

## Article

### Integration Reinforced Through Apologetics: Two Case Illustrations

Richard C. Chewning and Delia Haak  
John Brown University

*Chewning and Haak offer two case illustrations: one in management decision-making and the other in marketing. The illustrations could be used to help students identify what they believe and why they believe it, while teaching them how to biblically defend their world/lifeview.*

#### Introduction

Those of us working in the context of Christian higher education are ever-looking for ways to encourage and reinforce the development of a Christian (biblically-enlightened) world/lifeview in the lives of our students. There are obviously many pedagogical methodologies that may be employed in our efforts to foster a biblically informed world/lifeview—lectures, assigned readings, written reports, mentoring, discussions with individuals and groups, etc. The “case pedagogy” method is illustrated in this paper.

Helping young adults to think Christianly is noble work. It requires the help and nurture of the Holy Spirit in the lives of both the professors and the students. The Holy Spirit

implants facets of the mind of Christ into the hearts of those under His care through the use of Scripture. This conveyed biblical substance becomes the leavening element utilized by the Spirit to reshape and adjust the world/lifeview of those under His guidance and training. The biblical insights and truths imparted by Him are useful for informing and bringing godly insights to the rest of life’s providential experiences.

Cases are opportunities to encounter historic or imagined situations that allow the individual students to intellectually engage events and people on paper that they may “meet” later in life in non-academic settings. Contemplating case events automatically propels students into an evaluative role.

Opinions are formed. They formulate judgments about facts, situations, processes, organizational structures, the people involved, relationships, how others think, human behavior, environmental tensions, and numerous other possible considerations. The content of the case will determine the range of considerations and drives the issues to be explored.

Case discussions revolve around shared opinions. The value of such discussions emerges from three factors: 1) the individuals are required to formulate and share their world/lifeview as it pertains to a number of specific elements in the case, 2) the students will hear and be required to consider opinions that differ from their own during the course of the discussions, and 3) the students can be trained to defend pertinent aspects of their world/lifeview that are publicly exposed during such discussions—the purpose of Christian apologetics. The defense becomes their apologetic. And an apologetic that is biblically sound reinforces the union of faith and learning.

### Two Case Illustrations

The following two cases are offered to illustrate how a case pedagogy can be used to help students identify 1) what they believe, 2) why they believe it, and most importantly 3) *how to biblically defend their beliefs*—their world/lifeview. The two cases presented focus on issues in management decision-making and marketing. Faculty, of course, may choose cases from within any academic discipline to help build a Christian (biblically-enlightened) world/lifeview.

The two cases offered here are short and could be handed out and discussed during class. If this procedure were followed, the students would first be asked to read the case immediately upon receiving it, making notes as to the key issues they believe should be discussed by the entire class. By identifying key issues to be addressed, students begin to formulate *what* they personally believe and *why* they believe it. After completing the first reading, students might be asked to form small groups within which to share their personal beliefs about the major issues/problems the group identifies. Minority views should be encouraged; political correctness is not an academic asset.

The first case, “Salary Distribution,” provides the students an opportunity to 1) decide how new budgeted monies should be allocated among employees, and 2) identify the criteria they used in making their decisions. Student groups would then report their conclusions to the whole class. This allows the instructor to highlight differences and similarities between the different perspectives and decisions that emerge within and between the groups.

The second case, “Phantom Pricing,” progresses through four stages of decision-making—it is a four-part case. When reading Part I, the individual students will automatically begin to make personal assumptions about the case. After forming small groups to discuss Part I, the group will then automatically make and follow certain assumptions. The entire class should then discuss the disclosed opinions. Then the students are introduced to new information contained in Part II and the “discovery/group discussion/class discussion” progression continues on through Part IV. The groups will discuss relevant information that may affect their previous conclusions and recommendations as they go

along. In this case, the instructor has ample opportunities to discuss individual and group assumptions that reflect students’ beliefs.

During the “student discussion phase” of the case analysis, the instructor’s primary role is to ask key questions that strongly encourage students to summarize *what* they believe and *why* they believe it. The instructor should question and work with students until they can clearly articulate their “final” assumptions and beliefs. When this phase is complete, the instructor moves into the role of asking students to *biblically defend* their particular assumptions and beliefs that form their world/lifeviews—*set forth a biblical apologetic*. During this final phase of the use of the case pedagogy, students are challenged to explore, apply, and articulate biblical principles<sup>1</sup> found embodied in the propositional statements of Scripture, with the help of the Holy Spirit.

The “Salary Distribution” case will now be presented. It is followed by a “Possible Student Responses—Issues Considered” section that is in turn followed by a section titled “Apologetics as a Tool of Integration.” It is this latter section that explains the

Figure 1

Salary Distribution Case

Name	Present Salary	Title	Years in Dept.	Performance	Personal Circumstances
Jim Belk	\$48,000	Programmer	7	Outstanding. Assertive and pushy in style. Hard to work with but very creative.	Single. Has a reputation for being a “swinging party boy with an eye for women.”
Martha Hill	\$33,000	Junior Programmer	3	Acceptable output but makes lots of mistakes. Been warned about this.	Single. Looks after a chronically ill father.
Sarah Bird	\$28,000	Junior Programmer	8	Excellent worker. Initiates constructive changes. Very dependable.	Married. Husband is a surgeon. Two grown children.
Harold Kline	\$54,000	Senior Programmer	12	Acceptable, with little original new material now. Consistent and loyal, but minimal performance.	Married. Four children: two in high school, one in college, one in graduate school.
Bob Still	\$44,000	Programmer	6	Acceptable but spotty performance—good work/late work (may not be his problem).	Married. Five children. Sole family support.
Jill Chan	\$40,000	Programmer	2	Good, but tends to socialize too much. Can distract others. Her own output is above average.	Single. Been rumored she hangs out at the same places as the boss. Has an expensive wardrobe.

concept of apologetics that is so essential in the development of a biblically-guided world/lifeview. This section is in turn followed by “Apologetics Applied to the Case ‘Salary Distribution,’” where the application of biblical principles in the defense of one’s position is illustrated.

### Case 1—Salary Distribution Case

(See Figure 1 at left.) Joseph Workmore, the supervisor of the programming department, was given \$17,500 to divide up for salary increases among the six workers in his department. This represents a seven percent overall increase in the total salary package in a year when inflation was running at a four percent level.

How should Workmore distribute the money?

### Possible Student Responses—Issues Considered

Discussion often begins in small groups with students asking questions of their own about the case. These questions and their responses lead to identifying the major issues and *what* students believe about these issues.

In the Salary Distribution Case, one finds questions like, “Should personal circumstances,

such as number of wage earners per family or marital status, make a difference in one’s salary? Should years of experience or current output weight the salary scale, or should the level of a position carry the greatest weight?” Specific questions, such as, “Why does Sarah Bird, with the second highest years of experience and an excellent, dependable work record, make the least of all employees and more than 17 percent less than the next higher salary? Why is Sarah encountering such discrimination? Is it a fair or unfair form of discrimination?”

As students begin to explore these issues, their values are first exposed and then debated. Students will often offer a rationale to frame an issue such as a range of salary based on positions like a junior programmer, programmer, and senior programmer. The length of employment will seem to present an issue because of discrepancies in salary. Gender also surfaces as an issue as students observe that the males earn the three highest salaries in the department, regardless of position, length of employment, or quality of work. Questions arise like, “What is fair wage? What should compensation be based upon?” And ultimately

the case question emerges: “Should the budget increase be equally distributed among the co-workers or based upon merit?”—an egalitarian/libertarian distribution issue.

Students will bring up, perhaps with the instructor’s probing, the issues of discrimination, fair wages, and rights and responsibilities. The instructor and students are now ready to address these issues apologetically.

### **Apologetics as a Tool of Integration**

The issues identified by the students during their discussion of the case establish the moral focal points and parameters within which their thoughts and opinions are expressed. Their thoughts and opinions focus on those concerns they believe are the most important. It is the teacher’s job to see that all germane issues are identified and brought forward. This is best done through the Socratic method of questioning that leads the students to the discovery of any “hidden” or “overlooked” issues.<sup>2</sup>

Once the teacher is satisfied that all of the relevant issues have been identified and discussed and opinions expressed, the time is ripe for calling upon the students

to articulate their reasons for taking the particular positions they did in the case discussion. As the students begin to respond, they can be subsequently challenged to further explain *why* they hold the particular positions they do.

The first time a class is exposed to the process being recommended at this juncture, there will come a point in time when the teacher will perceive a relatively high level of frustration on the part of the students. This tells the teacher that the time is ripe to begin teaching the students how to engage in *biblical apologetics*—a procedure whereby one learns to apply *biblical truth as the relevant evidence for a defense of a stated position*.

The students should be told that what they are now going to be repeatedly exposed to in the weeks to come is not something to be employed in the marketplace but is an exercise that will help develop their personal ability to relate biblical truth—the raw materials from which their faith presuppositions flow—to the issues they encounter in life and to which they bring their faith-based world/lifeview to bear. They should be encouraged to

learn how to employ biblical apologetics as a means of growing in their ability to relate *faith and life*.

The students will probably object to the “apologetics approach” when they are first exposed to it. The typical complaint is that they do not know their Bible well enough to employ the technique. What an opportunity to reinforce the truth that this admission exposes! Biblical ignorance is to be overcome, not overlooked. It is not to be used as an excuse for accepting an undeveloped Christian world/lifeview. Such an admission should become the very basis for learning how to develop one’s ability to relate God’s Word to life’s experiences. Let the confession drive us back to the Scripture. Let it goad us into learning how to use the

concordances and biblical cross-referencing materials that are available to every Christian in our schools and universities. The practice of biblical apologetics will do more to aid in the development of a Christian (biblically-enlightened) world/lifeview than almost anything else one can do to nurture a Christian perspective on life.

### **Biblical Propositions That Pertain to the Salary Distribution Case<sup>3</sup> Issues**

(See Figure 2.) The instructor must have done her or his “apologetics work” before the students are given the case. And, no less than three scriptures addressing each issue should be identified in order to make sure a biblical principle is being applied

Figure 2

#### **I. God is No Respector of Persons**

1. James 2:1-13 (v. 9)
2. Ephesians 6:9
3. Galatians 2:6
4. Romans 2:11
5. Acts 10:34
6. II Chronicles 19:7
7. Deuteronomy 10:17
8. Deuteronomy 1:17

#### **II. Fair Wages**

1. Malachi 3:5
2. Jeremiah 22:13
3. I Corinthians 9:7
4. I Timothy 5:18

#### **III. Responsibility/Rights**

1. Proverbs 29:7
2. Proverbs 31:8-9
3. Isaiah 10:1-2
4. Jeremiah 5:28-29 (vv. 30-31)

properly. There is a risk of poor hermeneutics taking place if less than three biblical references are used.

### **Apologetics Applied to the Case “Salary Distribution”**

Guiding students to study these issues in light of Scripture brings God’s perspective into very real-world, marketplace issues. As students wrestle with whether discrimination has taken place and on what basis, there is a biblical perspective on the issue. For example, James 2:1-13 tells us that any favoritism that arises out of inappropriate “distinctions” (v. 4) results in sin (v. 9). Anyone that shows unjustified favoritism becomes a law-breaker (vv. 9-10). In Ephesians 6:9, Paul reminds us, when talking to those who owned slaves in his day, that “both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no favoritism with Him.” On this issue Scripture is absolutely clear: “... there is no partiality with God” (Romans 2:11). Inappropriate discrimination is simply ungodly.

The issue of “fair wages” is not even a question in the minds of most employers. They assume the “free market” sets a fair wage and anyone is free to go elsewhere if they do not like the wage they are earning. Isn’t that

right? Many women, blacks, and other minorities might disagree with such a conclusion. The Lord condemns those who *oppress the wage earners in their wages* (Malachi 3:5). The wage oppressors are accounted as being no better than sorcerers, adulterers, and perjurers. The Bible warns us in Jeremiah 22:13, “Woe to him who ... does not give him his wages.” Paul declares in I Timothy 5:18 that the “laborer is worthy of his wages.” And James 5:4 states that “the pay of the laborer ... cries out against you ... [and] has reached the ears of the Lord.” Wages that are too little, wages that are withheld, or wages that are paid too infrequently are all “unjust wages.” We can conclude from the biblical account that employers are accountable before Christ for the payment of *just wages*, and free marketplace practices are not necessarily dependable forces in the determination of a just wage.

The even more difficult issue to address, however, is “What am I to do about it?” Scripture is clear. It states managers have the responsibility to “defend the rights” of those in their care—those in a lesser power position. A righteous manager must address injustices wherever they

are detected. Failing to act to resolve an injustice where one is known to exist transfers one into the category of the unrighteous manager. Proverbs 31:8-9 tells us to judge rightly and to speak up and defend the rights of the powerless. We cannot remain silent, for to do so is itself an “evil deed” in God’s eyes. Jeremiah 5:28-31 reveals God’s displeasure when “... they also excel in deeds of wickedness ... and they do not defend the rights of [others].”

Students more easily deal with these issues when they are observed in a case setting. The case becomes practice for the realities that lie ahead. Students should be encouraged to examine their personal values, priorities, and intended actions *through the lens of God’s applicable principles* as they are set forth in Scripture. It is good to walk in the counsel of the Lord. Discrimination, fair wages, and the rights of the powerless are issues on which God has given us counsel. We should heed and apply His counsel.

### **Case 2—Phantom Pricing Case (Part I)**

A summer intern from a major university marketing program was given the

opportunity to study the pricing structure of the major jewelry retail chain at which he was employed. This was an outstanding opportunity for him to make an impression on the management of the chain and speed up the timeframe within which they could consider him for a permanent position after he finished his degree.

In studying the response of customers to sales events over the past several years, he discovered that when extremely large discounts were advertised with a sales event, customers responded very favorably. This did not surprise him, and he shared this information with his manager.

As he studied the way these discounts were offered in a typical year, he found that the “regular price” for gold jewelry existed less than five percent of the time. In many of the years, as he went back through the history of the company, he found that the regular price “never existed,” and only “discount prices” were ever shown.

He asked his supervisor if there could really be a regular price if it never existed. His supervisor replied that he had had the same concern but that in the five years he had been with the company he had never felt he



had the right to question such a critical policy, for, after all, the success or failure of the company hung on such matters.

*Question: Is it deceptive to refer to a “regular price” that never exists in the marketplace? Should the summer intern attempt to bring this question out into the open? If so, how? If not, why not?*

### **Possible Student Responses (Part I)**

Students often differ in their opinion on whether the common practice of “discount” pricing is indeed deceptive or not.

Those who believe it *is* a fundamentally deceptive practice base their reasoning on the explicit indication that a “discount” signifies that a “regular” price does in reality exist. Those

students who argue it is *not* a deceptive practice do

so on the basis that “discount” signifies the price is below the actual value of the product.

For them it is similar to an appraisal on a house.

The appraisal is not necessarily the asking price of the house.

Indeed, the actual price of a home may be higher or lower than the

appraised value. Such is their definition of “discount” pricing. Student responses vary on whether “discount” pricing is intentionally deceptive to consumers, but they are not usually passionate in arguing their positions on either side of the practice. When discussion turns to what an intern should *do* about this practice, student responses typically become more intense.

Of course, those students who believe such practices are “absolutely” deceptive often advise that the intern must bring this deception to the attention of his supervisors and make his displeasure and/or discomfort known.

Students who believe there is no violation of truth-telling in this practice believe the intern should proceed without any revelation of his discomfort or displeasure.

Those who perceive there “may be” a partial deception occurring range in advice from simply asking for clarification of the “regular” price or the amount of mark-up to suggesting an alternative pricing strategy or technique. (The latter group generally has difficulty in

providing specific recommendations—generalizations prevail.)

### **Phantom Pricing Case (Part II)**

As his summer drew to a close, the intern was invited to a top management team meeting for a debriefing regarding his summer internship. The president of the company chaired the meeting. They asked the intern what he had learned and if there were things he had encountered that he did not understand or had questioned. He wondered if his chances of being asked to go to work for them might be affected by an insensitive answer at this juncture regarding the pricing question. He knew he would just have to accept the existing policy, should it remain in place, and he eventually accepted a position with the company.

*Question: Should he raise the pricing issue in his discussion with the management team?*

### **Possible Student Responses (Part II)**

Again, student responses are often divided. Some believe it is “smart” to be quiet. To ask or raise a question is to run the risk of offending management. Others, however, think that if a concern exists with the pricing

policy, the intern should raise the issue with his superiors. Students often emphasize, however, that the intern must be tactful and not appear to be questioning the company’s morals or ethics. He should appear to be curious, but not judgmental. Those who want to raise the issue believe it will eliminate further obligations on the part of the intern. Regardless of the corporate response, the intern would have fulfilled his responsibility in bringing the policy into question.

### **Phantom Pricing Case (Part III)**

The intern chose not to raise the issue during the interview. At the conclusion of the interview the president of the company said that he had heard from the intern’s supervisor that he had raised the issue about “fake discounts.” He was asked, straight out, “Was that a problem for you?”

*Question: Should he explain the problem he had with the pricing issue at this point, or should he evade the fact that it was a problem for him since he assumed the president instituted the policy?*

### **Possible Student Responses (Part III)**

At this point, students often rephrase the issue as a “cause of confusion” rather than as a “lack of moral backbone.” The students will probably still be divided as to a solution, however. Some will interpret it as a marketing issue and not as a moral issue. Those who see it as a marketing issue are more likely to brush off the question with an evasive response like, “I wondered about it but concluded it was an acceptable marketing ploy and ceased to question it.” Students that see it as a true ethical issue are more prone to want the intern to “confess” his concern and admit his “protective tendency.” Student discussion often seems to be evasive around the earlier discussions framing this policy as ethical or unethical.

### **Phantom Pricing Case (Part IV)**

The intern chose to defer the question, saying that he had probably been misunderstood on the issue. The president then said the policy had always been a major problem for him, and a major priority for the next year was to study the pricing system to make it more ethical. The president expressed his disappointment that the intern did

not see pricing as a problem because he would have wanted him to participate in its study.

*Question: Does the president's attitude surprise you? Should people make assumptions about others' probable reactions to problems, or simply speak their own mind about situations?*

### **Possible Student Responses (Part IV)**

Students are often surprised by the president's self-revelation. The president's questioning of the company policy seemed inconsistent with their view of a corporate president. In fact, the president had only been with the corporation for four years, having been brought in from the outside to solve many problems. The president was just now ready to tackle this particular issue. Those students who believed the intern should have expressed his apprehensions generally see him as having been dishonest—or minimally as having a weak moral backbone. Those who wanted the intern to “be careful” generally see the situation as one of “poor personal positioning” rather than as a moral or character issue. They will rationalize, “While it is important to be honest, it is just as important to express one's

thoughts in a self-protective manner.”

### **Apologetics as a Tool of Integration**

Apologetics, as a tool of integration, was discussed earlier in conjunction with Case 1. Integration itself may take place or occur in many ways in an individual's life. For example, some people receive the truth of Christ and His teaching like bread receives leaven: the truth simply mixes with their world/lifeview unconsciously and they live by it without being able to explain or defend it.<sup>4</sup> Other people are more conscious of their worldview and its relationship to Christ's teachings. When the world presents an issue and the culture's accepted position on the matter contrasts sharply with biblical truth, it is good for the Christian to be able to formulate a biblical apologetic so that minimally they can discuss it in biblical terms with their brothers and sisters in Christ.

Apologetics, the formal biblical defense of one's world/lifeview as it pertains to a particular matter, is not a better form of integration than other forms, but it is a better training tool than other methods. This is so because it brings into the open

the application of specific biblical principles and truths where they can be examined and discussed by those for whom we have a particular responsibility for fostering and developing a biblically-grounded world/lifeview. Biblical apologetics forces the use of concrete examples demonstrating the relationship between particular biblical truths and specific issues encountered in the broader world.

### **Biblical Propositions That Pertain to the Phantom Pricing Case Issues**

(See Figure 3 on next page.)

### **Apologetics Applied to the Case “Phantom Pricing”**

In “Case 2—Phantom Pricing,” the moral issues that need to be identified include motives and intentions, integrity, honesty, deception, presumption, and a “fallen nature” tendency to seek to please men rather than to please God. Psalm 139:1-4, for example, reminds us that God is omniscient (knows everything). When the psalmist cries out, “O Lord, You have searched me and known me ... You understand my *thought* [emphasis mine] from afar ... and are intimately

Figure 3

**I. Intentions/Motives**

1. I Corinthians 4:5
2. II Corinthians 5:12
3. Hebrews 4:13
4. I Kings 8:39-40
5. Psalm 139:1-4
6. Jeremiah 17:9-10

**III. Integrity**

1. Proverbs 19:1
2. Isaiah 33:15
3. Ezekiel 18:5-9
4. Luke 6:31
5. Luke 16:10
6. II Corinthians 4:2

**V. Seeking to Please Men, Not God**

1. John 5:41-44
2. Romans 2:29
3. II Corinthians 10:18
4. Hebrews 11:24-26

acquainted with all my ways,” he is revealing that God is intimately acquainted with man’s motives and true intentions as well as his actions. Solomon, as did his father, acknowledges that God alone discerns the heart (the motives and intentions) of men. In I Kings 8:39-40, Solomon prays, “Then hear in heaven Your dwelling place, and forgive and act and render to each according to all his ways, whose heart You know, for You alone know the hearts of all the sons of men, that they may fear You all the days

**II. Deception/Falsehood**

1. Job 36:4
2. Psalm 5:6
3. Psalm 12:2
4. Ephesians 4:25
5. Colossians 3:9
6. Revelation 21:8

**IV. Presumption**

1. Proverbs 13:10
2. Proverbs 18:12-13
3. James 4:13-16
4. II Peter 1:4-11 (v. 10)
5. Luke 12:18

that they live ...”. The writer of Hebrews also confirms in 4:13, “... all things are open and laid bare to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do.” Not only is God aware of our deepest motives, He alone can understand the intentions of the heart, for He knows that “The heart is more deceitful than all else and is desperately sick; who can understand it? ‘I, the Lord, search the heart, I test the mind’” (Jeremiah 17:9-10). God knows the intentions and motives of the intern’s heart and ours.

Principles of honesty and integrity are in sharp contrast with deception and falsehood in Scripture. Proverbs 19:1 highlights this contrast when informing us that “Better is a poor man who walks in his integrity than he who is perverse in speech and is a fool.” The Apostle Paul instructs us in Ephesians 4:25—“laying aside falsehood, speak truth ... for we are members of one another.” He admonishes us, “Do not lie to one another, since you laid aside the old self with its evil practices” (Colossians 3:9).

It is fairly evident that the intern in the case was trying to please his superiors and was not giving any thought to what God might desire. We are to please God before we seek to please men. (John 5:41-44 is a powerful illustration of this tendency: see the Scripture list on page 66).

Finally, Jesus himself gave us the measure of how we are to interact with others by instructing us to treat them in the same way we would want to be treated (Luke 6:31). In the Phantom Pricing Case, as in all cases, students are afforded the opportunity to evaluate the moral issues that are imbedded in the case—the practice of “discount” pricing in this example.

The issues of “intentions/motives,” “deception/falsehood,” “integrity,” “presumption,” and “being men-pleasers rather than God-pleasers” are all present here.

**Conclusion**

The following four elements play a role in the development of a Christian world/lifeview: 1) the individual Christian’s existing world/lifeview, 2) the Holy Spirit, 3) the Holy Spirit’s use of Scripture in the life of the individual Christian, and 4) the providential events that impact the individual Christian’s life that are superintended by the Holy Spirit. Professors are really influencers that provide “providential events that impact the individual Christian’s life”—a portion of God’s economy expressed in number four. This being so, we believe that those of us who want to help our students think Christianly can do nothing better to facilitate this possibility than to create opportunities in which the students are exposed to Scripture and are required to think about its application to the academic work they are currently confronting.

We further conclude that the practice of *biblical apologetics* maximizes the explicit effort to



relate God's Word to a particular current study while concurrently demonstrating the need to be in God's Word and to be seeking its appropriate application. Biblical ignorance is the bane (killer) of integration. Biblical apologetics confronts and seeks to overcome biblical ignorance. Biblical apologetics provides the Holy Spirit an opportunity to use the Word of God to renovate the world/lifeview of the students. Biblical apologetics can be a powerful tool when employed in our efforts to encourage the development of a Christian (biblically-enlightened) world/lifeview in the hearts of our students. Let us seriously consider its use as a significant part of our teaching pedagogy.

**Richard C. Chewning**

Distinguished Scholar in  
Residence

**Delia Haak**

Assistant Professor, Division of  
Business

Graduate Programs Coordinator  
for Business

John Brown University  
2000 West University Street  
Siloam Springs, AR 72761

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>"Biblical principles," as defined in the context of this paper, are "normative values"

or "biblical ideas" that are presented in the Scripture *three or more times*—a value or idea that is revealed (reiterated) no less than three times in Scripture.

<sup>2</sup>Teachers should avoid expressing their own perspectives on a case until they are ready to conclude the case, at which time we, the authors, believe it is the teacher's responsibility to reveal his or her world/lifeview as it pertains to the case at hand.

<sup>3</sup>All biblical quotations in this paper are taken from the New American Standard Bible (NASB).

<sup>4</sup>I Peter 3:15 implies strongly that every Christian needs to be able to minimally "give an account for the hope that is in" them—their belief that Christ is the Son of God and that He died for their sins. It does not necessarily imply that all are to be able to practice Paul's admonition fully as it is set forth in II Corinthians 10:5 and Colossians 2:8, where we are exhorted to avoid capture by the vain philosophies of the world. Many Christians need guidance and help from their church leaders to accomplish this.

**JBIB**