vulnerability due to their social location. Liberation and feminist theologies are representative of theological

---

19 For other works by bell hooks that examine the intersection between oppression, racism, and sexism, see: *All about love* (2000a), *Feminist theory. From margin to center* (2000b), *Salvation* (2001).
positions that, building on this prophetic tradition, emphasize the importance of using the power and influence of the researcher to ‘side with,’ or privilege, marginalized voices in order to create more just theory and practice (Thistlethwaite & Engle, 1998; Poling, 2002; Ramsay, 2004; Neuger, 2004; Kujawa-Holbrook, 2009).

This dissertation uses a nuanced class analysis as a lens to privilege the perspective of persons marginalized by their class affiliation in order to construct a theology of neighbor-love and practices consistent with that construction. This analysis invites attention to the complex character of class as a system that contributes to intersectional oppression. A hermeneutic of suspicion encourages practitioners to engage critical deconstructive and reconstructive analyses to generate theory and practice that attends to biases affiliated with social location as well as the presence of power within discourses of knowledge. Such a stance, combined with attention to class analysis, generates space for practitioners to collaboratively create new theory and practice that subvert structures that facilitate oppression, injustice, and exploitation related to class.

Here the question of difference seems significant, particularly as we consider the theological-ethical doctrine of neighbor-love. What does it mean to love our neighbor? How might we invite further conversation around what it might mean to love our neighbor as one like oneself, when a neighbor is very ‘un-like’ oneself? What might it mean to do, or not do, to another as you would have done, or not done, to yourself when there is not a shared habitus—shared perceived possibilities? And what difference might it make if the habitus of the marginalized class were privileged during the conversation? What would a theology of neighbor-love from a margin look like? Further, how might our practices be challenged and changed from the conversation? This dissertation engages these questions.
Illustrations of the Importance of Class Analysis for Pastoral Theology and Care. In the preceding section I argued that appreciating the complexities of class impacts pastoral theory and practice. Persons of diverse class backgrounds engage ministry contexts with distinct sets of assumptions that inform their perceptions, values, strategies, and goals. They occupy different social space and have internalized different *habitus.* Imagine with me the following ministerial scenarios:

- A pastor provides pastoral care for a 21-year-old who was raised in an impoverished household and who has been homeless since the age of 13. During the conversation the pastor attempts to elicit a plan of action based on the parishioner’s goals over the next year. The pastor had in mind the following goals: secure a bicycle for transportation, secure employment at a fast food restaurant, complete the GED, apply to vocational school or junior college, secure a livable wage. The parishioner confessed becoming ‘stuck’ at the first step—how could he afford a bicycle, how would he keep it from being stolen. Interestingly, the pastor hadn’t considered public transportation. How might the interaction have changed had the parishioner’s perspective informed the pastoral interaction? How might that challenge the pastor’s operative theology of neighbor-love?

- A family in the church receives aid from the benevolence fund and chooses to spend the money differently than the benevolence committee thinks is appropriate. Why was the family’s response confusing to the benevolence committee? How might the family’s experience challenge the benevolence committee’s operative theology of neighbor love?

---

20 The plural of *habitus* is *habitus.*
• Volunteers in the clothing ministry experience ongoing conflict regarding the
distribution of clothes. The key volunteers involved in the conflict are a professional
middle-class woman and a chronically underemployed impoverished woman. The
middle-class woman prefers a consistent, policy-driven, clearly defined philosophy
of distribution. The marginalized woman preferred room for case-by-case analysis
and preferred that privileged distribution be given to persons who regularly
volunteered at the mission. What would happen if the marginalized woman’s
perspective were given more weight in the ministry? How would her perspective
challenge the operative theology of neighbor love in the ministry and that of the
middle-class woman?

While multiple lenses can be used to analyze the above scenarios (e.g. congregational
studies, family systems, developmental perspectives, gender studies, race studies,
psychotherapeutic approaches), the above scenarios highlight the way in which class
analysis as it is made evident in notions of *habitus* can be particularly helpful in pastoral
theology. Class, as an aspect of social location, influences both perception of and
participation in the social world, as well as access to capital. Relation and access to various
forms of capital correlates with power. Thus, focusing on class as a category should yield
critical insight into a context’s social stratification and the ways that power functions in a
context. Given that class has been under-represented in pastoral theological research and
discourse, this dissertation provides one avenue to further the significance of this
conversation for the theological construction of neighbor love and the resulting practices
that arise from that perspective.
In the following chapters I argue that class is a critical interpretive category for attending to difference associated with social location. Further, Bourdieu’s analysis invites attention to the complex ways in which social stratification is produced and reproduced through subjective and objective processes. This analysis provides a method for engaging deliberate empathy in an attempt to appreciate the particular perspectives of a marginalized neighbor. Finally, I argue that siding with marginalized persons involves sharing power through collaborative participation in the construction of pastoral theory and practice. That is, I argue for a theology of neighbor-love and correlate pastoral practices informed by a margin.

**Literature Review**

The following literature review has two sections. The first locates neighbor-love within pastoral theological discourse and orients the reader to discussions within Wesleyan-holiness theology. The second section locates class within pastoral theological discourse. This dissertation contributes to ongoing discussions of neighbor-love and class and their import for pastoral theological theory and praxis.

**Neighbor-Love in Pastoral Theology and Wesleyan-Holiness Theology.**

“Griddle cakes, pancakes, hotcakes, flapjacks: why are there four names for grilled batter and only one word for love?”—George Carlin

Though love is a single word, its definitions are diverse. Pastoral theologians draw on various sources to engage the subject of love. In the 1990 *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling*, Alastair Campbell asserts the notoriously ambiguous and obscure meaning of

---

21 Tom Oord (2010) introduced me to Carlin’s complaint.
love and attempts to clarify concepts of love by tracing insights from theologians and psychologists from the early to mid twentieth century (pp. 666-668). Though Campbell’s article is helpful in establishing a historical perspective of the role of love in pastoral care and counseling, given the many contributions from science, theology, and philosophy since that time, a fresh appraisal is needed.

Since 1990 several trends have impacted the trajectory of pastoral theological conversations about love. Nancy Ramsay’s edited work, Pastoral Care and Counseling: Redefining the Paradigms (2004) traces important shifts for pastoral theology since the 1990 publication of the Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling. While tracing the impact of all the shifts within pastoral theology is beyond the scope of this dissertation, several key themes impact pastoral theological conversations about love in general, and neighbor-love in particular. These themes include: a revised theological anthropology, pastoral theology as public theology, attention to power and difference, and an emphasis on relational justice as a necessary corollary for love. The revised theological anthropology includes a shift from a notion of the self as an autonomous individual to an irreducibly interconnected, relational self (Miller-McLemore, 1993; Graham, 1997; Ramsay, 1998). Concurrent with a new understanding of the self came a broadened scope for pastoral theology that extended beyond care of the individual to a focus on the contexts and communities to which the self is interconnected (Miller-McLemore, 1993; Graham, 1992). Postmodern philosophical shifts within the field called critical attention to the issues of power and difference (Neuger, 2004). Attention to power and difference highlights how normative understandings of

\[\text{22 Campbell traces discussions related to concepts of love, drawing on thinkers representing diverse approaches. The most contemporary source quoted in his dictionary entry was 1978.}\]
truth are established and reified. Further, attention to power and difference emphasizes
the way knowledge functions as a form of social control using power to silence
deviant/diverse perspectives. Finally, a commitment to relational justice as an ethical norm
became central to pastoral theological work. This commitment informs the previous three
themes. Ramsay writes:

Identifying justice as a prominent norm signaled an epistemological and ethical shift
that brought the theme of neighbor love from the horizon to a primary diagnostic
category. Relational justice, normative for the communal contextual and
intercultural paradigms, shifts the understanding of the self to a far more contextual,
socially located identity in which the political and ethical dynamics of asymmetries
of power related to difference such as gender, race, sexual orientation and class are
prominent...relational justice requires that care also includes attention to liberation
from actual bondage of oppression—the corollary of freedom from bondage is

After recording the shifts from individual to communal contextual paradigms for
pastoral theology, Ramsay suggests that changes in theological anthropology,
understanding pastoral theology as public theology, and an emphasis on relational justice
inform pastoral theology’s engagement of love. Such a shift coincides with increased use of
process, narrative, and liberation theologies by pastoral theologians (Ramsay, 1998, 2004;

Pastoral theologians have continued the trajectory outlined in Ramsay's (2004)
work. Neighbor-love continues to be informed by attention to power and difference, a
relational understanding of the self, attention to context, and relational justice. Three
representative works illustrate this continued emphasis in pastoral theology: Pastoral
theologian David Augsburger (2006) treats the concept of neighbor-love through the lens
of ‘tripolar spirituality’ that invites a relation of ‘integrity and solidarity with the neighbor’
(p. 13) in which love of God, love of neighbor, and love of self are indivisible. Sheryl
Kujawa-Holbrook (2009) uses Dr. King’s image of the “beloved community” and Catherine Nerney and Hal Taussig’s work (2002) to encourage pastoral caregivers to develop faith communities that take seriously love and power in order to confront and transform the evils of our world (p.16). Poling’s *Rethinking Faith* (2011) presents a theology that draws on process theology and his engagement with the lived experiences of oppressed and oppressors. In his treatment Poling draws on process theologian Bernard Loomer’s definition of love. When we understand God as love we refer to an “ability to sustain relationships over time with all their contrasts and contradictions and move those relationships toward harmony and beauty (22).” Poling understands the image of God in humanity to indicate the love and power intrinsic to the human condition. That is, humans are created with the ability to love (to be in relationship) and have power (respons/ability) to move toward God’s goal for humanity, the creation of greater harmony and beauty.

Augsberger, Kujawa-Holbrook, and Poling illustrate a continued emphasis within pastoral theological conversations about neighbor-love. Neighbor-love recognizes the reality of oppression. Neighbor-love is informed by a commitment to relational justice. Neighbor-love requires empathetic negotiation of difference. Neighbor-love recognizes the self/neighbor as intrinsically relational and socially located. And finally, neighbor-love is informed by mutuality. However, there is another theme within pastoral theological discourse that deserves attention: that neighbor-love is contextual.

Three works illustrate the contextual nature of neighbor-love within pastoral theological conversations. Joretta Marshall in *Counseling Lesbian Partners* (1997) quotes Daniel Day Williams that, “there is no one way to express the meaning of love in the Christian faith” (p. 52). She then constructs a definition of love that is distinctive for lesbian
covenantal partnerships. Emmanuel Lartey, *In Living Color* (2003), emphasizes love (*agape*) as the “self-giving love of God modeled through the incarnation of Jesus Christ (p.30).” Larkey argues that key to love is understanding that the love of God is for the whole world, created in all its diversity. Therefore, love does not force uniformity but respects and affirms diversity. Love asks how the beloved prefers to be loved. James Poling, in *Render Unto God* (2002), understands love as inclusive. Inclusive love means a “radical openness to otherness and difference (204).” For Poling, inclusive love includes those who have been marginalized by the dominant culture and includes the full range of human experience. Inclusive love opens doors to dialogue about core values. Hence, inclusive love invites conversation about what neighbor-love means to persons of diverse experiences.

Each of the three authors construct a definition of love appropriate to their context: Marshall constructs love between lesbian partners, Larkey constructs love in view of cultural diversity, and Poling constructs love in view of economic vulnerability and family violence. This dissertation adds to the pastoral theological conversation by constructing a theology of neighbor-love informed by neighbors who are oppressed by their location within oppressive class stratification.

The concept of love continues to garner considerable attention outside the field of pastoral theology. Garth Hallett (1986) argues a sustained critical examination of neighbor-love has yet to be conducted. He traces six historical and incompatible constructions of neighbor-love. Catholic theologian Bernard Brady (2003) provides a brief historical overview of love, as does Carter Lindberg (2008). These broad overviews demonstrate the presence of diverse Christian understandings of love and provide a background for a Wesleyan Holiness engagement of love.
Mildred Bangs Wynkoop (1972) and Thomas J. Oord (2010) articulate Wesleyan-holiness trajectories of love. Wynkoop traces love in John Wesley’s works and contends love is the best explanatory concept for Wesley’s thought. Wynkoop builds on Daniel Day Williams’ (1968) Spirit and the Forms of Love in order to construct a dynamic theology of love. She then uses this theology to critique “substantive” rather than “relational” understandings of Wesleyan-holiness theology and love. However, Wynkoop fails to produce a concise definition of love. Oord also draws on process thought but critiques Wynkoop for failing to develop and engage a clear definition of love. He responds to this critique by constructing a definition of love informed by an interdisciplinary approach. Oord elaborates this construction in The Nature of Love: A Theology. This dissertation engages Wynkoop and Oord in the normative task in order to construct neighbor-love informed by a margin.

Epistemological arguments related to the contingent, contextual, historical, and power-laden character of knowledge make the discussion of love complex. Catholic theologian Werner G. Jeanrond (2010) conducts a historical study of love emphasizing the social construction of love in each context while advocating love as praxis. Jeanrond’s emphasis on the historical and social construction of love provides fertile ground for exploring the sociological impact on constructions of love. If Jeanrond is correct in asserting that each construction of love is influenced by the philosophical and historical

\[23\] I will elaborate on Wynkoop’s argument in chapter 5.

\[24\] Oord draws on Stephen Post (1990). Post is a leading researcher on love and altruism and significantly influenced interdisciplinary research on love through the Templeton Foundation, established 2001. This movement employs scientists, theologians, and philosophers to analyze love from multiple angles. The commitments and theoretical perspectives employed by the participants inform love’s synonyms: altruism, compassion, agape, prosocial behavior, care, positive regard, and benevolence (Oord, 1998, p. vii).
context then it follows that an individual’s social location is a critical component in the construction and praxis of love. Any construction of love includes terms that are laden with assumptions and perspectives that the theologians bring with them. Therefore the terms are not only laden with history that may or may not include symbolic oppression, e.g. feminist critiques of definitions of agape as self-sacrifice (Gill-Austern, 1996), but if class critique is employed, the terms are also loaded with assumptions provided by the *habitus* of the researcher.

This dissertation responds to the above epistemological critique by asking, what would happen if we constructed a theology of neighbor-love from a margin—privileging the voices and perspectives of persons marginalized by class? Instead of the meaning of love, or more particularly the meaning of neighbor-love and its impact on the formulation of theory and practice within pastoral care, this conversation produces a construction of neighbor love informed by the voices and perspectives of persons marginalized by class.

For example, Oord (2010) offers the following definition of love, “To love is to act intentionally, in sympathetic response to others (including God), to promote overall well-being” (p. 14). If Bourdieu is correct in stating that *habitus* provides a way of constructing and performing in the world that is distinct and possibly invisible to persons informed by other *habitus*, then perceptions of well-being and sympathetic response could be diverse to say the least and possibly even conflictive. Without a critical consciousness that is equipped with tools to forefront class-laden constructions, persons likely act intentionally in ways that they think are promoting overall well-being but are in practice ineffective, to say the least, and possibly oppressive. In short, we need a critical angle on class to inform Oord’s and other’s definitions of love.
**Class in Pastoral Theology and Pastoral Counseling Literature.** Though focus on class is underrepresented in pastoral theological publication and research, it is not absent. As early as 1966 Howard Clinebell noted the importance, and lack, of class analysis (p. 152). Liston Mills noted the continued lack of class analysis in pastoral theological publications in the 1990 *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling* (p. 1194-1196).

Further, Christie Neuger (2004) noted the continued relative lack in the 2004 supplement to the *Dictionary* (p. 76-77).

While there has not been a complete disregard of class analysis within pastoral theological conversation,\(^{25}\) the attention given to class as a category of analysis has been predominantly economic rather than sociological. Mills’ entry in the 1990 *Dictionary* anticipated the trajectory of pastoral theology’s engagement of class in the last 30 years. Mills wrote that, class’ “central criterion is economic, however amplified” (p. 1194). Mills entry included allusions to a more complex analysis of class’ impact on the ways that persons view life, values, aspirations, and what is proper in social interaction, and he highlighted the necessity of doing pastoral practice with issues of class in mind. Mills’ entry marks a trajectory within pastoral theology. While pastoral theologians recognize class nuances that extend beyond economics, pastoral literature and analysis of class remain significantly tied to, and limited by, an economic understanding of class. In this case, Mills’ entry was prophetic: class’s central criterion has been economic.

---

Pastoral theologians committed to liberation and justice have selected a social theory, largely Marxist, that foregrounds systemic economic concerns. Judith Orr (1991) argued that pastoral theological selection of a social theory should be based on the theory's ability to clarify and critique sources of oppression. Marxist analysis, while needed and helpful in identifying and critiquing sources of oppression related to power and control over means of production, is not sufficient to highlight the many ways that class functions in persons' lives apart from control over production, ideological analysis and critique, and naming superstructures that support the dominant ideology. Liberative pastoral theological conversations related to class will benefit from other social theories that develop a thicker appreciation for class' impact on lived experience. Bourdieu's social theory emphasizes a social genesis to the construction and reconstruction of social stratification that impacts lived experience rather than viewing social interaction as secondary to, or distinct from, economic factors.

Six pastoral theologians since the publication of the landmark *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling* are cited as significantly contributing to the discussion of class and pastoral theology: Judith Orr, Edward Wimberly, Pamela Couture, James Poling, Carroll Watkins-Ali, and Barbara McClure. While other authors have published in the area of class and pastoral theology, these six have published book-length treatises that have been linked to class and are sufficient to demonstrate the pastoral theological engagement of class in the United States.

---

26 Key terms in Marxist analysis include: capital (understood primarily as the presence or absence of control over production), commodification, ideology, base, and superstructure.
Of the six authors Judith Orr most explicitly addressed class, grounding her
definition of class in Marxist social theory. Orr argued correctly that any engagement of
class analysis should be clearly grounded in a social theory. The cognate sources she
engaged in her methodology well illustrated class’ (non-economic) impact on the
worldviews, values, hopes, and aspirations of working-class women and resulted in a rich
description of class’ impact on working-class women. Orr concluded her work by offering
constructive theory and a pastoral decalogue for care with working-class women. Her
analysis develops a thicker description of the experience of working-class women by
addressing issues related to sexism, classism (from a Marxist perspective) and patriarchy.

Pamela Couture identifies herself as a practical theologian; however, her work is
appealing to pastoral theologians and practitioners as she articulates the particular
struggles of women and children who are impacted by poverty. Her earlier project Blessed
are the Poor? (1991) and her later project Seeing Children, Seeing God (2000) are organized
around the effect of poverty on vulnerable persons. Couture has also been active in
contributing to edited works dealing with pastoral care, poverty, and economics.27

Couture’s projects do not address class directly. Couture expresses legitimate
concerns regarding poverty, economic policies, the value-laden quality of public social
policies, public rhetoric, the experiences of women and children, and critical theological
engagement with each of the above. However, her work does not constitute, nor does it
claim to be, a thorough engagement of class.

27 Other works include: “The Social Gospel and Pastoral Care Today” (2001), “The
Future of Pastoral Care and Counseling and the God of the Market” (1995), and “Single
James Poling’s *Render Unto God* (2002) is a pastoral theological engagement of economic vulnerability and family violence. Poling does not attempt to engage class directly; rather, he uses class as a means to identify economic vulnerability by asking questions related to economic vulnerability and violence. Poling concludes his research with recommendations for ‘pastoral care among persons who are vulnerable’ and exhorts the church toward a nine-step ‘spirituality of practicing goodness.’ While Poling’s work has definitely contributed to the pastoral theological conversation related to economics and vulnerability, it does not stand as a thorough engagement of class and its impact on pastoral care.

Carroll Watkins Ali identifies poor Black women as the focus of her 1998 construction of a “Pastoral Theology in African American Context.” Watkins-Ali adopts two descriptive terms that describe the life situation of poor Black women: ‘Genocidal poverty’ and ‘victim system.’ These terms could serve as markers that signify a particular class; however, the reader is left to draw such a conclusion. Watkins-Ali does not define ‘class’ in her work, nor does she engage a social theorist or theory that frames her engagement of a particular people group.

Watkins Ali proposes a pastoral theology that facilitates survival and liberation in the presence of poverty and racism. Her treatment advances pastoral theology in the context of poor Black women and offers a significant critique regarding the ‘distance’ between the interpreter of a context and the one who experiences first hand an oppressive

---

28 Poling asks: What do people experience when they are economically vulnerable? How does economic vulnerability contribute to experiences of violence in families and communities? How are economic decisions made that determine the vulnerability of the world’s population? How can religion be a resource of support for those who seek a better life in situations of economic vulnerability and family violence (Poling, 2002, p.3)?
context. The strength of her work is in her naming and working with a specific people group and utilizing sources that do not contribute to a victim system but rather build on the inherent strengths and particular insights of poor Black women. However, for the reasons stated above, her work does not represent a pastoral engagement of class.

Edward Wimberly (2006) contributes to the discussion related to the intersection of racism and classism in his work *African American Pastoral Care and Counseling: The Politics of Oppression and Empowerment*. Similarly to Watkins-Ali’s approach, Wimberly traces what is unique about a pastoral theology from an African American perspective. Statistically one cannot help but note the correlation between poverty, economic deprivation, and racism within the African American context. While Wimberly develops a thicker appreciation for the effects of poverty and racism on any pastoral care and counseling involving African Americans, his is not a thorough engagement of class *per se*.

Barbara McClure (2010) has most recently been named as a pastoral theologian who demonstrates “serious attention...to the class implications of our ministries.” McClure’s work should be read as a critique of middle-class assumptions particularly around *individualism*, and comes with suggestions for transformative pastoral practices that build on an image of synergistic relationship between persons and society. However, McClure’s work demonstrates a theme within pastoral theological circles; though her work is categorized as a treatment of class, in reality its focus is individualism. McClure defines and locates *individualism* in a social theory, but not class. Again, a concept that may be identified with class (e.g. individualism, or as is the case with Poling, Couture, and Watkins-Ali, economics, poverty, and the perspective of poor Black women—respectively) becomes

__________

29 Mary McClintock (2010) in Barbara J. McClure *Moving Beyond Individualism in Pastoral Care and Counseling*. 
the focus, rather than class itself. While each of the previous engagements significantly contributes to constructive pastoral theological theory and praxis, pastoral theological conversation will benefit from a treatment that grounds class in a social theory and attends to the ways that class informs social and therefore pastoral interaction.

**Conclusion**

Pastoral theologians need to engage a social theory that accounts for the various ways in which class is constructed, practiced, reproduced, and transformed in order to construct a theology and praxis that is capable of challenging abuses of power and transforming relations between persons of distinct classes. It is time to turn to other social theories to develop a thicker appreciation for class and its impact on persons engaged in the social world—an engagement that includes pastoral interactions informed by a nuanced commitment to neighbor love from the margins of class stratification.

This dissertation extends the pastoral theological conversation related to both class and neighbor love by engaging a social theory that offers a thicker description of class. It does so by eliciting the lived experiences of persons engaged in social ministry with distinct classes, and by offering a critical engagement of neighbor love in light of the perspectives of persons inhabiting distinct *habitus*. This dissertation offers pastoral theology a lens for class analysis that includes but is not limited to economics, an engagement of lived experience that foregrounds class’ impact on lived experience, and a class-based critique of theologies of neighbor-love. Finally, this dissertation invites pastoral theology to continue
to clarify the means and standards by which theologically informed ethical decisions are made.30

Research employing qualitative and grounded research methods is difficult to separate from the researcher (Charmaz, 2006). Put differently, research arises out of the experiences and perspectives of the researcher. If a different researcher were interested in the same subject matter, a different question and a different project would result—even if the same theological tradition, cognate discipline, and interviewees were engaged. My commitments to social justice, understanding humans as beings created in the image of God, treating human experience as a source for theological construction, and a particular Christian tradition inform my research. Further, insights from postmodern epistemology that emphasize the social construction of knowledge and attention to power and difference shape my engagement. These commitments inform the methodological decisions I made for this project.

**Outline of Project**

Chapter 2 details the pastoral methodological and qualitative research decisions I made to engage the question: How might attending to the *habitus* of persons marginalized by their class location inform Wesleyan-holiness understandings of neighbor-love and offer new constructions of neighbor-love with implications for pastoral practice? In chapter two I introduce Richard Osmer’s (2008) four practical theological tasks as a framework of engagement. His four tasks are descriptive, interpretive, normative, and pragmatic. Chapters three, four, five, and six correspond to each of the tasks.

---

30 I will address this in chapter 6 under future questions. What are the conditions under which an understanding of well-being may be established?
Chapter three details the descriptive task in which a rich description of the context is obtained through participation in the context, qualitative interviews, and data analysis. The descriptive task reveals themes, patterns, and dynamics that arise from the context. I grouped these findings under three categories: daily rhythms of homelessness, challenges and obstacles faced by homeless persons, and preferences for care. This descriptive task provides the data for the interpretive task.

Chapter four details the interpretive task. The interpretive task utilizes a cognate discipline to analyze the themes, patterns and dynamics discerned in the descriptive task. I present the key analytical terms and concepts from Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology. I then use these concepts to develop a thicker appreciation of the rhythms of homelessness, the challenges and obstacles the particular homeless person faces, and his or her preferences for care. Further, consistent with an emancipatory correlative approach (Chopp, 1987), I use the research participant’s perspectives to inform and challenge Bourdieu’s theory.

Chapter 5 details the normative task. The normative task engages a faith tradition in the preceding conversation. I engage Mildred Bangs Wynkoop and Thomas J. Oord as exemplars from the Wesleyan Holiness tradition who highlight love as a central theological category. I argue that the presence of power and difference associated with social stratification necessitate the addition of deliberate empathy as a necessary component to an understanding of love directed toward another. Such an addition is consistent with the trajectory of a Wesleyan Holiness understanding of love. Further, an emphasis on deliberate empathy is consistent with the preferences of care articulated by the research participants. Hence, a definition of neighbor-love informed by margin is to act intentionally,
in deliberate empathetic response to God and others, in order to promote overall wellbeing.

Chapter 6 details the pragmatic task. The pragmatic task advances constructive theory and praxis appropriate to the context under consideration. I expand my construction of love emphasizing deliberate empathy and recommend three correlate practices: a stance, a form of engagement, and the creation of communities of care. I recommend skills developed in narrative therapy as an approach that is consistent with both my construction of love and the practices I recommend. The chapter concludes with further avenues of inquiry arising from the study.
CHAPTER 2
A METHOD FOR ENGAGING MARGIN, CLASS, AND NEIGHBOR-LOVE

Chapter One introduced the focus of this study in the context of current pastoral theological conversations. Chapter Two presents a pastoral theological method for exploring the question: How might attending to the \textit{habitus} of persons marginalized by their class location inform Wesleyan-holiness understandings of neighbor-love and offer new constructions of neighbor-love with implications for pastoral practice?

In the following discussion I present a definition of pastoral theological method and criteria for methodological integrity. By identifying the commitments informing this study and naming the sources this study engages a nuanced understanding of critical correlational conversations emerges. Finally, this chapter introduces the spiral metaphor for pastoral methodology and identifies four methodological tasks as a framework for advancing through the spiral.

\textbf{Pastoral Theological Method}

Pastoral theological method involves thinking through a plan to explore a topic or research question. Theodore Jennings’ entry in the \textit{Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling} (1990) describes pastoral methodology as third order reflection. That is, pastoral theological method involves critical reflection upon the choices made by researchers about the commitments, sources, and procedures they employ in their investigation of an issue.
Methodological transparency is critical for methodological accountability. Methodological transparency involves clearly communicating research decisions and their rationale. Methodological accountability involves the act of giving an account for one’s decisions and actions. Attempts at methodological transparency invite critical ‘third order’ dialogue regarding research decisions. Methodological decisions include and exclude, highlight and obfuscate, open and close realms of data and experience utilized to construct knowledge. Given the constructive nature of research, critical methodological dialogue invites researchers to give an account of methodological choices and the rationale that informs those choices. The question follows, how does one talk about methodological accountability? Or, put differently, how does one advance a viable pastoral methodology with integrity?31

Joretta Marshall’s entry in Pastoral Care and Counseling: Redefining the Paradigms (2004) provides a framework for addressing methodological accountability. Marshall utilizes Jennings’ definition and traces the development of multiple methods and methodological trajectories within pastoral theology. Given the expanding interests within pastoral theology and the increasingly diverse and complex contexts in which pastoral theologians find themselves, diverse and nuanced methodologies are needed. This burgeoning of pastoral theological methodologies invites the question of methodological integrity: how does one advance a pastoral methodology with integrity? Marshall suggests that, in order for contemporary pastoral theological methodologies to have integrity, they

31 I use the term integrity to signal two commitments. The first is a commitment on the part of the researcher to communicate as clearly as possible in order to prevent obfuscation. The second is a commitment by the researcher to submit work that holds together in the context of the discipline in which the researcher works. Hence, Marshall’s framework is a means to provide an honest accounting for research within a particular discipline.
should account for five elements: the explicit or implicit role of theology, the role of experience in the construction of theological claims, an awareness of the import of communities and context, the relationship to cognate disciplines, and integration of theory and praxis. Thus, Marshall’s typology for methodological integrity provides trail markers for discussing methodological accountability.

While Marshall names five elements for methodological integrity, Emmanuel Lartey (2006) provides a metaphor for methodological reflection. Lartey likens methodological decision making to parenting.32 Lartey suggests parents think of their child in his or her uniqueness, and the particular issues that the child is facing. Lartey then suggests performing a mental inventory of the multiple theories that might speak to that particular child’s identity and context and choose the theory that seems most fitting, knowing all along that the choice might be wrong and being willing to change. In parallel fashion, Lartey advocates that one “study carefully as many methods as you can. Study also very carefully the particular situation (child, client, group) you are faced with. Then make a selection on the basis of what seems to you to have the best fit—knowing full well you may be wrong—and then be prepared to change as the situation develops” (2006, 91). I confess a bit of anxiety around Lartey’s use of the word “wrong”. I would rather suggest persons study the topic, study the various methodologies, and make a methodological decision that seems to fit the topic, knowing all the while that a different decision would yield another perspective.

32 Metaphor serves as a tool to facilitate understanding of one subject in terms of another. A caveat exists any time someone uses a metaphor. The parallel between one subject and another is never exact; there is not a one-to-one correlation. However, metaphors are useful as long as one keeps the limits of a metaphor in mind. For further discussion related to the use of metaphor see Sallie McFague (1975), Lakoff and Johnson (1980). For a discussion of the use of metaphor in pastoral theology see Craig Dykstra (2005).
An implicit aspect of Lartey’s metaphor is helpful for pastoral theological research; the parent cannot be separated from the parenting process. Similarly, the researcher and her/his commitments cannot be removed from the methodological process. Pastoral theological method directly correlates with the commitments, or norms, carried by the researcher.

**Commitments**

The commitments that inform this dissertation include: understanding humans as beings created in the image of God, knowledge of prevenient grace and sanctification consistent with the Wesleyan-holiness tradition, a view toward social justice, and an appreciation of a critical postmodern stance. Finally, as a pastoral theologian I am committed to privileging lived experience as a source for the construction of theory and practice. These commitments inform the methodological decisions for this project.

Humans are created in the image of God. This commitment is not a theoretical commitment so much as it is an ethical commitment. Humans are created for a righteous relationship with their Creator, fellow humans, and creation. I define righteousness as relationships that facilitate individual and social flourishing consistent with the concept of *shalom*. *Shalom* is a religious reality arising from the biblical and theological heritage that joins love and justice for the sake of greater community and harmony (Graham, 1992). Hence, as beings created in the image of God, humans are intended for respectful, mutual, and justice-oriented interactions that nurture and promote *shalom*.

The Wesleyan-holiness tradition emphasizes hope while inviting action through the doctrines of prevenient grace, sanctification and neighbor-love. The doctrine of prevenient
grace suggests that God is always actively wooing all persons into righteous relationship with Godself, each other, and creation. The doctrine of sanctification suggests that persons can continually approximate righteous relationship. The doctrine of neighbor-love grounds love in practical, ethical action towards others. The doctrines inform the dissertation by inviting me to see God inviting oppressed and oppressor into more just, righteous, and life giving relations. Further, the doctrines inform my quest to discern cognate disciplines that help me appreciate the complexities of oppression so that I may partner with God and others to promote shalom.

A stance of social justice is implicated within the discussion of imago dei, prevenient grace, sanctification, and neighbor-love. In reality, human beings exist in hierarchical systems that simultaneously and systematically privilege and oppress persons. James Poling is correct in suggesting that these systems are evil (1991). Naming, resisting, and dismantling evil in order to create more just and righteous relations is an appropriate goal for pastoral theology. A commitment to social justice requires intentional selection of conversation partners. Hence the cognate disciplines for this research further understanding and invite the naming, resisting, and dismantling of complex systems of evil.

A critical postmodern stance recognizes the social construction of knowledge while maintaining “modern and pre-modern” commitments to justice, mutuality, and the authority of religious traditions (Ramsay, 2004). Further, the stance attends to the ways knowledge is used as a form of social control and oppression (Ramsay, 2004, Neuger 2004). Knowledge, power, and difference invite attention to both the mechanisms of oppression and expressions of power, agency, and resistance by marginalized persons. This critical
postmodern stance invites a critical evaluation of sources in light of their ability to promote *shalom*.

Pastoral theology is a constructive and contextual discipline with social justice as its telos. It recognizes living human experience as an authoritative source for the construction of theory and practice. Further, pastoral theology informed by emancipatory and liberative commitments privileges the experiences of silenced marginalized groups in theological construction (Chopp, 1987; Graham, 1991; Neuger 2001). Privileging marginalized perspectives serves as a corrective to abuse of power associated with constructions of knowledge. It opens avenues for more liberative constructions of theology and practice. Hence, liberative pastoral theology provides a method to partner with God in the process of sanctification to more closely approximate *shalom*.

These commitments inform my engagement of the research topic, my formulation of the research question, and my methodological decisions related to cognate discipline selection and procedures for conducting interdisciplinary dialogue and qualitative research. The following section will detail my rationale for selecting Pierre Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology as a primary cognate discipline to conduct a critical correlational conversation between human experience at a class margin and Wesleyan Holiness constructions of neighbor-love.
Sources

To explore the question of how attending to the *habitus* of persons marginalized by their class location might inform Wesleyan-Holiness understandings of neighbor-love and offer new constructions of neighbor love with implications for pastoral practice, I utilize Pierre Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology. This theory provides a framework to more thoroughly understand social stratification, class marginalization, and its consequences for persons who experience intergenerational poverty and lack of formal education. I subsequently draw on Bourdieu to analyze the experiences of persons living at a margin in order to critique and inform Wesleyan-Holiness understandings of neighbor-love. Hence the three sources I engage in this dissertation are Pierre Bourdieu, human experience at a margin, and neighbor-love within a Wesleyan-holiness theological trajectory.

**Bourdieu.** As I argued in the introduction, utilizing a sociological theory as a conversation partner is not without its limitations. Cognate discipline selection, or social theory selection, means choosing among a breadth of theorists based upon the researcher’s assessment of the viability of a theory as well as its usefulness, or fit, for the context of the research question. Pierre Bourdieu’s reflective sociology was chosen because of his influence in late twentieth-century thought, his fit with the research question, and the clarity of his framework for engaging the topic.

Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) is one of the most significant social theorists of the late twentieth century. His influence extended beyond the field of sociology to include anthropology, education, critical theory, literary criticism, art history, and media studies (Reed-Danahay, 2005). His work has also become influential in pastoral theology (Graham
2002; Ramsay 2004; Larney 2006). One of the reasons I chose Bourdieu as a conversation partner is his current influence in the fields of both sociology and pastoral theology. By selecting Bourdieu I position this dissertation at the intersection of contemporary pastoral theological and sociological conversations.

A second rationale for choosing Bourdieu is the anticipated fit between his theory and the research question. I resonate with Bourdieu’s attempt to navigate objectivist and subjectivist contributions to understanding social agents’ actions in the social world. Such an attempt preserves agency while attending to structures that constrain agency. Bourdieu’s notion of *habitus* locates social agents as “the practical operator(s) of the construction of objects” (1990, 13). Thus, his theory enables us to attend to structures that constrain persons as well as to individual agency through action. Attending to this interplay between subjective and objective factors creates a more complex analysis that respects human freedom and responsibility while acknowledging systemic constraints.

A third rationale for choosing Bourdieu is the clarity of his social theory. Like many thinkers Bourdieu continued to nuance his theory throughout his career. However, Bourdieu’s central concepts of distinction, field, capital and *habitus*, and symbolic capital/violence provide a clear and viable framework for examining social stratification and social action within social space. In order to change the world, Bourdieu argues, one has to understand the way the world is made, that is the vision of the world and the practical operations by which groups are produced and reproduced. Thus, Bourdieu offers a theoretical framework for social transformation. Pastoral theologians committed to social

---

33 Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* and its impact on thinking about individual agency will be addressed below.
34 See Deborah Reed-Danahay’s *Locating Bourdieu* (2005) for a thorough treatment of Bourdieu’s background, career, and contributions to various disciplines.
justice have through Bourdieu's theory a method for naming, resisting, and reconstructing social stratification in ways that more closely approximate *shalom*. Bourdieu's theory is more fully explored in chapter 4.

**Human experience.** Pastoral theology utilizes a complex methodology. Neuger (2004) describes the methodology using the image of a spiral. This methodology begins by examining a particular context and then uses that experience to critique and inform traditions that in turn inform pastoral practices. These traditions include theological doctrines and cognate disciplines. From that dialogue new theories and practices are constructed. These theories are then brought into pastoral care contexts to see if they are helpful in empowering, liberating and healing persons in those contexts. This evaluation then leads to further cycles of deconstruction and reconstruction. Hence, pastoral theology is continually involved in cycles of reflection and action that privilege living human experience as an authoritative source for the construction of theology and praxis (Boisen, 1936, 1960; Hiltner, 1958; Lartey, 2006).

“Human experience” as an authoritative source for this dissertation includes the interpreted experiences of six persons, this researcher's experiences engaging the context, and the interview event. Cumulatively these sources for human experience constitute a perspective that informs the critical correlative conversation between Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology and Wesleyan-holiness perspectives of neighbor-love.

**Wesleyan-holiness trajectories of neighbor-love.** The third source for this dissertation focuses on Wesleyan-holiness trajectories of neighbor-love. Mildred Bangs Wynkoop (1972) and Thomas J. Oord (2010) represent an emphasis within the Wesleyan-
holiness tradition on love as a central and orienting theological category. Their contributions are further analyzed and critiqued in chapter 5.

Wynkoop and Oord are helpful to this dissertation because they represent a significant shift in Wesleyan-holiness theological construction. The Church of the Nazarene is a Wesleyan and Holiness denomination with a broad theological umbrella. Wynkoop and Oord utilize process thought in their constructions. As an ordained elder in the Church of the Nazarene, I am interested in engaging this conversation as process thought is consistent with many of the commitments I name above.

Pastoral theological method must account for the process of engaging interdisciplinary sources. I will use a nuanced critical correlative method to engage Pierre Bourdieu, interpreted marginalized experiences, and a trajectory within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition.

**Conducting Critically Correlative Conversations**

How does one conduct a conversation between lived experiences, social theory, and theological tradition? Another way of stating the question is: how does one conduct a cross-disciplinary dialogue that retains integrity for each partner while moving toward more just social transformation? We discussed above the choices one makes when selecting a

---

methodology for a research question: analyzing the issue and context, assessing the relative strengths and weaknesses of different approaches, and selecting an approach, all the while knowing there are other approaches that would yield different results. Researchers make similar choices when conducting cross-disciplinary dialogue. Just as there are many methodologies, there are many ways of conducting cross-disciplinary dialogues.36

Variations of the correlational method of interdisciplinary dialogue continue to inform the field of pastoral theology. David Tracy (1979) and Don Browning (1987) critiqued the correlational model represented in Paul Tillich’s *Systematic Theology* (1951) as too one-sided. In Tillich’s model, cognate disciplines raised questions to which theology provided normative answers. Tracy and Browning suggest a ‘revised’ or ‘critical’ correlational approach envisioning a mutually critical dialogue between the context, questions and answers raised by cognate disciplines focusing on the context, and those raised by ‘Christian classics’ or normative Christian tradition(s).37 Key to Browning and Tracy’s argument is the suggestion that cognate disciplines should engage in mutual dialogue: “Practical theology is the mutually critical correlation of the interpreted theory and praxis of the Christian faith with the interpreted theory and praxis of the contemporary situation” (Tracy 1983, 76).

36 Osmer discusses three stances, with internal variations, that could be adopted in conducting cross-disciplinary dialogue: correlational (Paul Tillich, David Tracy, Don Browning), transformational (James Loder, Deborah van Deusen Hunsinger, Hans Frei), and transversal (Wentzel van Huyssteen). Osmer sees great potential for interdisciplinary dialogue in the transversal model. However, variations of the correlational model with emphases on praxis and liberation continue to influence Pastoral Theology.

37 That there is significant contestation about what should be regarded as ‘authoritative’ and what constitutes a ‘Christian Classic’ is not clear in Browning or Tracy’s arguments.
This dissertation adopts a critical correlative approach to cross-disciplinary dialogue. It attends to the questions and explanations raised by class analysis\textsuperscript{38}, representatives of the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition, and human experience as it explores neighbor-love informed by a margin. This critical correlative model advances a mutually influential relationship between the disciplines where the questions and meanings gleaned from each discipline are brought into dialogue with one another. During the dialogue the facilitator is responsible for maintaining the integrity of each discipline while seeking to develop a richer understanding of the situation by utilizing each of the disciplines as a distinct lens. Each perspective then serves to enrich the other perspectives yielding a greater appreciation for the situation under exploration.\textsuperscript{39} However, this critical correlative stance is not without critique.

Rebecca Chopp (1987) significantly criticized the use of the critical correlative method among theologians.\textsuperscript{40} Chopp critiques the 'liberal-revisionist project of correlation' from liberation, feminist, and German political theological perspectives as being too concerned with issues of cognitive meaning and understanding, too dependent upon

\footnote{\textsuperscript{38} I will use elements of gender and race analysis, noting the interlocking nature of oppression. However, the purpose of this dissertation is to foreground class as a preferred lens of analysis.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{39} See Mudge and Poling (1987) for a rich discussion of the revised correlative model.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{40} Chopp provides a sustained critique not only of the critical-correlative method and its limits but also of the liberal-revisionist theological agenda in light of liberation theology’s concerns. She grounds her critique by asking three questions: What is the point of religion? What is the nature of the method of correlation? What are the limits of ‘praxis’ in liberal-revisionist theology? Her treatment demonstrates Schleiermacher’s continued influence on the project and offers new directions for critical theological reflection committed to social-political \textit{praxis}.}
notions of universalized human experience, and too “at home” with tradition. I read her engagement as tracing the continued influence of Schleiermacher upon theological methodology. Grounding religion in experience and addressing it to non-believers, Schleiermacher set the trajectory for theology. This trajectory continues to focus on matters of cognitive belief, continues to address non-Christians, continues to value being/thinking over doing, and thus privileges theory over praxis. Chopp suggests that Schleiermacher’s trajectory is limited and she offers liberation theology as a viable direction for future theological construction and methodological considerations. She argues for a ‘critical praxis correlation,’ which includes a “de-ideologization of scriptures, a pragmatic interpretation of experience, a critical theory of emancipation and enlightenment, and a social theory to transform praxis.” (Chopp, 1987, p. 132)

Chopp’s arguments provide a convincing corrective for critical correlative approaches. First, Chopp calls for dialogue to move beyond the academy, beyond a focus on cognition towards praxis. Second, following liberation thought, she argues that critical correlative conversations should side with the poor. Finally, Chopp calls for critical social theory that facilitates naming, resisting, and subverting oppressive powers and principalities. It is not enough to achieve new insight, or appreciate the complexities of systems of oppression. New insight must inform practices that facilitate the transformation of the society into more just and liberative relations. This dissertation responds to Chopp’s

41 Chopp advocates critical distance from tradition so that tradition can be critiqued when it colludes with oppression. Being too ‘at home’ with tradition indicates an inability, or unwillingness, to critique, reform, or reject tradition.

42 Chopp cites Matthew Lamb (1982): “the nature of the correlation in the liberal-revisionist approach is always a theoretical correlation. The limits of this theoretical correlation lie in the dominance, and even the hegemony, of theory over praxis.” (Chopp, 1987, p. 131)
critiques by beginning and ending in the particularity of lived experience, by siding with the perspective of the interviewees as an authoritative voice in the conversation, and by recommending liberative practices that resist, subvert and transform social relations to more closely approximate shalom.

Building on this more nuanced critical correlative conversation I will now present a methodological process for engaging the sources and conducting the nuanced critical correlative conversation that leads to a construction of neighbor-love and correlate pastoral practices.

**Four Methodological Tasks for Progressing Through the Pastoral Theological Spiral**

Pastoral theology utilizes a complex methodology. This dissertation will build on the image of a pastoral methodological spiral and the importance of beginning and ending in contextual experience. It also draws on the work of Richard Osmer (2008), whose method offers a clear process for entering into the particularity of a context, engaging the social sciences, addressing normative faith traditions, and constructing theory and practice appropriate for the context under consideration. His method corresponds well to my interests in a particular social space (class margin), a particular theorist (Bourdieu), a particular theological emphasis (Wesleyan-Holiness neighbor-love), and a particular goal (constructing theory and practice informed by a margin). Hence, Osmer’s method is a good fit for this dissertation’s purpose.

Osmer offers four methodological tasks for practical theology that are consistent regardless of one’s approach to cross-disciplinary dialogue. The tasks include: the descriptive-empirical task, the interpretative task, the normative task, and the pragmatic

---

43 However, such a commitment to the perspective of the marginalized does not mean the perspective should be beyond critique.
Using the insights of Gadamer’s hermeneutical perspective, Osmer offers these four tasks as movements, or processes for practical theology. The initial movement develops a thick description of the context or ministerial situation. The next move engages critical interpretation, drawing on cognate disciplines to offer perspectives and explanations of the situation. The third move recognizes that cognate disciplines can only take theologians so far and invites an engagement of the sources and norms of the faith tradition and scholarship community in which the researcher is located. The final move involves the pragmatic task of constructing practices and articulating perspectives consistent with the previous three movements.

This dissertation uses Osmer’s method while privileging the role of experience. Osmer states that the normative task engages the sources and norms of the faith tradition and scholarship community in which the reader is located. Pastoral theology as a discipline takes seriously the lived experiences of persons as an authoritative source for theological construction. Hence, the interpretive, normative, and pragmatic tasks are conducted privileging lived experience as an authoritative source. The experiences of the

---

44 Gadamer (1975) in *Truth and Method* argued against the scientific assumption that pre-understandings or assumptions did not play a significant role in scholarship. Rather, Gadamer advocated acknowledging the significance of pre-understanding in research. Gadamer argued that all research begins with pre-understanding (the interpretive judgments and understanding with which we begin interpretation), advances to the experience of being brought up short (coming up against data that challenges our pre-understandings), invites dialogical interplay (between the horizon of the researcher and the horizon of the text, person, object being interpreted), fusion of the horizons (a construction of something new), and application (the construction invites new ways of thinking and acting in the world).

45 The lived experience under examination serves not only as data for the process to be analyzed from cognate disciplines and theological perspectives. In order for the process to be a pastoral theological undertaking, the data from lived experience must serve as an authoritative source for constructing theory and practice. This distinguishes pastoral theology as a constructive discipline and not an applied discipline. A pastoral theological appropriation of Osmer’s
Interviewees are used to critique, inform, and expand Bourdieu’s theory as well as Wesleyan-Holiness constructions of neighbor-love. This pastoral theological project does not end with theological construction. It proceeds to construction of practices of care that are congruent with the findings that arise from the cross-disciplinary discussion. In the following section I elaborate on how this project conducts the four tasks.

**Descriptive-empirical task and research methodology.** The descriptive task consists of obtaining a thick description of the lived experiences and contexts in which ministry takes place in an attempt to discern themes, dynamics, and patterns. This is done through formal and informal information gathering, careful listening, and looking closely at patterns and relationships in the context (Osmer, 2008, pp. 5-6). In order to provide the richest description of the *habitus* and constructions of neighbor love from the perspective of a margin, the interviews will figure most prominently in this section of the work. Hence, I address the qualitative research method below.

**Getting into the context: Qualitative research method.** This project is a pastoral theological study that draws on a qualitative research method in order to elicit a thick description of participants’ experiences. The method can best be described as limited ethnography. Ethnography involves sustained participation and observation in the methodology means nuancing Osmer’s interpretive, normative, and pragmatic tasks. The lived experiences of the interviewees must be given authority to ask questions of the cognate and theological disciplines in a critical correlative fashion. That is to say the interviewees' experiences are treated as an equal voice in the conversation and not simply as data to be analyzed from various perspectives. Further, the pragmatic task will be conducted by treating the interviewee’s perspective with authoritative status; that is to say the interviewee’s experience serves as a co-authoritative source with the cognate and theological disciplines.
community or social world being researched.\textsuperscript{46} I participated in the mission context one to two days per week for nine months. In that time I spoke with persons informally, served at the missions, and observed life in the mission district. Through these interactions I was able to develop rapport with persons participating in the mission context.

The qualitative aspect of this study includes interviews with six persons\textsuperscript{47} who meet the following inclusion criteria: annual income below the poverty line for at least five years, a family of origin income below the poverty line, chronic underemployment defined by two or more years without a full-time job, absence of diagnosed mental illness,\textsuperscript{48} a formal education of twelfth grade or below for the participant and family of origin, and between 25-65 years old. The inclusion criteria were selected in order to gain access to a \textit{habitus} marked by chronic economic and educational marginalization.\textsuperscript{49} The age inclusion criterion was an attempt to eliminate extraneous variables associated with age. An attempt to account for race in the study was made by selecting participants in proportion to the setting’s racial demographics. An attempt to account for gender in the study was made by

\textsuperscript{46} Charmez (2006) describes ethnography as “recording the life of a particular group and thus entails sustained participation and observation in their milieu, community, or social world. It means more than participant observation alone because ethnographic study covers the round of life occurring within the given milieu (x) and often includes supplementary data from documents, diagrams, maps, photographs, and, occasionally formal interviews and questionnaires.” (p. 21) See also Mary Clark Moschella (2008) for an extended treatment of ethnography for pastoral practice.

\textsuperscript{47} The size of the pool while insufficient for a quantitative study is large enough to conduct a qualitative study. Qualitative studies invite a thick description of the social location and perspectives of persons involved in the study. See Clifford Geertz (1973) \textit{The Interpretation of Cultures}.

\textsuperscript{48} Research participants could not have been diagnosed with a mental illness nor have participated in a treatment program for mental illness.

\textsuperscript{49} While economic and educational markers signify a class, they are not sufficient in themselves to explain class’ impact on persons. They are simply signifiers that suggest a different \textit{habitus} may be functioning in a given social context.
selecting an equal number of men and women. Information for inclusion was gathered using a questionnaire (See Appendix 1).

Interviews were conducted using a guided question format after meeting inclusion criteria (See Appendix 2). The guided questions were intended to garner information related to the interviewees’ perceived possibilities for social action as well as their hopes and aspirations for the coming year. In addition, information related to the interviewees’ practical reasoning, assumptions, and values was solicited as well as their perceptions of neighbor love through the receiving and giving of care.

In order to access the subject population, mission contexts were approached using personal, professional, and denominational contacts. A face-to-face interview was scheduled with mission leaders to discuss the purpose and procedures of the study. The missions were selected based on the frequency and quality of contact with the subject population. The missions selected had at least monthly contact with persons of the subject population over the course of a year, with services that include food and clothing donation, and educational or life skills assistance. This sort of relationship between mission and care recipients provided a series of experiences upon which the care recipients were able to reflect.

I scheduled a time to share with potential participants the purpose and involvement required for the study. After participants indicated a willingness to participate, the first questionnaire was administered involving inclusion and exclusion criteria. For participants who met inclusion criteria, a second interview was scheduled involving the second guided questionnaire format. Informed consent was obtained along with a media release form. A
follow up contact with participants was made two days after the second interview in order to address participants' questions or concerns.

The information gained from this qualitative aspect of the dissertation informs chapter 3. I transcribed the interviews\(^{50}\) and performed several readings of them using different coding techniques\(^{51}\) in order to highlight patterns, themes, and dynamics that arose from the interviews. I then utilized the second reader as a critical, and potentially corrective, lens prior to writing the data for the descriptive task.

**Qualitative research challenges.** There are at least three challenges one faces when engaging in qualitative research involving interpreted experience. First, qualitative researchers must attend to social difference. The social space in which I dwell is distinct from that of the research participants. I dwell in a social space that enjoys much access to material, social, and symbolic capital, but that access is also limited. I am fully employed as an emergency room registered nurse (material capital). I am a married, heterosexual, able-bodied man with children who has deep roots in Euro-American cultures (social capital). I am an ordained Ph.D. student (symbolic capital). My access to various forms of capital indicates a social space that includes inherited schemes of assumptions about, and engagement in, the social world, i.e. *habitus*. Much like cultural assumptions, the import of

\(^{50}\) I attempted to transcribe each interview along with memos immediately after the interview. I also used what I learned from the interview to nuance the other interviews. Coding exercises on the initial interviews highlighted themes to follow up on in later interviews. E.g. the distinction between 'mat people' and 'program people' was striking in initial observations, alluded to in initial interviews, and expounded on in later interviews.

\(^{51}\) See Charmez (2006) *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Charmez is a very helpful guide for introducing and walking persons through qualitative analysis. I used portions of her work to inform my own journey through the data. Her suggestions for coding were particularly helpful. I first performed a general reading attending to my own responses to the interview data. Next, I performed line-by-line coding exercise and a general coding exercise. I then used my second reader to perform a general coding exercise and to furnish feedback on my own codes.
one’s *habitus* becomes more apparent when engaging other *habitus*. It is important to include methodological accountability measures to understand my own *habitus*’ influence on research and interpretation.

I employ three accountability measures to account for my own *habitus*’ influence on research and interpretation. Two of the accountability measures impact the interviewing process. The third accountability measure involves data collection and selection of themes, processes, and dynamics gleaned from the interviews.

Narrative theory serves as one accountability measure. Interviewing research participants is not to be confused with counseling. However, narrative therapy commends a stance or position that accounts for difference and the potential for abuse of power during interviews. Narrative therapy invites the interviewer into a stance similar to an investigative reporter whose purpose is to develop a story on the corruption associated with abuses of power and privilege (White 2007). The interviewer demonstrates a genuine curiosity about the world in which the interviewee is an experiential expert. The interviewee is treated as an active collaborator, or a co-author, and a resident expert in the exploration and story-ing of his/her world (White, 2007; Winslade and Monk, 1997). Since the interviewee is considered the authority on his or her experience, the interviewer is freed to explore difference associated with social space, or *habitus*. This freedom can invite a relationship that respects difference and it encourages interviewees to guide an interviewer into a foreign network of social relations and *habitus*. While a narrative

---

52 Emmanuel Lartey (2006) describes pastoral theology as a ‘trialogue’ between experience, faith tradition, and cultural resources in *Theology in an Intercultural World*. While his description is not unique among pastoral theological methodologies, he does emphasize the ‘multicultural world’ that informs persons. It is the multicultural emphasis that invites attention to the various ways that culture (*habitus*) informs person’s “ideas, beliefs, feelings, perceptions and assumptions”. 
therapeutic stance does not guarantee the absence of abuse of power, or the ability to appreciate difference associated with *habitus*, it does provide a means of negotiating social difference by privileging participants' expertise, authority, and local knowledge.

While narrative theory initially served as a measure to account for power and difference in the interview process its import for constructing correlative liberative pastoral practices became more significant to the project. As the project unfolded narrative’s emphasis on deconstructive listening correlated well with Bourdieu’s emphasis on bringing the mechanisms of social construction and oppression to consciousness. Further, narrative’s emphasis on creating communities of witness to nurture and support preferred ways of living provided a means for Bourdieu’s political mobilization. These concepts will be discussed in chapters 4 and 6.

The second accountability measure involves soliciting feedback from the interviewee. When asking about a situation, perspective, value, or goal I continually solicited the interviewee’s feedback to make sure I had heard and understood him or her to their satisfaction. While this technique does not guarantee appropriate appreciation of their perspectives, it does reduce the degree of misunderstanding.

The third measure of accountability involves the use of a second reader. I selected a second reader from a distinct social location\(^{53}\) to assist with the descriptive task. The reader provided feedback related to perceived themes, dynamics, and processes after reading transcripts of the interviews and my data analysis. I attended to similarities in our analysis and paid particular attention when the two of us noted different themes from one another. Difference invites me to further question the data.

\(^{53}\) The second reader self-identified as an African American, heterosexual, single female with a Master’s in Social Work.
No methodological accountability measures are full proof. However, attempts at methodological accountability related to social location are necessary to account for the provisional, situated, contextual, and perspectival aspects of knowledge in a socially constructed world. I've attempted to engage the complexity of difference associated with social location through the use of a narrative stance, soliciting interviewee feedback, and the utilization of a second reader. Still, the conclusions drawn from the research are interpreted conclusions. My social location and assumptive worldviews cannot be completely extricated from the interpretation. This leads to a second challenge.

The second challenge for which researchers must account is the value-ladenness of research. I am aware that the process of interviewing is not neutral or objective. The questions that I ask and the manner in which I ask them bias the data. Further, the ways that the research participants receive and respond to the interactions also influence the data collected. Given that social location, theological commitments, research interest, and cognate discipline selection inform engagement with lived experience, it is incumbent upon the researcher to account for, and be critical of, the influences of these criteria. Thus a hermeneutic of suspicion toward my own social location and habitus was particularly important as I sought to engage the perspective of persons marginalized by class in social ministry settings. I stated above the three methodological accountability measures implemented to account for social location and research bias. These measures along with a hermeneutic of suspicion toward my own social location provided critical distance to address the bias associated with research.

The third challenge qualitative researchers face is in dealing with the construction of something novel via the interview. That is, the interview itself constructs something via
language and embodiment that did not exist prior to the interaction. How does one attend to this novelty? Drawing upon grounded theory provides a qualitative research tool to attend to the novel construction. This mixed research methodology\(^\text{54}\) builds upon previously established theory, particularly Bourdieu and the theological constructions of neighbor love from the Wesleyan-holiness tradition, while expecting the interviews and research to lead toward new directions and understandings of habitus and neighbor-love. The interview-constructed event becomes a contributor to the inter-disciplinary conversation. I negotiated this research challenge by treating the novel construction as a conversation partner with co-authoritative status in the critical correlation dialogue.

In sum, the descriptive task involves obtaining a thick description of the lived experiences and contexts in which ministry takes place in an attempt to discern themes, dynamics, and patterns. It utilizes a mixed qualitative research methodology combining elements of grounded theory and limited ethnography in order to discern themes, dynamics, and patterns arising from a particular context. It is a constructive task in which accountability measures attend to the influence of the researcher. The descriptive task constructs an interpretation of lived experience that provides data for the interpretive task.

**Interpretive task.** The interpretive task is to take a ‘step back’ in an attempt to make sense of the information gleaned during the descriptive task. This task involves engaging cognate disciplines to discern why certain themes, patterns, and dynamics are occurring (Osmer, 2008, p. 7). The primary conversation partner during the interpretive task is

\(^{54}\) Grounded theory attempts to develop new theory from the data gleaned from qualitative research (Charmez, 2006). My goal is not to develop a new social theory but to use current theory as a lens to attend to the particularity of class. However, the experiences of the interviews do challenge and inform Bourdieu’s theory. Hence, my research methodology is a mixed methodology combining an established theory with grounded theory qualitative methods.
Pierre Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology. Key definitions and relationships arising from Bourdieu’s framework will help us attend to the experiences of the interviewees.\textsuperscript{55}

Bourdieu’s theory suggests social interactions take place in social space measured in terms of proximity of interaction. Within social space, multiple social fields exist. A social field can be thought of in terms of a game. Each social field has its own rules, roles, and goals. The goals are usually conceived in terms of material, social, and symbolic capital. Bourdieu’s theory is a competitive theory in that social agents are in competition with one another for various forms of capital. The means of gaining capital vary depending upon the social field in which one participates/competes. Habitus, the internalized schema as to what is preferred, the ability to comprehend what is preferred, and the rules by which one obtains what is preferred, is key to Bourdieu’s theory. Habitus provides the social agent with the ability to sense and pursue goals within a social field. Further, habitus provides persons with a view to what is possible, and this will be key to this study. Thus, habitus is the key to perceiving and functioning in the social world, according to Bourdieu. This interpretive task yields a thick description of the themes, patterns, and dynamics discerned in the descriptive task via the lens of Bourdieu’s theory.

However, as a pastoral theological study, human experience is never simply treated as passive. The interviewee’s experience, though interpreted, also serves as a lens to examine Bourdieu’s theory. Where do the experiences of the interviewees contradict or resist interpretation according to the categories of Bourdieu’s theory? This too is part of the interpretive task. The mutually critical correlational dialogue between context and cognate discipline takes place in both the interpretive and normative tasks. Particular

\textsuperscript{55} Chapter four develops Bourdieu’s key concepts.
attention is paid to the experiences of the research participants informing and critiquing Bourdieu’s theoretical perspective. The interpretive task, chapter 4, must attend to the possibility of human experience bringing theoretical perspectives up short (Gadamer, 1975).

Bourdieu’s theory has been criticized for failing to attend to other systems of oppression that impact human experience. Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology does not attend to intersections of race, gender, or sexual orientation. However, his concepts do provide a way to attend to these intersections. Therefore, the interpretive task notes where other systems, race, and gender, impact *habitus*.

In sum, the interpretive task utilizes a cognate discipline to thicken an understanding of the themes, patterns, and dynamics discerned in the descriptive task. The task involves critical correlational dialogue in which experience and cognate discipline critique and inform one another. This dialogue is then brought into conversation with a theological tradition in the normative task.

**Normative task.** Pastoral theologians and researchers can only be led so far by cognate disciplines. Pastoral theologians conducting critical correlative cross-disciplinary conversations must bring theology to the conversation. Hence, this normative task engages Wesleyan-holiness constructions of neighbor-love in the critically correlative conversation.

Because of the centrality of theological construction in this dissertation, it is also important to recognize that my theological heritage could be characterized as a theological *habitus* that invites particular emphases and excludes others. I am an ordained elder in the Church of the Nazarene and am active in a local church. My formation within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition emphasized a commitment to *holiness* uniquely characterized
by *holy-love* and demonstrated through actions consistent with neighbor-love. The tradition continues to employ variations of the ‘Wesleyan Quadrilateral’ for its sources for doctrinal formulations. The Nazarene church identifies as an evangelical movement yet has a broad theological umbrella—published Nazarene theologians represent existentialist, process, narrative, and fundamentalist perspectives. Yet the emphasis on holy-love and holy living characterized by neighbor-love remains central, though richly and variously described.

The normative task involves a critical analysis of prevailing concepts of neighbor-love within the Wesleyan-holiness tradition (Wynkoop, 1972; Oord, 2010) using the interpreted experiences of the interviewees in order to inform and challenge normative conceptions within the tradition. The normative task attends to instances of being ‘brought up short’ during the conversation, instances that invited ‘dialogical interplay’ (Gadamer 1975) between my horizon as a class-privileged (material, social, symbolic capital) Wesleyan-holiness pastoral theologian and the horizon of persons marginalized by their class location.

---

56 Nazarene descriptions of the 'Wesleyan Quadrilateral' involve Scripture (the Protestant canon) as a sufficient guide for the Christian faith and life, Christian tradition (consistent with the Apostle’s and Athanasian Creeds), reason, and experience. For more information on the Nazarene tradition see [www.nazarene.org/ministries/administration/visitorcenter/articles/display.aspx](http://www.nazarene.org/ministries/administration/visitorcenter/articles/display.aspx)


58 Love can be approached from many theological perspectives. Hallett (1989), Brady (2003), Lindberg (2008), and Jeanrond (2010) provide excellent descriptions of historical articulations of love. While acknowledging the multiple perspectives one could engage, this dissertation will focus on Wesleyan-Holiness articulations of neighbor-love.
The dialogical interplay builds upon a communicative model of rationality. This model emphasizes the need to offer rational arguments for the validity of a position. It suggests that there is no universal perspective. It contends that all theories are fallible and subject to reconsideration (Osmer, 2008, pp. 100-102). Hence, the normative task tests the adequacy of Wesleyan-Holiness constructions of neighbor-love in light of interpreted experience.

In sum, the normative task engages a critically correlative conversation between Wesleyan-holiness constructions of neighbor-love and the interpreted experiences elicited in the descriptive and interpretive tasks. The normative task tests the adequacy of Wesleyan-Holiness constructions of neighbor love in light of interpreted experience. This conversation informs the pragmatic task.

Pragmatic task. The final move is the pragmatic task. Given the previous discussion, how might we respond in ways that are faithful and effective? The pragmatic task advances both theory and practice by offering a construction of neighbor love informed by a margin and by recommending corresponding pastoral practices. The pragmatic task is conducted with the understanding that it is not a destination but a trail marker for future inquiries. The pastoral methodological spiral invites re-engagement with the context, continued analysis, and reformulations of theory and practice that more closely approximate shalom.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter made explicit the pastoral theological and research methods used for this dissertation. In it I identified the commitments that inform this study and named the sources this study engages. I presented a nuanced understanding of critical correlational
conversations by which I engage the sources. I re-introduced the spiral metaphor for pastoral methodology and identified four methodological tasks as a framework for advancing through the spiral.

At the beginning of this chapter, I noted the challenge of methodological accountability. In line with current conversations in the field of pastoral theology, I named five elements that a contemporary pastoral theological methodology should make clear: the role of experience in theological construction, the relationship of cognate disciplines, the import of community and context, the integration of theory and praxis, and the role of theology. This chapter advanced a method that accounts for each of the five elements as I attend to the *habitus* of persons marginalized by their class location in order to inform Wesleyan-Holiness understandings of neighbor love and offer a construction of neighbor love with implications for pastoral practice. The following chapter details the descriptive task.
CHAPTER 3

THE DESCRIPTIVE TASK: A DAY IN THE LIFE OF SIX HOMELESS PERSONS

This chapter presents the first task of our four-fold pastoral theological method. The descriptive task involves obtaining a 'thick description'\(^5^9\) of the lived experiences and contexts in which ministry takes place in an attempt to discern themes, dynamics, and patterns. The task utilizes formal and informal information gathering, careful listening, and looking more closely at patterns and relationships in context to elicit thick descriptions (Osmer, pp. 5-6). Further, the task utilizes a guided research questionnaire to provide the basic structure for the interviews.

The question we seek to investigate explores the *habitus* of persons marginalized through their class location. *Habitus* involves the perceived possibilities, goals, rules, and roles that constitute the social interaction of a given group. Initially, I sought access to a social group identified by economic and educational markers who regularly received care in a mission context. However, the mission sites that were accessible to me provided access to a particular subgroup within the parameters of the initial social group. This subgroup

\(^5^9\) Clifford Geertz (1973) used the term thick description to indicate gathering data regarding participants' views, feelings, intentions and actions as well as the contexts and structures of their lives (Charmaz, 2006). I will discuss in chapter four how this parallels an emphasis on habitus as well as habitat.
consisted of persons classified as homeless by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.\(^6^0\) Being in conversation with this group provided access to local knowledge that offered new ways of thinking about neighbor-love and practices of care. This chapter describes the mission contexts and offers a brief introduction to the research participants. The data from interviewee experiences will be organized around three categories: rhythms of daily life, obstacles and challenges, and preferences for care. I offer preliminary observations related to these categories that provide the basis for the interpretive task in chapter 4.

**The Mission Context**

Two missions in Fort Worth, Texas met the inclusion criteria for this study: First Street Methodist Mission and Presbyterian Night Shelter (PNS). Fort Worth has a number of resources for marginalized persons. Many of these resources are located on East Lancaster Street. Presbyterian Night Shelter, Union Gospel Mission, Salvation Army, and The Day Resource Center are the largest centers and provide the broadest scope of

\(^6^0\) HUD defines homelessness as meeting one of four criteria: 1) people living in a place not meant for human habitation, in emergency shelter, in transitional housing, or exiting an institution where they temporarily resided, 2) people who are losing their primary nighttime residence within 14 days and who lack resources and support networks to remain in housing, 3) families with children or unaccompanied youth who are unstably housed and likely to continue in that state, 4) people who are fleeing or attempting to flee domestic violence, have no other residence, and lack the resources or support networks to obtain other permanent housing.  
resources. First Street Mission is located in downtown Fort Worth approximately 2 miles from PNS and 4 miles from Salvation Army.\footnote{Throughout the dissertation I use the research participants' terms for the institutions they access for aide: Presbyterian Night Shelter (PNS), First Street Methodist Mission (1st Street), Union Gospel Mission (UGM), Day Resource Center (DRC), Salvation Army (Sally).}

First Street Mission offers care to economically vulnerable people who may or may not have a residence. The mission offers food, clothing, financial assistance, and forms of group education. The mission disburses resources depending on the day of the week. Sack lunches are provided on Mondays and Wednesdays, while grocery assistance is offered once every three months. The mission also offers life skill development educational groups, support groups, and provides a contact point to access case manager assistance. The case manager can be a key advocate for accessing, coordinating, and facilitating multiple social resources for the clients. The various forms and rhythms of assistance that the mission provides influence the frequency and character of interaction with persons served. The persons interviewed from this context utilized the food and clothing assistance from the mission. They were not involved in other forms of assistance that the mission offered.

Presbyterian Night Shelter focuses solely on the homeless community. The mission serves many groups within the homeless community: veterans, families, persons dealing with mental illness, men and women. It provides nightly shelter, food, clothing, case manager liaison, counseling, group work and a work therapy program. Its purpose is to work toward ending homelessness in Fort Worth. To facilitate this, the mission engages a tiered program; responsibilities and privileges are associated with each phase of the program. While clients are encouraged to enter the program, it is not required. The mission has no length of stay restrictions, charges no fees, and allows persons access to the shelter
even when under the influence of alcohol or drugs.62 I recruited participants to the study from the main shelter as it provided many opportunities to engage persons who met my inclusion criteria for the study.63

The six persons interviewed all had experience with the Presbyterian Night Shelter. Two of these six interviewees regularly received services from 1st Street Mission.64 While the interviews figure most prominently in this chapter, the descriptive task also invites drawing on my experiences volunteering at the missions and interactions with persons and staff from other resources for homeless persons. The culmination of these interactions provides a thick description of the mission context and the experiences of the interviewees.

**Introduction to the Research Participants**

There is an ethical danger in using other people’s stories for research purposes. Being marginalized due to class affiliation in this country has a dehumanizing effect on
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62 Other missions bar persons who are under the influence of alcohol or drugs.
63 Veterans were excluded from the study due to the educational, life skill opportunities the military afforded them, as well as the fact that a military career brings with it a military *habitus* which would unnecessarily complicate the study. Mentally ill persons were excluded from the study. Interviewing families who met inclusion criteria, while a worthwhile pursuit, brought with it complications related to childcare, such as being able to conduct a conversation without interruption. Therefore, I chose to focus on the clients receiving services at the main shelter. The services provided to the veterans and to women with children are different than the services provided at the main shelter.
64 While 1st Street is within walking distance of the mission district, it is unlikely that persons would travel downtown from East Lancaster unless some other interest took them in that direction, e.g. wanting to spend time at the downtown library. 1st Street’s scope of service does not invite homeless persons who are staying near or on East Lancaster to use its services; lunches and clothing assistance can be found daily on East Lancaster. However, many homeless persons not using East Lancaster resources regularly use 1st Street.
persons. I provide the brief biography below in an attempt to resist this dehumanization.\footnote{I will discuss this dynamic further under Bourdieu’s “symbolic violence” in chapter 4, The Interpretive Task.}

I have invented names for the persons interviewed and obfuscated some identifying markers (such as general vs. specific age) while retaining some of the stories and perspectives that elevate the unique history of persons interviewed. As we move through the descriptive task, I ask the reader to remember the histories, humanity, and hopes of Anne, Beth, Cathy, Derrick, Eric, and Frank.

Anne was the first person interviewed. Anne describes herself as a white married woman in her 40s. Anne and her husband stay at the shelter, which presents challenges to their relationship as the mission’s rules prohibit men and women sleeping together or displaying ‘too much’ affection. She experiences multiple health problems and is currently attempting to become qualified for disability. She relies on her husband for income and together they are hoping to save enough money to move into an apartment. She’s been intermittently homeless for a decade and has experience as a client and a volunteer with missions and women’s shelters locally and in other states. She participates in the program at the shelter, which allows her access to more resources at the center and a designated bed. Anne hopes to get an apartment where she can “start living again,” doing the kinds of things a wife is “supposed to do.” Further, Anne would like to help lead a women’s shelter where she can pass along life skills to women who need them.

Beth was the second person interviewed. Beth describes herself as an African American woman in her mid 50s. Her mother and father separated after her father molested a sibling. Her mother became a single parent head of household working as a housekeeper for a wealthy family. Beth dropped out of high school in order to take a job
and support her younger siblings as her mother's health failed. She did not finish her GED, which she describes as a failure on her part. She worked in the housekeeping industry until her own health failed. She uses a walker, deals with diabetes, asthma, and congestive heart failure, and was recently diagnosed and treated for tuberculosis. After experiencing the initial health difficulties that led to her unemployment, she stayed at a shelter that was able to coordinate resources to access an apartment for her and her son. However, she found the context of the housing unsafe for herself and her son and broke the lease. Subsequently, her son moved out at age 17 and she describes her sadness over her alienated relationship with her son. She has been a client at the shelter for over a year and has intermittently participated in the program. Currently, she does not participate in the program and sleeps on a mat. When asked what she hopes, Beth said, “I just don’t know. I just can’t see how things will change.”

Cathy was the third person interviewed. Cathy describes herself as a white, single woman in her 40s. Cathy participated in the work therapy program at the shelter and is now employed full time. Cathy resides at a local women's shelter. Cathy had intermittently experienced homelessness since early adulthood. She describes abusive relationships with men as a key factor leading to her times of homelessness. She qualifies for disability but prefers to work and stay busy. Cathy finished high school and has not sought further education citing problems with reading and comprehension. She sees her current job as “the best I can do.” While Cathy may qualify for section 8 housing assistance, she prefers the safety and boundaries of the women's shelter in light of her history of abusive relationships with men. Cathy thinks things are "pretty good right now."
Derrick was the fourth person interviewed. Derrick describes himself as an African American man in his early 30s. Derrick did not describe the events leading to his period of homelessness, but after staying one night under a bridge found his way to the shelter and immediately began working the program which led to the work therapy program and a full-time job. Derrick graduated high school on a special education program and has a learning disability. Derrick is in relationship with the mother of his children but does not live with them. Although employed full time, Derrick stays at a weekly hotel in an area known for crime, prostitution, and drug trafficking because “it’s the only place I can afford.” Derrick has $50 remaining every two weeks after paying child support, rent, and insurance for his family’s car. He describes life as “rough just trying to get by.” Derrick dreams of becoming a police officer or firefighter so that he can help protect people.

Eric was the fifth person interviewed. Eric describes himself as a white single man in his early 50s. Eric has been homeless for the last 17 years. Eric describes relational problems with his family as leading to him becoming homeless. The majority of nights Eric sleeps at the shelter but sometimes, after playing music for tips, he sleeps outside at a “special place.” He describes his relationship to the shelter as the “come in at night and leave in the morning schedule.” He regards the program at the shelter as a way of making it uncomfortable for the homeless. Eric prefers the days when there was no program and the shelter simply provided food, clothing assistance, and nightly shelter. Eric sleeps on a mat at the shelter. Eric hopes to “fulfill God’s destiny” for him through music.

Frank was the sixth person interviewed. Frank describes himself as a single white male in his early 30s. Frank has been intermittently homeless since he was 18. Frank graduated high school and left home due to an alienated relationship with his stepfather.
He has stayed intermittently with friends, girlfriends, and distant family. Frank has served various lengths of time in jail and “has a record.” Frank currently sleeps under a table in downtown Fort Worth and panhandles for cash. Frank has some experience with shelters, but prefers to stay on his own away from the “violence on Lancaster.” Frank goes to missions for food and clothing services. Frank hopes to save enough money to move to another state where he hopes to get back on his feet with the help of some friends and a past girlfriend. Frank describes homeless living as “surreal or not real” whereas he hopes to get back to real life. He describes real life as “life with a job, a home, a wife and maybe some kids.”

I used a guided interview questionnaire to provide a general outline of the kind of discussion I thought would best reveal the *habitus* of persons occupying a marginalized social space. The interview questions revolved around three themes: daily rhythm, practical moral reasoning, and perspectives on care. The first two question sets asked persons to walk me through a typical day. I asked about the kinds of decisions they faced, the obstacles they encountered, and the goals that provided direction for the day. The final question set was about descriptions of care in which I asked participants about experiences of preferred and non-preferred care.

After transcribing the interviews, I performed a line-by-line coding exercise (Charmaz, 2006). The initial coding revealed the following groupings: rhythms of daily living, material and spiritual obstacles encountered, and preferences of care. After gleaning the first set of groupings, I returned to the transcribed interviews and performed an axial coding exercise using these groupings to thicken my description. I then engaged a second

---

66 See Appendix 2.
reader to be accountable to my interpretation. What became clear in the process were the distinct differences associated with this context when contrasted to more privileged social space.

**Rhythms of Daily Living**

The initial question set asked persons to walk me through a typical day in their life. The first distinction to make among the interviewees’ experience is between times of having shelter and times of not having shelter. Of the people interviewed, all had experiences living without shelter or being on the streets. Five of the six persons interviewed had stayed at PNS for various lengths of time.

**Non-Sheltered Living**

The rhythm of non-sheltered living includes: finding safe places to rest, finding food, and occupying time. Finding safe places includes camp living or staying with other people under a bridge or in an area that does not cause problems for the homed. These places are not readily visible and are largely left alone by the police. Other areas of shelter include public areas, parks, college campuses, and sidewalks where persons feel safe enough to lay down and rest. However, when the city wakes up those homeless persons not in a campsite have to leave their safe places and begin either to find food or occupy time.

Finding food may include making the rounds to the resource centers that provide food. Knowing the times and places where one is likely to find a church or ministry offering food is essential. Also, knowing the quality of food offered is important. One of the interviewees was particularly attentive to the kinds of foods offered as she is diabetic and is careful of foods that increase her blood sugar levels and not keep her going. Often the types of food being offered are simple carbohydrates, e.g. bagels, pastries, and donuts.
These food types, though easily accessible and often offered, are of low nutritional quality. Options for finding food other than knowing the rhythms of the resource centers include accessing a food subsidy card, panhandling, or asking for food. Church groups who offer food from a van on Lancaster were also listed as a potential food source.

The continual need for food and the uncertainty of getting food coincides with the behavior of hoarding. When waiting for food in lines, persons who are able-bodied, strong, and or verbally aggressive are more likely to get the food being offered, and will often get two or more servings. Persons that are physically challenged or unwilling to become verbally aggressive may not receive any food. Participants in general described physically and psychologically aggressive persons as more likely to access food and other resources.

In between finding shelter and finding food, persons described a task of “occupying time.” While I do not think it fair to say people are “killing time” as that has a connotation of laziness, persons who are homeless do have to occupy their time. Between finding food and waiting for the city to die down enough for them to return to their safe place and rest, persons have to attend to their safety, remain inconspicuous or non-troubling enough not to garner the attention of the police, deal with elemental conditions, and keep their belongings safe. Participants grouped these tasks as part of occupying time.

Non-sheltered rhythms involve daily accessing resources needed for survival. These resources include shelter and food. Access to resources is complicated by at least two factors: competition and power inequalities. Further, the competition takes place in a

---

67 Mission settings deal with this dynamic by strict enforcement of rules and the presence of security measures, e.g. scan card with presentation of food, security guards, and cafeteria rules.
context that requires homeless persons to remain invisible and non-troubling to the culture of the homed.

**Sheltered Living**

The rhythm for shelter living varies from non-shelter living. Participating in a shelter adds a measure of accountability and some advantages. Having shelter adds a scheduled element to the day. Persons staying at a shelter have to be in the check-in line by a certain time, usually between 4 and 6pm. They also have to leave the shelter at a certain time, typically 7am. This reduces the number of hours spent occupying time while waiting for a safe place to rest. It also provides one guaranteed calorie-packed meal—but not at all necessarily nutritionally packed. Having shelter also offers an advantage by providing a place to keep belongings, thus reducing the number of items persons must carry.\(^{68}\)

Sleeping in a shelter involves sleeping in a large open room. The room is divided into male and female sides with a barrier through the center. Persons not involved in a program are given mat assignments on the floor. The mats are laid out upon the concrete floor with numeric designations. The mats have approximately six inches between them and are approximately the size of a large single sleeping bag. Several hundred people may occupy this large open room. Interviewees named lack of personal space, body odor, noise, snoring, unintentional touch, and dealing with aggressive behavior from other clients as nightly challenges associated with sleeping in a shelter. Interviewees described these challenges as resulting in poor quality sleep through the night. Wake up call is at 5:30 a.m.

\(^{68}\) PNS offers a locker to each guest. However, there are other options for keeping items somewhat secured. The DRC also offers a secure area to store personal items.
with persons not in a program required to vacate the building by 7 a.m. Breakfast is not provided.\textsuperscript{69}

Persons generally make their way down the street to Union Gospel Mission (UGM) for breakfast. If they miss the check-in time for breakfast, they may go to one of several other providers: Friar’s, Beautiful Feet, or a church group handing out food from a van. The other breakfast options usually include donuts, bagels, pastry, and coffee. After breakfast, people have several options. Many go to the Day Resource Center\textsuperscript{70} until lunchtime. Persons eat lunch at the UGM or another provider and return to the DRC until the shelter opens again.

A second rhythm described by the interviewees involves walking to downtown Fort Worth. Persons who are physically able often walk downtown to the public library. The library offers persons shelter from the elements and another option for occupying time. Persons read, access the Internet, and rest in the reading areas of the library. Persons who frequent the library often receive a sack lunch at 1st Street Mission on Mondays and Wednesdays.

Several hours of any given day are spent standing in line. People stand in line to get into the shelter, stand in line at the shelter to eat, stand in line to access the dispensary, stand in line to talk to a case manager, stand in line to access DRC, and stand in line at the UGM. While resource providers publish a schedule for services, many factors determine whether the providers are on time. Furthermore, due to the number of clients served,  

\textsuperscript{69} PNS has since changed its policy and now provides 24-hour services. Further, bunks are now available for all clients.

\textsuperscript{70} The Day Resource Center (DRC) located between PNS and UGM functions as an entry point for the services of the mission district. It provides day shelter, identification services, showers, laundry, storage, phone, internet, transportation assistance, and case management.
limited resources, and limited space, clients sometimes wait in line only to be informed that the resource for which they are waiting is no longer available, e.g. running out of sack lunches, deodorant, razors, or feminine products. Each instance of standing in line illustrates a lack of control on the part of the interviewees.

The lack of control is further illustrated by the dynamic of “waiting to be called.” Participants repeatedly referred to persons who controlled access as “they” or "them." The following quotations highlight this relation: “You have to wait for them to call you.” “They will open the doors when they are ready.” “They distribute clothes as they see fit.” Participants expressed frustration at their perceived lack of power in relation to those who controlled access. Furthermore, interviewees expressed an attitude of distrust or suspicion towards the people who control access.71 One of the interview participants was vocal about her distrust of those who control access. She gave multiple examples of perceived discrimination by resource providers and suspected that many of the resources were “rigged.” Participants found the presence of hierarchical power relationships in the shelter frustrating.72

The rhythm of the shelter includes sleeping in a context that is open, fairly compact, and puts persons in very close proximity to others. The rhythm involves searching for food, gaining access to food that is largely of poor nutritional value, and competing for this food. Participants describe standing and waiting in lines in a posture that depends upon others'
decision-making. The rhythm involves walking from resource to resource for breakfast, lunch, dinner, and shelter. Overall, the participants describe this rhythm as mentally and physically exhausting.

**Challenges and Obstacles Faced by Homeless Persons**

This dissertation is interested in exploring the perspectives (goals, rules, roles, and strategies) associated with a particular habitus. Focusing on challenges and obstacles faced by homeless persons provides an avenue to explore perspectives associated with daily living. I group the challenges and obstacles faced by the persons interviewed under the headings of material and spiritual obstacles. Material obstacles include challenges posed to a person's physical being or physical pursuits such as issues related to food, shelter, clothing, transportation, and earning potential. Spiritual obstacles include challenges to a person's self image, agency, and hopes, such as fear, dehumanizing judgments, and an awareness of their situation being 'abnormal.' Hence, the second set of observations arising from the descriptive task includes challenges and obstacles faced by the interviewees.

**Material Obstacles**

The interviewees unanimously named the crime and violence in their context as a major obstacle to their wellbeing. Violence and crime are perceived as common companions with the interviewees. PNS uses metal detector screenings, security staff, and police presence in the mission. The interviewees described these steps as effective for reducing much of the violence within the mission. However, they still perceive verbal and physical violence as problematic in the mission.
Violence and crime are perceived as more prevalent outside the mission. Persons face these challenges daily as they walk outside the mission walls. There are a large number of persons recently released from prison on Lancaster. Persons who do not have family connections or resources upon release are dropped off on Lancaster in front of the DRC. Often DRC staff are the first persons to assist reintegration for recently released persons. One staff person described the institutionalized mindset that people develop after 5-15 years of incarceration. This mindset combined with the mission district context invites an increase in criminal activity. The staff member suggested that dropping released persons without resources or contacts into a poor context with both a ready supply and demand for drugs, a prevalence of fraud schemes, prostitution, and violence was a recipe for increasing crime and violence.

A second challenge related to safety involved the perceived number of persons suffering from significant mental illness. Though mental illness was an exclusion criterion for this study, the participants named how the mental illness of others affects them. Participants expressed concern over other clients’ stability and whether or not a person would “snap” and hurt someone. Even when persons were not concerned with their safety associated with another’s mental illness, they voiced concerns over being grouped with, or being identified as a person who deals with mental illness. The ‘drama’ or energy that results from interactions with mental illness provides a continual stressor for persons already dealing with the obstacles of violence and crime.

A third challenge lay in transportation. Persons rely on public transportation. Case managers provide bus passes for persons who provide sufficient documentation or rationale. However, the passes are limited in number. Persons who cannot obtain bus
passes rely on walking, which limits their options to destinations within walking distance. Participants articulated problems getting to job interviews, day labor opportunities, and appointments. Transportation presents a daily obstacle for them.

The participants named lack of access to simple necessities as a fourth obstacle. Where do you go to the bathroom when you are homeless? Where do you get a cup of cold water? Where can you access shade? How do you keep warm? These necessities can be accessed at a resource center, but apart from the resource center, persons must develop appropriate strategies for dealing with these obstacles. Some strategies include: accessing the public library for shelter, water, and bathroom access; if a bus pass can be accessed, then riding the bus all day for shelter; creating shelter at a campsite; and panhandling for water or food. The participants described locating and accessing basic necessities as part of the challenge of their daily rhythm.

Participants named space and privacy challenges as a fifth obstacle. Life among the homeless is lived in close proximity to others both strange and familiar. Persons are always with other persons when in the shelter or Lancaster region. One sleeps within six inches of others, eats with others, waits in line with others, and walks to and from resources with others. The participants named this dynamic as particularly exhausting. This context allows little time or space for silence, reflection, or privacy.

Participants described the homeless rhythm as one with a hurried and harried tempo. Participants felt rushed from one task to the next in the company of hundreds of other persons in similar situations. The rhythm begins with awakening either on the street or in a shelter, dealing with the elements, finding food, waiting in lines, occupying time, and finding shelter again. The rhythm is physically challenging and requires persons to
continually walk, stand, or sit in public spaces. The rhythm also involves systems of power as access to resources depends upon others who have control over desired resources. The material obstacles named above complicate the rhythm. The rhythm also involves spiritual obstacles.

**Spiritual Obstacles**

The participants named the presence of fear and uncertainty, the presence of perceived judgments against them, and a perception of being abnormal as obstacles that affected their daily rhythms. While these mindsets could be grouped under psychosocial dynamics that affect the daily rhythms of people, I’ve chosen to group them under the term spiritual obstacles. Spiritual obstacles impact the meaning people make related to their identity, their future, their hopes, and their place in the social world.

Several people spoke of fear coming around in significant ways. One participant articulated a “dread” that comes around every time he enters the shelter. The dread is related to uncertainty about whether the shelter will continue to be available to him. The “dread” also involves his personal safety related to the probability of violence in the shelter and whether or not he’ll get any sleep that night. Another participant expressed fear of persons in power finding out where he’s living resulting in him getting dismissed and becoming homeless again. Another interviewee expressed the “fear” of getting an apartment and of not having the protection of the shelter, resulting in a return of problematic relations. Another person expressed fear of looking at the future—suspecting there wasn’t a future that was different than the present. The fear of returning to
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73 From a Wesleyan-Holiness perspective, God is always, everywhere, involved with persons inviting them to more closely approximate righteousness. Therefore, challenges to self-image, identity, future-hope, and so forth are spiritual challenges.
homelessness was something persons consistently named. After having escaped a life of homelessness, the fear was that it could be just around the corner, waiting to consume you again. Fear, in various forms, seems to be a regular companion with those interviewed.

Judgment is an obstacle several persons named. The interviewees of this study were quick to point out the falsehood of generalizations related to homelessness. Without dismissing the prevalence of mental illness and addiction within the homeless community, these persons were quick to point out their unique story and how it did not fit with the generalizations. They related how generalizations keep people from treating people with respect, and from realizing everyone has their own history, crises, and precipitating events leading to homelessness. Participants named frustration in having to deal with generalizations and judgments that dismiss the uniqueness of their stories and assume their guilt and active participation in their hardship.

The participants associated this judgment with a social stigma related to homelessness and poverty that becomes an obstacle to being treated with dignity and respect. Frank remarked on the way people treat poor people or the homeless in particular, “But then you got everything outside of that handful\(^\text{74}\) that see a homeless person and they look at us and in their mind we are no more valuable than a common street dog. I mean, you know, they look at it as they can treat us any way they want to. There is no consequences and no feelings of guilt because, like I said, in their minds we are no better than a common street dog.” The other participants named similar experiences of being

\(^{74}\) Frank was describing a few people as being the exception to the rule. However, in his experience the majority of persons he encounters treat him as subhuman because he’s homeless. Furthermore, Frank sees this mindset as a key reason that homeless persons are victims of crime and suspects the same mindset prevents homeless persons from receiving protection from the police.
treated with disdain due to being perceived as homeless. The participants named this societal disdain as having a negative impact on their own self-image, motivation, and energy for self-improvement.

A third spiritual obstacle involves being perceived as abnormal. Frank described a vision of the normal life, “a normal life cycle is being born, growing up, going to school, having friends, possibly going to college, holding a job, maybe a wife and some kids...That’s reality.” In contrast, he described homelessness as “losing reality” and being in an “unreal or surreal” situation. Eric described the homeless life as a “fantasy world.” Anne described the homeless cycle as “surviving” as opposed to “living.” Homeless living is a life lived in discord with societal expectations of how life should be lived. Participants expressed perceptions of being treated as less than human, without dignity, without respect by persons who occupy a different social space—one that harmonizes with the normal life cycle.

The spiritual obstacles named above articulate challenges faced by the participants. These challenges impact social interactions. Having described participants’ daily rhythms and perceived material and spiritual obstacles, we now have a context from which to examine descriptions of care.

Preferences for Care

The third set of observations related to the descriptive task included preferences for care. The question set surrounding care involved asking persons about times that they felt they were well cared for as well as times that they received care that they did not prefer.

---

75 The question was framed specifically toward care from a non-family member and non-partner. Interestingly, persons leaned first toward care outside the mission context. Further on in the conversation I guided questions of care toward the mission contexts.
or that they would term bad care. After coding, I grouped the responses into concrete and relational acts of care. Concrete acts of care involve the supply of material resources while relational aspects of care largely involve preferred and non-preferred qualities of communication.

**Concrete Acts of Care**

The interviewees suggested concrete acts are core to providing care. Concrete acts of care include providing shelter, space, food, clothing, and resource coordination. The persons interviewed had all experienced sleeping on the streets. One of the interviewees continued this option because of the perceived lack of safety in the mission district and at the shelter, while the other participants sheltered at PNS, a women’s shelter, and a weekly hotel. All of the participants accessed resource providers for the other aspects of care, e.g. food, clothing, and resource coordination.

In addressing the first two concrete acts of care, shelter and space, the interviewees suggested three important considerations for missions providing shelter: safety and rules, storage, and privacy. First, is the shelter safe? Given the violence present in the homeless context, persons expressed concerns as to the safety of the shelter. Rules are important to create a safe environment. Some of the rules included: expected behavior, admission criteria, cleanliness, and protecting personal and material space. They suggested that

76 Several persons outside of 1st Street Mission stated they lived in camps rather than at one of the shelters because of the violence and “drama” that goes on down on Lancaster. I questioned their perception of the violence having not witnessed an altercation during my volunteering at the mission. They suggested I simply had not been there at the right time. They suggested PNS was the most violent of the shelters because of their “take anybody” policy, whereas other missions were named as safer because they wouldn’t let you in if you so much as smelled of alcohol.
people who broke the rules, thereby creating unsafe conditions, should be banned from the shelter.

The interviewees all named the necessity of rules for the presence of good care. However, the same rules that provide a degree of safety within a violent context were also the occasion for complaints of poor care. A common complaint was “this place feels just like a prison with all the rules.” While interviewees perceived rules to be necessary, they also framed them as problematic because of either the lack of communication regarding the rationale for the rules, or disagreement with the rationale. Participants also suggested that the rules were not enforced equally. Ironically, three of the participants cited occasions where rules were bent or broken in consideration of their unique condition as an example of good care. While equality of rule enforcement was desired as a rule, having an exception made on their behalf invited the perspective of being given good care. Good care, as it relates to rule enforcement, appears to involve clear communication, transparent rationales, and room to bend rules in some circumstances.

Missions providing shelter should also consider the provision of storage space. Persons without a home carry with them their material goods. Clothing, identification, spare foodstuffs, hygiene products, and valuables must be carried if no storage is provided at the shelter. Obviously this affects mobility but it also affects advancement. If a person loses their identification, they also lose access to many resources including the possibility of job procurement. A concrete act of care for the homeless includes providing a space to store vital documentation and valuables.

A third suggested consideration for missions providing shelter involves creating quiet space. Homeless persons live in close proximity to one another, experience close
quarter sleeping conditions, regularly wait in lines, and experience an absence of private space. Participants suggested that having a quiet place in which one can have moments of solitude, peace, and quiet would go a long way toward helping people process, plan, and reflect. Persons felt well cared for when the shelter environment provided safety, storage, and some measure of quiet and privacy.

Moving on to the third concrete act of care involves the provision of food. Food distribution at both missions utilized for this study was dependent upon donations. The shelters provide a menu based on the available donations for the week. While the missions attempt to provide a measure of nutritionally loaded food, often the meals consist of high carbohydrate, high fat, and poor quality protein foods. Breakfast and lunch options vary according to the resources available that day (UGM, Beautiful Feet, Friar’s, 1st Street), but often choices include pastries, donuts, bagels, Vienna sausages, peanut butter crackers, and processed fruit. While these foods provide fuel for the body, they are not conducive to sustained metabolism through the day. One diabetic client voiced concern over negotiating blood sugar levels in relation to the foods provided. Participants developed resourcefulness in knowing and accessing resources that provided higher quality foods.

Participants voiced concern about the way food is presented and consumed. The number of homeless people served and the limited dining facilities result in persons feeling rushed to eat. One person remarked, “I feel rushed everywhere I go. Even when I eat it’s like ‘come on, come on. I’ve got 30 more people. You’re taking my time.” Another remarked, “I have to hurry up and shovel this in and then I have to walk 2 miles to the next place. Do you know what it’s like to do that for 17 years? I always have indigestion.” The interviewees suggested caregivers should give people time to sit down and not rush them.
Clothing is a third category of concrete care. Missions who depend on donations for clothing distribution often have limited options. However, participants voiced concerns over having appropriately sized clothing as well as clothing that did not label them as homeless. The quality of clothing was important to the participants. Further, participants expressed concern over the distribution of the clothing. “It seems like some people get the clothes they order and others don’t.”  

Participants felt well cared for when clothing was good quality, appropriately sized, and fairly distributed.

Finally, the interviewees named resource coordination as a concrete act of care. Distance poses an obstacle to the homeless. Being without a car and without money results in difficulty procuring transportation. When access to resources requires travel, homeless persons walk. This is particularly problematic when resource access points are miles from the homeless district and from each other. Therefore, participants appreciated the opportunity to access aid from one central location.

Case managers are able to facilitate medical resources, counseling, government assistance applications, and serve as a liaison between the client and the resource bureaucracy. The participants view the process of accessing medical and governmental aide as unnecessarily daunting and complex. They describe the process as a long series of hoop jumping to get what they need. The participants describe case managers as able to get through to the appropriate people and know how to talk to them, whereas participants felt dismissed and encountered blocks to getting the answers and resources they needed.

77 This comment reifies the emphasis on rule enforcement. Participants prefer equal treatment and equal enforcement of the policies and procedures related to resource distribution. Participants suggested that race discrimination influenced clothing distribution.

78 Such as applications for HUD housing.
Participants expressed an appreciation for the power wielded by the case managers on their behalf, naming it as an example of good care.

Five of the six participants expressed a common desire to find employment. Several obstacles, as named above, interfere with procuring a job. Other obstacles included physical challenges, lack of education, lacking documentation, and having a criminal record. Two interviewees named staff who took a personal interest in them and who offered them a job as illustrative of concrete acts of care. Helping persons secure employment, or helping persons access legal and safe ways of earning money is another instance of concrete care.

While there could be multiple ways of thinking through or categorizing care, there seems to be a distinction that should be emphasized between the concrete act of care (e.g. providing space, food, clothing, accessing resources and job assistance) and the

---

79 One interviewee was awaiting disability certification and was not looking for employment. She stated that her husband was working and she was relying on him for an income. Two of the other interviewees had full time jobs (which did not elevate them above the poverty line). The remaining three were actively looking for employment.

80 One interviewee suggested that in the absence of appropriate documentation even day labor was difficult to find unless he was being paid cash “under the table.” He described day labor as hard manual labor that didn't pay much ($20-$30 per day) for backbreaking work—though at the time of the interview he stated he’d love to have even that. Day labor sites are not within walking distance of the mission district or downtown.

81 In a personal interview with a staff member another obstacle was named. Persons lack an employable skill set which includes knowing how to talk to a boss, how to resolve conflicts, and being dependable at work (i.e. being there, being on time). The staff member suggested that ‘street life’ socialized persons into ways of behaving that were not compatible with steady employment. For example, a priority for a male on the street is to save face or not be “punked.” Receiving a reprimand from an employer for being late would be interpreted as being “punked,” and would elicit a verbally retaliatory response, which would result in saving face, but also in being fired. While this anecdotal story may not be applicable for all males who encounter homelessness, it is illustrative of the ways that homelessness, or street life, may socialize persons into behavioral patterns that are problematic for employment.
administration of concrete care. During the interviews, I wondered with the clients whether there were a way in which concrete examples of care were administered that modeled ‘good’ care. And conversely, is there a way that these concrete acts were administered that demonstrated poor, or not preferred care? This question led to two discoveries. First, participants preferred that a good quality of communication accompany concrete acts of care. Second, participants preferred that caregivers assume a non-judgmental stance. The context in which care occurs shapes both emphases. I address these emphases next as relational aspects of care.

**Relational Aspects of Care**

Communication variables between cultures are well documented. Verbal and non-verbal socially conditioned cues significantly impact the meaning made in conversation.\(^82\) In the context of this research, suggestions for appropriate distance and norms for eye contact did not vary significantly from generalized western expectations, e.g. eye contact is generally a demonstration of respect and a sign of paying attention, and appropriate social spacing may vary due to cramped living conditions. The interviews revealed little in terms of context specific variations related to eye contact and space related to caring communication.\(^83\)

---

\(^82\) In one culture, making eye contact is seen as being respectful. In another culture, eye contact between those not equal in social standing, such as between a child and an adult, or between a student and a teacher, is interpreted as a sign of disrespect.

\(^83\) While the participants revealed no new rules or guidelines related to caring communication between caregivers and clients, my interactions at the shelter and DRC did reveal some context specific variations. For example "street communication" in a violent culture involves a game of "saving face" or not being “punked,” or made a “punk.” To be shamed or made a punk invites others in this context to mark one as a victim. Therefore having a short fuse and being ready to escalate verbally and physically is a regular mark of communication in this context. While a caregiver is not best served by adopting this stance...
Interviewees suggested overall that they would appreciate more significant communicative encounters. The pace and volume of service provided in the mission provides little opportunity for sustained human communication. Passing communication, communication taking little time and that does not demand stopping and attending to a person, is the normal experience of persons in the mission context. Persons named exceptions to the norm as times when persons stopped and invested time conversing with them. They suggested that instances of sitting down, making small talk, actually getting to know the client’s unique story, and remembering portions of the story at the next encounter were all examples of care they’d like repeated.

Interviewees described frequent experiences of being “waved, or brushed off.” When I questioned the meaning of being waved off, participants indicated times when they were treated as though their interests, questions, or concerns were not valued. Being waved off is a power-laden act. One has the power to acknowledge or dismiss another’s concerns, presence, values, and goals. Participants acknowledged both the frequency and the frustration they experience with being waved off and named this act as a characteristic of poor care.

Participants described qualities of communication that shape good care. First, persons felt cared for when other persons stopped and attended to them. The opposite of being waved off is the act of attending to a person. Stopping, attempting to understand a person’s concerns, hearing a story or a unique perspective, were listed as examples of good care. It is well to understand this when entering into the context so that one does not read too much into a verbally aggressive situation.
care. Interviewees also described small talk—talking about the weather, or how a day was going—as a component of good care.84

Second, people felt cared for when they were spoken to as an equal. Persons described instances of being talked down to, or being talked to as a child, or being talked to as if they had no sense as common communication traits that demonstrated poor care. Further, persons described experiences of being talked to as if they were stupid, or conversely, spoken to with ‘college’ words as instances of poor care.85 Participants valued being included in problem solving conversations related to the mission. The participants preferred communication they could understand, that did not belittle them, and that invited them as an equal participant in the conversation.

Third, persons expressed the importance of physical touch in the communicative act. One interviewee made a parallel between leprosy and being homeless; in both cases the person is untouchable. The interviewees named the absence of non-coercive, non-sexual, affirming human contact as problematic. The presence of appropriate physical touch was listed as a mark of good care. Another interviewee, after naming the presence of physical and sexual violence, still remarked on the necessity of appropriate touch as a marker of good care.

84 The observing of social niceties, like small talk regarding the weather, signifies one belongs as a player in the social game. To be deprived of small talk, to be deemed an unworthy player for the social game of small talk, signifies the person as sub-society, to say the least, and likely sub-human.

85 Ruby Payne (1998) in A Framework for Understanding Poverty cites Martin Jos’ (1967) research describing language registers (p.42). A language register represents levels of language that are socially and contextually sanctioned. Using registers 2 levels above, or below, the appropriate register for that context is considered socially taboo or offensive.
Time, respect, and touch are important aspects of the delivery care. These qualities of communication influence how participants evaluate concrete acts of care. However, there is another aspect of care that is important to the persons interviewed. This aspect of care involves the perception of being judged. While the internal motivation and judgments present in the caregiver may or may not be detectable by the caregiver or the care recipient, when the care recipient perceives a judgmental attitude on the part of the caregiver then the care is interpreted as poor care.

The interviewees described the presence of “judgment” on the part of caregivers as problematic for them. They suggested that caregivers maintain an open mind as to the reasons behind someone becoming homeless. Participants indicated that though there may be common factors contributing to homelessness (mental illness, addiction, criminal record) the precipitating events behind those contributing factors are multiple and unique to each person’s story. The participants resented feeling like they were lumped together or were being pre-judged based on another’s story or the caregiver’s experience with other people in a similar situation. Part of caring communication involves suspending pre-judgment and spending the time to get to know each person’s road to homelessness.

The participants emphasized concrete and relational aspects of care. While the participants named concrete acts of care as “obvious,” the relational aspects of care contained contextual nuances. Given the social discourses that invite homeless persons into a less than human social status, the social cues of respectful, mutual dialogue become vital in the administration of concrete acts of care.
**Concluding Observations**

The descriptive task involves attending to themes, dynamics, and patterns within a given context. This study attended to the perspectives of six persons who receive care regularly from Presbyterian Night Shelter or 1st Street Mission. The study also draws upon the writer’s experiences volunteering at the missions and interacting with resources and persons in the mission district. The following themes are significant.

The participants described a daily rhythm related to a homeless lifestyle. This rhythm involves accessing multiple resources for daily needs. Persons involved in this rhythm access resources for shelter, food, clothing, transportation assistance, and various other forms of assistance on a daily basis. This rhythm involves a reliance on others with the social and material capital to access the resources. The rhythm involves waiting in lines and physical exertion. Participants described the rhythm as physically and mentally exhausting. The rhythm invites a day-to-day focus with little time or energy for sustained future-directed goal planning.

This rhythm is conducted in a context that is perceived by participants as violent. Every participant described instances of being violently victimized by others. The participants named the presence of guns and knives within the context as a given. Participants described drug trafficking, theft, prostitution, fraud, and assault as common factors that informed their context. They also described the dynamic of the physically powerful having the advantage in their context. This dynamic invites women and physically challenged persons into more vulnerable positions within the context. Participants
articulated different strategies to cope with violence. This context of violence invites a vigilant stance. Participants expressed their preparedness to become verbally and physically aggressive in order to protect their property and person. Participants defined being street smart as being aware of the potential for victimization as well as being prepared to fight for their interests. Persons who are street smart incorporate a set of rules, goals, and strategies that are unique to this context.

The context is one of perceived limited resources. Persons develop various strategies for accessing the limited resources. Some of the strategies named included: getting to know the context, using relational networking, and using physical or verbal techniques to obtain or retain desired goods. The perception of limited resources invites persons into competitive relationships with others seeking the same goods.

The context operates according to multiple power discourses. Participants largely viewed themselves as dependent upon others who have the power to grant access to goods and resources. This dynamic is illustrated by the act of waiting in lines, waiting for case managers to obtain access, waiting for government assistance, waiting for clothes. Multiple participants described the dynamic of dependence as frustrating. Participants named a sense of futility, or powerlessness to effect change on the system of distribution. However, several named strategies to gain access to goods and services. Sample strategies include: activating a social network or social worker to work on their behalf, tricking the system,

86 Women participants described strategies of allying themselves with others, while men participants described individual strategies.
87 That is getting to know the times, schedules, and services provided in a context. Participants utilize multiple resource providers in order to meet their needs.
88 This dissertation focuses on class. However, gender and race discourses are present as well. I noted this in footnotes 71, 79, 81 and 86, and will attend further to the intersections of gender, race, and class in chapter 4.
and activating an alternative economy. Here we see that persons are not without power, but that they use what power they have to access what they need. However, the participants’ resourceful demonstrations of power did not mitigate their overall sense of dependency, which led to descriptions of anxiety related to vulnerability.

The participants variously described a dynamic that I call anxiety related to vulnerability. The interviews revealed the presence of fear related to either remaining in a homeless, vulnerable position or returning to a state of homelessness. The perceived lack of control over one’s own life direction invited participants to worry whether: the shelter would stop serving them and they would return to the streets, their employer would fire them and they would return to shelter living, or relational dynamics would cause them to become homeless again. All six participants in the study voiced fears related to their vulnerability and the perceived probability of returning to a state of homelessness.

When questioned about their future orientation or the potentialities they perceive, the participants’ answers could be grouped as present oriented or distant future oriented. The rhythm of homelessness invites a day-to-day orientation. Persons described their goals as being around finding daily shelter and food, and occupying time. The two employed persons also named day-to-day orientation. When asked where they see themselves in the more distant future, persons named various hopes: running a women’s shelter, being a police officer or firefighter, being a musician, continuing in the present job, starting over in another state. One participant was unable to name a future vision. She was unable to

89 Eric described this as a sort of “dread” that accompanies him.
90 See Derrick’s story above.
91 See Cathy’s story above.
articulate a vision, and named the presence of current obstacles as insurmountable. The absence of intermediate goals, or steps toward distant future goals, was notable.

Participants described experiences of preferred and non-preferred care. Concrete acts of care included shelter, food, and clothing assistance and various other forms of material and social assistance. The dynamics described above nuance the administration of these concrete acts of care. While participants appreciated these acts of concrete care, they suggested that the relational characteristics present during the administration of these acts helped qualify the acts as preferred or non-preferred. Preferred relational characteristics consisted of being attentive, the use of respectful language and appropriate touch, and the suspension of pre-judgment. Participants valued this quality of social interaction in the presence of a social discourse that labels and treats homeless persons as deviant and sub-human.

**Concluding the Descriptive Task**

The descriptive task provides the basic information that will be used for the interpretive task. In this chapter, I have named themes, patterns, and dynamics raised from exploring the environment and perspectives of six marginalized persons receiving care from mission contexts. I grouped these themes, patterns, and dynamics into three categories of relation: rhythms of daily life, challenges and obstacles, and preferences for care. The following chapter will use Bourdieu’s social theory to formulate a deeper appreciation of these patterns, themes, and dynamics.
CHAPTER 4

THE INTERPRETIVE TASK:

UTILIZING BOURDIEU’S REFLEXIVE SOCIOLOGY AS A LENS FOR

ANALYZING LIVED EXPERIENCE AT A MARGIN

The previous chapter outlined the descriptive task and named patterns, themes, and trends that arose from the experiences of persons who received care in mission contexts. I grouped the descriptive findings into rhythms of daily living, challenges and obstacles, and preferences for care.

This chapter presents the interpretive task. The interpretive task uses a cognate discipline to expand, examine, and explain themes, patterns, and trends highlighted in the descriptive task. The task is a “step back” in an attempt to make sense of the information gleaned in the descriptive task from a particular perspective. I use Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology theory as an interpretive lens through which to examine the rhythms, challenges, and preferences for care described in chapter three.

This interpretive chapter begins by naming a challenge for cognate discipline utilization. I present my rationale for selecting Bourdieu as a cognate conversation partner and locate his thought within the broader sociological conversation. I describe Bourdieu’s theory, define his key terms, and use his theory, attending closely to habitus, to interpret the three key data groupings from the descriptive task.
Challenges for the Interpretive Task

Chapter 2 described variations of the critical correlational stance employed by pastoral theologians when conducting cross-disciplinary conversations. Pastoral theologians who embrace a critical postmodern stance recognize knowledge as socially situated, perspectival, and limited. When engaging in cross-disciplinary conversations, pastoral theologians must recognize the situated-ness of their cognate disciplines. Disciplines are situated within ongoing inter-disciplinary conversations located within broader academic and cultural discourses. Any appropriation of a discipline involves stepping into the middle of ongoing conversations.

Richard Osmer (2008) addresses concerns raised by a “critical postmodernity” by providing a framework for “wise” cognate selection that builds upon Jürgen Habermas’ (1984) communicative model of rationality (p. 102). Osmer suggests that persons submit good reasons to support their assertions and recognize that all knowledge is perspectival and fallible. Knowledge is situated in a particular context and articulations of knowledge (theories) are approximations of truth, never truth itself. Theories are always open to reconsideration, adaptation, and rejection in favor of theories that more closely, or reasonably, approximate truth. It is incumbent upon the researcher to locate a theory within its broader disciplinary conversation and to appropriate the theory recognizing its perspectival and fallible nature, while appreciating the interpretation it offers. I have chosen to use Pierre Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology as a conversation partner, recognizing its perspectival and fallible characteristics, while appreciating its contribution to understanding social interaction.

However, Osmer critiques Habermas’ goal of consensus suggesting that “dissensus” is a legitimate outcome of rational communication.
Bourdieu’s Reflexive Sociology as a Conversation Partner

The following section presents my rationale for choosing Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology as a conversation partner. It locates Bourdieu within the discipline of sociology, provides an overview of his framework, and offers definitions of his key terms. Clarifying Bourdieu's theory provides conceptual handles for the reader to appreciate the strengths and limitations of this perspective.

Rationale for Utilizing Bourdieu

Utilizing a sociological theory as a conversation partner is not without its limitations. Cognate discipline selection, or social theory selection, involves choosing among a breadth of theorists based upon the researcher’s assessment of the viability of a theory as well as its usefulness or fit for the context of the research question. Pierre Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology was chosen because of his influence in late twentieth-century thought, his fit with the research question, and the clarity of his framework for engaging the topic.

Chapter 2 detailed Bourdieu’s significant impact well beyond his primary discipline. Bourdieu's contribution to sociology is difficult to overstate. His influence extended to other fields including anthropology, education, critical theory, literary criticism, art history, and media studies (Reed-Danahay, 2005). His work has also become influential in pastoral theology (Graham 2002; Ramsay, 2004; Lartey, 2006). By selecting Bourdieu, I position this dissertation within contemporary pastoral theological and sociological conversations.

A second rationale for choosing Bourdieu is the anticipated fit between his theory and the research question. I am exploring the intersection between life at a margin of social stratification, theological constructions of neighbor-love, and practices of care appropriate
to that margin. I resonate with Bourdieu’s attempt to navigate objectivist and subjectivist contributions to understanding social agents’ actions in the social world. Such an attempt preserves agency, while attending to structures that constrain agency. Bourdieu’s (1990a) notion of *habitus* locates social agents as “the practical operator(s) of the construction of objects” (p. 13). Thus, his theory enables us to attend both to structures that constrain persons, as well as to individual agency through action. Attending to this interplay between subjective and objective factors invites a more complete analysis that respects human freedom and responsibility while acknowledging systemic constraints.

A third rationale for choosing Bourdieu is the clarity of his social theory. Like many thinkers, Bourdieu continued to nuance his theory throughout his career. However, Bourdieu’s central concepts of distinction, field, capital and *habitus*, and symbolic capital/violence provide a clear and viable framework for examining social stratification and social action within social space. While Bourdieu’s theory is perspectival and fallible, it provides a viable and heuristic lens for the interpretive task that will follow. Prior to engaging in the interpretive task, I will locate Bourdieu within his discipline as well as outline his theory and define his terms.

**Locating Bourdieu Within Sociology**

In selecting Bourdieu’s theory as a cognate conversation partner I am arguing for the viability of his theory while also acknowledging its limits; it is both perspectival and fallible. His theory is situated in a broader conversation.

---

93 Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* and its impact on thinking about individual agency will be addressed below.

94 See Deborah Reed-Danahay’s *Locating Bourdieu* (2005) for a thorough treatment of Bourdieu’s background, career, and contributions to various disciplines. See also Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), Schusterman (1999), and Burawoy and Holdt (2012). These works provide a critical overview of Bourdieu.
Historically, sociology as a discipline evolves, and like every discipline, some theories hold influence in the field for a time to be later modified or rejected for other theories. Sometimes the evolution involves new perspectives on perennial questions of a field. One of the perpetual issues in sociology has been the tension between subjectivist theories that focus on the free choices of social agents, and objectivist theories that focus on the external structures governing social interaction. When Bourdieu began his research career in the 1960s, Jean Paul Sartre and Levi Strauss represented the subjectivist and objectivist poles of the sociological debate.

Bourdieu sought a way through the objectivist and subjectivist polarity in sociological analyses. He labeled his work “constructivist structuralism” or “structuralist constructivism” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 123). By the term “structuralism,” he attended to the objective pole within sociology represented largely by Levi-Strauss, who argued objective structures exist independent of the consciousness and desires of social agents. These structures exert influence on social agents (individuals) and are capable of guiding or constraining agents’ practices and representations. By “constructivism,” Bourdieu attended to the subjective pole within sociology represented by Jean-Paul Sartre. Bourdieu acknowledged the active role that social agents (individuals) have in reproducing, through action, the very structures of social stratification. Thus, Bourdieu argued that social action and social stratification are best understood by attending to the interaction between objective and subjective factors.

---

95 I read Bourdieu’s intentional transposition to indicate the mutual interplay between the objective and subjective positions. See Wacquant (1990) An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology chapter 1 and Reed-Danahay (2005) Locating Bourdieu p. 15ff. for an introduction to Bourdieu’s thought in late twentieth-century sociology dialogue.
Bourdieu sought a theoretical via media between the two camps in an effort to recognize both the objectivist and subjectivist contributions to social interaction. His theory accomplished this task by emphasizing social agent’s role as both inheritor and producer of external and internal structures. Bourdieu’s theory of social action rendered explicit the role of distinction in social stratification. Distinction, or difference, along with social space, social field, capital, and habitus are the key terms through which Bourdieu analyzed social actions and social stratification. These terms render explicit the structures, processes, and practices through which, according to Bourdieu, social stratification is produced and reproduced.

A second ongoing debate within sociology involves the metaphorical world a theory embraces. Is the social world viewed through competitive or collaborative lenses? Bourdieu (1990a), along with Karl Marx and others, viewed the social world as essentially a competitive environment in which individuals and groups struggle against each other for limited resources (p. 128; Wacquant, 1992, p. 12). In this view, the social world consists of the dominated and the dominators, oppressed and oppressors. This can be contrasted to social theorists who understand the social world as collaborative, functional, or neutral.

In the midst of these debates within sociology, Bourdieu advanced a theory that accounts for the way that social groups are produced and reproduced. Bourdieu contended that his reflexive sociology was the means by which one could apprehend the logic of social stratification and, through this understanding, have the means to remake the social world. In order to change the world, Bourdieu (1990a) argues, one has to understand the way the world is made; that is, the vision of the world and the practical operations by which groups are produced and reproduced (p. 137). If one can render explicit that which is implicit, or if
one can understand the means by which social stratification and oppression are produced and reproduced, then one potentially\textsuperscript{96} has the means to change the world. Hence, sociology according to Bourdieu gives tools to the dominated for their struggle (Sapirol, 2010, xix).\textsuperscript{97} Pastoral theologians benefit by using sociology as a critical conversation partner in their attempt to facilitate liberation and justice in a world marked by oppressive social stratification.

**Definitions**

Bourdieu uses the following key concepts to render explicit the means by which the social world is made: distinction, social space, field, capital, symbolic violence, and *habitus*. These terms are particularly important as they become the lens through which the themes, patterns, and dynamics from the descriptive task will be analyzed.

- **Distinction**: a difference, gap, or distinctive feature that exists only in relation to other properties. Persons exist through difference, i.e. to exist as an individual or group is to be different from other individuals or groups (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 9).

  Significantly, distinction, or the ability to appreciate, assign value, and classify difference is critical to the maintenance of social stratification.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{96} Bourdieu argues that change demands the price of political activation, meaning the work of group formation, motivation, and action. See Bourdieu (1998) *Practical Reason*, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{97} See Gisele Sapiro ed. (2010) *Sociology is a Marital Art: Political Writings by Pierre Bourdieu*. New York: The New Press. Bourdieu argued for a ‘scholarship with commitment’ against positions that understood scholarship as politically neutral. “By revealing the social mechanisms of domination, sociology plays a critical role and gives tools to the dominated for their struggle” (xix). Pastoral theologians with commitments to liberation and justice should use sociology as a critical cognate partner.

\textsuperscript{98} Bourdieu’s (1984) work *Distinction* makes this argument (pp. 1-7).
• Social Space is Bourdieu’s term for “class.” Social Space is a construct in which
distances are measured in terms of capital. Social space is measured in terms of
proximities and affinities, distances and incompatibilities. The greater the distance
in social space, the less likely persons are to recognize similarity and identify with
one another. The lesser the distance in social space, the more persons engage in
similar goals, values, strategies, and preferences and potentially identify with or
relate to one another (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 6).

• Social Field: a space of social interaction in which agents compete for various forms
of capital (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 88). Each field has its own rules, roles, goals, stakes,
and strategies. Difference associated with social fields will be significant to this
dissertation because a field’s rules, roles, goals, stakes, and strategies frame the
context in which actions are performed.

---

99 Bourdieu’s four forms of capital will be discussed below. Social space is closely
correlated with a person’s access to and accumulation of material and cultural capital.

100 Any construction of class depends upon the criteria of classification employed by
the classifier. This construction is based on difference, or distance, between persons
measured by the criteria of the classifier. However, since the classifier does not exist in a
vacuum, he or she is also influenced by the very structures that guide and constrain
practices and representations. Hence, attention to social space as construction is critical.

Social space is constructed based primarily on two principles of differentiation:
difference in accumulation of economic capital and difference in composition of cultural
capital. Bourdieu (1998) argues that the structure of the distributions of the kinds of
capital (economic, cultural, social and symbolic), which vary from context to context, are
the organizing principle behind social stratification (p. 32).

101 Each field has its own goals, rules, and stakes. What is at stake or that which is
desired in any given field is capital. Further, various forms of capital are active and
appreciated in some fields but not in others. This is most obvious when forms of social
capital (e.g. name dropping or indications of belonging to a group) have no value in a
particular field, whereas in another field this action would open access to other forms of
capital.
Bourdieu (1990) uses the metaphor of “game” to enliven the concept of field (p. 11). Just as different games have different goals, rules, and values (e.g. golf, football, tennis, baseball, etc.), likewise fields follow their own rules, values, and goals. Just as a football game exists independent of a tennis match, likewise fields exist independently. The metaphor reaches its limit in that while a person can be a football player and a tennis player, it is unlikely the person will be playing both at the same time; with the concept of field, persons are always participating in multiple fields—playing multiple games concurrently.

• Capital: accumulated labor that enables agents to appropriate social energy (power) in the form of “reified” or "living labor." Capital takes time and energy to accumulate and is appropriated by agents participating in social fields to obtain the desired goals or stakes in a given field, resulting in more accumulation of capital. Bourdieu (1986) describes capital in three “fundamental” forms: economic, cultural, and social (p. 243).\footnote{These three forms of accumulated labor can be converted from one form to another. However, the efficiency of conversion depends upon the social field in which the conversion takes place; the respective forms of capital must be recognized and valued in the field in order for conversion to take place. Bourdieu conceded that all the forms have economic capital at their root, i.e. every field’s preferred mode of capital can be reduced, or converted, to economics. However, to simply reduce all forms of capital to economics misses the role that cultural and social capital play in both efficiency of conversion and social stratification. In short, access to cultural and social capital predisposes agents to accumulate economic capital with less time and cost. In other words, though capital can be reduced to economics in the final analysis, agents with social and cultural capital possess conversion engines that maximize efficient conversion, thus ensuring the conservation and reification of social stratification.}

  o Economic Capital is accumulated labor that can be immediately and directly converted to money, e.g. property rights, material goods.
Cultural Capital is accumulated labor that is not directly convertible into money but that positions persons in social fields to access and accumulate economic capital more readily, e.g. educational degrees, certifications, technical and non-technical skills (gait, posture, accent, embodiment). This form of capital is closely identified with *habitus*—internalized schema of preferences.

Social Capital is accumulated labor in the form of access to a durable network of mutual acquaintance and recognition—membership in a group that affords access to accumulated economic and cultural capital to its members.

- Symbolic Capital and Symbolic Violence: Bourdieu adds a fourth form of capital in his discussion of symbolic violence.
  - Symbolic Capital: the power to name, to be respected, and to be heard. The power to establish normative definitions. Groups compete and struggle for symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1990a, p. 135).
  - Symbolic Violence: represents the loss of the contingent nature of knowledge. Symbolic violence occurs as structures of difference, logic, and value (structures resulting from a struggle) take on normative or "taken for

---

103 Cultural capital exists in three forms: embodied, objectified, and institutionalized. Cultural capital in its embodied state becomes a *habitus*. It becomes an unconsciously embodied form of accumulated labor that results in a durable system of preferences, predispositions, and perspectives of seeing and acting in the social world. Thus, cultural capital, via *habitus*, gets misrecognized as an innate property or character of the individual or group when in fact it is transmitted through the family of origin or through prolonged association with a group with accumulated cultural capital.

104 For Bourdieu, group struggles are symbolic. They involve the struggle over the power to name, to be respected, and to be heard. Bourdieu emphasizes symbolic capital’s ability to name and create the very structures that govern social organization. This leads to Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic violence.
granted” status within a culture.

Symbolic violence is related to Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic capital. Bourdieu contends that symbolic violence occurs as one perspective becomes the dominant or normative perspective while the other perspective becomes abnormal, deviant, or distasteful. According to the logic of symbolic violence, the contingent nature of the perspective is lost as it takes on normative status. “Thus, dominated lifestyles are perceived, even by those who live them, from a destructive and reductive point of view” (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 9).

- **Habitus:** a socially acquired internalized schema of preferences—a system of dispositions, worldview, acquired schemes of perception and classification as to what is preferred. *Habitus* is closely correlated with cultural capital, as it is most often internalized cultural capital that grants perception of social fields with their respective goals, roles, rules, and strategies (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 1-7; 1990a, 13).

While *habitus* is an internalized structure granting a perception of the social world,

---

105 If one's *habitus* does not include a feel for a particular game, one will likely see the competition as absurd, or might not even be able to recognize that a game is taking place—in that one is unable to recognize the stakes, rules, roles, and strategies being played out before one. *Habitus* provides people with a “commonsense” perspective of the social space in which they act.

*Habitus* is helpful for understanding how social stratification perpetuates itself. Bourdieu’s analysis suggests that cultural practices and preferences (in food, clothing, entertainment, language, etc.) are closely linked to educational level and social origin. The social hierarchy of taste corresponds to the social hierarchy of consumers, predisposing taste to function as a marker of class. Bourdieu (1984) argues that preferences, or tastes, are socially constructed, communicated through *habitus*, and serve to fulfill a social function of legitimating social differences (p. 7).
it is not a determinative structure. As stated above, habitus is dispositional in that it prescribes a realm of potentialities, or options for action, within a given social interaction. Habitus performs a guiding or constraining function without depriving agency. Bourdieu (1990a) contends that, “Constructing the notion of habitus as a system of acquired dispositions functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment or as classificatory principles as well as being the organizing principles of action meant constituting the social agent in his (sic) true role as the practical operator of the construction of objects” (p. 13). Far from depriving agency, this relational understanding locates social agents in their “true role” as co-constructors of the world. They are not “free” constructors (subjectivist pole) nor are they determined machines (objectivist pole); rather, they act within a realm of possibilities furnished to them via a habitus that is socially transmitted through education, family of origin, and social location. As agents act according to the realm of possibilities furnished them via habitus, they re-present themselves within the social structure that then reifies the social structure.

Bourdieu’s key terms provide a clear heuristic framework by which I conduct a sociological analysis of the patterns, trends, and themes articulated in the descriptive task.

The Interpretive Task: Utilizing Bourdieu’s Key Terms to Interpret Descriptive Themes

In the following section, I utilize Bourdieu’s framework to examine, expand, and explain the three themes arising from the descriptive task. First, I will present how Bourdieu’s notion of distinction, social space, and physical space engage the mission
district as a context containing multiple social fields. I will then utilize Bourdieu’s concepts of social field, capital, and habitus to expand and explain the three themes arising from the descriptive task. Bourdieu’s theory develops thicker appreciation of the interviewees’ experiences from a sociological perspective. This section offers pastoral theology a model for an appropriation of social theory as a dialogue partner.

**Distinction, Social Space, and Physical Space**

In the introduction, I named my initial experiences in ministry as a mission director and pastor of a church serving persons who experienced economic and educational deprivation. I named a sense of disorientation; my worldview, preferences, logic, and values seemed ill fitted to those demonstrated by the persons I served. Bourdieu’s concept of distinction, or a gap, provides a sociological frame for the sense of disorientation and “ill-fittedeness” between my own tastes, values, and rules by which I navigated social interaction and the tastes, values, and rules of social interaction demonstrated by the persons I served. A gap exists between persons who dwell in distinct stratified social spaces.

Noting the gap, or distinction, between persons existing in social space provides an opening for sociological analysis. When social agents perceive different games, have different goals, and employ different strategies which are confusing to social agents dwelling in another social space, then the table is set to explore difference. Bourdieu argues that this gap is most apparent between persons who exist in different stratified social spaces. This argument raises the question of the construction of social space.

Bourdieu understood social space as a sociological construct based on similarities in accumulation and composition of economic and cultural capital. Because of the question
this study addresses, it was necessary to construct a class. The inclusion criteria for this study were based on Bourdieu's definition of social space or class. I selected potential interviewees who experienced a family of origin income of less than the poverty level for that time period and who had not lived above the poverty level for a 12-month period since leaving their family of origin. Thus, difference associated with economic capital was a primary consideration. Second, I selected potential interviewees who experienced a family of origin in which the parents had not encountered formal education beyond the 12th grade and who had themselves not experienced a formal education beyond the 12th grade. Thus, difference associated with cultural capital was considered. Given Bourdieu's theory, these two structural classificatory criteria constitute a legitimate articulation of class, or social space, on paper. However, Bourdieu also suggested social space should account for the change in economic and cultural capital over time. That is to say, social space also includes a trajectory manifested by past and potential accumulation and composition of capital. In predictive terms, one could anticipate the trajectory, or movement in social space, of the interviewees by noting past accumulation of various forms of capital. Hence persons occupying similar social space are more likely to follow similar trajectories and potentially, with political activation, could constitute a class (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 110). Given these factors, according to Bourdieu’s logic, the interviewees should occupy similar social space, i.e. the interviewees constitute a potential class.

I constructed a social space, or potential class, for the purposes of this research project in order to attend to distinctions between my own social space and that of the research participants who engaged in services in the mission context. The criteria for the project excluded persons receiving services from the missions who, through past
accumulation of cultural (educational) capital and economic capital, could be viewed as having participated in a different social space. My goal was to define a social space that attended to persons who experience marginalization through inter-generational lack of economic and cultural capital.

Bourdieu argued that social space and physical space are related. When one constructs a social space determined by accumulated economic and cultural capital, one would expect to find social spatial stratification associated with that social space. I would argue that the mission context is an example of this relationship.

This research project invited my participation in a social space affiliated with a physical space. Bourdieu wrote about the relation between social space and physical space. In *Site Effects* (1999) Bourdieu describes the relation between social space and physical space as “fuzzy,” i.e. it does not represent a direct correlation. However, there is a relation between embodied social agents and the physical sites they occupy that corresponds to the social space in which they act. The volume and type of capital humans possess influences both the social space and the physical space they occupy. The various relationships between forms of capital correlate with positions in the spatial world, i.e. access to and accumulation of capital structures living space. Capital grants persons the ability to position themselves in the physical world in close proximity to others with similar capital, or to distance themselves from undesirable social and physical space (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 126).

It is this distancing ability that I wish to highlight here. Persons with enough accumulation and composition of capital are able to navigate and appropriate physical space, create distance; whereas, lack of capital decreases the ability to select and navigate
physical space. Bourdieu (1999) writes “lack of capital intensifies the experience of finitude; it chains one to a place” (p. 127). The ability to navigate and appropriate location, or physical space, becomes a means for demonstrating difference and, through that demonstration, reify external and internalized social stratification. Conversely, the inability to navigate and appropriate physical space becomes a sign of dispossession, deviance, being dominated. Given this understanding of the spatial world, one would expect to find stratified living conditions within the social world.

The mission district models this social stratification. Social space marked by low accumulation and composition of capital correlates to a physical space of dispossession. East Lancaster is a region dispossessed of preferred forms of capital evidenced by the absence of industry, job opportunities, or day labor, the absence of grocery stores or retail stores (with the exception of a liquor store), and the presence of homelessness and criminal activity, i.e. fraud, drug use and trade, theft, and violence. While persons with higher accumulation and composition of capital have little probability of dwelling or interacting in this location, persons dispossessed of capital have little probability of leaving the location: they are chained to a place.

Bourdieu’s analysis focuses attention on the ways that social space (determined by accumulated economic and cultural capital) invites participation in physical space (the mission context and East Lancaster area) in which certain social fields are active. Here we should remember that social fields are composed of social interactions constituted by their own rules, goals, and active forms of capital and are engaged via habitus. Bourdieu (1984) offered a formulaic understanding of his theory of social action: (capital) (habitus) + social field = practice (p. 101). Social actions or practices can be understood by examining the
social fields in play and how social agents within those fields combine their *habitus* with the capital they can activate. However, discovering the social fields in play depends greatly on the ability to perceive the presence of a structure with defined goals, rules, and strategies, a structure that may remain invisible and inactive to a person not immersed in that *habitus*. Therefore, the researcher remains somewhat of a sojourner in an unfamiliar land, dependent upon residents to acquaint him/her with the goals (forms of capital), rules, and strategies being played out.\footnote{A comprehensive analysis of the multiple social fields present in the context is beyond the scope of this dissertation, as each interaction could theoretically be correlated with multiple social fields. For example, each service area within the mission could be analyzed as a distinct social field: clothing distribution, cafeteria, dispensary—each interaction containing its own rules, stakes, goals, etc. Further, interactions outside the mission context involve multiple fields—interactions with government/state authorities, interactions with other homeless persons, interactions with persons who have access to accumulated economic, cultural and social capital—each interaction having its own rules, stakes, goals. Given the numerous potential social fields in play within the context, it becomes important to limit the description of social fields, knowing that, by limiting the focus, we are excluding some interactions that could yield valuable insights for pastoral care.}

In the following section I use Bourdieu’s concepts of social field, forms of capital, and *habitus* to examine, explain, and expand the rhythms of daily living. This analysis then informs the engagement of the final two themes: challenges and obstacles, and preferences for care.

**Rhythms of Daily Living**

In this section I utilize Bourdieu’s social field, capital, and *habitus* to interpret the first theme that emerged from the interviews, the rhythms associated with sheltered and non-sheltered living. As noted above, the social space under consideration is a theoretical construct created in terms of accumulations of economic and cultural capital, defined by a dominant discourse of cash income below the poverty line and an educational level at or
below the high school equivalent. Within this social space, Bourdieu’s framework would anticipate multiple social fields functioning, various levels and accumulations of capital, and a *habitus* produced both by the social context and reproduced through interviewees’ actions.

**Social field**

The first concept under consideration is social field. Bourdieu suggested that social fields correspond to social space. Each field contains social forces or powers, discourses and histories that are active in the social field under consideration. Social agents perceive the field in play and act in concert with the goals/stakes, rules, roles, and strategies appropriate for that field. A field is defined by the goals, roles, rules, and strategies it contains.\(^{107}\) Therefore, it is appropriate to attend to the goals, roles, rules and strategies articulated by the interviewees in relation to the rhythms of sheltered and unsheltered living.

**Goals associated with daily living**

The participants named key goals associated with non-sheltered living. The goals could be grouped under the heading “survival.” Expressed goals included accessing food, clothing, and shelter, occupying time, keeping safe and keeping an eye on improvement. Some of the goals recurred on a daily basis: food, shelter, occupying time, and keeping safe; others were intermittent: securing clothing, searching for employment, and long-term

\(^{107}\) For example, tennis is defined by a court, racket, ball, net, and a set of rules and strategies contained within the game that is tennis.
shelter arrangements. The interviewees described the pace associated with the rhythm of securing these daily and intermittent goals as exhausting.

*Roles associated with daily living*

The interviewees described their roles primarily in dependent positions in this field. They viewed themselves as dependent upon the mission, the government, or the benevolence of others to meet their daily goals. Their relation to others with power was often expressed in the use of the pronoun “they” or “them” to signify those in power in statements: “They will let you in when they are ready,” “They don’t give out the clothes fairly,” “They have plenty of drinks back there. They just don’t want to bring them out.” These statements indicate the dependent position in which the interviewees primarily see themselves. Even as the participants expressed initiative in seeking out help, aide, and self-improvement, the initiative is couched in dependence upon the provision and services of others.

One way of perceiving roles in the social field involves looking at the significant relationships interviewees described in the rhythms of living. The relationships named in this field include relating to other homeless persons, relating to family, relating to persons

---

108 Five of the six interviewees placed finding employment or making money as a key goal. Four of the six interviewees named securing long-term shelter as a goal. The individual who did not name employment as a goal was relying on her husband for income and was hoping for SSDI approval. The interviewees who did not name long-term shelter as a goal differed: one suggested the homeless lifestyle should be seen as an acceptable lifestyle, the other found that her subsidized apartment provided an element of security and “forced boundaries” that she was concerned would be lacking outside of a women’s shelter.

109 The one-sided lack of economic, cultural, and social capital in the interaction clearly positions the recipients of goods and services as dependent.
with capital, relating to the mission, and relating to the state.\textsuperscript{110} In the first relationship, other homeless persons are largely seen as competitors (although some of the women named other homeless persons as collaborators) in the pursuit of food, shelter, and occupying time. Participants described familial relationships as “strained.” The participants indicated that, had family relationships been good, they would not be experiencing homelessness. The interviewees perceived their relationship to persons with capital (that is, persons who dwelt in another social space) as tension-filled since those persons appeared to exhibit disdain or judgment toward homeless persons. The relationship to the mission and other providers was largely described as “power under” as indicated by the various accounts of feeling powerless to influence policy and procedure or nurture change in the missions or government service agency.\textsuperscript{111} In sum, the interviewees' descriptions of their roles within this social field involve dependence, isolation, and reduced power.

\textit{Rules associated with daily living}

Participants expressed various understandings of rules or guidelines associated with the non-sheltered social field. However, a key rule involves keeping yourself safe, or stated differently, maintaining a vigilant stance being ready to protect yourself, your stuff, and your image. Participants unanimously described their location or context as one in which violence was a regular and expected possibility. Persons in this context described needing a readiness to become verbally or physically aggressive in order to protect their

\textsuperscript{110} When speaking of the “state,” I refer to representatives of local, state, and federal government services.

\textsuperscript{111} Bourdieu equated capital to power. That is to say, capital is a form of power. Therefore, persons with little capital wield little power in social interactions between distinct social spaces.
person or possessions. Protecting one’s image or not being made a “punk,” or a “target,” or one who can just be “walked over” correlated with concerns over future struggles or safety. Another parameter of non-sheltered living involves the lack of a protective state presence. Authorities, such as police and city workers, were viewed as a threat rather than a protective presence. Thus, participants understood that they were responsible for their personal and material protection. In other words, one overarching rule, or guideline, in this social field is the awareness that one is responsible for one’s survival.112

**Strategies associated with daily living**

The interviewees expressed an ultimate awareness of being very much on their own. Even while in relationship with the mission and service resources, persons still articulated a sense of being isolated and vulnerable. Strategies to deal with the vulnerability associated with this social space in this social field varied between participants. Some examples include strategies of hyper-isolation, strategies of relation, access strategies, and strategies of subterfuge.113 While participant’s strategies varied, the goals or stakes within the social field consistently focused on daily survival. Daily survival

---

112 This appears to be a paradox of the social field. On the one hand persons largely occupy dependent roles in the field (they are dependent upon others for their daily survival); on the other hand, they are individually responsible for their welfare (they cannot depend on others to protect them or assure their safety). Thus, participants are both isolated (related to their safety and individual responsibility to access provided services) and dependent (they do not have sufficient accumulated capital to access their daily needs apart from mission/government assistance).

113 The participants gave several examples of strategies utilized in the field. The men described isolation strategies, e.g. keeping to oneself, not making friends, minding your own business, while the women named more relational strategies, e.g. making friends, making sure you were with someone (walking as a group, or partnering with a male for protection). All named the necessity of access strategies e.g. developing the knowledge base and skill set to access food, shelter, clothing, and medical needs. Finally, several noted the necessity of “not looking homeless” or the art of “passing.”
in this social space involves goals, roles, rules, and strategies informed by vulnerability, dependence (correlated with low accumulation of capital), and isolation.

Bourdieu offered a formulaic understanding of his theory: practice = (capital) (habitus) + field. In order to understand practice, one has to have a sense of the capital involved in social action, the habitus involved in social action, and the field in which the social action takes place. We have seen that the field described by the participants is violent, individualistic, power-laden, and focused on daily survival. Thus, we have a sense of the field in which the rhythm of daily living for homeless persons takes place. We can now turn to forms of capital within this field.

**Forms of capital associated with daily living**

As described above, Bourdieu described capital in four forms. I will address the first three forms as they relate to the interviewees’ rhythms of daily living.

**Material capital**

First, capital in material form or access to accumulated labor that is readily converted into money was markedly diminished among the participants. Two of the six participants had access to a bank account and the ability to save money, while the other participants had no accumulated money or means to safely store saved money. For four of the participants, material capital, defined as money, had little function in this field except as a marker of deprivation. However, economic capital (as accumulated labor) in forms other than money function in this field.

---

114 Two interviewees were fully employed. One person was responsible for herself—she was actively saving money. The other person supported his children and their mother, leaving fifty dollars for food every two weeks after paying basic expenses.
Participants described economic capital in terms of having access to goods like food, clothing, and shelter instead of money. Persons used goods to barter for other goods. However, participants’ desire for a job in order to make money indicates that the formal definition was latent though not operative in daily social action. The interviewees’ use of economic capital stretches Bourdieu’s definition as food, clothing, and shelter are not easily, readily, or immediately convertible to money. The field lacks access to money as a form of capital; however, these goods do function in this social field as economic capital. Further, the field developed conversion strategies consistent with a different economy.

**Cultural capital**

Cultural capital, as it relates to homelessness, included knowledge or skill sets related to accessing or creating shelter, e.g. knowing good camp sites, knowing how to build a shelter, knowing how to recognize usable resources such as good cardboard. Another expression of cultural capital involves prestige associated with previous success negotiating struggles in the field. As discussed above, this field is violent, individualistic, power laden, and focused on daily survival. Persons who have developed skills in surviving, protecting themselves, their property, and their reputation within the field accumulate sums of cultural capital. This capital may be embodied through gait, speech patterns, posture, bodily presentation, etc. Further expressions of cultural capital include the skill set of knowing how to access local and state resources, how to get the most out of a visit, and how to bypass waits, lines, and red tape—or knowing how to get someone to bypass it for you. Though no certification exists for this specialized knowledge, it is a form of cultural capital active in this social field.
Social capital

Social capital in the rhythm of sheltered and non-sheltered living can be understood in at least two ways. Classically expressed, social capital identifies one as belonging to a group. Activating social capital brings the influence and combined accumulated capital of the group to function on behalf of the one activating social capital. In this first sense, the social capital active in this social field is negligible in terms of power to convert time, labor, or energy into money. However, there is a second sense in which social capital, belonging to a homeless group, is active and effective in this social field. Embodied cultural capital is enacted through social interaction which identifies one as belonging to the group and in some cases motivates the group to action on behalf of the individual, e.g. being known and liked, or having friends, invites others to guard or stick up for an individual; or, having cultural capital in the form of skill sets and knowledge sets activates the accumulated capital of the mission district. Thus, social capital is active but functions from the underside.

Symbolic capital

Symbolic capital in this field is a little more difficult to describe since symbolic capital operates between social spaces. Symbolic capital involves the struggle and the power to establish normativity. In the field of the rhythm of homelessness, there appear to be multiple discourses of normativity. However, there is an overriding discourse that defines homeless existence as less than, abnormal, deviant. But within the field of homelessness, there appears to be a struggle for symbolic capital. Bourdieu described symbolic capital in terms of struggle between groups to establish normativity. Each of the participants named this struggle. A consistent complaint raised from the interviewees
involved the perception of being judged as somehow deserving their situation. They resisted the judgment by describing their unique histories and challenges that resulted in their situation, e.g. family troubles, physical limitations, losing a job, problems in school. They resisted being labeled as criminal, crazy, or lazy and expressed a common desire for others to stop assuming knowledge of their situation. Beth passionately argued that persons should walk for a month in her shoes. She suggested, “then they’d see things differently.” Anne echoed this response by requesting persons stop assuming all homeless people are the same and treat each person with dignity. Frank wondered aloud about who gets to decide what is normal and what is abnormal as it relates to homelessness. Eric wondered how the “urban progress” was making it hard for him to live in his situation. Each of the above comments could be viewed as a struggle for symbolic capital.

Participants in the study articulated a desire to have their voice heard, to have their perspective valued. They named how their life was viewed as abnormal, or deviant, and resisted this view. However, the dominant viewpoint continues to impact their self-image as evidenced by the presence of their protest.

**Habitus**

Having examined the social field and forms of capital in this social space, let us now turn to *habitus*. *Habitus* is the internalized schema of dispositions and preferences through which persons perceive the social world and by which they act in the social world. *Habitus* and cultural capital are related. If cultural capital includes not only education but acquired skill sets unique to a given habitat (the skill sets of protecting oneself and goods, acquiring desired goods in the homeless context, negotiating risk), then habitat (social space, social
field, relation to capital) structures *habitus* and social agents structure the habitat via *habitus*. So the question remains, how might *habitus* engage the rhythm of non-sheltered living, or stated differently, how is the rhythm of non-sheltered living structured by *habitus*?

The social space constructed in order to attend to the experiences of inter-generationally poor and undereducated persons contains a field of social forces that operate under their own logic. This logic must account for scarce resources, a competitive and violent context, negotiating interaction with other social spaces (encounters with employed, educated persons, state authorities, etc.), positions of power under, and symbolic violence. If these social structures are internalized into a schema of perceiving, valuing, and acting within the social world, then what might be the result? What would one expect to see? What actions might one anticipate? What possibilities might one hope for?

Participants perceived the world as a hostile place, a place of limited resources for which persons compete. This perception facilitates suspicion toward others as competitors, or as dominators (persons with access to needed resources refusing to grant access to others). Such a perception, internalized as *habitus*, invites persons to attend to their own needs or perspectives rather than focusing on others.\(^{115}\) Such a *habitus* positions people to have a survival mentality with a focus on the moment. This focus invites a narrow window of possibilities or options for the future. Finally, such a *habitus*, when placed in relation to a dominant discourse, invites persons to view themselves as deviant.

\(^{115}\) However, there are exceptions within this *habitus*. Derrick viewed his role as being the protector of others, “using his body as a shield” as a strategy to protect the vulnerable. However, this strategy was not present when he was homeless; once sheltered, his role or job invited this strategy for him. Gender provided an exception to this strategy of self-focus. Women participants noted a strategy of caring for others or a focus on the collective, helping ensure personal safety and survival.
If Bourdieu’s formula is viable, then having described the social field, analyzed the forms of capital active in the field and the function of *habitus* within the field, we should be able to understand and predict social interaction and or individual actions within the field. We’ve identified a social field within this social space that could be named a “Survival Field.” Within this field, persons compete for limited resources needed for daily survival. Persons occupy different roles and use various strategies within the “survival field” that correlate with other identity markers (gender, history, embodiment, race) while the basic goal of survival remains. While we would expect to find a “lack” of accumulated capital within this field, what we actually find is not a lack of capital, but alternate forms of capital not recognized as such by the dominating discourse. The participants in the field readily recognize these forms of capital, and such capital functions to augment power within the field. Power is not absent among the dependent, survival-oriented, dominated group; rather, power is exchanged both within the social space and between social spaces in ways that may, or may not, be recognized by the dominant group. The participants internalize, or have inscribed upon them, the structure of the survival field and forms of capital/power active in the field which forms a *habitus* through which participants act in ways that are distinct from persons participating in different social fields, with different accumulations and understandings of capital. Hence, Bourdieu’s formula offers more than the ability to understand and predict social behavior. It highlights the contours of a distinct

---

116 Examples of internal power exchanges include the deference made to persons exhibiting high volumes of cultural capital (street savvy, local knowledge of resources, etc.) This alternately defined form of cultural capital is recognized and engaged as power within the group. External power exchanges include forms of protest, or challenges to the service providers, related to policy, procedure or implementation of service actions, e.g. protesting clothing distribution, protesting judgmental attitudes, protesting access restrictions.
subculture associated with the rhythm of homelessness that exist in a dominant culture that perceives the world differently.

The following two sections address challenges and obstacles, and preferences for care arising from the descriptive task. The above descriptions of social field, capital, and *habitus* associated with the rhythm of daily living inform the engagement.

**Challenges and Obstacles**

The second theme that emerges from the interviews involved descriptions of challenges and obstacles the interviewees encountered. I divided the theme into two categories. The first category included challenges and obstacles related to food, shelter, clothing, transportation, and earning potential, which I termed “material obstacles.” The second category involved challenges to person’s self-image, agency, and hopes—the participants named fear, dehumanizing judgments, and an awareness of being “abnormal.” I termed the second category “spiritual obstacles,” as the theme involved challenges to the spirit of the participants.\(^{117}\) The challenges and obstacles involve resistance to the pursuit of the participant’s goals. I’ve argued above that the goals perceived by the participants partially constitute (along with rules, roles, and strategies) a social field I’ve termed the “survival field.” The material and spiritual obstacles articulated by the participants correlate to the goals particular to the survival field and are complicated by the context in which the social field is played. In the following section, I engage the material and spiritual

---

\(^{117}\) I am not intending to enter into a prolonged discussion on what constitutes “spiritual” or “psychological.” I chose the term spiritual intending to call to mind images of purpose, peace, hope, identity, and meaning-making. As a Christian pastoral theologian, I locate purpose, peace, hope, identity, and meaning-making in relationship to a Christian understanding of the Triune God. Hence, “spiritual” rather than “psychological” better carries the content I wish to convey.
obstacles by analyzing the context in which the social field takes place and the function of capital within the obstacles.

Violence and crime are key complicating factors contributing to the difficulty in accessing and maintaining material goods within this context. Participants named both the temptation and threat of violence and crime. The temptation for some of the participants was to use criminal activity to access material capital and goods. The threat within the social field comes from either being victimized by violence or criminal activity, e.g. being assaulted, robbed, being made the “fall guy” for participating in a scam, or being treated as a criminal by proxy. The presence of violence and crime informs the strategies participants implement in the pursuit of material goods. Derrick named a “looking in looking out” perspective by which he indicated how the strategies changed according to whether one was inside the mission or outside the gate. While inside the mission, the presence of security measures (metal detectors and security personnel), resource staff (caseworkers, mission staff, hospital liaisons), the structure of the mission (behavioral rules, program participation), and the power to exclude (banning persons from the mission) changed the strategies for personal safety, accessing goods, and negotiating conflict. When outside the mission, persons were more vigilant and aware of the potential for violence and increased vulnerability.

Strategies for negotiating violence and vulnerability varied according to gender among the participants. Women in this study named a strategy of either being paired with a man, or being grouped with others in order to resist being victimized. However, even with this strategy, the women named the necessity of being able to “call up” physically and verbally aggressive behaviors in order to protect themselves and their goods. The men in
this study did not articulate a strategy of collaboration or pairing with others. Their strategies included being ready to fight, minding your own business, and keeping to yourself in order to maintain physical and material safety. Despite the difference in strategies, all the participants named the complicating presence of violence and criminal activity in their pursuit of material capital within the survival field. This context provides a backdrop in which the participants experience material and spiritual obstacles.

The forms capital takes within the social field also complicates the obstacles and challenges articulated by the participants. Though the presence of economic capital, specifically money, is scarce, participants engaged in other forms of economic exchange. Participants named a barter economy within the mission in which goods served as currency, e.g. exchanging goods, foods, medicine, bus passes, etc. for desired goods or favors. Knowledge as cultural capital was key to this barter exchange, i.e. having the knowledge or skill set to know who needs to be approached and how they need to be approached, in order to get what you need. Further, this skill set could be classified as relational, qualifying it as a form of social capital—having relational access to a person who has access to desired goods and services. It appears that economic, cultural, and social capital are active within this marginalized social space and that persons within this space activate various forms of capital within their social interactions in order to overcome material obstacles and challenges. However, the forms of capital within this social field are defined differently than that of the dominant social field. This brings us to the function of symbolic capital within the field and its contribution to the experience of spiritual obstacles.
Symbolic capital involves the power to establish normative definitions. Symbolic capital, in its accumulated form, correlates with the dominating group in social interaction. Therefore, the normative definitions of capital in all its forms and the most efficient conversion engines of capital are established by the dominant group. Symbolic violence occurs as the contingent nature of the struggle to define is “misrecognized” by both the dominating and the dominated group as “natural” or “taken for granted” status.

The social structures in which the interviewees participate operate with symbolic power. That is, the participants dwell in a social space that the dominating social space has labeled deviant or abnormal. Bourdieu argues that symbolic violence is a kind of violence which is misrecognized as such, and therefore accepted by the dominated because they share the dominant representations and categories of thinking that are inculcated through the educational system and the media. The interviewees named the perception of being judged, being treated differently, knowing that they were outside normal. Frank named the social stigma associated with homelessness as “being no better than a street dog.” All the interviewees described experiences of being stigmatized or being seen as abnormal. The definition of normal, or to use Bourdieu’s term, the symbolic value of normal includes having accumulated economic and “approved” forms of cultural capital that the interviewees did not have. The difference in accumulation and definition of capital marks the participants as deviant and devalued by the dominating discourse. The message of devaluation contributes to the spiritual obstacles named by the participants.

If we return to Bourdieu’s formula, practice=(habitus)(capital) + field, the following logic is apparent. Participants have internalized within their minds and inscribed upon their bodies a perception of social fields and the cultural capital (skill sets) as well as a set
of preferences that allow them to negotiate this particular field and this results in sets of observable practices. The obstacles and challenges they face coincide with the goals they perceive within the social field in which they are engaged. Their actions and strategies, while effective for negotiating survival in the survival field, are labeled deviant by the dominating discourse, and this results in participants internalizing concepts of deficiency, powerlessness, and despair.

The remaining term to be fleshed out in this equation is *habitus*. If *habitus* is the internalized structure of a social space and with it, an internalized set of dispositions, a way of perceiving and pursuing goals within the social field, then the interviewees’ *habitus* could be described in the following ways. The interviewees have internalized a day-to-day orientation, perceived scarcity, functional dependence, and decreased power in relation to the dominant group. In sum, the interviewees’ *habitus* could be construed as one of decreased power and limited agency related to an inability to accumulate enough economic and cultural capital to change their relation to the mission, or to society, resulting in continued vulnerability and dependence. Thus, the interviewees re-construct relations of vulnerability and dependence via their *habitus*.

The internalized structure of vulnerability and dependence contributes to the spiritual challenge of fear and uncertainty. Bourdieu addressed the presence of fear and uncertainty associated with “employment insecurity” suggesting that fear and insecurity is a “main consequence” to a chronically unstable system containing persons with no employment prospects, no future, and no plans (Sapiro, 2010, 191ff). While Bourdieu’s argument is directed toward the logic of multi-national corporations who offer no security to their employees, which results in a chronically unstable system, the parallels to the
obstacles faced by homeless persons are apparent. The interviewees’ context is one of chronic instability. The day-to-day orientation toward obtaining food, shelter, and clothing produces an immediate and legitimate concern for deprivation. Further, the reliance on others for daily provisions (whether a mission, a stranger—pan-handling, or a state representative—case worker) places persons in a vulnerable position, constantly relying on “them” for daily sustenance. In the midst of this rhythm of moving from provider to provider, from agency to agency, which the participants described as an exhausting, hurried pace, establishing a plan or a future orientation is difficult. Living within chronically unstable social structures results in fear, feelings of insecurity, and vulnerability, the very spiritual obstacles named by the participants. These relations are internalized as *habitus*.

The challenges and obstacles faced by the research participants are at least partly created by the actions of the participants when combined with the lack of socially sanctioned capital and the social fields or habitat in which the participants exist. That is to say, a now-orientation combined with the inability to accumulate acceptable capital in sufficient quantities to create physical and psychological space to attend to a future orientation with concomitant plans to accumulate sufficient capital that enables movement out of the rhythm of homelessness predisposes participants to actions that reify their current social location. To be sure, there are complicating factors outside the realm of action of the participants, e.g. social structures, physical and educational limitations, and environmental factors (beginning in a social space predisposed to vulnerability). However, the combination of *habitus*, capital, and context predisposes the participants to actions that render continued vulnerability and dependence upon institutional assistance.
Bourdieu’s analysis of practice, *habitus*, capital, and social field has been criticized as being deterministic (Wacquant, 1992, p. 132).\(^{118}\) That is to say, *habitus* is received, or inscribed upon persons, but persons also reify or reconstruct their *habitus* through action. The deterministic charge focuses on the circular mutual interplay between external social structures, internalized social structures (*habitus*), and social agents’ actions. Bourdieu resisted this charge by re-emphasizing social agents’ role in constructing social structures through action. Bourdieu argues that if agents are made aware of the means of social stratification—the influence of *habitus* upon perception of the social world, strategies for engaging the social world, and actions within the social world—agents have the ability, through action, to reconstruct *habitus*, and through this reconstruction, to change their relations to the structures with which they participate.

A limitation of Bourdieu’s analysis arises as the structures themselves are unchallenged (Von Holdt, 2012, p. 149).\(^{119}\) His analysis encourages social agents to attend to the ways in which social structures are inscribed via *habitus* and note the ways in which *habitus*-informed action perpetuates social vulnerability, decreased access to socially sanctioned capital, and constrains future trajectories and possibilities. A solution that arises from the analysis would encourage social agents to nurture a new *habitus* via

---

\(^{118}\) Wacquant details the arguments of several of Bourdieu’s critics. Gartman (1992), Giroux (1982), and Jenkins (1982) suggest *habitus* in fact reinforces determinism and “smothers” the possibility for change. Bourdieu (1992) responds by reminding the reader that while *habitus* is durable, it is not eternal. That is, “it (habitus) is an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore [is] constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures” (p. 133).

\(^{119}\) Von Holdt (2012) argues that while Bourdieu offers powerful analytic tools for understanding society, his theory needs to be expanded to take in the possibilities for destabilising and contesting symbolic order (p. 149). See Burawoy and Von Holdt (2012) *Conversations with Bourdieu: The Johannesburg moment* for a challenging critique of Bourdieu from the perspectives of Marx, Gramsci, Fanon, Freire, Beauvoir, and Mills.
education and training, which invites new actions that decrease social vulnerability, increase access and accumulation to socially sanctioned capital, and expand future trajectories and possibilities. Such an analysis provides little critique of the fact of social stratification. It does not challenge the current social order, but rather encourages conformity to the current structure of power within social stratification, e.g. it encourages participants to adopt an empowered habitus. Thus, the structures that complicate and constitute the interviewees’ material and spiritual obstacles are not transformed. The dominant group is not challenged; rather, the dominated are given access to the master’s tools in order to circumvent the challenges and obstacles. I present a pastoral theological response to this problem in chapter six.

Preferences for Care

The third theme arising from the interviews, the participant’s preferences for care, can be divided in two broad categories. I labeled these categories “concrete acts of care” and “relational acts of care.” Concrete acts of care include shelter, food, clothing assistance, and resource coordination with local and state providers. Relational aspects of care include interpersonal communication, interactions between staff and clients, and client perceptions of caregiver’s presentation and attitude. We will now use Bourdieu’s concepts of field, capital, and habitus to thicken our appreciation of care.

Bourdieu contends that each social field has its own fundamental laws and interests that are particular to that field. The goals or particular interests of a given field relate to forms of capital active in that field which are pursued through actions and strategies furnished by habitus. Social agents’ actions can be understood and even anticipated, according to Bourdieu, by analyzing field, capital, and habitus. However, Bourdieu insisted
that social agents preserved an element of freedom, though a constrained freedom, through which by their actions they can challenge current structures, construct different relationships to structures, and even re-structure the social world. I turn now to analyze the interviewees’ preferences for care using Bourdieu’s concepts of field, capital, and habitus.

The interviewees described their preferences for care in terms of concrete and relational aspects of care. The assumption I make here is that the interviewees’ preferences for care should coincide with the goals or interests and rules appropriate to the field under consideration. The interviewees’ named goals related to basic necessities of life, e.g. shelter, food, clothing, and forms of assistance that are directly related to a current need. Hence, the field is consistent with a position of dependence and vulnerability. What is at stake in the field is daily survival.

The interviewees preferred that the distribution of basic necessities be governed by a rule of consistency and fairness. “Fair” according to the interviewees meant everyone being treated by the same rules. Some examples cited by the interviewees included equanimity related to clothing distribution and disciplinary action related to violations of behavior expectations within the mission. Thus, the interviewees’ articulated a “fundamental law” or expectation within the social field of equal treatment, or no favoritism. It is interesting to note that two of the interviewees cited examples of rule bending related to extenuating circumstances as instances of good care. Hence, the fundamental law of equanimity must also have room to “flex” in order to address diverse circumstances.
The goals related to concrete acts of care can be construed as a nuanced form of capital. Five of the six interviewees had little or no accumulated economic capital. As I discussed above, the dominant group’s symbolic capital does not consider temporary shelter, donated food, or clothing as a form of economic capital since they cannot be readily converted to money. However, they are a form of capital as they represent interviewees’ interests or goals. Some of the interviewees indicated utilizing food, clothing, hygiene supplies, and medicine in a barter economy within the shelter context. Thus, though not readily converted into money, the items represent accumulated labor (waiting in lines) for goods that can be converted to other goods. The scarcity of capital in the form of money within the field necessitates a different economic exchange. Preferences for care necessitate viewing these alternate forms of economic capital as legitimate.

The field is filled with cultural capital. Bourdieu defined cultural capital as accumulated labor in the form of skills and mannerisms inscribed on persons participating in particular social fields. Interviewees’ skills, strategies for survival, and strategies for obtaining desired goods within the social field are forms of cultural capital—though not a form readily recognized as cultural capital in other social fields. This skill set is constructed by developing a knowledge base of the rules of the field, developing a mental map of the available resources, developing strategies to secure the resources, and physical and verbal strategies to maintain personal and material safety.

I consider dignity to be a form of cultural capital within the field. Interviewees described one goal within the field as maintaining a sense of human dignity. The
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120 Two of the six interviewees had full-time employment. One was able to accumulate capital while the other had fifty dollars to spend on food every two weeks after meeting his family’s basic needs.
interviewees used multiple terms to describe this goal: “saving face,” “not being made a punk”, the desire to be “treated as a human being and not a common street dog.” The preferences for care, both concrete and relational, appear to correlate with a desire to preserve dignity as a form of cultural capital. For example, the concrete act of providing a safe and clean shelter protects both the individual and the individual’s accumulated material goods; the preference for equal treatment related to distribution of goods facilitates dignity as persons are not treated as “less than” another person receiving goods and services. Further, the interviewees’ preference for relational acts of care that entailed interpersonal communication and physical interaction protects interviewees’ sense of human dignity. Interviewees preferred care that necessitated staff members taking time to speak with them, to be spoken to as an equal, to be deemed worthy of both having policy and rule rationale explained to them, as well as to be included in decision making. These preferred acts of care appear to correlate with the “particular interest” of preserving human dignity as a form of cultural capital in a field within a dominated social space.

Bourdieu described some social spaces as dominated social spaces. That is to say, symbolic violence results from the struggle between groups (located in social space) to define “normal.” Groups who have accumulated symbolic capital through struggle with other groups have the ability to name “normal” and “deviant.” The interviewees protested at being named deviant or “less than human” and being judged “lazy,” “crazy,” or “criminal” because they dwell in a particular social space. This protest correlates with preferred care that “does not judge” and that “respects” the unique circumstances and contexts that lead to individuals dwelling in this social space.
The interviewees were asked at the end of each interview what they would want to say to the world. Themes emerged from the interviewees’ responses that included a desire for others to stop judging, to realize how challenging it is to live in this social space, and to give them the benefit of the doubt. I understand these responses as a form of protest resulting from a lack of symbolic capital. That is, when given symbolic capital in an artificial environment (the interview), the participants protested the structures and discourses that attacked their dignity by refusing to legitimate their *habitus*, forms of capital, and agency within their social field. Interviewees preferred care that respects, protects, and nourishes their human dignity.

How then does *habitus* inform preferred care? Bourdieu describes *habitus* as “acquired schemes of perception and classification as to what is preferred.” These schemes closely correlate with cultural capital. Cultural capital is inscribed upon social agents through their social context (family of origin, education, social space) and is reified through action. This *habitus* functions in relation to a social space of vulnerability in which social agents compete for scarce commodities in order to meet their daily needs. Hence, participants informed by this *habitus* appreciate concrete acts of care related to meeting daily needs (food, shelter, clothing). The context of violence forms a *habitus* that perceives the ever-present possibility of violence resulting in preferences for care that attend to safety. The daily vulnerability associated with this social space forms a *habitus* oriented to the present. Thus, preferences for care have a present orientation. The presence of symbolic violence within the context forms a *habitus* that perceives the dominating group as “judgmental,” “condemning” and “condescending;” thus, preferences for care involve non-judgmental, supportive, and mutual interactions. Bourdieu’s analysis calls attention to
the interplay between social space, social field, and *habitus* resulting in particular preferences for care. The preferences are shaped by participants' unique goals, values, perceptions, and the particular contextual dynamics unique to the mission setting.

**Concluding the Interpretive Task**

The interpretive task uses insights that arise from perspectival and fallible cognate disciplines in an effort to expand, examine, and explain trends, patterns, and themes that arise from the descriptive task. Hence, the task itself invites epistemic humility as it explores the data that arise from the descriptive task. Bourdieu's reflexive sociology expands the information gleaned from the descriptive task by examining the ways that social fields, capital, and *habitus* function within the rhythms of homelessness, the challenges and obstacles faced, and the preferences for care articulated by the research participants. We do well to remember that insights that arise from Bourdieu's sociological analysis are perspectival and fallible; however, such an admission does not dismiss the perspective as irrelevant. Rather, it invites us to discern whether the explanation offered by this framework invites greater appreciation and understanding of the data.

Bourdieu's framework invites attention to the diverse social fields concurrently in play in the context. Further, the framework invites attention to the multiple goals, roles, rules, and strategies expressed by the interviewees within the social field. The framework also calls attention to the manifestation of capital in the field, as well as conversion and subversion strategies related to capital in its multiple forms. Finally, the framework calls attention to the ways that habitat, as social context, structures *habitus* (internalized cultural capital), and how *habitus* in turn structures habitat.
Any framework forefronts some issues while obfuscating others. This dissertation focuses on class stratification as a system of oppression. By focusing on class, it deemphasizes other systems that are active in the context. However, gender, race, and sexual orientation systems of oppression are present. Women experienced the culture of violence differently than men and developed cultural capital in the form of skill sets and strategies unique to their gender identity. Further, relationships between genders continued to model patriarchal oppression as illustrated in Anne’s, Beth’s, and Cathy’s stories. Racial tensions were noted related to clothing distribution. Further, there was a disproportionate number of African Americans who received care at the mission compared to Whites and Latin@s. Heterosexism was evidenced in the form of privilege among the interviewees. That is, the participants assumed heterosexuality as normative. Frank was the only participant to name sexual orientation as an issue. Hence, the participants experienced privilege associated with their heterosexuality though it remained unnamed.

Bourdieu’s theory could be enhanced by intersectional analysis to focus on the ways that other aspects of social location inform perception, action, and construction of the social world. Such analysis would require successive rounds of interviewing and data analysis that are beyond the scope of this dissertation. However, Bourdieu’s key concepts could provide avenues for exploring the intersections of other systems of oppression. In particular, cultural capital and its relation to *habitus* provides a conceptual framework to explore the impact of race, gender, and orientation on persons dwelling in marginalized social space.

\[^{121}\text{Frank complained of being propositioned by men for sexual favors. He questioned how his being homeless invited the unwanted attention.}\]
Reflexive sociological analysis calls attention to the distinct and multiple social fields in play, capital’s diverse forms, accumulation, conversion strategies, and the interplay between habitat and *habitus* in social interaction. This analysis also highlights symbolic violence’s role in social interaction by bestowing normative and deviant status on various aspects of social interaction. Some of these aspects include definitions of capital, acceptable and unacceptable strategies within social fields, and normative and deviant lifestyles (homed/homeless). Such an analysis develops a thicker description of the patterns, themes, and dynamics discerned in the descriptive task, which is the point of the interpretive task.

The question remains, how helpful is such an analysis in formulating pastoral theory and practice for the mission context? And, how does this analysis inform constructions of neighbor-love? Both of these questions will be addressed in the pragmatic task. However, before proceeding to the pragmatic task, we will engage Wesleyan-Holiness constructions of neighbor-love in the normative task.
Chapter five records the normative task, which includes an examination of representative Wesleyan-Holiness theologians Mildred Wynkoop’s and Thomas Oord’s constructions of love, noting strengths, limitations, and expansions. The task then brings these perspectives into conversation with emphases arising from pastoral theology. Next, sociological analysis of the context complicates the conversation. I conclude the chapter with a construction of neighbor-love informed by the discussion.

**Methodological Re-Orientation and the Normative Task**

This dissertation progresses in a linear fashion through four methodological tasks: the descriptive, interpretive, normative, and pragmatic. I have conducted the descriptive task and have identified three themes that arise from the six interviews. I analyzed these themes in the interpretive task using the sociological lens of Bourdieus’s reflexive sociology. I now turn to the normative task.

The normative task conducts a conversation between theological tradition(s) and
the norms of a scholarly guild (Osmer, 2008). Further, consistent with pastoral theology’s emphasis on lived experience as an authoritative source for theological construction (Neuger, 2004), this constructive dissertation engages the lived experiences that arise from a context of care as an authoritative source for theological construction. As such the normative task engages a critical correlational conversation between Wesleyan-holiness constructions of neighbor-love, trajectories within pastoral theology and the interpreted experiences discerned in the descriptive and interpretive tasks. The normative conversation informs the pragmatic task in chapter 6.

**Critical Correlational Conversations Between Wesleyan-Holiness Theology, Pastoral Theology, and Experiences from a Margin**

The following section identifies the three interlocutors for our critical correlational conversation. The normative task invites the input of various perspectives in order to ascertain what should be going on in a given situation (Osmer, 2008). This dissertation engages emphases from Wesleyan-holiness theology, Pastoral theology, and interpreted experience at a margin in order to inform a construction of neighbor-love.

**Wesleyan-Holiness Emphases**

The normative task engages theological sources from a particular faith tradition. This dissertation engages the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition as its primary theological conversation partner. The Wesleyan-Holiness tradition regards the bible, tradition, reason,
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122 I use the term scholarly guild to indicate a group of scholars who share an interest in a particular subject and who share commitments regarding their approach to a subject. This dissertation engages two distinct guilds: pastoral theology (primarily) and sociology (secondarily). The normative task conducts a critical correlative conversation between a sociological perspective, a theological tradition, and the context under examination under the auspices of a primary scholarly guild.
and experience as primary sources for theological constructions.\textsuperscript{123} When engaging the Wesleyan quadrilateral, one cannot speak of tradition as a monolithic, univocal, unchanging perspective. One should speak of traditions within the category of tradition. Further, the plurality of theological perspectives within any given faith tradition invites researchers to specify which perspective within a tradition one is engaging.

This dissertation engages neighbor-love, love directed toward neighbor, within the Church of the Nazarene as an expression of the Wesleyan-Holiness movement; however, even this small faith community within the greater Christian tradition contains diverse theological traditions. H. Ray Dunning's (1998) systematic theology for the Nazarene Church records this insight: “The fact is that probably every denomination reflects several different traditions that agree on certain central commitments, but there is usually also diversity at several significant points.” I have selected two influential theological perspectives within the Church of the Nazarene as interlocutors for this study.\textsuperscript{124}

Mildred Bangs Wynkoop and Thomas Jay Oord represent two separate manifestations of the Nazarene Church’s attempt to come to grips with love as the central theological criterion for a Wesleyan-Holiness theology. Wynkoop's \textit{A Theology of Love} (1972) and Oord's \textit{The Nature of Love: A Theology} (2010) are two expressions of traditions within a tradition that I engage to construct a theology of neighbor-love informed by a

\textsuperscript{123} How one weights these sources in their theological formulations varies significantly. However, the 66 books of the Protestant Canon hold privileged status within the tradition. The Bible is usually held to be “more” authoritative than tradition, experience, or reason following Wesley's argument for a plain, grammatical understanding of scripture.

\textsuperscript{124} It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to trace the diversity of traditions that inform the Church of the Nazarene’s engagement of love directed toward neighbor, or neighbor-love. However, I will select two published and influential representatives of a tradition within the broader Nazarene tradition.
margin. Wynkoop’s work significantly shifted the conversation about sanctification within the Church of the Nazarene. Oord’s work is too recent to determine his influence on the tradition. However, both authors place love as the central theological norm and seek to construct theological positions that are consistent with their constructions.

**Pastoral Theological Emphases**

The normative task also engages a scholarly guild in which the researcher is located. Different guilds have varied commitments to which researchers are accountable. As a pastoral theologian, I am accountable to a scholarship community that considers human experience as a source for theological construction (Neuger, 2004). Further, this scholarly guild is highly influenced by commitments to justice and liberation (Ramsay, 2004). However, like the theological tradition to which I am accountable, the scholarly guild also reflects diversity at significant points.

Pastoral theology has not delved deeply into a theology of neighbor-love.\(^{125}\) However, as a guild pastoral theologians have emphasized themes that are important to a theology of neighbor-love. These themes include an emphasis on relational justice as necessary corollary to love, an emphasis on mutuality with an implicit corollary of collaboration between persons, attention to power and difference, and a critical epistemological postmodern stance (Ramsay, 1998, 2004; Neuger, 2004; Augsberger, 2006; Kujawa-Holbrook, 2009; Poling, 2011). Further, neighbor-love, though not explicitly defined, moved from a peripheral concept to a primary diagnostic category within pastoral theology (Ramsay, 2004, p.9; Wimberly, 2003; Poling 2011). This dissertation contributes

to the ongoing conversation within pastoral theology by providing a concise definition of neighbor-love that engages the recent trajectories named above.

The postmodern turn of the last thirty years has had a significant epistemological impact on pastoral theology (Ramsay 2004) and its engagement of neighbor-love. Skepticism regarding grand meta-narratives, the (im)possibility of objective knowledge, and asymmetries of power associated with domination and difference now inform pastoral theological construction. This shift coincided with increased attention to a situated self as opposed to an isolated individualistic understanding of self (Miller-McLemore, 1996). Hence, attention to communities and context (Patton, 1993; Miller-McLemore, 1996), power and difference (Neuger, 2004), as well as a commitment to hear previously silenced perspectives became important to pastoral theology (Lartey, 2003; Neuger 2004).126

Concomitant with these commitments came an increased utilization of liberation, process, and narrative theologies by pastoral theologians (Graham, 1992; Miller-McLemore, 1996; Ramsay, 1998, 2004; Lartey, 2003; Wimberly, 2003; Poling, 2011).

The turn in pastoral theology noted above coincided with a renewed emphasis on a nuanced understanding of relational justice as a necessary corollary to love. Love cannot address the individual apart from the network of relations that constitute human identity. To care for humans, to love humans, involves addressing the network of relations in which

humans are embedded (Ramsay, 2004). Further, given the diversity present in the human condition, love involves embracing difference that demands the development of empathic skills (Kwaja-Holbrook, 2009). The twin emphases of relational justice and empathy invite renewed interest in mutuality within pastoral care (Ramsay, 2004; Kwaja-Holbrook, 2009; Gill-Austern, 2009). These trajectories within pastoral theology invite continued attention to mutuality, collaboration, and empathy in order to address unjust systems that oppress and marginalize neighbors. Neighbor-love cannot be reduced to sentiment; it involves collaborative action that creates more just relations in the world.

**Contextual Emphases From a Margin**

Finally, the normative task engages human experience, or the data arising from the context under study. The interpretive task (chapter four) used a sociological analysis to explain and describe themes, patterns, and dynamics arising from the descriptive task (chapter three). The normative task uses the data and perspectives gleaned from the descriptive and interpretive tasks to conduct a conversation between the data, the normative theological tradition, and a scholarly guild. The normative task encourages each perspective to critically engage the other perspectives in order to develop a rich, nuanced, and novel conversation, yielding perspectives that can be used in the pragmatic task (chapter six) to construct theological perspectives and practices appropriate to the rich, nuanced, and novel insights arising from the conversation.

The following section locates Wynkoop’s and Oord’s constructions of love within Christian, Wesleyan, and Wesleyan-holiness conversation.
Love in Wesleyan-Holiness Theology: Quadrilateral Thinking

As stated above, the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition uses a quadrilateral theological approach, with Scripture, tradition, experience, and reason as its primary sources for theological construction. The following section locates Wesleyan-Holiness constructions of love, and particularly Wynkoop’s and Oord’s constructions, within a broader theological conversation. No conversation about love arises ex nihilo. Wynkoop and Oord locate their perspective within, and in contrast to, other elements within the broader Christian theological conversation. Because the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition favors scripture as a primary (and normative) source for theological constructions, we will begin considering love in Scripture and then look at love in the early church. We will then locate love in the thought of John Wesley and examine twentieth-century scholarly contributions to love. Finally, we will turn to love in the thought of Wynkoop and Oord.127

Love in Scripture

Christian scripture is replete with references to love. From the Shema (Deut. 6:4-5) instructing God’s people to love God with all heart, soul, and might to the great ethical commands culminating in the instruction to love neighbor as one like yourself (Leviticus 19:9-18), love is an orienting theme in Hebrew scripture. The Greek Scriptures likewise repeat and emphasize the command to love God and love neighbor (Matt. 22:36-40; Mark 12:29-31; Luke 10:27-28; Romans 13:8-10; James 2:8). To love one’s neighbor is the fulfillment of the law. But what do we mean by ‘love’?

127 Both Wynkoop (1972) and Oord (2010) follow this line of reasoning in the formulation of their work. Both utilize scripture as a source for constructing love.
The first challenge one encounters when examining the Christian origins of love is grammatical. Varied Hebrew and Greek terms are translated into the single English word “love.” The Hebrew scriptures use several words to connote a range of meanings for love. Love may connote covenant faithfulness, obedience, reverence for God, and relational intimacy (Jeanrond 2010). Jeanrond argues that despite the nuances associated with each term there is unanimity about the origin of love; love emerges from God’s “creative and reconciling presence in the universe” (p. 30). Hence, the presence of the divine makes human love possible (p.31). Love, biblically speaking, is grounded in relationship with the Divine.

The Septuagint translates love into the Greek terms agape, philia, storge, and eros. Biblical scholars are by no means settled on how much weight and freight a given term may carry (Jeanrond 2010). However, nuances associated with each term are reduced when translated into the single word love. This is problematic for thinkers who seek to establish a biblical definition of love because the moment one turns to the Bible one finds diversity associated with the term. Further, Oord (2010) states, “Those who know the Bible well know it does not offer a definition (of love)” (p. 15). Despite Oord’s conclusion scholars continue to seek to establish a biblical definition of love.

For example, Anders Nygren in Agape and Eros (1953) argues for a unique meaning of agape that is not to be confused with philia, storge, or eros. Though Nygren’s argument
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128 While a complete word study of the biblical terms semantically related to love is beyond the scope of this dissertation, persons interested in the study should look to Carson’s entry in the IVP New Dictionary of Biblical Theology. See also Jeanrond’s (2010) A Theology of Love for a thorough engagement of love’s semantic range within Scripture and love’s history within the church.
129 Hebrew terms include: Aheb, dod, raya, hasaq, yadid, and hesed (Jeanrond, 2010, p. 31).
remains convincing for some, and his influence in twentieth-century theological thought is hard to exaggerate, his exegetical argument does not stand up to close analysis (Oord, 2010). The New Testament does not consistently load *agape* with the meaning Nygren imputes to it (Oord, 2010; Carson, 2000). Further, Nygren’s definition of *agape* is not without precedent in the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly the Hebrew *chesed* translated as covenantal faithfulness. The challenge of getting to “a” biblical concept of love is herculean; however, getting to a range of meanings for biblical concepts of love is less daunting.

Love, biblically speaking, ranges in meaning according to text and context. As discussed above, the Hebrew concept of covenant faithfulness corresponds to relational connotations of love as *agape* in the New Testament. However, multiple words mark different love relations throughout scripture. The point of this section is not to recite the variant semantic fields affiliated with different Hebrew and Greek words associated with the English word love; rather, the point is to suggest that there is a rich, diverse, and nuanced semantic heritage associated with the term love and this Biblical heritage informs and complicates Christian thinking about love. Hence, a turn to other aspects of the Wesleyan quadrilateral is in order. We turn now to tradition(s) as a source for theological reflection upon neighbor-love.

---


131 Nygren (1953) argues for a particularly Christian understanding of love as *agape*, which finds its ultimate context in the work of God through Jesus Christ. Nygren’s argument emphasizes God’s actions in Christ towards sinners, persons who are enemies to God. Nygren grounds his argument in Paul’s declaration, “while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.” Nygren argues this emphasis is particular to a Christian understanding of love as *agape*. Other scholars emphasize God’s covenant faithfulness to Israel demonstrates *agape* and that the concept is not unique to the New Testament (Oord, 2010).
Tradition: Love in the Early Church

The second challenge encountered when examining the Christian history of love is the presence of multiple perspectives. The early church writers expressed different aspects, or emphases on love. The poly-vocal testimony of the church makes finding “a” central definition of love daunting. Werner Jeanrond (2010) conducts a contextual historical investigation of love locating each construction within the culture and society that fosters particular conceptualizations. He understands each successive historical construction to be in dialogue with previous constructions, and this allows for new understanding and praxis. Jeanrond is but one example of the scholarly effort to locate love in Christian tradition, see also C. Lindberg (2008), Bernard Brady (2003), Hallett, G. (1989), Carson, B. V. Brady (2003), and T.J. Oord (2008; 2010). Love’s historical formulations inform constructions of neighbor-love. While love’s constructive history within the church is diverse, some formulations occupy a central position.

Augustine’s central position within the church’s formulation of love draws the above scholars’ attention. Augustine attempted to reconcile neo-platonic ontological assumptions regarding God as “the unmoved mover” with the Christian witness, resulting in a construction of love as charity. His construction is important for this dissertation because Wynkoop and Oord use Augustine’s construction to illustrate how philosophical assumptions create problematic doctrinal formulations. They suggest Augustine’s assumptions and resulting construction lack continuity with biblically informed constructions of agape. Wynkoop and Oord trace Augustine’s historical and contemporary
influence in Christian thinking about love and find his position untenable due largely to his neo-platonic assumptions.132

Love within Christian thought remains a rich field for historical study and critique. While Augustine’s influence is significant, other traditions offer interpretations of love. Jeanrond (2010) traces constructions of love associated with a host of Christian thinkers: Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, Hildegard of Bingen, Heloise, Martin Luther, Soren Kierkegaard, Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, and Karl Rahner. Jeanrond’s historical investigation and critique emphasize that constructions of love arise from particular social, historical, and philosophical contexts. The Christian history of love includes diverse constructions. Attempts to establish a normative definition of love must be undertaken with epistemic humility, realizing that constructions are related to previous constructions, are informed by fallible philosophical assumptions, and will contribute to, and be nuanced by, future constructions.133 This dissertation contributes to the constructive Christian history of love by presenting a definition of neighbor-love informed by social, historical and philosophical contexts. Further, this dissertation’s construction is informed by the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition, a particular Christian tradition associated with the thought of John Wesley.

**Love in Wesley.** Theological constructions of love result from historical and contextual conversations that arise from and constitute faith traditions. Our conversation takes place within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition for which John Wesley serves as both a formative theological voice and model. Wesley has been critiqued as a non-systematic and thoroughly

132 I will develop Wynkoop’s and Oord’s critique below.
133 Garth Hallett (1989) traces six rival versions of neighbor-love within Christian tradition. Constructions of neighbor-love may not lead to agreement. Hence, this dissertation offers a construction that may remain dissonant with other constructions of neighbor-love.
pragmatic theologian. Wesley was a prolific preacher and writer. His sermons, scripture commentaries, and personal correspondence provide a wealth of resources for thinkers to examine his thought.

The nineteenth century witnessed a resurgence of interest in Wesley as preacher, thinker, activist, and theologian, resulting in a number of books and articles that analyze Wesley's life and thought. Despite the academic attention Wesley has attracted in the last fifty years, scholarly conversation continues to actively debate whether or not a central or organizing principle can be discerned in Wesley;\textsuperscript{134} therefore, Wesley does not provide a systematic theological position that can serve as a normative and authoritative framework for future generations. Rather, Wesley provides a voice and a model for future theological reflection that draws upon contemporary contextual resources while highlighting central themes that are consistent with scriptural and historical resources. Love is just such a theme for Wesley.

Love for Wesley was tied to ethical action toward other human beings. "The heaven of heavens is love.' There is nothing higher in religion; there is, in effect, nothing else; if you look for anything more than love, you are looking wide of the mark, you are getting out of the royal way... Settle it in your heart, that from the moment God has saved you from all sin, you are to aim at nothing more, but more of that love described in the thirteenth of the Corinthians. You can go no higher than this, til you are carried into Abraham’s bosom” (Wesley, “Plain Account”). It is no wonder that scholars find love to be the central, unifying theme in Wesley's thought. However, Wesley did not provide a concise definition of love,
which left future Wesleyan theologians with the task of providing a definition of love that was consistent with Wesley’s model of pulling together historical, scriptural, and contemporary resources.

**Wesleyan-Holiness constructions of love.** We enter this extended love conversation with two thinkers who both locate love as central to Wesleyan thought and who advocate love as the center for all Christian theology. Though their arguments, definitions, and conclusions differ, Wynkoop and Oord share a philosophic center in process thought. Wynkoop, writing in 1972, and Oord, writing in 2010, stand in the same stream, while time and the contribution of other tributaries influence the flow, shape, and implications of their arguments. This results in different, but related, constructions of love.

The following sections describe Wynkoop’s and Oord’s separate contributions, noting their philosophic indebtedness to process thought, their interest in constructing a “biblical theology,” and their resulting constructions of love. I then introduce two new tributaries, one philosophical and one theological, that influence the flow, shape, and outcome for constructions of neighbor-love and correlate practices arising from these constructions.

**Wynkoop’s theology of love.** Mildred Bangs Wynkoop credits a “never-to-be-forgotten” philosophy course for introducing her to the discoverable, but often unexamined, basic presuppositions which account for the “way we think and the conclusions we are willing to entertain as truth” (1972,16). She credits Daniel Day Williams’ (1968) work for challenging
theology to examine its assumptions and reconstruct doctrine in light of philosophical assumptions that are more coherent to contemporary minds.\textsuperscript{135}

Wynkoop takes up the challenge in her \textit{Theology of Love}. She contends that “faulty” concepts of the nature of reality combined with “rigid” concepts of human personality, result in theological and religious problems. Chief among these problems are theologies that construct the God/human encounter in “substantive” rather than “relational” terms. Wynkoop criticizes Greek (neo-platonic) concepts that inform theological anthropologies (humans are constructed as a combination of mind, body, and spirit) and cosmoologies (dualisms of matter and soul/spirit). Wynkoop argues that these philosophic assumptions result in viewing sin as a substance rather than a problem of relation between God and humanity. Viewing sin in substantive categories results in a “magical” understanding of salvation (God fixes something in us/removes something from us) rather than a moral understanding of salvation in which salvation involves relational participation with God in the realm of free moral choice. Correcting these two faulty assumptions should move theological reflection toward a relational understanding of the connection between Creator and creation.

This relational understanding is foundational to Wynkoop’s “dynamic” understanding of Wesleyan theology. Dynamic here refers to an assumption that both God

\textsuperscript{135} D.D. Williams was influential among pastoral theologians for whom Process thought provided avenues for novel theological construction (Graham 1992; Ramsay, 1998; Poling, 2011). Williams argued against the philosophical assumptions of Augustine’s thought, which built on a neo-platonic metaphysical understanding of the universe. This understanding included assumptions about perfection and immutability that are particularly problematic for relational constructions of love. Williams suggested using Process thought as a more viable metaphysic for theological constructions. See Williams (1968) \textit{The Spirit and the Forms of Love}. 
and humanity are changing or in process. Wynkoop argues that love is the central organizing principle of the dynamic Creator/creation relationship. Love, Wynkoop states, makes more sense of the gospel than any other aspect of theology, e.g. sovereignty or justice. Further, Wynkoop urges her readers to consider love as the key to Wesley's thinking: “No matter which door one enters into (Wesley's) thinking—holiness, sanctification, perfection, cleansing, faith, man, God, salvation, or any other—not only does each of these begin to flow together and intertwine with the others, but the whole is channeled inevitably into love (1972, 21).”

How then should we define love? Wynkoop emphasizes the problems related to the translation of Greek terms eros, storge, philia, and agape as love, but concludes that the kind of love that is key to understanding Wesley and should be the center of understanding the gospel is an agape kind of love. Agape, Wynkoop argues, is a completely different dimension of love: “it is a principle by which one orders life... a personal orientation reaching to God and then, by necessity, to all other persons and things in life... it is not an emotion but a deliberate policy whereby the relations sustained with other persons are kept in balance by one’s deliberate orientation to God and his own self-respect—in the right sense, self-love (1972, 33).” After more qualifying descriptors Wynkoop finally settles on impartial goodwill as the best definition of agape (1972, 33).

136 Such an understanding requires a suspension of the neo-platonic assumptions of Augustinian theology. God cannot be an “unmoved mover” if God is moved, dynamic, or in process.
137 As argued above, Greek terms are less distinct and boundaried than the argument presumes. See Oord (2010).
However, having given this concise definition of love as "impartial goodwill," Wynkoop fails to explain what is encompassed by impartial goodwill, or what impartial goodwill extended toward a neighbor might involve. Wynkoop shows her hand when she states, "Agape cannot be defined but it can be demonstrated." She then follows an argument, similar to Nygren's conviction, that agape is demonstrated by God in Christ that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Agape is most clearly demonstrated through the forgiving and reconciling activity of God in Christ toward humankind in need of reconciliation. Agape, as impartial goodwill, is oriented toward forgiving and reconciling action between persons, even enemies, in relationship.

However, agape is constrained by the nature of relationship. Wynkoop offers the following constraints for agape: agape can exist only in freedom; agape exists between free moral agents and so cannot be coerced or manipulated. Wynkoop works out the implications of her understanding(s) of agape in the rest of her text by constructing a theological anthropology, hamartiology, and soteriology with special emphasis on sanctification.

The strength of Wynkoop's work lies in her familiarity with Wesley and her attempts to challenge the philosophical assumptions that inclined the Wesleyan-holiness tradition to formulate doctrines in substantive rather than relational categories. While Wynkoop moved theological conversation within the tradition to consider theological

---

138 Williams (1968) offered five necessary categories for love: individuality, freedom, action/to be acted upon, causality/mutual influence, and impartial judgment/reason (p. 112 ff). Williams’ treatment of love signaled a significant shift that continues to influence pastoral theologians (Graham, 1992; Marshall, 1997; Ramsay, 1998; Poling, 2011). Wynkoop appears to be influenced significantly by D.D. Williams’ argument particularly as the argument intersects with her emphasis on ‘relational’ over ‘substantival’ understandings of a Wesleyan articulation of the Christian faith.
constructions in relational categories and highlighted *agape* as a central theological lens, she did not provide a sufficiently concise definition of *agape* to guide Christian practice as it relates to *agape* directed toward neighbor. A pastoral theological appropriation of love requires more than Wynkoop's definition provides. With this in mind, we turn now to Oord's construction.

**Oord's nature of love.** Thomas J. Oord (2010) also calls for critical examination of the philosophic assumptions informing theological constructions. He too finds process thought a helpful conversation partner in constructing theological positions that provide a way forward from some of the problems arising from neo-platonic thought latent in Christian doctrine. Oord writes, “The test for the adequacy of any philosophy for the Christian Faith is the measure to which it illuminates the way Christians believe God calls them to live. If love is central to a Christian understanding of God and how Christians ought to live, we should avoid philosophies that weaken Christian attempts to talk coherently about love, act lovingly, and become loving people” (Oord 2010, 58).

Oord and Wynkoop stand in a common stream of thought. Both are informed by the process philosophy of Alfred Whitehead and theologians who have appropriated Whiteheadian metaphysics to critique and construct Christian doctrine. Oord has a historical advantage in that he is able to draw on thirty years of continued process thought as he forms his positions. Oord credits Wynkoop for inviting him to think critically about love as a center for Wesleyan theology. Further, Oord benefits from Wynkoop’s moving of the theological conversation from a “substantive” perspective to a “relational” perspective within Wesleyan-Holiness dialogue—no small task, as even today substantive language and understanding exert significant influence in the Nazarene Church. Notwithstanding, Oord
benefits from Wynkoop’s forays into process thought and its implications for a Wesleyan theology of love.

However, Oord criticizes Wynkoop for failing to provide and consistently use a concise definition of love. Indeed Oord contends that this is one of the primary problems with Wynkoop’s theology of love, a problem that he addresses in *Defining Love* (2010). In this very accessible text, Oord brings together perspectives from philosophy, sociology, psychology, and theology to construct a definition of love informed by conversations arising from these discrete disciplines. He concludes this text with a chapter entitled “A Theology of Love informed by the sciences.” In it he defines love as, “to act intentionally, in sympathetic response to others (including God), to promote overall well-being” (*Defining Love*, p. 15). This definition of love becomes the lens, informed by process metaphysics, through which Oord constructs *the nature of love: a theology* (2010). In this text Oord advances “Essential Kenosis” as a coherent and cohesive theology of love.

Essential Kenosis is Oord’s (2010b) contribution to a discussion that includes Whitehead, Williams, Pinnock, Wynkoop and other process oriented thinkers who are concerned to preserve legitimate freedom for God and creation, define love as a non-coercive act, and locate God’s activity in the context of human experience which includes time and rules of nature (p. 117ff). That is to say, Oord constructs a theology that works out the commitments of a process metaphysic, while centering his theology around his unique construction of love.
Oord’s work can be critiqued from multiple perspectives, including his selection and exclusion of biblical themes,\textsuperscript{139} his reliance on Whiteheadian metaphysics,\textsuperscript{140} and his willingness to disregard tradition as a normative source for theological construction.\textsuperscript{141} However, despite these critiques, Oord advances a construction within an influential stream of Wesleyan-Holiness theology that offers a viable definition of love regardless of whether one agrees with Oord’s attempt to make his definition of love ontologically formative for the Christian Triune God.

Oord presents a slightly nuanced definition of love found in \textit{The Nature of Love: A Theology} (2010b). Oord writes, “To love is to act intentionally, in sympathetic/empathetic response to God and others, to promote overall well-being.” Oord changes his definition from “in sympathetic response to others (including God)…” in (2010a) to “in sympathetic/empathetic response to God and others…” This change in Oord’s definition deserves more attention.


\textsuperscript{140} A postmodern critique of grand explanatory schemes surely applies to Whitehead’s process philosophy. Such a critique does not negate the heuristic value of the theory, but it does invite a deconstructive eye that constrains process from claiming “Truth status.” Whitehead’s process thought is a meta-physic. It is a singular system, which seeks to explain time, being, and the Divine from a particular set of physical theoretical assumptions. As such, process should invite the same critical deconstructive attention applied to other meta-narratives. For example, how might non-western (non-linear) concepts of time influence a process perspective?

\textsuperscript{141} Tom Oden (1983) argues for the reliability of tradition, particularly the oldest level of Christian tradition associated with the ecumenical councils, as a normative source for theological construction. Oden is not alone among conserving scholars who argue for the continuing adequacy of traditional articulations of Christian doctrine. Thus, Williams’, Wynkoop’s, and Oord’s call for reconstructing doctrine in light of process philosophy has its detractors within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition.
Oord specifies love is an intentional act requiring deliberation, motivation, and freedom. The second part of his definition uses the words sympathy and empathy to refer to “the affective, emotional, or feeling aspect of love.” Oord writes, “I use the words to remind us that a real, relational bond exists between the lover and others” (22). Sympathy and empathy do signal the presence of relationship with an other. Feeling for, and imaginatively understanding or vicariously feeling an other’s perspective requires some level of relating to and with an other. However, empathy is more than the affective, emotional, or feeling aspect of love. Empathy requires deliberate, imaginative, accountable action in order to “feel with” an other. Accurate empathy doesn’t just happen.

Love requires informed empathetic response. Stated otherwise, love requires accurate empathetic understanding in the presence of difference. To love another, to act intentionally, in sympathetic/empathetic response to God and others, to promote overall well-being often necessitates navigating difference. Difference associated with social location is extensive and involves complex interactions between social agents and social systems. This dissertation argues that difference associated with class informs a discernable habitus that is distinct from habitus associated with privileged social space. Thus, habitus provides an avenue for the imaginative work that deliberate empathy

\[142\] Oord indicates that deliberation has to do with decision-making: “The decision to love does not necessarily require long and drawn-out reflection...but creatures need not know everything nor always focus deeply and at great length when deciding what love requires (Nature of Love, 27).” I disagree with Oord here. Neighbor-love requires informed empathetic response or wise empathy. To love another more often than not involves negotiating difference. Cross-cultural and cross-class relations requires one to question/verify their sympathetic/empathetic response to assure a measure of accuracy, before taking action toward wellbeing.
requires.\textsuperscript{143} Hence, deliberate empathy involves the negotiation of difference associated with social location.

Second, difference associated with social location impacts the quality of relationship between loved and beloved. This is particularly true when systems of oppression predispose persons into relations of oppressor/oppressed as is the case with class. When Oord uses sympathy and empathy to signal the presence of relationship, the complicating presence of systems of oppression are not accounted for. Hence, effects arising from the presence of oppressive systems, like symbolic violence with its accompanying internalized oppression, are not attended. Further, the distribution of symbolic capital and its effect on the production of knowledge go unchallenged.\textsuperscript{144} Deliberate empathy offers an avenue for attending to difference and the complicating presence of systems of oppression.

**Experience: Thickening Love with Deliberate Empathy**

Deliberate empathy involves intentionally thinking through what it might be like to be in another person’s situation, to imaginatively face similar internal and external considerations, and to attempt to appreciate how another might think and feel in a given situation. While there are constraints upon such deliberate imaginative action (can one person ever really know how another thinks or feels?), the act itself is consistent with

\textsuperscript{143} Though multiple identity markers could be named (e.g. race, class, gender, orientation, able-bodiedness, age, etc.), each marker functions as a form of social capital that increases or decreases accumulation of power. Various identity markers operate in relation to systems of power within a society. Location within these systems of power influences the way the world is perceived and one’s actions in the world. Hence, empathy without an attempt to account for power’s function in the other’s becoming (to use a process term), cannot hope to be accurate. Further, assumptions about well-being may not be accurate.

\textsuperscript{144} I address the issue of social location and the social construction of knowledge in the critical correlational discussion between contextual experience and Wesleyan-holiness trajectories.
acknowledging another as one who is like oneself. The other is one who, like oneself, constructs meaning within a complex web of objective and subjective constraints. Hence, deliberate empathy facilitates the engagement of the contextual and particular lived experiences of others as a source for theological construction.

Miraslov Volf (1996) makes an argument similar to this need for deliberate empathy when he describes love and the act of double vision. Volf follows Hannah Arendt (1968) and Seyla Benhabib (1992) who suggest, “the capacity to reverse perspectives,” the “willingness to reason from the other’s point of view,” and the “sensitivity to hear their voice” are abilities critical to moral conversations (Volf, 1996, 212). Volf argues that a distancing step from one’s own perspective, assumptions, and commitments is necessary to create space for the other. To be in relationship requires a temporary willingness to suspend our own perspectives so that we may deliberately empathize, or attempt to reason and see life from the other’s perspective. This double vision, according to Volf, is necessary for moral conversations related to different notions of justice, which include different notions of wellbeing. Informing Oord’s definition of love with deliberate empathy, an intentional critical distancing oneself from one’s own perspective, yields a nuanced definition of love that theoretically accounts for difference.

---

145 I am not adopting all of Volf’s (1996) argument; however, his notion of double vision describes a dynamic that I am attempting to thicken. Deliberate empathy utilizes imaginative double vision in order to appreciate difference and power in the midst of relational difference.

146 Pastoral theologian Brita Gill-Austern (2009) also utilizes Volf in order to construct practices of solidarity with the poor. While Gill-Austern does not use the term "deliberate empathy." her practices parallel the argument I am making.
Let us recap our engagement with a theological trajectory. The theological tradition that I am accountable to, as a pastoral theologian, identifies with a Wesleyan-Arminian position in the broader Orthodox tradition. The tradition includes many voices that occupy different positions and hold different philosophic pre-suppositions that inform their positions. I’ve identified one tradition within the Nazarene tradition that is informed by process theology and committed to a “biblically informed” Wesleyan position. Wynkoop and Oord represent a normative theological tradition informed by a Whiteheadian metaphysic, within the broader Nazarene tradition. They advocate a “relational” understanding of God-human interaction that is best interpreted through the lens of “love.” Oord’s work provides a well-reasoned definition of love. However, I find that his use and explanation of “empathy” lacks sufficient depth to account for the diverse perspectives that inform social/relational interaction. I provide a corrective for Oord’s thin use of empathy and use the term “deliberate empathy” to indicate the imaginative work that love requires. Love’s definition should include “deliberate empathy” as a corrective to the tendency for persons to assume similarity rather than difference. Thus a preliminary definition of a theologically informed definition of neighbor-love is: to act intentionally, in deliberate empathetic response to God and others, to promote overall well-being.

**Reason: Pastoral Theological Emphases**

The normative task engages a theological tradition and a scholarly guild to explore the question, “What should be going on?” in a particular context. Pastoral theology involves
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third order reflection about the sources, norms, and procedures used to make theological judgments (Jennings, 1990, p. 862). Hence, the scholarly guild emphasizes reasoned evaluation regarding “What should be going on?” in a particular context. The question is made more complex by the particular emphases that pastoral theology carries into the conversation.

**Experience, praxis, critical postmodernity, relational justice**

Pastoral theology, like Wesleyan-Holiness theology, is diverse. Pastoral theologians operate from multiple perspectives with varying philosophic commitments. Diversity within the guild necessitates locating which trajectory I engage. Four criteria identify the pastoral theological trajectory this dissertation engages. First, critical reflection upon contemporary experience is a normative source for pastoral theological construction. Second, pastoral theological reflection and construction is a process that begins and ends in practice. Third, I embrace a “critical postmodern” stance. Fourth, pastoral theology views relational justice as a necessary corollary to neighbor-love. These commitments provide points of engagement between Wesleyan-Holiness constructions of neighbor-love and pastoral theology.

First, pastoral theology regards critical engagement with lived experience as a normative source for theological reflection. Following Anton Boisen and Seward Hiltner, pastoral theology regards reflection upon the lived experience of persons as a legitimate source for theological constructions (Hiltner, 1958, p. 20; Lartey, 2006, p. 20; Ramsay, 2004, p. 5). That is to say, when constructing theological definitions and perspectives, reflection upon contemporary human experience contributes to the construction alongside scripture, tradition, and reason. When constructing a definition of neighbor-love, the
interpreted lived experience of the interviewees is considered a legitimate and necessary contributor to the construction. Which leads us to the second criteria.

Second, pastoral theology begins and ends in pastoral practice (Neuger, 2004). This stream of pastoral theology understands practice to be theory laden. Current practices arise from assumptions and commitments that the practitioner brings to the event. Pastoral theology examines (interrogates, deconstructs) these theories, assumptions, and practices in order to construct more viable theories and practices. Current practice is also influenced by the assumptions and commitments that the care-receiver brings to the event. Therefore pastoral theology must also interrogate the interpreted assumptions and commitments of the care-recipients in order to construct more viable theories and practices.

Third, pastoral theology embraces a critical postmodern stance (Ramsey 2004). Critical postmodernity embraces some “modern” constructions such as “justice” and “liberation,” while recognizing that these values are socially constructed. However, acknowledging the social origins of a value does not necessarily deny its existence outside of language. Critical postmodernity acknowledges the value of pre-modern and modern perspectives. However, critical postmodernity is informed by skepticism toward grand meta-narratives that claim universal explanatory power. The meta-narratives produce power discourses privileging certain perspectives while obfuscating and silencing others. Critical postmodernity embraces diverse ways of knowing and encourages alternate perspectives in an effort to produce more inclusive and truth-filled accounts of reality. Thus, the scholarly stream with which I will construct a definition of neighbor-love

\[148\] All pastoral theology does not adopt this “critical postmodern stance.”
privileges marginalized perspectives, recognizing their (interpreted) experiences contribute to liberative construction of neighbor-love. This brings us to the fourth emphasis.

The litmus test for construction of theory and practices is social justice (Ramsay, 2004). Theories and practices related to neighbor-love should facilitate naming, resisting, subverting, and transforming unjust social relations in order to more closely approximate shalom (Graham, 1992). Hence, pastoral theology, as understood within this scholarly stream, is a mutually critical correlative process of theological deconstruction and reconstruction that begins in context and ends in liberative practices.

In summation, the second conversation partner in the normative task is the scholarly guild in which the researcher is located. The pastoral theological stream to which I am accountable embraces a critical postmodern stance in its engagement of lived experience as a source for theological constructions that begin in context and end in liberative practice. A definition of neighbor-love must be informed not only by a normative theological tradition, but also by a critical postmodern appreciation of the (interpreted) lived experiences of the interviewees in a particular context. Hence, deliberate empathy is necessary to an adequate definition of neighbor-love. Without deliberate empathy, how is

---

one to appreciate the lived experiences of interviewees within a particular context as a normative source for theological construction?

**Neighbor-Love and Quadrilateral Thinking**

The preceding section outlined a nuanced engagement of love considered through the lenses of Christian scripture, tradition, experience and reason. When neighbor acts as a modifier for love then the construction of neighbor-love becomes grounded in the concrete particularity of a neighbor while maintaining a trajectory consistent with Christian constructions of love. Neighbor-love then is informed by both an a-priori commitment to neighbors being created in the image of God (similarity) and an appreciation for the potential radical difference represented by neighbor (dissimilarity). Neighbor-love holds similarity and dissimilarity, familiar and alien, affinity and repulsion together in the concrete, historical, particularity of human experience. Hence, neighbor-love assumes both the possibility and the necessity of the negotiation of difference via deliberate empathy.

The previous section presented Wesleyan-Holiness and pastoral theological emphases informing neighbor-love. The next section conducts a critically correlative conversation between these two interlocutors.

**Neighbor-Love Considered: A Critically Correlative Conversation**

The normative task that I have outlined conducts a mutually critical conversation between three conversation partners: a theological tradition, a scholarly guild, and experiences arising from a context. The conversation should be easier to follow if we begin the conversation with two of the partners and then add the third.
Wesleyan-Holiness and Pastoral Theological Perspectives in Conversation

Our first conversation partner is a process philosophy tradition within Wesleyan-Holiness theology. This process tradition has multiple concerns, nuances, and manifestations. Here, I focus on three emphases for this conversation: the God–human relation, love as the central norm for theological construction, and constraints upon love. These three emphases must be brought into a mutually critical conversation with a scholarly guild. The scholarly guild also has multiple concerns, nuances, and manifestations. However, for purposes of this conversation I am highlighting this scholarly guild’s emphasis on a critical postmodern stance, its theological reflection that begins in context and ends in liberative practice, and its commitment to draw upon lived experience as an authoritative norm for theological construction. Let us now turn to this mutually critical dialogue and attend to areas of conversation that invite dissonance.

The theological tradition finds process thought to be an illuminating explanatory system for the Christian faith and more precisely constructs a definition of love out of process categories. This system re-constructs God apart from traditional neo-platonic categories, re-constructs humans in a novel theological anthropology, and re-conceives the God-human interaction in primarily relational terms. This relationship between re-constructed God and re-constructed humanity is grounded and governed by a construction of love. A critical postmodern stance invites caution before embracing such a grand system of thought.\footnote{Process thought, like any theory, is particular, limited, and fallible. It is an approximation of truth. For an overview of process thought see Williams (1968, pp. 102-110). For a critique of process thought, see Lindsey (1977).}
Conversely, the theological tradition challenges a critical postmodern stance. While critical postmodernity invites skepticism toward grand explanatory systems, the theological tradition makes the audacious claim that God in Christ reconciled the world to Godself. Such a claim necessitates a search for language and systems of thought to express itself to each new generation. Since the gospel is best understood through the lens of love (Wynkoop, 1972; Oord, 2010), then love should be clearly defined, and this demands adequate language and philosophical systems to communicate a definition clearly.

Process thought is a quintessential modern narrative and invites deconstruction as such. However, the fact that process thought is a grand sweeping account does not negate its heuristic value. It invites images of God as One who is intimately relationally involved with creation’s becoming. God non-coercively nurtures creation’s actions toward well-being. Further, it invites us to think of humanity as beings-in-relation who have legitimate agency and constrained freedom¹⁵¹ to act for their own and others’ well-being. Thus, the God-human relationship finds in process thought a context for making love meaningful—with the caveat that this system does not exhaust the God-human relation.

Another area of dissonance between the theological tradition and pastoral theology is the tradition’s tendency to begin in philosophy and pastoral theology’s emphasis on beginning in practice. The tradition begins with a search for an adequate system to illuminate Christian reflection that invites clarifying terms and definitions. Both Wynkoop and Oord begin and end in theory. Pastoral theology begins and ends in ministerial context. The questions arising from each starting point are dissonant as any liberation theologian would be quick to point out. However, the notes sounded from the respective starting

¹⁵¹ Humans are constrained by finitude, embodiment, and in relation to social discourses.
points converge, or begin to harmonize, as one begins to reflect about what course(s) of action are to be preferred and why. These moments invite moral ethical conversation about what actions promote overall wellbeing and why. However, such conversations should not be held without a third consideration, which creates another area of dissonance.

The theological tradition does not forefront critical engagement with contemporary lived experience as a co-equal authoritative source for theological construction as pastoral theology does. However, in this case it becomes apparent that the moral ethical conversation about preferred courses of actions should not be conducted without the voice of the other. Returning to the theological tradition’s emphasis of a relational understanding of God-human and human-human interaction, to be in a loving relationship involves non-coercive, non-manipulative action in concert with the other to promote overall wellbeing. The experiences and perspectives of the other cannot be disregarded either in the construction of neighbor-love or in actions stemming from a commitment to love. Hence, while the theological tradition begins in theory, commitments arising from the theory invite attention to lived experience as a collaborative source for praxis.

**Deliberate empathy and neighbor-love.** The dissonance between the scholarly guild and the theological tradition invites the construction of another note. I suggest that adding deliberate empathy to the chord provides a connecting note that resolves some of the dissonance of the previous conversation.\(^{152}\) Using "deliberate" as a modifier for "empathy" connotes a thoughtful, purposeful, reflective process for imaginative empathetic engagement. This engagement involves the attempt to understand, identify, and imaginatively feel with another. Some of the concerns that arise from the previous

\(^{152}\) The point is not to resolve difference or dissonance; however, deliberate empathy addresses concerns raised by both communities.
conversation are addressed in the following definition of love: To love is to act intentionally with deliberate empathy, in response to God and others, to promote overall wellbeing. The scholarly guild’s concern about the discursive power of grand meta-narratives is addressed by the definition’s emphasis on empathy. Deliberate empathy involves epistemic humility\textsuperscript{153} and intentionality. One acknowledges being related to a distinct other (with diverse perspectives) and accepts the responsibility to act in ways that respect the freedom and integrity of the other as one who is both similar and dissimilar.

Love requires that the lover create relational imaginative space to consider life from the beloved’s perspective. Love requires the lover to enter into ethical reflection to determine what courses of action best promote overall wellbeing and to submit that reflection dialogically with the beloved. Finally, love requires the lover to act. Pastoral theology’s concern for ending in praxis is addressed by love’s emphasis on action.

Future conversations between these streams should continue to attend to normative influences within both streams. In this conversation the scholarly guild invites the theological community toward a more tentative adoption of a philosophical meta-narrative. The theological tradition encourages the scholarly guild to respect its commitment to continually adopt the most coherent and cogent systems for the proclamation of the gospel about Jesus Christ seen through a lens of love. While both conversation partners value diversity in the form of engagement with other, the scholarly guild emphasizes the other’s constitutive role in the construction of theory. The theological

\textsuperscript{153} Epistemic humility recognizes that all constructions are approximations of truth and not Truth itself. As such, all constructions are partial, fallible, and open to critique and reconstruction. Hence, deliberate empathy, the intentional attempt to understand another’s perspective, requires the lover to hold his/her own knowledge tentatively, anticipating legitimate difference associated with the other’s perspective.
community emphasizes the other’s informative role in the application of theory. What might result from engaging the experiences of the persons under examination as a normative constructive source for neighbor-love? In order to attend to such a construction we must bring in our third conversation partner.

**Neighbor-Love Considered: Privileging a Margin**

Experience is mediated through language. Thus, the experiences that arise from the context under examination are interpreted experiences. Specifically, I’ve used the lens of a particular social theory in order to construct interviews and have had my own thinking influenced by the lens I’ve used. Hence, the experiences that inform the third conversation in the normative task are interpreted experiences, not raw data. Further, the experiences cannot be construed as belonging to the interviewees, though I attempted throughout the interviews to verify my interpretation of the respondents’ replies as accurate and appreciative of the respondents’ intent. Thus, the task of using the context and lived experiences of a marginalized population to construct a definition of neighbor-love has an asterisk by it from the onset.

Having defined the asterisk, I proceed with a construction of neighbor-love informed by a margin. Such a construction includes deliberate empathy, as discussed above. Deliberate empathy acknowledges the diversity of human experience. Further, deliberate empathy acknowledges the power associated with difference that a critical postmodern stance highlights. However, having its beginning and ending in practice,

---

154 I would argue that experience is also mediated through embodiment, not just the physical senses. However, the moment we begin to communicate about experience to another, we must use language and then the social constructionist movement’s logic is appropriate. See Berger and Luckmann (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality.*

155 However, this asterisk is present in all qualitative research (Charmaz, 2006)
deliberate empathy cannot succumb to endless analysis without action. Deliberating over a myriad of identity markers that influence experiences of oppression, no matter how interlocking they may be, may result not in wise empathy but in non-action. To love is to act intentionally, with deliberate empathy, to promote overall wellbeing. The question remains: how does the context under examination inform and critique this definition?

**Contextual concerns related to neighbor-love: Difference, power, and human dignity.** I used key concepts from Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology to thicken an understanding of the interviewees’ experiences. These interpreted experiences furnished insight into a particular social field that I termed the survival field. The survival field has its own logic, forms of capital, rules, and strategies to navigate daily rhythms, challenges and obstacles. That is, the survival field has an accompanying habitus that is distinct from habitus associated with other fields. This habitus informs preferences for care in the survival field. Definitions of neighbor-love, informed by a class margin must account for these contextual differences. I highlight three concerns associated with contextual differences. I utilize these concerns to further nuance a construction of neighbor-love informed by a margin.

First, the context under consideration necessitates recognition of difference. As stated above, the survival field has its own logic, forms of capital, rules, and strategies to negotiate the social world. Further, the field is active in a context marked by violence, decreased access to capital, alternative forms of capital, and the presence of oppressive social systems. Persons internalize a schema, in the form of a habitus, that is appropriate for this context. This habitus is distinct from habitus associated with other fields in more privileged contexts.
Second, the context under consideration functions in relation to systems of power that use symbolic violence. Symbolic violence reifies current structures that govern access to capital in its various forms. Further, symbolic violence constructs understandings of normalcy and deviance. These constructions reify oppressive social relations that discriminate between groups and perpetuate oppressive social stratification. Groups with sufficient accumulation of symbolic capital continue to construct knowledge that predisposes privileged access and accumulation of other forms of capital. Social agents, whose habitus and relation to capital is considered deviant by the dominant group, internalize this sense of deviance.

Third, participants in this context expressed a unanimous desire for interactions that promote their sense of dignity. As noted above and in chapter 4, the context is informed by symbolic violence with consequent internalized sense of deviance. Interviewees preferred actions that preserved and promoted their value as a human regardless of their social standing. Interviewees preferred to be treated with dignity and respect. Participants wanted to have their perspectives, their unique stories, and their input affirmed.

**Neighbor-love informed by deliberate empathy and collaboration.** Neighbor-love informed by marginalized perspectives should account for difference, power, and the presence of symbolic violence. I have argued that deliberate empathy accounts for difference and the presence of complicating social systems; however, the final concern raised by the context invites further nuance to neighbor-love. Neighbor-love should include the neighbor collaboratively. Neighbor-love involves actions that respect, nurture, and preserve the dignity of others. It invites collaboration between the lover and the beloved.
Thus, constructions of neighbor-love should emphasize collaborative relations that value the dignity, respect, and contribution of marginalized persons (Lartey, 2006; Kwaja-Holbrook, 2009).

I have interpreted a slice of six people’s experience based on an extended qualitative interview and from my interpretation of their experience have developed a limited contextual critique of love. Definitions of love that privilege this marginalized perspective should account for the daily rhythms, challenges, obstacles, and preferences for care highlighted by these persons. Thus, love must be a flexible enough term to attend to multiple and diverse contextual concerns. I offer deliberate empathy as a constitutive element in a Wesleyan-Holiness, pastoral theological definition of neighbor-love from a margin. Deliberate empathy intentionally emphasizes relationship with an other who should be treated as a fully human collaborator in action that nurtures and promotes wellbeing. Thus, drawing upon and extending Oord’s contribution to the ongoing love conversation, I offer the following definition of neighbor-love: *to act collaboratively and with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, to promote overall well-being.*

**Concluding the Normative Task**

This chapter has described the normative task of a conversation between the theological tradition, the scholarly guild, and the context to which the researcher is accountable. I engaged three interlocutors in the critically correlative normative conversation. The first is a tradition within the Christian community that identifies with Wesleyan-Holiness and process thought. The second is a scholarly guild committed to a critical postmodern appreciation of lived experience as a source for theological reflection and construction. This guilds spiral method of engagement begins in lived experience and
ends in liberative praxis. The third interlocutor is the interpreted experiences or perspectives of persons within the marginalized context under examination. I’ve advanced deliberate empathy as a necessary component for a Wesleyan-Holiness construction of neighbor-love from the margin. Deliberate empathy means creating space for an other who experiences the world differently and whose perspective must be appreciated in order to discern what constitutes overall well-being and what actions will best promote that constitution. Hence, neighbor-love is both collaborative and deliberately empathetic.

The following chapter will conduct the pragmatic task of this dissertation. The pragmatic task pulls together the contributions of the descriptive, interpretive, and normative tasks in order to construct appropriate theory and practice. Specifically, the next chapter elaborates on my construction of neighbor-love, which is to act collaboratively and with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, to promote overall wellbeing, and it advances correlate practices for the context under consideration.
CHAPTER 6
COLLABORATIVE ACTION AND DELIBERATE EMPATHY:
NEIGHBOR-LOVE AND CORRELATE PRACTICES

This constructive pastoral theological dissertation addressed the question: “How might attending to the *habitus* of persons marginalized by their class location inform Wesleyan-Holiness understandings of neighbor-love and offer new constructions of neighbor-love with implications for pastoral practice?” After conducting the descriptive, interpretive, and normative tasks, I offered the following definition of neighbor-love informed by a margin: *to act collaboratively and with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, to promote overall wellbeing.*

This chapter addresses the pragmatic task, which advances both theory and practice by offering a construction of neighbor-love informed by a margin, and by recommending corresponding pastoral practices. This chapter presents and expands collaboration and deliberative empathy as characteristics of neighbor-love. I offer three correlate practices arising from my construction of neighbor-love: a philosophical stance, contextual engagement, and creation of communities of wellbeing. Since pastoral theology utilizes a spiral methodology, the chapter includes trajectories for future inquiry arising from the study.

The following section expands my construction of neighbor-love, emphasizing collaboration and deliberate empathy. The construction is a product of the critical correlational conversation conducted in the normative task. This conversation privileged
the interpreted experiences of persons dwelling in a class margin. However, as I have pointed out in chapters 2 and 5, my own participation in the interpretive, hermeneutical, and constructive process cannot be excluded. Hence, this construction of neighbor-love is informed by a margin. I make the distinction between “informed by” and “arising from” a margin. To be informed by a margin indicates the inclusion of interpreted experiences in the constructive process, whereas arising from a margin indicates first-person construction from a margin.

**Toward Neighbor-Love Informed by a Margin**

One purpose of this dissertation is to construct a definition of neighbor-love that is informed by the perspectives of persons who dwell on a margin—according to a particular understanding of social stratification. I approached the question via the normative task. That is, I asked how neighbor-love has been defined by a theological tradition, then brought that definition alongside a context under consideration, testing where the definition could be informed and expanded by the concerns raised from the context.

In chapter 5 I joined a conversation within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition informed by process thought. The main interlocutors were Mildred Bangs-Wynkoop and Tom Oord.156 From these conversations, I framed a theological trajectory within Wesleyan-Holiness tradition that focused on love. Wynkoop emphasized a “relational” understanding of theology. That is, words about God necessarily involve God in relationship with Godself and with creation. Wynkoop contends that the great theological themes of creation, fall, and redemption are best understood in relational terms. Wynkoop argued that love,

---

156 While Wynkoop and Oord served as the main conversation partners, their own positions were influenced by a host of other thinkers, including Augustine, John Wesley, John Cobb, D.D Williams, and Alfred North Whitehead. The point is not to name each contributor, but to note that the conversation is diverse and ongoing.
understood as a relational, dynamic process between God and human beings, is the most coherent and cogent explanatory theme for the gospel. Further, love, understood as a relational, dynamic process between human beings, is the best ethical category for guiding human relations. The problem with Wynkoop's argument is that she never concisely defines love.

Oord shared Wynkoop's appreciation of process thought and emphasis on relationality. However, Oord critiqued Wynkoop for failing to provide a concise definition of love. Oord constructed a definition of love through conversation with the physical and social sciences and expanded his construction into a theology of love. Oord's (2010) *The Nature of Love: A Theology* traces a historical theological trajectory of love and presents his construction: “To love is to act intentionally, in sympathetic/empathetic response to God and others, in order to promote overall well being” (p. 17).

The context investigated in this dissertation challenged Oord's definition in two ways. First, the definition did not make sufficient room for the “other” to participate in the construction. Oord’s definition begins in theory, not in human experience. Hence, the other, with whom one is in relation, is not included as a source for theological construction. The study participants described a preference to be included, to have their voice, perspectives, values, strategies, and goals respected and heard as a legitimate dialogue partner. The participants’ desire is particularly poignant given the presence of symbolic violence and cultural discourses rendering participants subhuman. Collaboration addresses the concern for the “other” to have a place at the constructive table. Second, the definition did not sufficiently account for human difference. The interpretive task demonstrated significant differences between persons of varying social spaces. These differences, internalized as
habitus, inform distinct perceptions and actions in the social world. Deliberate empathy provides an avenue to attend to this difference. I define collaborative action and deliberate empathy below.

**Collaborative Action**

Collaboration is more than working alongside someone. Collaboration involves a post-modern philosophical stance related to knowledge, language, and human interaction. Generally, postmodernity understands knowledge to be socially constructed. Further, postmodernity adopts a skeptical stance toward universal knowledge claims. Postmodernity considers knowledge as particular, historical, contextual, and constituted through language (Gergen, 1994). Humans construct knowledge through social interaction using contingent language constructions. Building on this philosophical stance, collaboration values genuine engagement with the other as a co-constructor of knowledge, theory, and practice. It involves a stance that honors the local knowledge, expertise, truths, values, and agency of persons who have first-hand knowledge of themselves and their situation (Marshall, 2010, p. 154). Hence, collaboration respects and invites the unique contribution of a neighbor.  

Collaboration is compatible with theological trajectories that emphasize humans as beings who are created in the image of God. Further, collaboration is consistent with commitments to liberative praxis. Both emphases, *imago dei* and liberative praxis, necessitate treating others in mutual, respectful, honoring ways. However, valuing the local
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157 Pastoral theology influenced by feminist, postmodern, and post-colonial thought emphasizes the themes of mutuality and collaboration in the construction of pastoral theory and praxis. As I argued in the introduction, pastoral theologians have sought to privilege previously silenced and marginalized perspectives by engaging in collaborative construction, see Lartey (2004), Kujawa-Holbrook (2009), Wimberly (2003), Cooper-White (2008), and Moessner and Snorton (2010).
knowledge of the other does not negate one’s own knowledge, expertise, values, and agency. Collaboration involves mutual engagement. Hence, collaboration is dialogical and constructive. It involves social agents participating in genuine conversation with others.

This conversation results in the construction of new knowledge arising from the interplay between distinct perspectives, values, actions, and ways of being in the social world. However, collaboration does not end in construction but in action.

Collaborative action finds its telos in practices that promote well-being, or shalom (Graham, 1992). Pastoral theology informed by liberative and feminist commitments must move beyond cognition (Chopp, 1987) to embrace practices that facilitate resisting, empowering, nurturing, and liberating (Miller-McLemore, 1999). Hence, collaborative action moves toward liberative transformation. Liberative transformation involves the deconstruction of oppressive, unjust systems and their effects and the reconstruction of systems that enhance shalom. Hence, neighbor-love as collaborative action honors and invites the neighbor in the production of knowledge, arising from mutual interactions, that challenges and transforms oppressive structures in order to promote shalom. However, there are constraints on collaborative action.

**Constraints upon collaborative action.** I have argued for collaborative action as a necessary component of neighbor-love. Collaborative action means the negotiation of power and difference between multiple agents. Pastoral theology, as discussed above, attends to issues related to power and difference in the production of knowledge (Neuger, 2004). Power is always complicated by social structures that amplify or diminish power in relation to social location. Hence, collaborative action between persons of diverse and power-laden locations is complicated by the unequal amplification (or diminution) of
power in the interaction. Collaboration is never fully mutual. Hence, the onus of responsibility lies with persons who have greater access to privilege and power. These persons need to employ persistent accountability (Neuger, 2004, pp. 80, 85) in order to attend to the complicating presence of power in collaborative construction. The correlative practices I advance using narrative theory as an accountability partner address this first constraint upon collaborative action.\footnote{Joretta Marshall (2010) names the challenge of negotiating the presence of power in supervisory relationships in “Collaborative Generativity: The What, Who, and How of Supervision in a Modern/Postmodern context.” While the supervisory collaborative relationship is different than the relationships present in a mission context, the challenge of naming and negotiating the unequal presence of power is similar.}

A second challenge to collaborative action hinges upon the volition of multiple agents involved in the mission context under consideration. The mission context involves clients, staff, volunteers, and community resource persons all of whom choose the degree to which they wish to participate in collaborative action. One of the underlying commitments to neighbor-love is the lack of coercion (Wynkoop, 1972; Oord, 2010). Collaborative action is constrained by the volition of agents. Further, the volition of agents is complicated by the social structures, habitus, and history that inform the agents’ perception of the world. Hence, collaborative action is dependent upon building relationship between potential collaborative agents whose willingness to enter into collaboration is complicated by history and context.\footnote{The complicating presence of history and context was made evident to me by the length of time it took to complete the qualitative interviews for this project. My willingness to enter into respectful, mutual, collaborative dialogue was present from the onset of the study. However, it took several months of volunteering at the missions to build the necessary interactional skills and relational trust to complete the interviews.}

A third constraint upon collaborative action involves the negotiation of difference. Difference has to do with more than social location and relation to power. Difference also...
has to do with various conceptualizations of well-being and diverse understandings of appropriate ways to facilitate well-being. Hence, collaborative action invites the negotiation of both the means to and the definition of well-being—while attending to the complicating presence of power, history, context, and the volition of agents. The constraints upon collaborative action are partially addressed through the deliberate development of empathy.160

**Deliberate Empathy**

Deliberate empathy makes room for a collaborative other. Neighbor-love without deliberate empathy does not have conceptual room for the diverse perspective of the other. In short, without deliberate empathy the marginalized have no avenue to contribute to the conversation; they remain passive objects and the victims of symbolic domination by those with the power to define love. Neighbor-love involves the attempt to appreciate the “other’s” perspective.161 Neighbor-love requires deliberate empathy.

I have argued for a definition of love that includes deliberate empathy. By “deliberate,” I signal an intentional methodical process by which one attempts to arrive at empathy. By “empathy,” I signal an imaginative knowing. I do not mean to signal a “feeling into another’s experience”—such a process does not sufficiently account for difference. Rather, empathy begins with a critical distancing from the familiar, and nurtures an authentic curiosity about another that builds on the assumption of difference. To be

---

160 While I drew on the experiences and perceptions of the research participants who constitute “neighbor” for this dissertation in order to arrive at an emphasis on deliberate empathy, other pastoral theologians have advanced similar arguments. See Gill-Austern (2009) and Kujawa-Holbrook (2009).

161 Appreciating an “other’s” perspective involves more than simple acknowledgement. I use the term “appreciate” to signal a valuing of diversity. Such valuing invites the beloved’s difference to influence the lover. Deliberate empathy attends to diversity, allowing distinct perspectives to inform the construction of knowledge.
deliberately empathetic is to clear intellectual space for different ways of seeing and acting in the world. In this way, deliberate empathy becomes an avenue for the construction of knowledge.\textsuperscript{162}

Deliberate empathy accounts for differing perspectives, differing mechanisms of valuation and evaluation, and different theories of action.\textsuperscript{163} Deliberate empathy accounts for differing perspectives because such a stance assumes diversity as fundamental to the human condition. At a minimum, no two humans can occupy the same physical space, nor can any two humans be assured that they perceive the world in precisely the same way. Hence, human communication involves some measure of difference.

Deliberate empathy creates space for an “other.” While some critical theorists may be skeptical as to the human ability to empathize or know another’s perspective, deliberate empathy sides with theorists who posit that human relationality, communication, and understanding are possible.\textsuperscript{164} Theologically speaking, this is a part of a confessed theological anthropology consistent with the Wesleyan-Holiness position discussed above.

\textsuperscript{162} I operate under the tenet that knowledge is particular, contextual, and socially constructed. Therefore, using deliberate empathy to attend to particular, contextual ways of perceiving and acting in the world opens avenues for new constructions of knowledge. This stance is epistemological.


\textsuperscript{164} Some critical theorists, following Habermas’ critique of Gadamer, argue that objective structures form unconscious ideological constraints upon the imagination of the knower making it impossible to achieve empathy. See Mendelson (1979), Taylor (2004), and Brookfield (2005) for an introduction to this critique.
Deliberate empathy depends on the use of intellectual imagination through which the unknown may become known.

Love that includes deliberate empathy is relational. To be in relation with another human being involves being in relationship with a person who is like all other humans, who is like some other humans, and who is like no other human (Kluckholn and Murray, 1948). Twin dangers await persons in relationship: to assume essential similarity and in so doing neglect diversity, or to assume essential diversity and in so doing neglect similarity. The first error predisposes persons to gloss over real difference and deprive the other of voice. Further, such a mindset neglects oppressive cultural discourses, ideologies, and power relations associated with difference. The second error threatens to dismiss the possibility of human relation, making difference an insurmountable obstacle.

Deliberate empathy recognizes power in relationship. To be in relationship with another human is to acknowledge a range of dissimilarity and similarity and the complicating presence of power that influences the consequences associated with difference. Recognizing the other in the relationship as similar to oneself invites a measure of mutuality. Recognizing the other in the relationship as one who is dissimilar and whose dissimilarity connects with interlocking oppressive systems invites critical attention to abuses of power.

Deliberate empathy requires a telos. Neighbor-love’s final component “to promote overall wellbeing” provides that telos. Neighbor-love provides a method for constructing visions of overall wellbeing that arise from collaborative engagement and deliberate empathy. However, some commitments influence the construction. A priori commitments
to justice, mutuality, and liberation inform constructions of wellbeing. Contextual constructions of wellbeing are accountable to previous ethical trajectories.

Neighbor-love is particular and contextual. Constructions of wellbeing will also be particular and contextual. Actions considered loving in one context may not be considered loving in another context. Deliberate empathy pays attention to the various particularities of context and realizes that each context calls for new discernment, new collaborative conversations, and new visions of wellbeing.

Deliberate empathy is a necessary component for an act to be construed as loving. Given an increasing appreciation of human diversity, the effects of language on meaning-making, and the presence of power in all relationships, to act for another’s wellbeing without attempting some measure of deliberate empathy would be tantamount to perpetuating abuse of power. Without deliberate empathy, the other is no longer seen as a “neighbor,” with agency, desires, perceptions, and preferences, but rather as an object upon which we project our own assumptions, biases, worldviews, and ways of relating. Neighbor-love requires deliberate empathetic attempt to appreciate the “other’s” perspective.

**Limits of deliberate empathy.** Deliberate empathy is always partial since an “other’s” perspective can never fully be appreciated or understood. However, deliberate empathy, while incomplete, facilitates authentic communication, yielding varying perceptions of needs and appropriate courses of action given particular contexts. Further, deliberate empathy helps persons name and challenge oppressive structures and functions of power associated with difference in particular contexts. In short, deliberate empathy helps the lover distance himself/herself from presuppositions and worldviews that may or may not
be shared by the beloved. Deliberate empathy invites the lover to question ways of being and acting that may/may not promote the beloved's overall wellbeing. Deliberate empathy invites the beloved to contribute to visions of wellbeing and critique mechanisms and actions that detract from wellbeing. Hence, deliberate empathy provides an avenue for collaborative action.

Since deliberate empathy is always partial, neighbor-love that is informed by deliberate empathy requires multiple lenses. No single lens adequately accounts for human difference or the multiple identities active in a given context. I am writing as an able bodied, white, heterosexual, fully employed male. Naming these identity markers highlights certain relations to capital in the social world. Adding the categories of father, married (once), and Registered Nurse changes relations to capital in various contexts. While social stratification weights some categories differently in different contexts, no single lens can capture the multiple forces, identities, and relations at play in my life. Analyzing my life through a social theory, or a gender, race, or orientation lens offers more avenues for one to attempt to deliberately empathize with my perspective, but no lens is sufficient; they are all partial, or limited.

One could say, "Well then, what is the point? Why love if it is so difficult? Even if I use a social lens to more fully appreciate another's perspective, the attempt falls short since I can never fully appreciate, empathize, or know another's perspective. If I construct theory and practice attending to the ways that social stratification via classism affects a person's perspectives, values, and action in the social world, that theory and practice is still inadequate because no attempt can fully overcome the difference that is part of the human
condition. The chasm of difference can never be fully breached no matter how complex or layered the lens of construction utilized for the empathic bridge.”

The point of neighbor-love is not to achieve full empathy. Rather, the point is to act collaboratively and with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, to promote overall wellbeing. Neighbor-love is context-specific and perspectival. For example, for the purposes of this dissertation a mission context in Fort Worth provides the general context, and the interpreted experiences of the research participants form a more specific context in which to practice deliberate empathy. Furthermore, a social theory furnishes a lens that focuses empathetic attention. Action can be more or less informed. As a general rule, acting in ways that promote overall wellbeing while considering the person, values, and perspective of the other, in context, is more loving than actions that dismiss, or neglect, the person, values, and perspective of the other.\footnote{One could cite multiple examples of persons who acted in ways they thought were compassionate, kind, and loving—but whose actions, in fact, caused greater harm and suffering and decreased overall wellbeing.} Further, intentionally using lenses appropriate for a context furnishes perspectives that would otherwise remain obfuscated. While full empathy is unachievable, partial empathy is a prerequisite to love. It demonstrates relationally, the attempt to know, in contextual and perspectival ways.

There are a number of lenses that the lover may use to create space to appreciate difference. For example, one could use cognitive developmental theory to notice the difference between children’s and adults’ thinking, and such an investigation would yield different loving responses to the same event or situation. Or, one could use gender and race lenses to examine difference. The use of each particular lens potentially lends a more complex understanding of another’s experience of the world. While multiple lenses invite
more thorough appreciation, there is the danger of endless analysis leading to inaction. Love necessitates action. Hence, succumbing to endless rounds of analysis and deliberation without action cannot be construed as neighbor-love.

**Class, Deliberate Empathy, and Collaboration**

Context determines which lenses are most appropriate to facilitate deliberate empathy. I posit that sociological analysis, as it relates to class, is an important lens for neighbor-love when neighbors are affected by intergenerational poverty and lack of education. How can we love inter-generationally (economically and educationally) marginalized persons without a lens through which to attempt to empathize or understand their perspective, values, and actions within their context? How do we address agency, power, and systemic discourses without a lens to appreciate the ways they function in a given context?

Chapter 4 approached these questions using Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology. Bourdieu argued, informatively, that persons internalize a schema of perception (*habitus*) and reinforce that schema through performance, resulting in appreciable and enduring ways of perceiving and acting in the social world. These schemas correlate with social stratification and various relationships to capital. These schemas are distinct between social groups; they are an occasion of difference. Significantly, Bourdieu argued that these occasions of difference are the means by which social stratification perpetuates itself. Hence, action that does not take account of difference/distinction, distinction’s relation to power, and power’s function in oppressive social arrangements may contribute to the reification of oppressive arrangements (Bourdieu, 1994; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Conversely, attending to difference and its role in social stratification provides an
opportunity to notice the mechanisms of social production and reproduction. Further, exposing the mechanisms of social production and reproduction provides the means to remake the social world.\(^{166}\)

Remaking the social world means appreciating difference and its function in the construction of social stratification. Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology provides an avenue for deliberate empathy. It facilitates attending to difference and creating space for alternative ways of perceiving and performing in the world. It also offers an avenue by which to construct social stratification through subjective and objective means. Bourdieu contends that drawing attention to the relationships between social space, capital, *habitus*, and oppression provides the means to transform social stratification (Bourdieu 1990a, p. 137-139). Thus, this sociological lens provides a method for social restructuring, or reordering of relations to capital. When deliberate empathy uses reflexive sociology as a lens to create space for another’s perspective, then possibilities for action consistent with this new understanding may follow.

Deliberate empathy provides an avenue to attend to difference. Deliberate empathy combined with Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology invites persons to attend to difference associated with class. This imaginative work assists in collaborative communication in the presence of difference. Further, deliberate empathy facilitates naming, noting, and negotiating the complicating presence of systems of oppression. Finally, collaboration and

\(^{166}\) For a very helpful introduction to Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology see “The Structure and Logic of Bourdieu’s Sociology” by Wacquant in P. Bourdieu and L. Wacquant (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. This overview provides a thorough introduction to Bourdieu’s key terms as well as the transformative logic that informs his sociology. Wacquant writes “In Bourdieu’s eyes the business of the sociologist is...to destroy the myths that cloak the exercise of power and the perpetuation of domination (p. 50).” See also Bourdieu et al., (1999) *The Weight of the World* for exemplars of his social theory in practice.
deliberate empathy provide an avenue for constructing visions of wellbeing and practices that facilitate wellbeing.

Having clarified an understanding of love that emphasizes the need for deliberate empathy, let me return to the beginning of this argument. My approach was to bring a previously established construction of love and place it alongside a context under investigation to test the adequacy of the definition. I determined that expanding the definition with collaboration and deliberate empathy better accounts for real difference—especially difference associated with class or social stratification. When we add deliberate empathy to the definition, it creates space for the voices and perspectives from a margin to contribute collaboratively to a vision of wellbeing and practices that facilitate wellbeing.

Before proceeding to correlated pastoral practices arising from neighbor-love, collaborative action, and deliberate empathy in response to God and others to promote overall wellbeing, it is well to note the import of insights that arise from narrative therapy (White 2007). As I presented in chapter 2, narrative therapy provides a means for accountability as it honors the agency and local wisdom of persons who consult while inviting the interviewer into a stance of epistemic humility. I used a collaborative stance, informed by narrative theory, as one means to account for power and difference in the interview process. However, the import of a collaborative stance became more salient as I considered the complicating systemic and internalized effects of social stratification for liberative care. Further, I was surprised by other aspects of narrative therapy that became
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important through the course of this study. In particular, narrative’s emphasis on
deconstructive and reconstructive listening and its practice of widening the audience in
order to nourish the living of preferred realities became significant as I considered
liberative pastoral practices informed by the perspectives of the research participants.
These aspects of narrative theory address limits associated with Bourdieu’s reflexive
sociology, as noted in chapters 4 and 5. The following section foregrounds pastoral
liberative practices that draw upon narrative theory, Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology, and
insights arising for the research participants.

**Toward Neighbor Loving Praxis**

Neighbor-love is to act collaboratively, with deliberate empathy in response to God
and others as a means to promote overall wellbeing. Neighbor-love is context specific.
Constructions of wellbeing vary in relation to context, collaborators, and core concerns.
This dissertation draws on six participants in a particular context. The core focus is *habitus*
associated with social stratification. Hence, the practices foregrounded here are particular,
dependent on the interpreted experiences of the participants, and focused on social
stratification associated with class.

In the following sections, I will recommend practices arising from the context under
consideration, sociological analysis, and this theology of neighbor-love. The recommended
practices include a collaborative stance, deconstructive/reconstructive engagement, and
creation of communities of wellbeing.
Practice 1: A Collaborative Stance

Developing a collaborative stance is critical for ministry at a margin. I use the term stance, rather than mindset, to signal the significance of relationality. A stance emphasizes relational positioning with an other who occupies a different social space. This research study demonstrated diversity associated with social stratification. Seen through the lens of *habitus*, this diversity, manifested in goals, values, rules, roles, forms of capital, objective and subjective structures, and the like, is constitutive of human social interaction.

Practitioners need to develop a stance that anticipates difference and nourishes an authentic curiosity about an "other's" perspective. Such a stance acknowledges the other as the resident expert on his/her life and nurtures an epistemic humility, realizing there are multiple ways of construing the world that inform various logics of practice. Hence, a collaborative stance recognizes the necessary presence of the other.

Narrative and collaborative therapies (White, 2007; Anderson, 2007) and Bourdieu’s sociological interviewing (1999) model the type of stance I’m recommending for pastoral practitioners.\(^{168}\) This stance acknowledges the diversity present in the human

\(^{168}\) I am not suggesting that White, Anderson, and Bourdieu's distinct perspectives are synonymous. However, each models a relational way of being that invites respect, mutuality, and a dependence upon the ‘other’. See White (2007), Anderson (1997), Anderson and Gehart (2007), and Bourdieu (1999). Bourdieu (1999) understands the interview as a "sort of spiritual exercise" aiming at a "true conversion of the way we look at other people in the ordinary circumstances of life" (614). The interviewer seeks to understand persons as they are in their own distinctive circumstances, that is, in their own contextual particularity according to their distinctive perspective. Bourdieu suggests this is a type of intellectual love (p. 614). Bourdieu (1999) writes: "By offering the respondent an absolutely exceptional situation for communication, freed from the usual constraints (particularly of time) that weigh on most everyday interchanges, and opening up alternatives which prompt or authorize the articulation of worries, needs or wishes discovered through this very articulation, the researcher helps create the conditions for an extra-ordinary discourse, which might never have been spoken, but which was already there, merely awaiting the conditions for its actualization."
condition as well as the social construction of knowledge. Practitioners should adopt a stance of authentic curiosity about the perspectives and dynamics that inform a situation or context. This stance recognizes a dependence upon an “other” as a guide into a novel, or foreign context. The knowledge and perspective of the practitioner is particular; it is not assumed to be accurate for the new context. Hence, an epistemic humility regarding the practitioner’s own assumptions, preferences, logic, and values about the social world should be maintained. That is to say, the practitioner needs to hold his knowledge both tentatively and skeptically—tentatively, because of the diverse ways of seeing the world, skeptically, because of an awareness of symbolic violence. The social construction of knowledge, the fact of diversity, and the presence of symbolic violence necessitate a relational approach to the construction of new knowledge—knowledge depends upon relation to an “other.”

Narrative therapy emphasizes the value of the client as a resident expert of her experience. This perspective coincides with the stance for deliberate empathy delineated above. Persons are distinct and difference is assumed. Narrative therapists adopt an investigative reporter, or cultural anthropological stance, nourishing authentic curiosity about and dependence upon the native’s own perspective, wisdom, and resilience. This stance nurtures respectful and mutual interactions rather than hierarchical interactions.

...certain respondents, especially the most disadvantaged, seem to grasp this situation as an exceptional opportunity offered to them to testify, to make themselves heard, to carry their experience over from the private to the public sphere; an opportunity also to explain themselves in the fullest sense of the term, that is, to construct their own point of view both about themselves and about the world and to bring into the open the point within this world from which they see themselves and the world, be come comprehensible, and justifies, not least for themselves (p. 615).”

169 This stance of authentic curiosity involves an implicit humility—the practitioner/investigator does not, and in a very real sense cannot, know apart from relationship with the “other.” Knowledge then, depends upon relationship.
Such a stance correlates well with preferences expressed by the research participants. The interviewees requested “to be spoken to as an equal, as if they had some sense,” to be included in decision making, to have their perspective and wisdom sought out. A narrative stance respectfully engages agents as sources of local wisdom and exemplars of resilience. This stance contrasts significantly to social discourses and dynamics that label and treat persons as deviant and devoid of contributive potential.

The stance I’m recommending is also informed by theological anthropological commitments. While the mindset does not depend on a particular construction of theological anthropology, it does require an anthropological understanding that emphasizes human agents created in the image of God. That is to say, a human agent is created in the image of God, and as such, commands a degree of reverence and respect. While critiques of western hyper-individualism and conceptualizations of humans being irreducibly inter-connected inform pastoral theological anthropological understandings, anthropologies that deny the sanctity of an individual human life, one created in the image of God, potentially subvert the value of a human. This concern is heightened when the human under consideration exists in a systemically oppressed and marginalized social space. A theological anthropology that values each human as one created in the image of God provides a rationale for respecting, honoring, and valuing the existence and perspective of that individual, even if agreement cannot be attained. In short, a theological anthropology that views each human as one created in the image of God provides an a priori theo-logic for valuing that human apart from their location in social space, their access to capital, or their habitus.
Finally, the stance acknowledges the presence of power associated with knowledge. Both Bourdieu and White emphasize the social interplay between power and knowledge. Bourdieu uses the concept of symbolic violence and symbolic domination to address the social struggle over normative knowledge (Bourdieu, 1992, 1994). White, on the other hand, informed by Michel Foucault, names knowledge as a social discourse that involves conceptualizations of normalcy and deviance (White and Epston, 1990). Bourdieu and White recommend interaction that critically attends to the interplay between power, oppression, and the production of knowledge. Such a stance is critical for pastoral practitioners with liberative commitments. This stance nurtures a critical eye toward the practitioner’s potential complicity to oppressive social discourses, and this strengthens the practitioner’s commitment to epistemic humility and authentic curiosity. This awareness could then serve to mitigate further complicity and create space to nurture imaginative resistance to symbolic domination.

A collaborative stance values the human agent as one created in the image of God and appreciates the interplay between power, oppression, and social stratification. This stance assumes difference as common to the human condition, nurtures genuine curiosity about others, and encourages epistemic humility about one’s own perspective. Such a stance creates imaginative space to construct the contextual practices to which we now turn.

**Practice 2: Deconstructive and Re-Constructive Practices of Engagement**

In the descriptive and interpretive tasks, I listed themes, patterns, and dynamics under the categories of rhythms of daily life, challenges and obstacles faced, and
preferences for care from a margin. The line by line coding revealed these categories to which I applied Bourdieu’s key concepts in reflexive sociology to thicken an appreciation of the dynamics, themes, and patterns. I concluded the interpretive task with a question that will be addressed below: How helpful is Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology for formulating liberative pastoral theory and praxis?

Bourdieu’s analysis calls attention to the relation between power and social stratification (1986, p. 241-242; 1990a, p. 135; 1991; 1992). Power, defined as the ability for A to achieve certain ends despite B’s protest or resistance, manifests differently in and between social spaces. Further, persons in more privileged social spaces (i.e. social spaces with greater accumulation of symbolically recognized and convertible forms of capital) yield greater power than persons in social spaces with less privilege. Bourdieu’s (1986) analysis highlights power’s relation to social stratification and accumulations of capital (pp. 241-242). This analysis is particularly helpful for pastoral practitioners as they consider symbolic oppression, or symbolic violence. Symbolic capital entails the struggle for the power to name, or to establish canonical understandings of normal and deviant. The winners of the struggle for symbolic capital establish definitions of “normal” and “deviant.” These winners determine what is a normal or deviant lifestyle, what qualifies as economic capital, which forms of cultural and social capital are legitimate and which are deviant, and so forth. These decisions establish stories, or histories of knowledge, and cultural discourses and practices with consequences.

The study participants consistently named consequences of the above dynamic of symbolic domination. This dynamic reifies a privileged discourse normalizing an educated/skilled, employed, and homed perspective. Persons existing outside this norm
have internalized a sense of deviance, failure, or deficiency and have this sense reified by the cultural discourse (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 471). Each person interviewed named this internalized sense of deviance, failure, deficiency, or being abnormal and also named as problematic the accompanying cultural discourse of judgment. Further, what is lost in this problematic dynamic is the contingent nature of the discourse—the discourse exists contingently as a result of a struggle for symbolic capital.

Pastoral practitioners are challenged to communicate the relevance of the social construction of discourses to persons who are struggling daily for survival. However, practitioners who see this dynamic can take deconstructive steps that potentially loosen the grip of the discourse on the person’s imagination. For example, when I asked persons to walk me through a typical day for them and nourished authentic curiosity about their perspective, skills, strategies, challenges, and goals, persons consistently demonstrated different body language, pace of speech, and energy in the conversation than during interactions in which I or others were less attentive. Persons were treated as the “expert” on their own lives and this shift in role, this shift in dynamic, changed the person’s access to symbolic capital in the interview context—they accumulated a measure of symbolic capital during the interview process.

The interview dynamic described above is similar to that which occurs during a narrative and collaborative therapy consultation.\textsuperscript{170} Narrative and collaborative therapies

\textsuperscript{170} Narrative and Collaborative therapies build on a social constructionist philosophical platform. They attend to the ways that language creates reality. As such, narrative emphasizes the ways that people make meaning by “storying” their lives through language. Problem stories are dependent upon cultural discourses (i.e. race, gender, class) that obfuscate and limit individual agency. Narrative therapy listens with a deconstructive ear to the problem story situated in problem discourse and attends to exceptions to the problem story expressed by the client. By rendering explicit the problem story’s relation to
represent postmodern approaches to counseling. The philosophical stance, discussed above under collaborative stance, and the method of engaging relationally with others advocated by these therapies serve as a model for relational pastoral engagement at a margin. Both positions esteem persons as valued experts in their own life. Persons are treated with respect in a collaborative engagement. Persons are regarded as distinct from the problems that affect them. Knowledge is understood as socially constructed, hence open for critique, deconstruction, and reconstruction in the moment. Local wisdom, personal resilience, and individual agency are honored. These postmodern therapeutic commitments provide a model for the type of pastoral engagement appropriate for this context.

Narrative therapy shares Bourdieu’s concern for symbolic violence as the struggle for symbolic capital is forgotten and knowledge becomes “common sense” or “taken for granted” (White and Epston, 1990, 18ff; Bourdieu, 2010, p. x). Both perspectives recognize problematic discourses of normalcy and deviance that constrain human agency and opportunity. Since knowledge is socially constructed, it is also contingent. Both perspectives pay attention to the problematic ways that knowledge and power intersect and produce profound effects on persons and cultures. For narrative therapy, the concern is raised in counseling sessions; for Bourdieu, the concern revolves around the production and reproduction of social stratification and its corollaries. The point for practices of care in this context is to realize that social stratification, *habitus*, and the like are contingent cultural discourses, the narrative therapist joins collaboratively with the client to re-author a preferred story. Given the power of cultural discourses, it is essential for the client to create a community of resistance, or a community of witness, in order to nurture support for their preferred story.

For an excellent introduction to narrative therapy see Alice Morgan (2000), *What is Narrative Therapy?* See also Freedman and Combs (1996), Michael White (2007).
manifestations of knowledge and are open to challenge, deconstruction, and reconstruction.

Pastoral engagement at a margin should include an understanding of the contingent nature of normative understandings (associated with class) and a commitment to render those contingent understandings explicit. For example, the interviews revealed alternative forms of capital operative in an economy of social practices that included different roles, rules, goals, and strategies. Different skill sets were necessary to negotiate this context. Because these forms of capital, social fields, and habitus are not part of the normative discourse, they are viewed as deviant. The normative cultural discourse does not acknowledge the interviewees’ successes, strengths, and resilience, resulting in the interviewees’ having difficulty appreciating their own agency. Bourdieu termed this dynamic symbolic violence. Bourdieu argued that social transformation occurs as persons challenge the contingent, “taken-for-granted,” “common-sense,” constructions that inform social interaction, making the struggle for symbolic capital active (Bourdieu, 2010, p. xix). That is, Bourdieu argues for a deconstructive and reconstructive process that makes social agents aware of the structures and mechanisms of social stratification. Insight into these processes opens the possibility of challenging symbolic violence and transforming the social world. Pastoral caregivers can lend their presence and support to those collaborators from a margin who challenge symbolic violence.

What sort of practices then should we recommend based on the interviewees’ concerns? To begin with, whatever contextual practices are advanced, they should be informed by the commitments above. That is, effective practices begin with a commitment to a theological anthropological stance that considers persons as relational agents who
participate with God and others in social relations. As such, persons need to be engaged in ways that increase their agency and create distance between themselves and the problem situations, discourses, or stories in which they find themselves. Such an *a priori* commitment should induce relations more closely approximating values of mutuality, respect, justice, and liberation (liberation from problematic or oppressive discourses in which persons participate).

When we consider the sociological lens that this dissertation engages, the problematic discourses under consideration include the mechanisms of production and reproduction of oppressive social stratification. Bourdieu insightfully argues that making the internalized and external mechanisms of social stratification apparent is a means of deconstruction and potential reconstruction since social agents (individuals) are key to reproduction of social stratification. Hence, liberative pastoral practices should engage the construction of social stratification by rendering explicit the support structures by which oppressive social stratification is produced and reproduced. Therefore, pastoral practices should attend to the ways in which social fields, accumulated capital, and *habitus* are reified through an agent’s social practices.

Narrative counseling and Bourdieu’s social interviewing strategies converge at the point of rendering explicit a problem discourse, or a problem story’s support network (White and Epston, 1990, p. 18ff; Freedman and Combs, 1996, p. 56ff; Bourdieu, 1990a, p. 138-139; and Wacquant, 1992, 12-14). Bourdieu’s key categories (capital, *habitus*, social field) provide themes for practitioners to be mindful of while interacting with agents in mission contexts. Narrative’s therapeutic stance of persistent curiosity and epistemic humility (that knowledge should be held tentatively recognizing its contingent, particular,
contextual nature) can use Bourdieu's categories to explore an individual's *habitus* and agency in a given context. This combination renders explicit alternative relations to and conceptualizations of capital, strategies for negotiating social fields, agency, and relationship to problematic discourses. Such rendering can be the means of both deconstructing problematic discourses and increasing individual agency in relation to such discourses.

Mission contexts are best served if they utilize commitments associated with a collaborative stance and social analysis for training purposes. Training materials for orientation to the mission could include heightening awareness of the diverse ways in which persons engage the social world. Bourdieu's categories could be utilized to increase awareness of diverse ways of perceiving the social world and the symbolic violence associated with this diversity. For example, if staff and volunteers are educated about the various forms of capital active in their own lives (how they perceive, accumulate, convert, and utilize economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital), and then contrast these forms of capital with the manifestation of capital and its use in the mission context, then they will be more prepared for the diversity of social logic and action they will encounter. Further, if this training includes attention to the ways that social discourses and power function in relation to these alternative ways of perceiving and acting in the world (the dehumanizing effects of being labeled “deviant”), then participants would be better prepared to acknowledge the ways that they participate in and benefit from symbolic violence and potentially resist participating in this discourse.

Missions are also served by collaborative deconstructive engagement with persons marginalized by class. If other perspectives are considered “normal” rather than “deviant,”
then contributions or perspectives from a different social stratification could inform practices at a margin. Hence, persons who receive care in mission contexts could be solicited as mutual partners in the construction of policies, procedures, and practices at a margin. In this study, persons articulated concern regarding the rationale for multiple practices (being unable to leave the building after check in, the procedures for clothing distribution, storage and privacy issues, participation or non-participation in “the program,” concerns related to violence, safety, and conflict resolution). If participants were included in processes for evaluation and reformation of mission practices, while acknowledging the significant differences associated with social stratification (habitus, capital, social field), then practices could be constructed taking difference into account, rather than practices being constructed from the perspective of a privileged social space.

Hence, a primary pastoral practice that arises from this study includes creating space to invite perspectives from a margin to contribute collaboratively to mission policies, procedures, and practices.

Another practice that informs pastoral engagement at a margin includes attention to communication. Participants expressed concerns over the lack of respectful attention they received from persons who occupied privileged social and physical space. Participants preferred care involving time and attention. In an economy of social practices that includes symbolic violence against person’s occupying deviant social space, communication between social spaces tended toward dismissive, inattentive, hierarchical interactions. Participants preferred mutual communication where they were spoken to as one who had something to contribute to the conversation; in other words, the participants desired a part in the production of meaning during interactions. Symbolic violence during personal
communicative interactions includes the deprivation of voice from persons who occupy oppressed social space. Participants requested a mutual place at the table. Interactions involving mutual regard involve resisting discourses that designate a person as deviant and therefore undeserving of the courtesies afforded to persons designated as normal, such as time, attention, and respect.

Time, attention, and respect characterize more than interpersonal communication. Bourdieu (1984) argues that the time and attention one feels entitled to give and take from others is closely correlated with the position one occupies in social space (p. 471). Hence, the distribution of time, attention, and respect can either reify oppressive social relations or oppose them. Creating environments that communicate that clients are worthy of time, attention, and respect best serve the mission context. For example, a concern expressed by the participants involved the rushed and harried pace associated with the homeless lifestyle. Participants invested much time waiting in a dependent posture for those with access to resources to grant access. Mission contexts that address how they might nuance the structure of resource distribution in ways that respect participants time demonstrate respect for the clients. Participants also indicated feeling hurried through meals “like animals.” Mission contexts that resist “herding people through a process” demonstrate preferred care. However, missions are challenged by time, space, and resource constraints. Staff and volunteers could address these concerns via deliberate empathy; however, offering participants a collaborative place at the table constructing practices that address these concerns more directly addresses oppressive discourses and offers opportunities for participants to exercise their agency. In other words, practices built on collaborative engagement more adequately deconstruct and resist oppressive discourses.
Finally, if we seriously consider the ramifications of language upon social interaction, then practitioners should attend to their own use of language during social interaction. Discourses regarding normalcy and deviancy depend upon continual reification through language. Language informs the social constructions of reality and the perceived possibilities within the constructed world. Inattention to language contributes to the reification of oppressive discourses. When we lose sight of the constructive/reconstructive nature of social space and social stratification, we are in danger of perpetuating oppression in its various forms. Our language reflects and reconstructs this oppression (Bourdieu, 1991). Practitioners committed to liberative care cannot afford to dismiss this dynamic. Language can either reify problem discourses or it can deconstruct them and open possibilities for more liberative practices.

Bourdieu’s key terms offer an avenue for attending to language and social stratification. If we construe capital in its alternative expressions and use language that acknowledges the legitimate diversity associated with various habitus, ways of perceiving and acting in the social world, then we can challenge the symbolic oppression associated with social spaces. Such attention can reduce our own unwilling participation in the reification of symbolic violence and create space for other legitimate constructions of the social world. This action is a necessary step toward constructing space for alternative ways of perceiving the world to contribute to the human conversation.

Bourdieu (1990a) argued that in order to change the world we have to understand the ways the social world is constructed and reconstructed (p. 19). Noting the presence of symbolic violence, its contingent nature, and its effects on marginalized populations provides an avenue by which to create space for diverse constructions. Bourdieu’s
argument appears entirely academic. However, when considered from the lens of practice, that is, when considering the interview process and the reality constructed from the interview process, it is much more than academic. Each instance of hearing and legitimizing the agency, perspective, and humanity of the research participants was an act in which the reality of the interviewee was restructured. The interviewees noted their rhythms, challenges, and obstacles, and the way they preferred to experience care. In those moments during the interview, the agency, hopes, and resources accessed and activated by the interviewees became “experience near” and were available to the interviewee to change their relationship to the social world. In this sense, Bourdieu was right. Rendering explicit and legitimizing participants’ relation to capital, strategies, goals, and hopes made new ways of relating to themselves and the social world possible. In short, the participant changed the world in that moment.

In sum, pastoral engagement informed by a margin begins with a commitment to regard persons as relational beings created in the image of God. It recognizes the contingent nature of social stratification and attends to problematic social discourses with a deconstructive ear. It facilitates marginalized agents’ voices by legitimizing, through language, alternative ways of construing and acting in the world. It offers a collaborative place at the table for marginalized persons to construct practices to address the rhythms of daily life, challenges and obstacles, and preferences for care arising from a margin. This form of pastoral engagement begins the process of creating a community of care that potentially could restructure social stratification.
Practice 3: Creating Communities of Wellbeing

Pastoral practitioners who view social justice as an appropriate telos for pastoral practice are interested in lasting change. Bourdieu contended that rendering explicit the mechanisms of the production of social stratification, which includes attending to the constructive role of the social agent, is the key to remaking the social world. This stance coincides with a narrative approach to counseling that emphasizes the individual as author, or narrator, of her/his life. Both approaches highlight the agency of the individual as key to cultural change. However, both approaches emphasize the constraining effects of cultural discourses upon the agency of individuals and invite discourse deconstruction. Hence, individuals are simultaneously free and constrained.

Bourdieu and narrative therapy attend to the problematic role of cultural discourses. Bourdieu views symbolic violence as a dynamic associated with a cultural struggle for meaning. The dominant, or oppressive group, historically and contingently seizes the power to establish the meaning of normal, and conversely deviant. This struggle produces social structures that regulate access to material and social resources. Rendering this dynamic explicit opens opportunities for resistance (Bourdieu, 2010, p. xix). However, resistance requires political mobilization and action in order to challenge oppressive structures (Bourdieu, 1998, p.33). Narrative therapy also calls for political mobilization through the creation of communities of witness (White, 1997, p. 138ff). Narrative recognizes the power of cultural discourses to constrain individual agency; therefore, a final step in therapy includes the creation of communities to “widen the audience” who function as a witness and a support system for the client’s preferred story. Thus, narrative theory provides a means to make the personal public through the creation of communities
of witness. Sociologically speaking, this audience functions as a social group that facilitates a preferred way of being in the social world—an alternative social group.

When pastoral practitioners combine the insights of Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology and narrative theory, the import of communities of well-being becomes clear. The relation of power to cultural discourses with concomitant symbolic violence is problematic to individuals living in marginalized social space. These individuals do not have the power in themselves to sustain lifestyles of resistance or to successfully story their reality in preferred ways. It takes a community of persons in relationship to sustain preferred realities that can then challenge and restructure the social world into more just manifestations.

Bourdieu argued that social groups only existed in theory until they mobilize politically. That is, persons in a social space must organize and express political power to challenge the structures and power associated with current social stratification. Thus, in order for lasting social reconfigurations to occur, the audience of witnesses along with the social agents (in this case persons receiving care in mission contexts) must organize politically in order to challenge the current social expression of power. Hence, a pastoral act appropriate for the mission context includes facilitating political mobilization that invites conversations about current structures, access to capital, and distribution of power, and that develops strategies for transformation. Such action includes deliberately leveraging one’s own power and privilege on behalf of marginalized persons and groups (Bishop, 2002; Gill-Austern, 2009; Ramsay, 2014). In other words, pastoral practitioners continue the prophetic commitment to side with the politically poor.
Finally, the creation of communities of wellbeing demands a telos. As I argued previously in chapters 2, 4, and 5, a Wesleyan-Holiness pastoral theology finds its telos in more closely approximating shalom. Graham (1992) describes shalom as a religious reality that joins love and justice for the sake of greater community and harmony. As discussed in chapters 2 and 5, pastoral theological emphases nuance conceptualizations of community and harmony highlighting mutuality, relational justice, the role of empathy and collaboration, and attention to contextual dynamics of oppression. In light of these emphases pastoral theology added to its traditional functions of healing, sustaining, guiding, and reconciling the functions of resisting, empowering, and liberating (Miller-McLemore, 2004, p. 62). Hence, communities of wellbeing should facilitate resistance, empowerment and liberation from oppressive social structures in order to more closely approximate shalom. However, constructions of shalom require the collaboration of marginalized persons in order to discern what shalom looks like in a given context. Thus, a re-entering of the pastoral theological spiral is required.

Re-Entering the Pastoral Theological Spiral

The pragmatic task advances new theory and praxis arising from the discussions conducted in the descriptive, interpretive, and normative tasks. The theory and praxis advanced in the pragmatic task together provide an entry point for future cycles of theological reflection. This study advanced a nuanced Wesleyan-Holiness construction of neighbor-love: to love one’s neighbor is to act collaboratively and with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, in order to promote overall wellbeing. While acknowledging the limited nature of deliberate empathy, it emphasized the necessity of collaboration and
deliberate empathy in order to create space for the “other” who is one created in the image of God.

The study used Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology as a lens for deliberate empathy. Bourdieu’s key terms social space, social field, capital, and habitus provided a means to highlight the perspectives of persons who experienced intergenerational poverty and lack of formal education. Their perspective informed three recommendations for pastoral practice: first, a collaborative stance attuned to the image of God in persons, the presence of diversity, and the complications of power associated with diversity; second, deconstructive/reconstructive engagement that attended to problematic discourses, individual agency, and collaboration; and third, the creation of communities of wellbeing to nurture lasting change. These recommendations depend upon the presence of the “other” to forward context specific action. Future pastoral theological work includes bringing these recommendations back to the context to see if they constitute liberative practices. Hence, the pastoral theological spiral continues.

**Summation and Future Trajectories of Inquiry**

This dissertation sought to answer this question: How might attending to the habitus of persons marginalized by their class location inform Wesleyan-Holiness understandings of neighbor-love and offer new constructions of neighbor-love with implications for pastoral practice? A constellation of questions surround and inform the question: How might we invite further conversation around what it might mean to love our neighbor as one like oneself, when a neighbor is very “un-like” oneself? What might it mean to do, or not do, to another as you would have done, or not done, to yourself when there is not a shared habitus—shared perceived possibilities? And what difference might it make if
the *habitus* of the marginalized class were privileged during the conversation? What would a theology of neighbor-love from a margin look like? Further, how might our practices be challenged and changed from the conversation?

I used four methodological tasks to explore these questions. The descriptive, interpretive, normative, and pragmatic tasks provided a framework to engage lived experience, social theory, and a theological tradition in a critical, correlational conversation that produced a novel pastoral theological construction of neighbor-love that in turn informed correlate, liberative, pastoral practices for the context under consideration. I advance the following definition of neighbor-love: to act collaboratively and with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, to promote overall wellbeing. Neighbor-love in this context invites a collaborative stance, deconstructive/reconstructive engagement, and the creation of communities of wellbeing. The first two practices prohibit advancing context specific practices without marginalized persons’ active collaboration. However, I recommended some tentative practices that included training recommendations, the creation of collaborative space in order to construct practices of care, and trajectories for political mobilization. This dissertation’s theory and praxis provide a re-entry point into the pastoral theological methodological spiral.

**Questions Arising From the Study**

Research reveals more questions than it answers. This study set out to privilege the perspective of a group of persons who experience marginalization associated with their class location in order to construct a definition of neighbor-love and recommend correlate practices arising from that construction. I used Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology to thicken an appreciation of a marginalized context and brought this appreciation into conversation
with a theological trajectory within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition. The conversation produced a definition of neighbor-love that emphasizes collaborative action and deliberate empathy as necessary components. Further, this dual emphasis highlighted the need for continued collaboration with persons in order to construct context specific practices. Questions arising from this study can be grouped along philosophical, theological, and pragmatic themes.

First, this study used Hans-Georg Gadamer’s hermeneutical theory. His theory emphasized pre-understanding’s role in the construction of knowledge. Gadamer suggested that pre-understanding could be modified through the experience of being brought up short, dialogical interplay, a fusion of the horizons, and the construction of new knowledge or application. This study followed Gadamer’s logic in suggesting that both the researcher and research participants could, via a collaborative process, attend to the construction of social space (the function and form of capital, roles, rules, strategies, symbolic violence, etc.), deconstruct it, and reconstruct it in less problematic ways. That is, this study assumes that the subject can create distance and can critique pre-understanding. Jürgen Habermas disagreed with Gadamer’s approach suggesting that the subject can never really separate himself/herself from his/her pre-understanding because objective structures in the form of ideologies constrain the subject (Habermas, 1987). The study then raises questions as to the relation of individual agency and ideological constraints upon social agents. Can subjects create imaginative space to construe the world differently?

in order to empathize with another? Or, what are the necessary conditions under which empathy can be achieved?

This philosophical question informs a second series of questions that arise from the study. I stated that this study would use a social theory as a lens for examining the context under consideration. I proceeded with the social lens while acknowledging the interlocking dynamic of other identities, e.g. race, gender, age, orientation, and so forth. My rationale for isolating a social theory as a lens was heuristic and practical. Heuristic, as Bourdieu’s social theory allowed one to consider issues surrounding capital, *habitus*, social field, and symbolic violence related to social stratification. Practical, as time and space prohibited the use of multiple lenses. However, future engagement using other lenses to thicken appreciation of interlocking mechanisms of oppression will have to account for Habermas’ critique. Can one create space to appreciate and empathize with another’s perspective when the other deals with identity markers that are not shared by the knower? Again, what are the necessary conditions under which empathy can be achieved?

The third philosophical line of inquiry relates classism, critical theory, and insights from intersectional theory (Kujawa-Holbrook and Montagno, 2009; Weber, 2010; Wijeyesinghe and Jackson, 2012; Ramsay, 2014). Discussions of classism include analyses of class as a system of privilege as well as disadvantage. This dissertation contributes to this discussion by providing a method, grounded in a particular social theory, for analyzing class. This dissertation used Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology to analyze life at a particular margin associated with class. However, reflexive sociological analysis applies to privilege as well as disadvantage (Bourdieu, 1984). Continued reflexive research should focus on how privileged social spaces function in the mission context. Such an analysis could
provide avenues for understanding the interplay between social spaces in the mission context. Further, insights arising from this analysis could contribute to the larger conversation about class as a system of privilege and disadvantage while informing practices that leverage privilege to promote *shalom*.

A fourth philosophical line of inquiry addresses the necessary conditions for social change. Bourdieu’s theory suggests that through a process of conscientization (making the social agent aware of the processes of social stratification) along with social mobilization (seizing and exerting political power) the social world can be remade. While Bourdieu’s theory is certainly descriptive, the question remains how transformative is reflexive sociology? Bourdieu’s theory lacks an ethical *telos* to guide social transformation. Further, without such a *telos* the issue of motivation arises. What are the necessary conditions to motivate social transformation and to what end should society transform? What might sufficiently motivate practices of mutual collaboration, deconstructive engagement and nurturing communities of wellbeing that challenge and transform systems of advantage and disadvantage? Further, by what criteria should the efficacy of these practices be tested?

The second series of questions is theological in nature. This study engaged a trajectory within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition that engages love as a normative theological category. The study invites further theological inquiries related to anthropology, hamartiology, sanctification, and ecclesiology. How do we understand humans to be made in the image of God? How does that image impact our understandings of human agency and human relations, and what are the social ethical ramifications of an *a priori* commitment to that image? How do we understand sin? What constructions of sin
adequately address the presence of oppression, symbolic violence, and prejudice associated with social stratification? Further, what understandings of sin adequately address personal and systemic resistance to actualizing shalom? How do we understand sanctification? How do theories of sanctification engage the reality of social oppression? Finally, how do conceptualizations of the church challenge or reify oppressive social stratification? How might current ecclesial conceptualizations be challenged by this inquiry?

The final series of questions is pragmatic in nature. This study emphasized the necessity of collaborative partnerships with marginalized persons in the production of praxis. How can the construction of neighbor-love and the correlate practices recommended in this study be tested? Is this a viable model for promoting the overall wellbeing of the persons involved in the study? The next step arising from this study should involve returning to the context under examination in order to test the recommended theory and praxis. This step would be consistent with the first two pragmatic recommendations arising from this construction of neighbor-love—a pastoral stance committed to deliberate empathy and creating space for collaborative engagement. If possible, the original participants should be sought out and invited to engage in continued conversation. The purpose of the study, the findings, the interpretive lens, the construction of neighbor-love, and the correlate practices would be presented for critique and reconstruction. As such, this step would be a return to the cycle of theological reflection—theory-informed practice, deconstruction, analysis, and re-construction of theory informed practice. At this point, the theory and practice could be rightly described as “arising from a margin” rather than being “informed by a margin.”
As mutual dialogue with the participants from a margin occurs, and as theory and practice are developed that address this context, trends and themes should arise that can be presented to more persons who live with intergenerational poverty and who lack formal education. This study drew on elements of grounded theory and a mixed qualitative method to produce theory and practice. The findings of this study could be presented to a larger pool in order to test quantitative generalizability and feasibility for similar contexts. While the emphasis on context specificity or particularity remains valid, considering empathy’s emphasis on diversity, humans are also similar—when humans encounter similar challenges associated with social stratification, then humans might also learn from theory and praxis that persons in similar circumstances found emancipatory. In particular, the collaborative mindset, deconstructive/reconstructive modes of engagement, and creation of communities of wellbeing should foster other context specific permutations of neighbor-loving praxis.

Finally, this study raised questions regarding ethical dialogue. I introduced a definition of neighbor-love that finds its telos in the promotion of overall wellbeing—to love one’s neighbor is to act collaboratively and with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, in order to promote overall wellbeing. Bourdieus theory highlights the diverse goals, values, strategies, and perceptions associated with social stratification which influence wellbeing’s conceptualizations. Further, Bourdieus emphasis on symbolic violence invites attention to the relation between power, struggle, and discourses of normativity—discourses that impact wellbeing’s constructions. Given these considerations, what are the conditions under which a vision of overall wellbeing may be advanced? Or, what are the necessary conditions for mutual ethical dialogue?
Conclusion

This dissertation constructed a concise definition of neighbor-love that arose from a critical correlative conversation between interpreted lived experiences, reflexive sociology, Wesleyan Holiness theology, and pastoral theology. To love one’s neighbor is to act collaboratively, with deliberate empathy in response to God and others, to promote overall wellbeing. This definition invites the neighbor to be a collaborator in the construction of knowledge; it respects the neighbor as an “other,” created in the image of God; it creates space for the imaginative work deliberate empathy requires; and it acknowledges the complexity of wellbeing’s construction(s).

This dissertation constructed three practices that arise from a theology of neighbor-love: collaborative stance, deconstructive/reconstructive engagement, and nurturing communities of wellbeing. The collaborative stance is about postmodern commitments respecting diversity, the social construction of knowledge, and the power of social discourses. Deconstructive and reconstructive engagement invites collaborative dialogue with marginalized persons that results in social transformation. Nurturing communities of wellbeing facilitates lasting social change. These three practices use strategies that arise from narrative therapy and Bourdieu’s social theory.

This dissertation uses Pierre Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology to appreciate the complex character of social stratification and its consequences. This engagement modeled a pastoral theological appropriation of sociology as a cognate discipline to thicken an appreciation of class. The liberative efficacy of this model for persons existing at a social margin has yet to be tested. However, if Bourdieu is correct then pastoral theologians
through reflexive sociology have a conceptual framework to nurture discernment, resist oppression, and reconstruct social relations that more closely approximate *shalom*. 
APPENDICES

APPENDIX I
SOCIO-ECONOMIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How old are you?
2. What is your medical history?
   2.1. Do you deal with any long-term mental illnesses?
   2.2. Are you currently seeing or have you in the last year been seen by a mental health professional for psychiatric illness?
4. Is English your first language?
5. How many people, on average, have lived in your household over the past five years?
   5.1. Do you have any children?
   5.1.1. If so, how many?
   5.1.1.1. How many under 18?
6. What describes the highest formal educational level you’ve encountered? Did you graduate?
   6.1. Elementary school
   6.2. Junior High
   6.3. High School
   6.4. Trade School
   6.5. College
   6.6. Other
7. What describes the highest formal education level of your parents? Did they graduate?
   7.1. Elementary school
   7.2. Junior High
   7.3. High School
   7.4. Trade School
   7.5. College
   7.6. Other
8. In the last five years would you consider yourself:
   8.1. Under-employed
   8.2. Seasonally employed
   8.3. Part-time employed
   8.4. Full-time employed
   8.5. Other (day work, weekly work, monthly work)
9. What is your annual household income?
   9.1. 0-10,000 (0-$200 per week)
   9.2. 10,000-24,000 ($200-$460 per week)
   9.3. >24,000 (> $460 per week)
10. What was your annual household income last year?
   10.1. 0-10,000 (0-$200 per week)
   10.2. 10,000-24,000 ($200-$460 per week)
   10.3. >24,000 (> $460 per week)
11. What was your annual household income 5 years ago?
   11.1. 0-10,000 (0-$200 per week)
   11.2. 10,000-24,000 ($200-$460 per week)
   11.3. >24,000 (>=$460 per week)
12. What was your annual household income 10 years ago?
   12.1. 0-5,000 (0-$100 per week)
   12.2. 5,000-10,000 ($100-$200 per week)
   12.3. 10,000-15,000 ($200-$300 per week)
   12.4. >15,000 (>=$300 per week)
13. What was your family household income growing up?
   13.1. 0-2,500 (0-$50 per week)
   13.2. 2,500-5,000 ($50-$100 per week)
   13.3. 5,000-10,000 ($200-$300 per week)
   13.4. 10,000-15,000 ($200-$300 per week)
   13.5. >15,000 (>=$300 per week)
14. As you think about your three closest friends:
   14.1. What formal education have they encountered?
   14.2. What formal education did their parents encounter?
   14.3. What is their annual income (roughly)?
   14.4. What was their parent's income while they were growing up (roughly)?
APPENDIX II
GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Perceived Possibilities

• Can you walk me through a typical day for you?
  • What decisions do you face?
  • What are your daily options?
  • What makes for a good day? Bad day?
• How do you tend to think about the future, or your future
  choices/hopes/possibilities?
  • Days ahead, weeks ahead, months ahead?
  • What would make for a good next week, next month, next year?
  • What are the obstacles to having a good week? Month? Year?
• How does your living situation affect these possibilities?
  • How might the presence or absence of good care from others affect these
    possibilities?
• If you were to make a list of the things/values that are most important to you, what
  would they be? What is important to you about each of these?

Practical Moral Reasoning

• If you had to describe the situation and relationships you live with to someone who
  came from another country and was going to live in your shoes, how would you
  describe it?
  • What kind of space are you living in now? How would you describe it to them
    in a word picture?
  • What are some of the rules that they would have to know to get by?
  • How would the environment, the living situation, affect their choices?
  • What kinds of options do they face? What should they aim for?
    ▪ How might their goals change if they were man/woman?
    ▪ How might their goals change if they were black/white/Latino?
• If you were to describe or draw this world what would it look like?

Care

• Can you tell me about a time when you felt well cared for by persons other than your family?
  • How did you know that you were being well cared for?
  • What type of actions indicated you were being well cared for?
• Can you tell me about a time when you felt well cared for in this place?
  • What took place that told you good care was happening?
    ▪ What stood out about those actions?
    ▪ What about those actions is important to you?
    ▪ Why?
• Can you tell me about a time when you felt poor care was being given?
  • What took place that told you poor care was present?
If you were to describe poor care what would it look like?
  • What makes poor care ‘poor’?
• If you were to make a list of guidelines or rules for good care what would they be?
• How do you prefer to be cared for?
• Can you tell me about a time when you provided good care to someone else?
WORKS CITED


    Louis: Chalice Press.


    University Press.


    Fortress Press


    Press.


    Pastoral Psychology. 63:453-469.


Charles Scribner's Sons.


___ (2001). The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism (S. Kalberg, Trans.). Chicago: Roxbury 
Publishing Co.

Vol. XI. Kansas City: Beacon Hill.


Co.


___ (2006). African American pastoral care and counseling: The politics of oppression and 
empowerment. Cleveland: The Pilgrim Press.