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Abstract
This study examined the use of structured social-rhetorical exegetic assessments in two on-line doctoral programs, offered by the same school, as a means of stimulating spiritual growth and formation. The article presents background information on the five exegetical analysis phases of: (a) inner-textural, (b) inter-textural, (c) social-cultural, (d) ideological, and (e) sacred followed by the presentation of data collected from 31 doctoral students spanning two cohorts of both a PhD and applied doctoral programs. The data shows conclusively that the students perceive a positive impact on their spiritual formation through the use of the five exegetical assessments. The recommendation of the study is that Christian schools should consider the use of similar exegetic assessments as a means of helping students grow spiritually.
Exegetical Assignments as a Form of Spiritual Formation Development

in two Online Doctoral Programs

Willard (2000) posits that “the disciplines for life in the Spirit [are]: (a) solitude and silence, (b) prayer and fasting, (c) worship and study, (d) fellowship and confession, and the like” (p. 1). While the first and second items above are distinctly personal and self-directed, curriculum can guide the student through self-directed learning for the third and fourth items that Willard lists. Alexander (2005), in his study to more fully understand the role of faculty in student’s faith/spiritual development, determined that the professor’s role is perceived as less important, in the mind of the student, than in the mind of the professors. It is precisely for this reason that the Regent University School of Leadership studies developed its two doctoral program curricula – the PhD in Organizational Leadership and the Doctor of Strategic Leadership – to allow the student to engage in prescribed exegetical assignments within the program as a means of helping the students’ spiritual formation rather than to depend on a faculty-student mentor-mentee relationship.

To determine if the intentional use of exegetical assignments in the doctoral curriculum do, in fact, aid students in their spiritual formation, the authors developed a questionnaire asking the students about spiritual formation and for self-evaluation of the exegetical assignments’ role in the students’ spiritual formation. The data and conclusions presented in this study help advance the literature on the role of the Christian university in the spiritual formation of its students.

Regent University’s School of Leadership Studies (SLS) offers an applied master degree, an applied doctorate and a research doctorate in leadership that include, although not overtly stated, the spiritual formation of the student. SLS subscribes to the notion that spiritual formation is an individualized process in which the student engages in activities of study and reflection that leads to spiritual formation. This notion is presented by Estep’s (2002) comment that spiritual formation is a development process and is best conducted in stages.
Spiritual Formation

As evidenced by the devotion of three special issues on spirituality in the workplace by the Journal of Organizational Change Management (Volume/issue: 12/3, 12/4, and 16/4), and the spiritual audit work of Mitroff, Denton, and Denton (1999) there is a developing interest in spirituality and SLS believes that it is essential for developing leaders and leadership scholars to engage in personal spiritual formation. Related to Estep’s (2002) work mentioned earlier, Ward (1995) posited that the spiritual formation of individuals occurs in five environments: physical, intellectual, emotional, social, and moral. SLS’ curriculum focuses on the intellectual environment with the exegetical assessments. Ward makes a telling statement in his quote:

[a] developmental perspective invites the educator to see each human life as a unique person emerging through common aspects that can be observed, measured, and evaluated, yet in essence a human soul, a soul with spiritual reality at core, alive through God’s redemptive grace or else spiritually dead in sin, unregenerated. (p. 16)

SLS’ exegetical assignments allow professors to observe, measure, and evaluate the intellectual presentation of the spiritual formation process within the intellectual environment.

King and Nicol (1999) contribute to our understanding of spiritual formation in their use of Jung’s and Jacque’s theories to explain how organizations can stimulate and support spiritual formation of employees. King and Nicol posit that Jung’s notion of developing the ‘self’ through study and self-reflection coupled with Jacque’s stratified theory in which the organization is organized such that individuals can work at the level appropriate with their maturity and understanding aids the individual’s spiritual formation. SLS structures five exegetical assignments over the course of the student’s required doctoral coursework such that each assignment represents a higher stratum of maturity and understanding. This is done through the use of five stages of social rhetorical critical exegetic analysis.
Social Rhetorical Critical Exegetical Analysis

Robbins (1999) proposes a multi-dimensional approach to the analysis of ancient texts and defines it as socio-rhetorical criticism. This qualitative research method was first used in the humanities, specifically in the study of historical documents and communication, as well as the study of speeches and poetry; and according to Hart (1996) the method was used to carefully investigate the written and spoken messages unveiling the author(s)’ meaning and intent. Robbins explains the exegetical strategies of this approach to textual analysis:

Rather than being another method for interpreting texts, socio-rhetorical interpretation is an interpretive analytical approach that evaluates and reorients its strategies as it engages in multi-faceted dialogue with the texts and other phenomena that come within its purview. The approach does not claim to be comprehensive. Rather, the claim is that the approach uses the insights of sociolinguistics, semiotics and ethnography in an interactionist philosophical mode that sets ancient, modern and post-modern systems of thought in energetic dialogue with one another. (p. 1)

Robbins attempts to integrate all the recent developments in linguistic, social and cultural studies in a highly programmed methodology that has as purpose to not only enlarge our understanding of the social and cultural dimensions of the text, but also to facilitate new avenues of exploration in textual interpretation. It is important to note that as much as socio-rhetorical criticism is a new approach to the analysis of texts, it is based on and incorporates the accomplishments of past scholars working in varied fields, ranging from textual analysis, linguistic studies, sociology, anthropology and cultural observations (Gowler, 1999). This aspect of socio-rhetorical criticism has made it difficult to formulate and define this new approach. Gowler explains the problems scholars have in defining socio-rhetorical criticism:

Socio-rhetorical criticism is not a "methodology" in the sense that it becomes an interpretive matrix imposed upon biblical texts like a strait-jacket. Socio-rhetorical
criticism, so far, developed over a period of 20 years in which Vernon Robbins and
others wrestled with biblical texts, not imposing a method but investigating and adapting
this approach to the complexities of those texts. (p. 1)

This new integrated approach to textual analysis introduces a determined paradigm shift
in the way exegetes perceive, understand and analyze texts. Instead of seeing the text as a
window through which readers perceive meaning, exegetes focus on the several layers or textures
within the text as the key to interpretation. Robbins explains the dynamics of multi-layered
analyses:

  Guided by the metaphor of a text as a tapestry rather than a site of windows and mirrors,
socio-rhetorical interpretation has begun to focus not only on multiple textures of a text
but also on multiple discourses that interweave with one another within those textures.
The interweaving of multiple textures and discourses within a text creates an environment
in which signification, meanings and meaning effects interact with one another in ways
that no one method can display. Only an approach that is highly programmatic,
complexly variegated and readily adaptable can begin to engage and exhibit the rich
world that texts bring into the life of humans as they live, work, struggle, suffer, die,
celebrate and commemorate together. (p. 1)

Socio-rhetorical criticism has not only opened a variety of new avenues for the textual,
social and cultural analysis of text, but it has also provided exegetes with a new context for multi-
disciplinary exchange and discussion on the meaning, effect and use of texts (Gowler). The
socio-rhetorical critical approach to textual analysis developed by Robbins (1996a, 1996b) is
highly structured and as such facilitates relative easy comprehension and use of the method. In
order to structure this integrated approach to textual analysis, Robbins proposes five broad
categories of investigation: (a) inner texture analysis, (b) intertexture analysis, (c) social and
cultural texture analysis, (d) ideological texture analysis, and (e) sacred texture analysis. Inner
texture analysis explores the linguistic dynamics of the text by observing the repetitions, pattern, structures and devices that are used. Intertexture analysis examines how the text interacts with the “outside world” through detailed inter-textual exegesis. Social and cultural texture analysis defines how the text support social change by studying the social norms, customs and contexts of the original author/s, recipients and contemporary reader/s. Ideological texture analysis explores how the text positions itself in relation to others through the mapping of the ideological beliefs and values evident. Lastly, sacred texture analysis examines how the Divine is portrayed in the text through a detailed study of God, Jesus, Angels, etc. SLS uses one exegetical assessment for each of the five distinct exegetic strata.

Socio-rhetorical criticism is not a static approach to textual analysis, but in constant development, exploring further integrated social, cultural, linguistic and rhetorical avenues for interpretation. Robbins has proposed that there are two further areas of investigation that have arisen from the exploration of the socio-rhetorical critical approach to textual analysis, namely: (a) narrational texture analysis, and (b) emotional-psychological texture analysis.

Socio-rhetorical criticism widens the field of investigation for interpreters of Biblical texts and as such makes further investigation and interpretation possible. The value of this approach to textual analysis lies not only in its apparent ability to enter into dialogue with the texts being investigated, but also in that it facilitates dialogue between interpreters involved in various academic disciplines. Gowler makes this clear:

Socio-rhetorical criticism takes its place among the works of other scholars who are testing these interdisciplinary waters. These waters do not lead to that mythical promised land of the "one correct interpretation," presupposed by some New Testament scholars, but they initiate a helpful and much needed dialogue. Only these interdisciplinary approaches can facilitate the profound stylistic, artistic, and ideological perspicacity that
we need for dialogue with these texts and with each other. The texts themselves -- and the
world around us -- urgently request that dialogue. (p. 12)

Data and Analysis

To determine if the intentional use of the five exegetical assessments aid in the students’
spiritual formation the authors developed a questionnaire that asked students the questions listed in table 1:

Table 1: Questions and basis for the questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/item</th>
<th>Basis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which doctoral program are you in?</td>
<td>To determine if there is a difference between the two doctoral programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which cohort are you in?</td>
<td>Two cohorts were asked to participate. The cohort that began in the fall 2003 semester completed four of the five exegesis assessments at the time of the data collection and the cohort that began in the fall 2004 semester completed three of the five exegesis assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a few sentences please explain the impact on your spiritual formation from the use of the social-rhetorical exegetic assessments in the doctoral program.</td>
<td>Asking for self-report of the value of the exegesis assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the use of social-rhetorical exegesis as a means of examining scripture?</td>
<td>Asking for self-report of satisfaction with the exegesis method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how the intrertextual analysis helped your spiritual formation process</td>
<td>Looking for students’ self-report of the usefulness for each of the five social-rhetorical strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how the intertextual analysis helped your spiritual formation process</td>
<td>Looking for students’ self-report of the usefulness for each of the five social-rhetorical strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how the ideological texture analysis helped your spiritual formation process</td>
<td>Looking for students’ self-report of the usefulness for each of the five social-rhetorical strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how the social-cultural analysis helped your spiritual formation process</td>
<td>Looking for students’ self-report of the usefulness for each of the five social-rhetorical strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain how the sacred texture analysis helped your spiritual formation process</td>
<td>Looking for students’ self-report of the usefulness for each of the five social-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How satisfied are you with your own spiritual formation process?

Asking for self-report of satisfaction with the spiritual formation process

Do you believe that your spiritual formation progress will continue after your doctoral course work concludes?

Looking for evidence of self-directed behaviors.

What suggestions do you have for SLS to consider regarding other spiritual formation tools/methods/events/processes?

General question looking for thoughts and ideas from students

The sample frame consisted of 27 students in the applied doctorate 2004 cohort, 26 students in the applied doctorate 2003 cohort, 24 students in the PhD 2004 cohort, and 21 students in the PhD 2003 cohort for a total of 98 students. Of the 98 students 31 students completed the questionnaire for a response rate of 32 percent. Follow-up conversations with ten students who did complete the questionnaire revealed that the only reason given for not participating was a perceived lack of time. Of the 31 students, 16 were in the applied program and 15 were in the PhD program. Eight students were from the 2003 cohort and 23 students were from the 2004 cohort. Table 2 shows the cross-tab results of degree and cohort

Table 2: Sample demographics by degree and cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree/Cohort</th>
<th>Cohort 2003</th>
<th>Cohort 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-report of the value of the exegesis assessments.

Of the 31 participants, 29 responded to this open-ended question. Of the 29 responses, 26 participants expressed positive value in the exegesis assignments, 1 expressed negative value and two were neutral indicating that as pastors, they both have used the social-rhetorical strata before and are comfortable with it, but the two participants did not express positive or negative opinions. The one negative comment alluded to a lack of comprehension and an extensive amount of time.
spent trying to understand what to do in the first assessment. Examples of the positive value statements include:

- . . . has really opened my eyes to the depth of scripture. I no longer simply take things at face value but always strive to look behind (and between) the texts.
- Grounded me from the very beginning of the program on Biblical core values . . .
- I have become so influenced by this type of assignment (learning), that I have challenged other believers in my immediate circle to do the same research when it comes to rightly dividing the word. Spiritual growth is important and this type of assignment insures growth if done properly.
- The social-rhetorical assessments have had a tremendous impact on my spiritual formation. Exegesis has brought a deeper understanding and knowledge of Scripture and has helped me to apply that understanding to current day situations.
- . . . The outcome was not the dreaded "loss of faith," instead my faith is increased and stronger. It has equipped me the essential tools required to walk out the call of Christian leadership.

*Self-report of satisfaction with the exegesis method*

A four-point Likert response scale provided a forced choice of ‘Very Dissatisfied,’ ‘Dissatisfied,’ ‘Satisfied,’ or ‘Very Satisfied.’ Of the 31 participants, three selected ‘Very Dissatisfied’ and four selected ‘Dissatisfied’ with the Social-Rhetorical Critical method of exegesis. Of the remaining 24 participants six selected ‘Satisfied’ and 18 selected ‘Very Satisfied.’ Of interest, the three participants that selected ‘Very Dissatisfied’ two reported very positive comments in their open-ended responses while one participant commented that the social-rhetorical method was over-complicated and prevented him/her from studying scripture in a manner that led to improved spiritual formation. The open-ended responses by the four that
selected ‘dissatisfied’ all provided positive comments about the exegetic assessments. Therefore the authors are perplexed as to what inference to draw from the self-report of dissatisfaction.

Self-report of the usefulness for the social-rhetorical stratum of innertextual analysis

Of the 31 participants, 28 responded to this question and all but one participant made positive comments implying the positive value of the use of innertextual analysis. Examples of the positive value statements include:

- The intentionality of the specific wording and sequences seems to support the Lord's guiding hand in the development of scripture.
- Noting words and phrasing and repetitions in the text helped me to see important patterns.
- Innertextual analysis has prompted me to look for the details in scripture in new and different ways. The characters become more personal and the revelations that receive from innertextual analysis has brought me to a deeper personal application of the text.
- As a result of the intertextual analysis assignments, I have come to realize that God's Word holds much more truth and application than I have ever realized before. It has strengthened my walk with Him and causes me to dig deeper when I read passages now.
- I was a flagrant example of wrongly applying contemporary my contemporary experience to scripture, which resulted in a shallow interpretation of His Word. In the innertextual analysis of the Mark text, I received deep revelation through the exercise of thoroughly examining the elements. The revelation was applicable personally and for the body as a whole.
- Innertextual analysis opened my eyes to completely different meanings to specific texts compared to what I thought they meant in the past. I fear I am
missing out on much the Bible has to say to me because I haven't expanded my
innertextual analysis.

- Innertextual analysis has helped me to evaluate the Scriptures more deeply and to
  see meaning and application beyond which is readily apparent on the surface of
  the text.

A general sense that emerges in the open-ended responses is that innertextual analysis is
useful for the student to understand the intended meaning of the author.

_Self-report of the usefulness for the social-rhetorical stratum of intertextural analysis_

Of the 31 participants, 27 provided open-ended responses to the request for information
about the usefulness of the intertextual analysis. Among the 27 responses, 24 were positive and
specific, two indicated that the same response as to the innertextual analysis applied, and one
response was negative about the value of the intertextual analysis. A general theme that
reoccurred through the open-ended responses was that the ability to tie different sections of
scripture together through the intertextual analysis helped the student understand a greater whole
to scripture. Examples of the positive value statements include:

- Revealed the depth of the Scriptures, and how they are connected through and
  through.

- Intertextual analysis has helped me to understand how the culture impacted
  various Scriptures. It also has helped me understand the relationship between

- It helped me with making the connection between different parts of scripture and
  increased my understanding.

- Intertextual analysis helped me link scripture to a broader cultural context,
  enhancing my ability to apply the principles of scripture to life.
This was very interesting. Suddenly these people became real. The way they dressed, ate and how they actually lived, made them real. And in this reality, I learned more about the real meaning and depth of what was actually happening or being said in a specific situation. I found that I had sub-consciously developed a simple and probably superficial interpretation of some scripture because subconsciously I was interpreting things in my own time, place and cultural worldview.

Reflecting on the integration of the old and new testaments is reassuring of God's larger plan.

The intertextual analysis was a fascinating study of the interpretation and application of Old Testament texts by the New Testament authors. For me, it helped me understand more fully the progressive nature of God's self-revelation historically, textually, and interpretively. The passage for analysis drove home to me the absolute necessity that the Christian leader must be Divinely empowered.

It reinforced to me that the authors of Scripture in Jesus' day drew both on their understanding of the Hebrew Bible, as well as contemporary literature of Second Temple Judaism to understand the work of the Holy Spirit. The implication for us is that we too can draw on extra-canonical sources to understand human empowerment and actualization.

Intertextual analysis should show the consistency of the Scriptures over time, leading me to greater assurance that the Scriptures are God-inspired.

It has made me more aware of the interaction of the text with each other. How they support each other and give stronger meaning to the text being examined.
• Intertextual analysis has helped me to see how themes related together in the Scriptures and has given me a greater understanding of how the Scriptures under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit tie together in a powerful way.

Overall, the anecdotal evidence provided in the open-ended responses supports the idea that intertextual analysis is helpful for the student’s study of scripture.

_Self-report of the usefulness for the social-rhetorical stratum of ideological analysis_

Of the 31 participants, 14 participants provided responses to this open-ended request about the usefulness of the ideological analysis. Since the applied doctorate 2004 cohort’s exegesis assessment occurs later in the semester, fewer of the applied doctorate students had completed the ideological assessment at the time of data collection. Of the 14 responses, 12 showed positive value for the ideological analysis. Two participants stated that their response was the same as the prior analysis methods. A general theme that ran through the responses is that looking for the author’s ideology was helpful in understanding the deeper meaning of scripture. Representative comments from the participants follow:

• All of this allowed for helping the Scriptures to come alive, and become more relevant to other things we do daily with our lives.

• This actually made me more critical of the text and its translators and commentators.

• Examining my perspectives versus those of others minimizes pride.

• This section has caused me to be more aware of personal bias as I have studied the scripture. This section had a major impact.

• Ideological analysis helps me to understand myself in terms of my own ideologies. Some of which I have not confronted until I learned about ideological texture. I have also learned to look at the ideologies of the author and the cultural setting of the text to understand hidden layers of the texture of the text.
• The ideological texture analysis helped me to understand my own biases in interpreting Scripture. It lead me to see that the fruit of Christian leadership should a liberation expressed in Spirit empowerment, effective witness, and joy.

• The ideological texture analysis has helped me see and evaluate my own ideological bias or presuppositions due to my own cultural context.

• By understanding of the ideology of the author, in other words where they were coming from based on their perceptions and bias, I was better to get a feel and understanding of the scriptures and passages.

Overall, it is apparent from the comments that the use of the ideological analysis helped the students examine their own ideology as the students develop spiritually.

*Self-report of the usefulness for the social-rhetorical stratum of social-cultural analysis*

Of the 31 participants, 14 provided responses to this open-ended topic. Of the 14 responses, 12 provided positive value statements and two participants stated that the response was the same as the prior analysis methods. The responses to this open-ended item were much shorter than the other responses, possibly due to fatigue. The shorter, less informative responses make it harder to draw inference but, overall, there is an indication of increased understanding of scripture but less support for the benefit to spiritual formation. The responses follow:

• Again--Bible study thus becomes more than a "good habit".
• Broader base upon which to build application to life
• ties in with much that was said above...social reform and change of perceptions
• Practical application
• Jesus' dyadic personality in relation to God vs man was insightful
• I learned to look at the text through the lens of the social culture.
• I use this process to say how a particular text views the world as far as values
• It revealed the power of social-cultural constraints.
• Made me aware that I need to be aware of customs and phrases of the time and demographics
• This may have been one of the most interesting aspects - placing the scripture in context with the ideas
• Understanding time-sensitive social and cultural issues provided a backdrop to study
• To understand the time period of the text
• You understand the importance of culture and how it influences interpretation.

Self-report of the usefulness for the social-rhetorical stratum of sacred analysis

Of the 31 participants, ten provided responses to this open-ended topic. The reduced number of responses is logical since only the 2003 cohort would have completed this last stratum of the social-rhetorical analysis. Of the ten responses, nine responses showed positive value statements about the sacred analysis and one participant implied a reduced value due to the complexity of the analysis to the student as revealed in the student’s comment “. . . [t]he only thing I have been able to come away from this work is that it is a valid approach, but something that is seemingly as trying to understand plasma injection in physics. . . “ The other nine responses follow:

• All of this allows one the opportunity as a Christian to apply the Word to our lives, and in our church work (Sunday School teaching, etc., etc.).

• it is interesting because it take some maturity to go past some personal, preached and presented perceptions. The historical Jesus and all that...makes one think because it is almost sacrilegious to read the apocrypha and such...but it is there and it puts it in context...and blows away some of the superficial perceptions...have not done much with this concept as yet but that is my understanding
• More meaningful after having studied the previous types of analysis.

• I don't look at the pieces of the analysis process separately so I'm not sure how to say one piece helps one way and another helps another way. (That may be because I am not well versed enough in the process to differentiate where one part starts and the other leaves off.) I have always read based on the current time and with a perspective of my own culture. I now look more closely at the author's culture and time. I also pay more attention to the repetitive themes which are present than before and I pay more attention to the details in scripture (normally I'm a "big picture" person more interested in the concepts than the details).

• I have grown in my understand of the sacred and learned how to apply these themes to my life as well as the text.

• I use this technique more than any of the others because it is intertwined with the other textures. It provides the foundation and insights for studying the relationship between mankind and the divine, using the techniques of all the other textures combined. When preaching a sermon, this gives me a clear picture of our relationship with God. The Holy Spirit guides my thoughts through the passage as I discover His world which leads me to speak to His flock.

• I enjoyed all the socio-rhetorical analysis assignments, this one impacted my spiritual formation the most. This is largely due to the profundity of the passage under consideration. The understanding gained of the Kenosis act of emptying oneself for the sake of one's followers forever changed my understanding of leadership, but more profoundly it has changed how I live. For the Kenosis leader - leadership is not a role or even a lifestyle - it is the experiential reality of the only life worth living.
• To understand God better
• Helps me to apply leadership principles to my personal leadership formation.
   Helps me see how I can improve as a leader through the principles studied.

The general sense from the data is that the sacred analysis method assists students to understand God in more depth and helps the student see his/her role in the spiritual journey with greater clarity.

*Self-report of satisfaction with the spiritual formation process*

The 31 students responded to this five-point Likert-response question asking the student to rate his/her satisfaction with his/her spiritual formation process by selecting ‘Very Dissatisfied,’ ‘Dissatisfied,’ ‘Neutral,’ ‘Satisfied,’ or ‘Very Satisfied.’ All 31 students responded to this question of which no one selected ‘Very Dissatisfied,’ five selected ‘Dissatisfied,’ four selected ‘Neutral,’ 14 selected ‘Satisfied,’ and eight selected ‘Very Satisfied.’ Overall with 22 of the 31 selecting satisfied or very satisfied compared to the five who selected dissatisfied, it is reasonable to infer that the students in the two doctoral programs.

*Evidence of self-directed behaviors.*

Students were requested to enter a number from 1 to 5 indicating how likely they were to continue their spiritual formation after their doctoral course work concludes with a rating of ‘1’ meaning ‘Yes it will,’ to ‘5’ meaning ‘No it won’t.’ All 31 participants provided a response to this question with 29 respondents selecting ‘1’ and two respondents selecting ‘2.’ The skewed distribution to the ‘Yes it will’ category implies that the spiritual formation journey experienced in the program will continue. While this question does not imply that the doctoral program curriculum is responsible for this, the open-ended responses to the exegetical method items above imply that there has been some positive impact by the program on the spiritual development and the end result of the program along with other possible variables is that the students have become long-time self-directed learners, or at least showing conative factors toward behavior.
The last question asked by the researchers was a general question seeking to gleam any additional thoughts or comments about the use of social-rhetorical exegesis in the doctoral program. Of the 31 participants, 21 provided comments to this question of which 20 had a general focus on exegesis. Of the 20 responses, three suggested that more training be given in the use of the exegetical methods, three suggested that more exegetical assessments be incorporated into the program, two suggested that more time be allowed to work on the exegetical assessments, six suggested that the program use more documents other than the Bible for spiritual formation, four suggested continued use of what is currently in the program, one suggested removing all the exegetical assessments, and one suggested more discussion and dialogue of combining faith and work as a form of spiritual formation. Overall, the responses to this open-ended item were diverse but generally showed an interest in the use of exegesis in the program for spiritual formation.

Recommendations

The data seems to support the positive value in using structured exegetic assessments in a doctoral program to help students work through scripture and to examine specific passages aimed at helping the student examine the application of scripture to the student’s spiritual development. With only one major dissenting voice among the 31 participants, the general indication is that the curriculum developed for the two doctoral programs with regard to spiritual formation is working. The authors recommend that Christian colleges and universities consider adding structured stratified exegetic assessments as part of the curriculum.
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