Often our approach to business education seems to treat students as “blank slates” upon which we can write the skills and knowledge necessary to be successful leaders in the business world. However, many observers believe that students have changed—that their values, beliefs, and behaviors have been shaped by a postmodern world that is out of synch with traditional university education. For example, Tim McCracken argues:

The new two cultures problem is no longer between science and the humanities, but between modernism and postmodernism. Because the classroom is part of the culture, this separation between modernism and postmodernism is larger than the artistic and literary movements from which its actions and reactions came. This separation’s primary educational significance is that while the curriculum is predominately modern, the students that curriculum hopes to educate are predominately postmodern. This dissonance is more than a media-hyped “generation gap”; it signals real distinctions in attitudes, expectations, and outcomes among the academy, its professors, and its students (7).

Whereas according to McCracken (8) the “modern” curriculum is characterized as the “transmission of information, content, processes, and skills from [a specialized] elite authority to the student [and ...] ability to absorb [these] via reading and writing abilities constitutes initiation into the academic dialect ... most American students born after 1960 and with normal media exposure have postmodern social characteristics ... These characteristics include a leveled view of authority and the importance of their own opinion, a belief that experience is more important than knowledge, an avoidance of pursuit for deeper meanings, a preference for passiveness, and a consumer orientation to almost everything.”

Many have recognized these changes and have advocated shifts in pedagogy to accommodate these realities. For example, elsewhere in this issue, Ronald Webb in his paper “Business Education and Microenterprise: A Millennial Marriage” argues that microenterprise development should be incorporated into the programs of Christian schools of business because “The current move towards providing a more experiential education for today’s more easily-distracted and visually-oriented students is well-established and represents a change from a teaching paradigm to a learning paradigm. Education in the next millennium will become increasing experiential ... [and] creative experiential opportunities [will be found] in the microenterprise development arena.”

There is no doubt that effective cross-cultural communication with our students will require adaptation. But how far should we go to accommodate the culture of our students? Do students need to be challenged to reshape their cultures to bring them into conformity with scriptural principles? Is current student culture congruent with the values, beliefs, and behaviors which contribute to success in today’s business environment of demanding global competitiveness?

What is Postmodernism?
Bob Francis (18) characterizes postmodernism as involving loss of accountability, legitimate authority, and absolute truth. He articulates three postmodern precepts:

Precept One - Culture Shapes the Person.
“In other words, social forces like language, values, and relationships mold human thought. People do what they do because their culture made them who they are. The natural result? An attitude of ‘It’s not my fault,’ and a tendency to do whatever one pleases.” Hence, the loss of accountability.

Precept Two - Knowledge About the World is not Discovered, but Constructed.
“Our perception of reality is colored by our culture. Trapped in our own subjectivity, we cannot perceive the external world as it really is. Since we’ve been culturally programmed, we never discover anything, rather we construct knowledge—essentially making it up as we go.”

**Precept Three - Truth is Relative.**

“Each group or individual decides for themselves what is true. ... Something is not believed because it is true ... rather it is true because it is believed. For example, there is nothing right about monogamous heterosexual marriage apart from cultural conventions and traditions. And there is nothing wrong with homosexuality other than cultural prejudice. There exists no objective criteria or authority for moral judgment.”

Other beliefs and behaviors follow directly from these precepts. Precepts two and three undermine the basis for legitimate authority and promote egoism. If there is no objective truth or knowledge, then “my” experience is the relevant reality. Francis agrees with McCracken that students have been heavily influenced by this worldview.

According to Alan Bloom, author of *The Closing of the American Mind*, almost every student entering the university claims to believe that truth is relative, especially as it relates to morals. This denial of objective, universal, absolute truth lies at the heart of postmodernism. “If this belief is put to the test,” says Bloom, “students ... will be uncomprehending. That anyone should regard the proposition as not self-evident astonishes them, as though we were calling in question 2+2=4” (18).

How has embrace of this worldview by Generation X affected higher education? Apparently the goals and aspirations of incoming college students remain traditional, but there is strong antipathy to what McCracken called the “modern curriculum.”

**Student Culture in a Postmodern World**

Research by Eskilson and Wiley suggests that the goals and aspirations of current college students are quite similar to the “mainstream values that occupied the attention of previous generations.” They concluded that “as predicted there was considerable value consensus across race, gender, and social class categories, and little to suggest that Generation X college students differ from preceding generations in their core concerns; for example, women students attached greater importance than men to attaining family goals, but men and women students did not differ in the importance they attached to economic success ... Contrary to the popular assumption of Generation X alienation, most students thought it likely that they would achieve their life goals.”

However, although their goals are fairly traditional, the authors note a disturbing failure in current students to realistically contemplate the discipline and preparation required for them to reach their goals. Their research suggests “that their (students’) hope for the future may not be founded on present effort and accomplishment.” This theme of entitlement without the necessity of paying one’s dues is echoed in Peter Sacks’ 1996 book *Generation X Goes to College*, which is written for a broad audience in a journalistic style.

Sacks’ book has clearly struck a raw nerve sparking substantial journalistic review and analysis from the academic community. He chronicles his experiences as a college professor following a distinguished career as a journalist who had received numerous honors and rewards, including nomination for a Pulitzer Prize. Sacks (pseudonym), in the words of reviewer Donald Swift, ...

... quickly learned the unwritten rule that when the student does not get the grade she or he wants, it is always the instructor’s fault. The customer is always right. Students discounted criticisms of their work as merely the instructor’s opinion, but the College’s administration equated student evaluations of instructors with holy writ, so obtaining tenure depended ... on pleasing students. ... Presented with devastating student evaluations and the fact that the average grade at the College was a “B”, Sacks decided to give the customers what they wanted, an undemanding course with easy grades and no serious criticism of student performance. He called this the Sandbox Experiment and likened it to a self-inflicted lobotomy. Colleagues encouraged him to play the game, reminded him that teachers are just performers, and urged him to teach to the evaluations.
The chair of the tenure committee even urged Sacks to take an acting class because he wasn’t entertaining enough for the MTV crowd (Sacks, 82). However, the game has consequences. In the words of reviewer Mark Peterson: “Sacks describes ‘ruinous deflation of academic standards’ (169). A survey of his students reveals that they, on average, study about one-quarter of what would traditionally be expected. Many resent or refuse to read and expect to be spoon fed with extra credit and study guides for multiple choice exams. ... [He] claims that Generation X students have a strong sense of entitlement: ‘I paid for it so I shouldn’t have to work for it’ (169). This entitlement mentality reflects rejection of modernity, ‘its belief in reason, sober analysis, and appropriate standards and authorities’ (109). ... ‘Reality for GenXers is an image on a video screen ... with truth being a whim of marketing managers and public relations flacks’ (124).” Swift agrees that “this situation is found throughout higher education. [He is] persuaded, however, that the greatest damage is found in the lower reaches of the academy, including comprehensive public and private universities.”

In the second half of his book, Sacks discusses at some length the connection between postmodernism and the student behaviors he observed. As summarized by Swift:

>The root of the problem is that there has been a dramatic shift in the student subculture: Generation X 16- to 30-year-olds have been reshaped by postmodern culture. [It] is a rejection of the rationalism, scientism, and faith in progress that marked modernism, and its most powerful vehicles are television, cinema, and modern advertising. Postmodernism’s victims are passive, distrust reason and authority, have opinions about everything, and lack respect for knowledge. ... Postmodern culture dissolves distinctions between high and popular culture and between specialization and popularization. Objectivity does not exist for the postmodernist, and subjective experience, especially “feeling,” replaces analysis, truth, facts, and empirical evidence in importance. The philosophical statement of postmodernism and Generation X could be, “I am entertained; therefore, I am.” Postmodernism did not invent moral relativism, but it elevated cafeteria values and nonjudgmentalism to the status of central religious tenets—the only absolutes it recognizes. Postmodern thought removes the individual’s responsibilities for her or his own actions and seems to replace it with the ethos of victimhood. Yet, Sacks rightly sees members of Generation X as victims of a culture that overwhelmed them. ... The de-emphasis of knowledge for its own sake has been a major force in educational circles for generations. Those forces all fed postmodernism and made its basic attitudes almost irresistible, contributing to its triumph in many parts of the educational world. In other times, there also were lazy, bored, self-centered students. The difference now is that an overpowering culture promotes those traits.

Mark Ray Schmidt seems to agree that this is a phenomenon of society’s popular culture rather than the culture of a particular generation.

At first, Sacks convinced me that postmodernism was not the real issue. ... As I read, the real problem seemed to be the students’ immaturity and poor motivation. Then I hit upon another idea; perhaps postmodernism is just immaturity writ large across our culture. As I thought about Sacks’ rather loose definition of postmodernism, I began to see the issues in a new light. Sacks explains that postmodernism is a rejection of traditional authorities, of clear rational thinking, and of objective standards. This is also a good definition of immaturity. Sacks overlooks an important distinction. In the 70s, many 18-year-olds were also immature and poorly prepared. However, those students could be induced to correct their weaknesses. They had some sense that objective standards of writing, thinking, and behavior existed. Today, young people and their parents often reject rationality and objective standards. Thus students are no longer ashamed of their lack of preparation, their rudeness, and their disregard for learning. ... Perhaps today’s freshmen are less prepared and more immature. However, the really significant change has been
the social approval/support now given to such students by our postmodern culture.

Sacks attributes many aspects of student culture including the tendency to be “disengaged” from learning to the influence of modern media:

That look of indifference that threw me into culture shock when I became a teacher might be the mirror image of the magnificent spectacle of images that have nurtured GenXers from childhood. Colorful, mesmerizing images and sounds flash and go; at a child’s whim Big Bird metamorphoses into Mr. Brady, who in turn is transformed into an MTV sex object. The spectacle that Generation X was born watching is never boring—the handheld remote guarantees that much. In Brave New World, Aldous Huxley foresaw a society whose inhabitants had repudiated thinking and reflection for the constant desire to be entertained, to be provoked and engaged, is good and natural, many of my students sometimes expected entertainment to the exclusion of almost everything else (143).

He goes on to express his perception that students conditioned their attention in class on theatrics that needed to rival those of Madonna or Michael Jackson. When Sacks asked a former student what he wanted in his teachers, he bluntly replied, “We want you guys to dance, sing, and cry. Seriously, that is what we consider to be good learning. We expect so much more from everything now because of the media. You guys can’t compete” (144). Swift agrees about the role of media in shaping students.

The more people watch TV, the more likely they are to believe the world is as it is shown on the tube. ... Excessive time spent watching television has produced people with short attention spans who are passive, inattentive, and shaped by the medium’s bias against subtleties. All images exist only in the present and are not anchored in separate times and places. Cultures, political processes, and events have no more historical dimensions than the shiny dune buggies advertised on the screen. ... The implications of these aspects of television’s influence on learning and behavior in ... classrooms are obvious and disquieting. ... People ... socialized by television ... expect to be entertained, to receive simple and superficial instruction and easy answers—all with the exertion of minimal energy. ... We need to develop strategies to inoculate students against passively accepting media impressions and to help them evaluate those offerings and distinguish television and cinematic images from reality.

Flacks and Thomas characterize current student culture as one of “disengagement”—disengagement from learning, from a search for truth, from a concern for deeper meaning, from a concern for morality, and from a desire to make any value judgments about culture. Sacks and Swift have argued that this disengagement follows naturally from saturation in the media-driven popular culture of our time. Several of McCracken’s “characteristics of the postmodern student” echo this theme of disengagement and make a connection between it and the popular culture. They are:

1. Pluralistic and passive acceptance of undifferentiated experience; the “promiscuous cool” of postmodernism allows for value-free experience.
2. Belief in the surface and the obvious; meaning is depth, experience is surface; “Everything is cool.”
3. Deliberate relaxation or avoidance of angst-driven meaning making.
4. Local, peer construction of reality.
5. Ironic distancing of the “serious” because the “serious” implies a hierarchy and an elite who determine the serious. Figures such as Bruce Willis (a.k.a. David Addison), David Lee Roth, David Letterman, and Bill Murray are examples of the ironic detachments from the serious.
6. Ironic stance towards everything; the loss of innocence whether real or perceived has taken the shock out of anything and everything.
7. Minimal aesthetic: less is enough; a deliberate deconstruction of all interpretations or their multiplicity; again “the cool surface.” And, more of the same is more of the same; postmodern
music is often formulaic and very repetitious because those very repetitions give not only a familiar pattern to experience, but frees the listener from personal choice (8-9).

Before moving on to the next section, let me acknowledge that the portrayal of the culture of postmodern students above is somewhat stereotypical—almost a caricature perhaps. Even Sacks would acknowledge that some students are committed to being learners, are engaged, and are self-disciplined. However, he contends they are a vanishing minority in American higher education. Perhaps we should understand these characteristics of the postmodern student as being indicative of a worldview which is increasingly evident to some degree in most but not all students. In a study of 800 students, Flacks and Thomas found that “disengagement” was most common among students of privilege, suggesting a relationship between indulgence and the postmodern student culture. They conclude that “advantaged students assume that a college degree is absolutely necessary for survival, but they see little connection between the content of their academic work and their future opportunities. Many are less motivated to learn than they are to get adequate grades. They pursue fun rather than growth. Students whose families have made sacrifices so that they can go to college, or who have struggled themselves to pursue an education ... feel obligated to make good use of their opportunities. They want not simply to get a degree, but to expand their intellectual horizons.”

We might speculate that personal faith in God and spiritual commitment might also be predictive of engagement in learning. Unfortunately, my search of the literature and resources such as the CIRP reports has not revealed any data which compares the postmodern characteristics of Christian students against the general population. However, the anecdotal experiences of my colleagues and I suggest that students at Christian colleges are heavily influenced by the popular culture and exhibit many of the characteristics described by McCracken and Sacks. My recent experience teaching for one semester at a secular private school, similar in size and programs to my own and where postmodern student culture was strongly evident, suggests that this culture is somewhat less evident at Christian colleges with closed enrollment.

The Christian Mandate to Serve God Rather Than Popular Culture

Where does Christianity stand with regard to the academic culture? Many Christians have welcomed postmodernism as offering a voice to Christian thinkers in the academy which was largely denied under modernism. And yet postmodernism with its commitment to subjectivism trivializes Christianity as just another opinion. “No worldview suffers more from the loss of truth than the Christian one,” says author and lecturer Ravi Zacharias. Why? Because Christianity is built on truth (Francis, 19). The Christian worldview is not wedded to modernism nor to postmodernism. It represents a third way to approach academics as summarized in Figure 1. I have identified four key aspects of the academic culture which seem to capture the essence of the discussions above and permit a comparison of the key differences between the three worldviews as reflected in the culture of the

Figure 1
Comparative Aspects of Academic Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Culture</th>
<th>Modernism</th>
<th>Postmodernism</th>
<th>Christianity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nature of Truth</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extent of Engagement</td>
<td>Search for Truth is Paramount</td>
<td>Passivity/ Entertainment</td>
<td>Truth has Eternal Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Source of Authority</td>
<td>Educated Elite</td>
<td>Elevation of Personal Opinion</td>
<td>Creator God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nature of Accountability</td>
<td>Accountable to Society</td>
<td>Entitlement</td>
<td>Accountable to God for Stewardship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
academy. These differences are discussed in greater detail in the following paragraphs.

**The Nature of Truth**

The immutability (Heb. 13:8) and omniscience of a God who knows his creation and his creatures without limitation (Psalm 139) and whose very essence is truth (John 14:6) stand in stark contrast to the subjectivity and relativism of postmodernism. Furthermore, that truth is revealed to us in Immanuel and through His Word. Modernism’s commitment to the reality of objective truth comes closer to a Christian worldview although it tends to limit the scope of truth to that ascertained through the scientific method. The Christian also sees truth through the eyes of faith (Heb. 11:1-3).

**Extent of Engagement**

For the modernist, the search for truth is the paramount responsibility of humanity because there is faith that through this search human civilization will progress and humanity will find fulfillment. The Christian goes further. Truth sets us free (John 8:31-47) and the “truth” is also the “way” to eternal life. Our worship of God is rooted in our belief in the absolute truthfulness of his creative acts (Psalm 100:3) and the resurrection of Christ, and if these things be not true then we are the most pathetic of all peoples (I Cor. 15:13-19). In contrast, the disengagement of the postmodernist borders on nihilism. The desire for undifferentiated surface experience in place of a search for deep meaning, the desire to craft a virtual reality through entertainment, and to avoid value judgments about anything reminds one of the people of Jerusalem who responded to the call for repentance by God in the face of coming destruction with the words, “Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die!” (Isaiah 22:12-13).

**Source of Authority**

Christian academics often say, “All truth is God’s truth.” It flows from His omniscience as revealed in His creative works (Rom. 1:18-20), through the “Word,” and finally through His Son (Heb. 1:1-3). At times His truth has been conveyed to humanity through anointed ones—prophets, priests, and apostles. But, under the New Covenant, we revel in the priesthood of the believer and the illumination of the indwelling Holy Spirit. “God created rationality and reason. The fathers of modern science (Bacon, Galileo, Kepler, Copernicus) held to a Christian worldview. They believed in a reasonable God who created a reasonable universe. Therefore man, by virtue of his God-given reasoning powers, could discover the form of the universe. We have the capacity to discover at least some truth about some things” (Francis, 22). Christians recognize the legitimate place for duly constituted authority in all spheres of life (I Peter 2:13-18). However, when considering authority in the context of the search for truth we must be somewhat cautious of placing the authority of “educated elites” above the authority of God. Furthermore, we must guard against the elevation of traditions which actually serve to close the mind. Remember the struggles between Jesus and the Pharisees over the nature of truth. He counseled his disciples that tradition could be counter-productive to the search for truth with the illustration that “new wine should be poured into new wineskins” (Matt. 9:17). Nevertheless, the “making of disciples” thrust of Christianity and the mentoring implicit in this process is radically different from the mind set of the postmodernist who elevates personal opinion in an idolatrous rejection of the knowledge and wisdom accumulated through the ages as a gift from God.

**Nature of Accountability**

This idolatry continues for the postmodern student with a sense of entitlement which egoistically denies accountability to society or to God for what is done with one’s life. Modernists at least have a utilitarian sense of accountability to society for what one does with their gifts and talents. The Christian has an even greater accountability to God for the exercise of good stewardship in the development and use of the gifts and talents which God has endowed us with. Paul urges us that “whatever you do, work at it with all your heart, as working for the Lord, not for men” (Col. 3:23) and “it is required that those who have been given a trust must prove faithful” (I Cor. 4:2). Good stewardship clearly requires self-discipline, which is linked directly to truth, wisdom, and understanding in Prov. 23:23.
Faith and Learning in a Changing Arena of Truth, Engagement, Authority, and Accountability

Christian higher education has historically concerned itself with countering the omission of a place for faith in modernism with its focus on the “integration of faith and learning.” Education in theology and biblical truth fills a gap in the modern curricula of the university, and attention is given in each discipline to the imperatives of faith for ethical behavior and integration with biblical truth. However, if the discussion above is successful in convincing the reader that a Christian worldview is incompatible with the postmodern student culture, then Christian higher education faces a major challenge. Whereas the Christian college has coexisted with modernism by supplementing its curriculum with Christian truth and integration,8 no such accommodation seems possible with postmodernism. Rather, confrontation of the culture seems imperative if we are to serve God with all of our “heart, soul, and mind.” Furthermore, the clash between the Christian worldview and postmodern culture is not simply an intellectual disagreement, but rather an affair of the heart and the will. As Swift argues above, part of the task is to help students (and perhaps ourselves) find freedom from the virtual reality of the popular media and to develop the skills necessary to value—to discriminate9 between the good and the bad, between the transcendent and the common, between the elevating and the corrupting. Promotion of engagement with learning and the requisite self-discipline may require institutions to challenge co-curricular priorities, to question the wisdom of wiring dorm rooms with cable TV, to combat grade inflation, and promote student responsibility for learning. The trend towards experiential learning should be tempered with respect for knowledge and the wisdom of the ages. Short attention spans should be challenged and disciplined towards an ability to comprehend, process, and internalize substantial and substantive bodies of knowledge. The notion that the processing of knowledge rather than retention is all we need to be effective in the 21st century frightens me. How can one do critical thinking without any knowledge base? Without the lessons of the past we are unlikely to identify a sufficiently broad spectrum of alternatives in our critical thinking nor have the insight to value the alternative outcomes correctly.

Such efforts to confront the culture—to accent the serious nature of the quest for truth and combat disengagement, entitlement, and the philosophy of “I am entertained; therefore I am”—will literally require the transformation of student personhood. A freshman seminar is not likely to accomplish such radical and foundational change. One of my colleagues has suggested that all students be mentored for four years by a specific faculty member (discipleship) as a possible model for transformation of student culture. However, at the center of this clash between cultures is an age old spiritual struggle—who will be on the throne of my life? God or I? Students are unlikely to submit themselves to the process of transformation unless they are fully surrendered to the Lordship of Christ. In fact, we might wonder about the fate of a college that took a truly countercultural stance. Would students come? Can a Christian college accomplish something that parents and churches cannot? Frankly, I am somewhat positive. I believe that the Christian community is already somewhat countercultural in this context, and Christian colleges could enhance this commitment to Christian stewardship in the academy through a determined effort to “swim upstream.” Employers already recognize a difference in the preparation, work ethic, and accountability of students graduating from my institution, and the potential exists to be “salt and light” to even a greater extent if we were to combat the postmodern culture rather than to accommodate it.

And this brings me to a few concluding remarks which are especially germane to members of the Christian Business Faculty Association. We have ... in the world of business. Which of these three cultures serves the needs of the business community best?
Congruence of Student Culture and the World of Business

Certain aspects of the postmodern student culture would seem to be congruent with the needs of modern businesses with their rapid pace of change and global competitive arenas of operation. Len Lewis says of “Gen X, Gen Y, and the echo boomers,”

Contrary to some opinions, these are not slackers and malcontents with pierced body parts and attention spans measured in nanoseconds. Nor do they bear any resemblance to the disaffected “tune-in, turn-on, dropout” youth of the 1960s. They are a diverse group of hardworking, entrepreneurial problem-solvers—the spawn of Silicon Valley. The just-in-time generation that thrives on flexibility, change, and information overload. They want it good. They want it fast, and they want it now. And they will invent their own solutions, if you don’t give them what they want.

Not being wedded to tradition does enhance flexibility and acceptance of change, and Gen Xers are willing to work hard—when they see the point and are motivated to do so.

Sacks reported that immediate, direct incentives promoted academic preparation whereas more indirect incentives (learning, self-development, equipping oneself for vocation, or even “it could be on the final”) failed to do so. Furthermore, it could be argued that addiction to the media-driven popular culture provides a suitable orientation to entering the “information age.” However, most aspects of the postmodern student culture would seem to clash rather sharply with the needs of business.

Nature of Truth
A subjective approach to truth, while promoting flexibility, has the nasty potential to suggest that there is no “right” way to do things. There is no basis for a “conscientious” approach to one’s work, and corporate policy is no more binding than the Ten Commandments.

Extent of Engagement
In a global economy, disengagement from geography, historical context, and knowledge of current events is a recipe for disaster. Rejection of the need for rational thinking and careful analysis, including especially the development of facility with quantitative analysis, leaves employees incapable of properly analyzing the crucial decisions of business such as capital budgeting, pricing, and competitive product line strategies. Diligent attention to detail often leads to important breakthroughs. Albert Meyer brought down the New Era Ponzi scheme by noticing that the miniscule interest income on New Era’s 1993 statement of revenue and expenses failed to match up with the Foundation’s claim to have invested the funds entrusted by its various client nonprofit organizations. Finally, a culture of passivity and “entertain me” is poisonous to the need to acquire the skills and knowledge specific to the industry and crucial to effectiveness.

Source of Authority
While it is true that organizational structures in business have become much flatter in recent years and businesses seek to empower lower-level employees to make decisions quickly at the job site, failure to respect hierarchical authority is sure to terminate a career quickly. A decision’s personal opinion over that of organizational mentors and company policy is likewise unhealthy, particularly when that opinion is not informed by the fruit of disciplined, diligent analysis emblematic of engagement.

Nature of Accountability
Businesses in this increasingly competitive world have no choice. Decisions have consequences! Good stewardship creates a positive bottom line and survival. Inattentive, incompetent stewardship leads to bankruptcy, hostile takeovers, or at least loss of job. Market forces require accountability, and that accountability extends to all employees. Employees oriented towards entitlement only will outlive their welcome quickly. Those who understand that reward must be rooted in contribution to the success of the enterprise are likely to succeed. The Christian virtue of faithfulness is valued by every organization. Elsewhere in this issue, Virgil Smith, in his paper “Organizational Control Through Trust: A Biblical System?”, suggests that organizations are increasingly desirous of using “trust” as a control system creating a need for trustworthy employees. He says, “Christian employees should be highly desirable in this setting, providing an opportunity for Christian
higher education institutions who seize it.”

The Christian worldview, therefore, is conducive to success in the business world, and business departments in Christian colleges will fulfill their responsibilities to equip their students to be effective business people by confronting rather than accommodating tendencies towards postmodern culture.

ENDNOTES

1 As paraphrased by Payne and Holmes.
2 McCracken (9) agrees citing one characteristic of postmodern students as “a belief that the present is the only moment worth anyone’s time, since progress cannot be infinitely sustained.”
3 This tendency towards disengagement has obviously negative implications for the proclamation of the gospel as well as for education.
4 They “found that students with low scores on [their] adversity index (i.e. students of privilege and affluence) also had low scores on various measures of academic engagement and participation in cultural and volunteer activities. But they had, by far, the highest rates of partying and binge drinking ... In general, drinking and partying are negatively related to several widely-accepted indicators of academic engagement.”
6 “Do not deceive yourselves. If anyone of you thinks he is wise by the standards of this age, he should become a fool so that he may become wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness in God’s sight” (I Cor. 3:18-19).
7 See also the parable of the talents (Matt. 25:14-30) and the exhortation that our work will be tested for quality in the judgment (I Cor. 3:10-15) for other instruction on the importance of stewardship.
8 In my view, integration has often meant rationalization and compromise when biblical truth confronts the accepted presuppositions of a discipline. Perhaps confrontation should be more common in the intersection of the Christian worldview and modernism.
9 This might require us as teachers to stop accepting papers loaded with Internet “deluge” without bona fides attesting to the trustworthiness of such sources through corroboration, etc.
10 I am amazed at the large number of students who work substantial hours during the school year not to pay tuition, but rather to put gas in their car, buy CDs, and otherwise pay for entertainment.
11 The high percentage of expatriates staffing the engineering and technical functions of American businesses is a sober indictment of the incompatibility of American education and the postmodern student culture it nurtures with the needs of society. Gifted students at my institution shun engineering, computer science, and even business information systems majors as being too rigorous in spite of the large premium in starting salaries commanded by these majors.
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