

2007

Go and Make Learners!: Supporting Transformation in Education and Evangelism

Mary E. Hess

Luther Seminary, mhess@luthersem.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty_articles



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Missions and World Christianity Commons](#), and the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hess, Mary E., "Go and Make Learners!: Supporting Transformation in Education and Evangelism" (2007). *Faculty Publications*. 226.
http://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty_articles/226

Published Citation

Hess, Mary E. "Go and Make Learners!: Supporting Transformation in Education and Evangelism." In *Christian Education as Evangelism*, edited by Norma Cook Everist, 101–11. Minneapolis : Fortress Press, 2007.

9. GO AND MAKE LEARNERS! SUPPORTING TRANSFORMATION IN EDUCATION AND EVANGELISM

Mary E. Hess

“Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you”

—Matthew 28:19

This phrase has reverberated throughout Christian communities of faith over the centuries, particularly those that have found their identity in the sharing of the gospel. But what does it really mean to “make disciples?” One of the root meanings of the Greek word μαθητευω is that of “apprentice,” or “learner.” It might be far more useful in our current contexts to translate this phrase as “go and make learners.” Yet in many ways, “making learners” is the opposite of much that has been done in the name of discipling and mission. Far too often, the impulse to share the good news has been combined with a very narrow definition of teaching and learning. This definition and experience of learning has led to enormous pain and oppression, as Christians have sought to impose their beliefs on others. Yet how might we help each other—and members of our communities of faith—transform our understandings of teaching and learning?

Robert Kegan, an adult learning theorist, has teamed up with Lisa Lahey in an extensive exploration of change. They have proposed some concrete ways to support transformation among adults that is both constructive and lasting. At the heart of their process is a series of “revisions” or “reframings” of common ways in which we talk. Their book—*How the Way We Talk Can Change the Way We Work*—describes these reframings in terms of seven languages, seven ways of describing the world and ways of working with it that invite us into habits, into practices that shape and support transformation.¹ Kegan and Lahey describe four personal, or internal, languages and three social languages. Woven together, these seven languages draw people toward patterns of practice that make the community of truth a very present reality. While their book is not explicitly theological, their ideas extend very easily and constructively into pastoral contexts and provide rich nourishment for evangelism oriented as learning.

From Complaint to Commitment

The first language is one that they describe as, “moving from complaint to commitment.” Kegan and Lahey’s assertion is that, deep within our complaints lie corresponding commitments that give rise to the complaint. Seeking to understand the commitment brings a different and more constructive energy to the situation. When Lutheran congregation members complain about door knocking as a strategy of evangelism, is it the strategy itself they are critiquing? Is there an underlying commitment to open inquiry that they seek to preserve? In other words, if their personal experience of door-knock evangelism is limited to Jehovah’s Witnesses or salespeople intent on selling the newest product, they might equate such a practice with close-minded repetition of a specific position, rather than open inquiry.

In contexts in which we are trying to help church members move outside of their usual boxes and find out who is in the neighborhood, it might be more appropriate to think about the practice of door knocking as one of inquiry: Who lives in the neighborhood? What are their concerns and needs? How might our church respond?

The language of complaint is found in our own learning as teachers as well. Many of the complaints I find myself voicing—or perhaps venting would be a better word when I am tired!—have at their heart a deeper commitment. Forcing myself to state an issue as a positive commitment, rather than as a negative whine, both affirms such a commitment and frames it in a way that empowers me.² When I complain that adults in my church never have time to volunteer with children, I am really pointing to my deeper sense that the children in our parish need time with adults outside of their own families. But *have* I provided ways for adults to perceive their own journeys of faith as important stories to share with younger members of our church? *Especially* the stories of their own doubts and dilemmas? Looked at it in this way, I am forced to acknowledge that my complaint holds the seeds of its own resolution. This language leads naturally to Kegan and Lahey’s second language: that of moving from a language of blame to one of personal responsibility.

From Blame to Personal Responsibility

One way in which Kegan and Lahey speak of this language is to ask the question: “What are you doing, or not doing, that is keeping your commitment from being more fully realized?” Right now in the Lutheran church, there is a significant amount of writing and other energy directed at pointing to the ways in which the ELCA appears to be evangelical in name only: “Lutherans don’t want to share their faith”; “Lutherans don’t have a missional bone in their body”; “to be evangelical one cannot be Lutheran,” and so on.³

At first, my underlying assumption is that mission—sharing the gospel with others—is at the heart of learning, and hence crucial to engagement in contemporary ministry. But when I ask myself what I am doing, or not doing, that keeps this commitment from being realized, I begin to consider my complaint from a different angle. Why don’t my fellow congregational members want to share their faith? What about the process has taught

them that it is not appropriate? In asking these questions, I can begin to get at deeper elements of the dilemma. Perhaps they are not sure enough of what they believe to share it and fear letting on that they aren't certain. Perhaps they have had bad experiences with other people sharing faith and have felt their own faith diminished in the process. They certainly do not want to inflict that experience on someone else!

Perhaps I, as religious educator or as a pastoral leader in a particular context, have not helped further an understanding of the joy of sharing faith stories or helped the stories come alive for people. Given the cultural contexts we inhabit, a postmodern turn of mind rarely accepts assertions—particularly from institutional authorities—as a priori correct. Just because I have *told* people that Christian theology draws us outward in mission, that does not mean that they accept that assertion. How can I help them sympathetically identify with such an understanding? How can I engage them, provide enough routes into the idea and enough immediate connecting points, that they begin to see, in their own imagination, in their own experiences, how faith and mission might be connected? Do I even know how to go about inviting them effectively into the material I wish to share? And if I do not, does that mean I am unqualified for my current role as a pastoral leader? Such doubts emerge all too often in the work of teaching, and all too often, there are few places to voice, let alone explore, such questions.

Part of the dilemma I have found is that, it is not enough to work with these issues on the cognitive level; the affective and the psychomotor levels carry at least as much power in shaping student understanding. That is to say, we need to work not simply with assertions of *ideas*, but also seriously consider people's feelings and support their actions. So the very way I approach the concerns of adults in my congregation teaches them something about whether their concerns matter. This, in turn, teaches them something about their own faith. The same is true about my own doubts. Do I simply push them down and ignore them? Do I too often use that misdirected internal energy to blame the learners for their problems? Or do I ask myself the questions that bring me beyond individualism and break open room for the Spirit to enter in?

Recognizing that I bear some personal responsibility in the situation is not, of course, to assume that I carry all of it and that the people in our congregations bear none. As author Parker Palmer notes, teaching in the community of truth demands an engagement with the truth at the heart of the circle of knowing; it demands that there be a *there* around which we gather.⁴ I bear responsibility. My fellow congregants bear responsibility. And together, we meet in a specific context and around a specific topic that carries its own substance and center.

From New Year's Resolutions to Competing Commitments

Recognizing the larger context in which we are embedded moves us to Kegan and Lahey's third language, that of moving from New Year's resolutions to competing commitments. Most of us are familiar with New Year's resolutions—those bright and cheery resolutions

to begin the New Year afresh—to lose 10 pounds, to pray regularly, to invite one person to church, and so on. Kegan and Lahey point out that one of the problems with such resolutions is that they do not take into account the reality that many commitments coexist, and often conflict, with each other. The language of resolutions also tends to put a negative spin on the task at hand, given all of the times I am not successful in keeping them.

I may be committed to praying with my children every day, but I am also committed to making sure they are fed nutritious food, clothed in clean clothing, and have finished their homework before they go to bed. If I cannot manage ten minutes of family devotion every day, then surely it is a failure on my part. Yet in a world of twenty-four-hour days, there may not be time to do everything well. Facing the challenge of recognizing one's own limitations requires the ability to move outside of oneself to consider these competing commitments, as well as the specific underlying assumptions that may be preventing us from effectively meeting them.

I know that, far too often, I am tired and frustrated at the end of the day. Spending ten minutes of reflective time with my children seems like more than is possible, when all I want to do is get them into bed, so that I can finish my chores and go to sleep myself. Alternatively, getting up half an hour early so that we can share together seems daunting with the press of morning tasks. These very same pressures face most of the adults with children in our congregations. Prayer time becomes yet another chore, rather than a pause that can refresh. Evangelism—even with our own children!—seems like another demand, rather than a natural practice. But when we do find ways to build “faith talk” time into daily practice in ways that build refreshment and joy into the day, we shift the notion of religious education from one of instructional duty to one of shared practice.

The corresponding implicit curriculum—that evangelism and/or religious instruction must be done in a certain way—and beneath it, the unvoiced null curriculum⁵ of, “it has always been done this way, and if we do not continue to do it this way the whole church will fall apart”—holds powerful sway. As Palmer writes, the “great things” at the heart of our engagement can demand more of us than we recognize and shape more of our teaching and learning than we are ready to admit that they do.⁶ It is at this point that the final language of Kegan and Lahey's four personal languages—the foundation of their mental machinery model—becomes so important.

From Assumptions that Hold Us to Assumptions We Hold

Kegan and Lahey assert that we need to move from the language of big assumptions that hold us to the language of assumptions that we hold. This is a key element of transformational learning. What was once “subject”—what once held us to the point that we could not see it—becomes “object,” or something that we can now hold out and consider. One of the biggest assumptions to pervade religious education is that of teaching authority, that of the difference between the objectivist myth of teaching

and learning critiqued in Palmer's work and the more relational, connected model he supports.⁷

The objectivist, instrumental model of teaching assumes that the acknowledged authority best mediates interaction with the topic under consideration. Indeed, that model suggests that such interaction is essentially unidirectional, proceeding at the invitation of the teacher and in the direction the teacher outlines. How much more painful is such an assumption for evangelism! If only we, as the evangelizers, hold the truth to be shared, consider the dangerous consequences if we are wrong or if we fail. Indeed, it seems to me that some of the panicky energy that can be felt in discussions of mission and evangelism in the Lutheran Church grows out of this inadequate model. As long as we are held by this assumption, it is impossible to question it, even to begin to build a relationship to it, rather than being held by it. Perhaps it is true, but how can we know unless we consider other alternatives? How can we know, unless we can imagine our way into a space in which it is not the case?

I am convinced that part of the challenge I face in my own attempts to share faith with others comes from this unexamined assumption; so much flows outward from it, not the least being religious education programs that are modelled on typical classrooms with paper-and-pencil texts or confirmation curricula that are heavy on doctrine and light on faith practice. Perhaps the analogy to art education is apt. Most art educators will argue that children are natural artists, but they become schooled away from their creativity in classroom settings where they learn to "draw within the lines" and sculpt clay into recognizable figures. Religious educators who spend thoughtful and engaged time with young children will tell you that they are natural evangelists, asking deep questions of the world around them and attending to its intricacy and beauty in ways few adults can match. But these same children learn to let go of such questions and thin their attention to such a degree that, by the time they are in confirmation classes, their faith has shrunk down to a commitment to "jump through the hoop" so that their parents are happy, rather than a deepening of their attention and a related ability to raise key questions.

Perhaps we need to remember Paul's words to the Corinthians, "I did not come with sublimity of words or of wisdom. For I resolved to know nothing except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2: 1-5 NAB).

What does it mean to know nothing except Jesus Christ and him crucified? Surely not that we all should simply show up and wait passively for information to be showered upon us. But what kind of learning environment creates an active space of listening for such a revelation? What kind of design can structure the space to allow for the best opportunity for such engagement? What kind of learning is transformational? What kind of education is evangelism? This question is the fulcrum of Kegan and Lahey's work as well, for the four languages just described build a foundation for change; however, they need to be embedded in the social languages that Kegan and Lahey delineate.

From Prizes and Praising to Ongoing Regard

The first of these social languages is the movement from the language of prizes and praising to that of ongoing regard. One way to think about this shift is deeply theological: it is moving away from a space in which one's actions earn merit to one in which one is gifted simply by being a child of God. In other words, it is the difference between a world of earned merit and one of overflowing, unmerited, and unearned, but freely available *grace*.

Do members of our congregations understand themselves as fully capable evangelists, gifted with unique stories that must be shared to enable learning for everyone to come alive? Or do they instead enter our churches seeking to discover, in the shortest time possible, what the church wants and how to display it so that they can stay in relationship? Or even worse, do they enter our churches just seeking some quiet respite from the outside world, rather than deeper engagement in creation with God in the midst of it?

Are our practices of religious education—particularly within structured adult learning programs—focused on passing along certain information to passive students and thus equipping them? Or are they focused on recognizing and noting our experiences of God, both positive and challenging, leaving students *informed* (but not *deformed*) by our words? For example, “Martin, thank you for being such an attentive learner,” versus, “Martin, I appreciate the way in which your questions caused me to think in new ways about what this text means.” The first statement attributes a trait to the learner. The second describes how the learner had an impact on my own learning. It is the second form that encourages evangelical learning.

Kegan and Lahey note that this kind of language:

Distributes precious information that one's actions have significance; infuses energy *into* the system; communicates appreciation or admiration directly to the person; communicates *specific* information to the person about the speaker's personal experience of appreciation or admiration; *non-attributive*, characterizes the speaker's experience, and not the person being appreciated; sincere and authentic, more halting and freshly made; transformational potential for both the speaker and the person being regarded . . .⁹

Providing a *variety* of ways in which adults can share their faith and, in doing so, learn more about the community of faith in which they find themselves, communicates something very different from offering only a single, four-five minute class between liturgies. There are so many ways adults can be creatively involved. Providing opportunities for adults to take the risk of trying something they are *not* good at, with deliberate incentives for trying something new and difficult rather than steep penalties for failing, contributes to an environment of ongoing regard.¹⁰ Sharing one's faith with a friend is hard enough, let alone with a stranger. But what about making a collage of magazine pictures that attempts to describe who God is? Or spending a day fishing, and then coming back to share three things one observed about God's Creation?

In the seminary context, I often use critical incident reports, described by Stephen Brookfield, to communicate to my students that their experience of the learning event matters.¹¹ How often do we provide real room for adult learners in a congregation to share their experience of learning? How often we do move outside of our own realms of expertise and join them in theirs? When was the last time that we visited congregation members in their workplaces and asked them to articulate what it means to be a person of faith in that context? To do so, I believe we need to make very clear, first, that we are not seeking a specific doctrinal voicing; rather, we are genuinely curious about what they are learning about God and about their relationship with Jesus Christ in a context in which such language is often forbidden. As Craig Van Gelder notes: “Interestingly, just as the church is responsible to read and relate to its context in order to better translate the gospel and specific church forms, so also the context reads and changes the church in relation to its efforts to present the gospel.”¹² How do we create room for the *context* in which we are embedded to contribute to our own learning, for the *context* to evangelize the church?

As these are clearly social languages that Kegan and Lahey are describing, their implementation must stretch beyond any individual congregation or church. Set within the often competing commitments of secular society, creating an environment of ongoing regard can be very difficult. Yet there are ways of doing so, not the least being using the core theological categories at the heart of our belief system as central organizing principles rather than defaulting to those of the wider culture. Rather than organizing religious education and evangelism in terms of prizes going to those whose programs draw the largest number of people, it is possible to organize religious education in terms of matching people’s God-given gifts to specific tasks and roles. It is possible to think about a congregation nourishing people and supporting them in their vocations *in the world* as a primary means of evangelism. Perhaps we should be asking, “What is the impact of our congregation on this context?” and “Who would miss us if we were not here?” rather than “How many people are coming through our doors?”¹³

In my local parish, it is clear that certain people are gifted as pastoral leaders, others as advocates, still others as parents, as political leaders, as retail clerks, as cleaning people, or as teachers, and so on. The vocation of each is vital, and the process of sharing faith in each setting is unique. Providing room for each set of gifts to be identified and given room to flourish contributes to an overall atmosphere quite different from that in which congregational ministry usually exists. It also inevitably creates constructive synergy that spreads energy, as opposed to stress-filled busy-ness that simply saps energy. It embodies, very visibly, the community of truth Palmer describes and which, I believe, is at the heart of evangelical mission.

From Rules and Policies to Public Agreement

Deliberately moving in these directions, however, tends to be moving against the grain of much current pastoral ministry. It, therefore, requires the next language that Kegan

and Lahey have identified: that which notes a difference between rules and policies as opposed to the language of public agreement. Most of us are quite familiar with what is meant by “rules and policies”—these are explicit statements in most organizations. Rules and policies are almost universally developed at the top of an organization and rarely provide constructive ground for engagement. You may know when you have broken a rule, for instance, but much like the language of prizes and praising, the language of rules and policies is observed more in the nature of its application to violations, rather than in proactive, ongoing ways.

The language of public agreement, by way of contrast, is a “vehicle for responsible people to collectively imagine a public life they simultaneously know they would prefer and know they will, at times, fall short of.”¹⁴ This is the language of covenant, rather than contract. It is a language of relationship, of commitment to each other, of repentance, and of forgiveness. It is a language that teachers often ask small groups to develop at the beginning of a collaborative process: What will be our agreement about collaboration? How will we know if we are indeed living into it? Such agreements allow individual members of a group space in which to call the group into accountability. It is a language that demands, as well as facilitates, participation. I would go so far as to argue that much of Paul’s rhetoric in the letters to the scattered churches of the first century is an attempt to articulate such a language.

At the beginning of each adult learning event that I facilitate, we spend some time exploring this notion of a language of public agreement. One obvious example involves agreeing with those present that stories that are shared in this context stay here, unless someone explicitly gives permission to share them in other settings. All of my events are designed with room for improvisation; helping each other understand what that can mean begins in the first session of any such learning event.

From Constructive to Deconstructive Criticism

The final language that Kegan and Lahey describe is that which moves from the language of constructive criticism to that of deconstructive criticism. This relates to both education and evangelism. Given how most of us were trained to practice constructive criticism, it can be jarring to recognize the assumptions upon which it rests. For instance, constructive criticism:

assumes the perspective of the feedback giver is right and correct. . . . An accompanying assumption is that there is only one right answer. . . . As long as we hold our view to be true—we have a vested interest in maintaining the truth. . . . Once we establish our meaning as the standard and norm against which we evaluate other people, we essentially hold them to our personal preferences.¹⁵

Criticizing constructive criticism is not an argument for the impossibility of normative truth. Rather, Kegan and Lahey point beyond notions of destructive and constructive criticism to what they have instead labeled “deconstructive criticism,” a term that assumes that offering criticism is an opening for engagement in real dialogue that seeks to foster substantial learning. Such engagement rests on a series of “deconstructive propositions”:

1. There is probable merit to my perspective.
2. My perspective may not be accurate.
3. There is some coherence, if not merit, to the other person’s perspective.
4. There may be more than one legitimate interpretation.
5. The other person’s view of my viewpoint is important information in assessing whether I am right or identifying what merit there is to my view.
6. Our conflict may be the result of the separate commitments each of us holds, including commitments we are not always aware we hold.
7. Both of us have something to learn from the conversation.
8. We need to have two-way conversations to learn from each other.
9. If contradictions can be a source of learning, then we can come to engage not only internal contradictions as a source of learning, but interpersonal contradictions (i.e., “conflict”) as well.
10. The goal of our conversation is for each of us to learn more about ourselves and the other as meaning makers.¹⁶

Note how these propositions shift us from the mode of being the owners of truth to being seekers of truth. Quite visibly, they move us from processes of indoctrination or proselytism to more relational and dynamic models for a community of learning. In making this move, we rely on our faith that there is, indeed, truth to be discovered—but our very faith shapes the humility of our search for truth.¹⁷

These propositions are bases by which to begin a true conversation. They are a clear foundation for the kind of learning involved in discipleship. As Paul notes, “I come not bearing wise words of wisdom, but only Christ, and him crucified.” Paul knows something of what he speaks, having had his entire life turned upside down, quite literally struck from his stance into blindness and turned to a new road. It is important to recognize that:

A language of deconstructive criticism is not a language of discounting one’s own negative evaluation. Rather it’s about holding two simultaneous realities together. And practicing a language for deconstructive conflict does not leave one in paralysis of analysis, unable to act, merely better understanding the conflict. Finally, language for deconstructive conflict is not practiced first of all for the purpose of making the conflict disappear or even reducing its intensity.¹⁸

Indeed, this kind of language can, at times, heighten awareness of the differences that exist in a given situation. Imagine what this kind of conversation makes possible among differing generations in a specific context, among differing denominations, or among differing faiths!

It is an argument *for* the nuanced and complex notion of truth that Palmer identifies as *troth*, or the truth for which one gives one's life.¹⁹ Such truth is neither easily derived nor simply specified. This is the kind of truth for which Jesus was crucified and on the basis of which we as sinful human beings are redeemed. This is also the truth—through pledging of troth—that most often poses the really painful dilemmas of growth for our learners and ourselves.

Fundamentally, educators know that learning brings transformation. Fundamentally, evangelists know that sharing the good news brings transformation. What we have to remember is that transformation is at least as often *our own* as it is anyone or anything else's. When the Gospel pushes for a missional emphasis, these stories invite us into “troubling the waters.” They invite us into the currents of a large and tumultuous river leading to an even larger ocean. They invite us ever more deeply into our own brokenness and, paradoxically, into the joy of God's gift of grace in spite of that brokenness.

We need, at once, to trust that our faith can carry us beyond that brokenness, and that our despair at our brokenness is but the starting point of our joy. This experience, this learning, is at the heart of evangelism: *go and make learners!*

Questions for Reflection and Conversation

1. When the idea of sharing faith is raised in your church setting, what are the concerns that emerge? To what underlying commitments do these concerns point?
2. What are you, as a member of your congregation, thinking/feeling/doing that makes it *harder* for you to share stories of faith? What would facilitate sharing of faith stories?
3. In what ways does your congregation model *ongoing regard* as an element of its faith practices?
4. Name some examples of ways a community of truth has emerged in some context of your life. Can you imagine ways that experience could become part of your faith community?

Parish Strategies

1. Spend a year with your congregation deliberately visiting them in their primary places of engagement during the week. The goal should be to listen and to collect stories of the ways in which the members' faith shapes their daily lives, and then to use those narratives as the platform for extended evangelical planning.
2. Institute a ten-minute period of time just before or after a weekly worship service when congregational members are invited to tell their own journeys of faith.
3. Have your congregational leadership write an evocative question each week based on the readings within liturgy that is then posed at the end of the liturgy (perhaps as part of the announcements) and which is also printed in the bulletin and on the Web site. Invite them to share their own responses to that question as they attend other church meetings during the week.
4. Using the resources from the *Practicing Our Faith* movement (see the Web site: www.practicingourfaith.org), invite congregation members to try some of the practices during the week. Then, when they're able, invite them to share a practice with someone.

*Sharing the gospel with others is at the heart of learning,
and hence crucial to engagement in contemporary ministry.*

5. See James Dittes, *Men at Work: Life Beyond the Office* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996) and *Driven by Hope: Men and Meaning* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996).
6. National Congregations Study (NCS) of 1998, as quoted in David Murrow's *Why Men Hate Going to Church* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 2005), 54–55.
7. Murrow, 29–30.
8. Murrow, 224.
9. Murrow, 92–94.
10. Murrow, 175–76.
11. David W. Anderson, Paul G. Hill, and Roland D. Martinson, *Coming of Age: Exploring the Identity and Spirituality of Younger Men* (Minneapolis Augsburg Fortress, 2006), 54
12. Murrow, 59.
13. Murrow, 72.
14. Murrow, 180.
15. Murrow, 136.
16. Murrow, 207–14.
17. Murrow, 200–15.
18. An example is *Beginnings: An Introduction to Christian Faith*, written by Andy Langford and Mark Ralls, video resources by Rob Weber (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003). This material focuses each week on a question like, “Why am I not where I want to be?” (on sin and the cross), “Can I start again?” (on forgiveness and wholeness), and “Why should I join any group that will have me as a member?” (on the nature of the church).
19. “Americans and the God Question” *The Christian Science Monitor*, September 25, 2006, <http://csmonitor.com>. (May 2007)
20. “Losing My Religion? No, Says Baylor Religion Survey,” Baylor University Public Relations News, September 11, 2006.
21. Hannah Elliott, “Americans Believe in Four Gods, Baylor Religion Study Finds,” *ChurchExecutive.com* (n.d.), <http://www.ChurchExecutive.com>. (May 2007).
22. Anne Neufeld Ruff, *Growing Together: Understanding and Nurturing Your Child's Faith Journey* (Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1996), 26–27.
23. Ruff, 27–28
24. Ruff, 27–28.

Chapter 9: Go and Make Learners!

1. Robert Kegan and Lisa Lahey, *How the Way We Talk Can Change the Way We Work* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002).
2. This, of course, is also part of the energy behind the research methodology known as “appreciative inquiry.” See David Cooperrider, Frank Barrett, Suresh Srivastva,

- “Social Construction and Appreciative Inquiry: A Journey in Organizational Theory,” in *Management and Organization: Relational Alternatives to Individualism*, ed. D. M. Hosking, H. P. Dachler and K. J. Gergen (New York: Ashgate Publishing, 1995). Also, Mark Lau Branson, *Memories, Hopes and Conversations: Appreciative Inquiry and Congregational Change* (Herndon, VA: Alban Institute, 2004).
3. Indeed, I fear that one of the side effects, or “incidental” learnings, that many people might take from the recent—and quite powerful—book, *The Evangelizing Church: A Lutheran Contribution* (Augsburg, 2005) eds. by Richard Bliese and Craig Van Gelder—is that in an effort to highlight the urgent need to move into evangelization, the authors might at the same time be inadvertently perpetuating a painful stereotype (that is, Lutherans are not evangelizers) that relies on negative assertions to make its point.
 4. See Parker Palmer, *The Courage to Teach* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997) and *To Know as We Are Known* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1993).
 5. The “null curriculum” is that which is not taught, but which also has consequences.
 6. Palmer, *The Courage to Teach*, 106 ff.
 7. Palmer’s critique and proposal are most clearly elaborated in *To Know as We Are Known* and *The Courage to Teach*.
 8. I Cor 2:1-5 NAB.
 9. Kegan and Lahey, *How the Way We Talk Can Change the Way We Work*, 102.
 10. It is worth noting that Sharon Daloz Park’s work on leadership education suggests that “it must be underscored that it is the reflection on one’s own experiences of leadership failure that is the essential, vital feature of this leadership formation practice.” Sharon Daloz Parks, *Leadership Can Be Taught: A Bold Approach for a Complex World* (Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation, 2005), 96.
 11. See Stephen Brookfield, *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995), particularly chapter six.
 12. Craig Van Gelder, “For the Sake of the World” in *The Evangelizing Church: A Lutheran Contribution*, ed. Richard Bliese and Craig Van Gelder (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005), 67.
 13. Jack Fortin’s eloquent, short book *Centered Life* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005) is an excellent example of how to do this.
 14. Kegan and Lahey, *How the Way We Talk Can Change the Way We Work*, 114.
 15. Kegan and Lahey, 128–29.
 16. Kegan and Lahey, 141.
 17. Mark Edwards names a series of Christian virtues in relation to this kind of humility as being quintessential scholarly responses in his essay, “Characteristically Lutheran Learnings?” in *Dialog: A Journal of Theology*, vol. 41, #1, Spring 2002.
 18. Kegan and Lahey, *How the Way We Talk Can Change the Way We Work*, 143–145.
 19. Palmer, *To Know as We Are Known*, 43.