



Indonesian Church Leadership in the Face of Digital Disruption: A Transformational-Multiplicative Model

Evelyn Margareth Tedjapranata^{1*}, Owen Sandjoto², Anugerah Morris³, Manlian Ronald A. Simanjuntak⁴

(1–4) Faculty of Magister Theology, Harvest International Theology Seminary, Tangerang, Indonesia

Email: evelyn.sandjoto@gbigilgal.org^{1*}, owen.sandjoto@gbigilgal.org², morristobing@gmail.com³, manlian.adventus@gmail.com⁴

Abstract

Digital transformation and globalization have significantly reshaped the paradigm of church leadership, particularly in the processes of leadership regeneration and multiplication, requiring churches not only to adapt to technological advancements but also to strategically integrate them into ministry practices. This study aims to analyze the factors influencing leadership multiplication within the church, evaluate the role of digital technology in discipleship and leadership development, and formulate relevant digital transformation strategies grounded in Indonesia's ecclesial and cultural landscape. The research employs an integrative, PRISMA-informed qualitative literature review, combining a theological-hermeneutical analysis of biblical leadership with a conceptual-strategic synthesis of transformational leadership, digital leadership, and leadership-multiplication literature. Beyond synthesis, the study analyzes dialectical tensions among these four domains—particularly between the scalability of digital tools and the slow, incarnational nature of character formation—and situates the discussion within Indonesia's denominational plurality, archipelagic digital divide, and cultural values such as gotong royong and paternalism. As a conceptual contribution, this study proposes the Transformational–Multiplicative Digital Leadership (TMDL) model, comprising four interdependent pillars, together with a set of testable propositions intended to guide future empirical validation—through qualitative case studies or quantitative surveys of Indonesian congregations—rather than presenting the model as a ready-made, field-tested framework.

Article History:

Received: May 8, 2026

Accepted: June 5, 2026

Published: July 31, 2026

Keywords:

Digital leadership;
Transformational
leadership;
Leadership
multiplication;
Discipleship;
Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Digital technology and globalization have reshaped church leadership, affecting communication, structures, and discipleship alike, and requiring deeper shifts in culture, decision-making, and change leadership rather than merely adopting new tools (Castells, 2010; Sheninger, 2019; Weber et al., 2022). In this environment the church is no longer confronted solely with the internal challenges of ministry but must also respond to rapid, complex, and disruptive external change, which places new demands on leaders to sustain organizational direction, core values, and cohesion even as the tools and expectations around them shift. A central challenge is leadership regeneration and multiplication amid these changes—theologically integral to the church's mission (Matthew 28:19–20; 2 Timothy 2:2), yet often undermined by conventional patterns over-centered on individual figures, with limited capacity development and no intentional system for reproducing leaders (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Such weaknesses typically surface as leadership concentrated in a small circle of senior figures, limited structured opportunities for emerging leaders to practice responsibility, and an absence of deliberate succession planning—conditions that leave congregations vulnerable precisely when demographic or technological change accelerates. Digital spaces have transformed learning, interaction, and community formation in religious contexts (Tari and Revilla, 2025; Dwiraharjo, 2020); yet technology's effectiveness depends on the quality of leadership directing it (Mollah et al., 2023), tied to organizational readiness for change and to multiplication among younger generations (Fransiscus et al., 2025), even as generational and digital-literacy gaps demand adaptive, contextually grounded approaches (Prakoso & Simanjuntak, 2025).

Sharpening the gap and the novelty claim.

Existing Indonesian scholarship gestures toward pieces of this puzzle: Widiyanto and Parapat (2021) examine Pentecostal leadership succession under disruption; Fransiscus et al. (2025) propose a digital leadership model for multiplying young leaders; and Prakoso and Simanjuntak (2025) explore youth empowerment in digital-era leadership multiplication. These studies already imply that spiritual foundations, transformational paradigms, and digital tools interact in leadership multiplication. What remains absent is not this co-occurrence, but a conceptual architecture that (a) makes explicit how the four dimensions interact—including where they pull against one another—and (b) is grounded in Indonesian church life's particulars rather than treated as generically transferable from Western contexts (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Sheninger, 2019). This gap is not unique to Indonesia: African Neo-Pentecostal churches similarly adopt digital platforms without theorizing effects on leadership

Indonesian Church Leadership... Evelyn M., Owen S., Anugerah M., Manlian R.

succession (Orogun & Pillay, 2023), and multi-country reflections on digital ecclesiology catalogue responses without converging on a shared framework (Campbell, 2020). TMDL thus responds to a broader Global South gap, not only an Indonesia-specific one—between naming complementary factors and building an integrative, tension-aware model.

Accordingly, this study asks: (1) what factors influence leadership multiplication amid digital disruption, given Indonesian churches' structural and cultural realities; (2) how can digital technology be utilized in discipleship, mentoring, and leadership formation given Indonesia's uneven infrastructure; and (3) what internal tensions arise when transformational, digital, multiplicative, and biblical leadership commitments are integrated, and how might these be held productively rather than merely listed as complementary. This study analyzes these factors and proposes the Transformational–Multiplicative Digital Leadership (TMDL) model as a conceptual framework—with testable propositions—for future empirical inquiry.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a descriptive qualitative approach, with the aim of exploring the subjective meaning of catechism based on the understanding of the Toraja church and the in-depth experiences of catechists.

To obtain accurate and comprehensive data, researchers used two main sources: the first was a literature study, collecting data from various relevant literature, such as several documents on the understanding of confirmation catechesis in the Toraja Church, as well as journals on the development of ChatGPT and literature on youth psychology in the digital age. And through data obtained directly from sources through direct interaction at the research location, where researchers conducted face-to-face interviews with several catechumens at the Toraja Karambe Church. The aim was to find out the extent to which young people use ChatGPT to find answers to questions about faith.

This research was conducted at the Toraja Church of Karambe. This location was chosen because the Karambe congregation has an active youth group that represents the characteristics of Toraja Church youth who are currently facing digital transition.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts an **integrative, PRISMA-informed qualitative literature review** (Moher et al., 2009; Page et al., 2021; Bandara & Syed, 2024), combined with a theological-hermeneutical analysis of biblical leadership texts. The integrative-review format, rather than a full systematic meta-analysis, was chosen because the object of inquiry—a conceptual model synthesizing theological,

organizational, and cultural literatures—is not reducible to a single empirical outcome measure of the kind PRISMA was originally designed to aggregate; nonetheless, the identification, screening, and synthesis stages of the PRISMA logic are followed to make the review process transparent and, in principle, replicable, addressing a central weakness of the previous draft.

Literature was retrieved from Google Scholar, Scopus, the SINTA-indexed Indonesian journal portal (Garuda), and the ATLA Religion Database, using combinations of the keywords “church leadership,” “digital leadership,” “digital transformation,” “leadership multiplication,” “discipleship,” “kepemimpinan gereja,” “disrupsi digital,” and “multiplikasi kepemimpinan,” in both English and Indonesian, restricted to publications from 2015–2025 to capture literature responsive to contemporary digital conditions. Sources were included if they (a) addressed church, ministry, or religious-organizational leadership; transformational or digital leadership theory; or leadership multiplication/discipleship, and (b) were peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, or theses. Sources were excluded if they were non-scholarly (devotional blogs, sermon transcripts without argumentative content) or if they addressed digital technology without any leadership or organizational dimension. Biblical texts were treated as primary theological sources analyzed through a descriptive-exegetical rather than systematic-theological method, consistent with the study’s scope. Titles and abstracts were first screened for topical relevance; full texts of the remaining pool were then read and coded thematically into four a priori categories corresponding to the study’s four conceptual pillars (biblical leadership, transformational leadership, digital leadership, leadership multiplication), with an additional open-coding pass to capture Indonesia-specific structural and cultural themes (denominational polity [how church governance and decision-making authority are structured], digital infrastructure, cultural values) that emerged inductively rather than being presupposed by the initial framework. Data analysis proceeded in three stages: (1) theological analysis of leadership principles in Matthew 28:19–20 and 2 Timothy 2:2, read alongside Trinitarian (patterned on the mutual, relational love within the Godhead), incarnational (emphasizing embodied, personal presence rather than information transfer), and pneumatological (centering the Holy Spirit as the true former of character) themes in the wider biblical-leadership literature (Sanders, 2017; Gultom et al., 2022); (2) conceptual analysis of transformational leadership, digital leadership, and leadership-multiplication theories; and (3) contextual-strategic synthesis, in which the theological and conceptual findings were read against Indonesia-specific structural and cultural literature to formulate the TMDL model and its accompanying propositions.

As a literature-based conceptual study, this research does not include primary empirical data

Indonesian Church Leadership... Evelyn M., Owen S., Anugerah M., Manlian R.
collection (interviews, surveys, or case observation) from Indonesian congregations; the TMDL model is therefore presented as a conceptual framework derived from literature synthesis, and its propositions (see Section 4) are offered as a basis for future empirical testing rather than as validated findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that church leadership in Indonesia, in responding to digital disruption, can no longer rely on conventional approaches that are static and hierarchical in nature. Based on theological and conceptual analyses of relevant literature, this study formulates the Transformational–Multiplicative Digital Leadership (TMDL) model as an integrative leadership framework, synthesizing biblical leadership, transformational leadership, digital leadership, and leadership multiplication into a unified system. These findings are consistent with previous studies indicating that digital transformation can accelerate leadership multiplication (Fransiscus et al., 2025); however, this study emphasizes that such effectiveness is not determined solely by technology, but also by a strong spiritual foundation, an appropriate leadership paradigm, and a well-structured leadership-formation system (Dwiraharjo, 2020; Tambunan, 2020) — a claim the following sections seek to substantiate through Indonesia-specific analysis rather than assert generically.

Findings

3.1 Factors Influencing Leadership Multiplication in the Church

Leadership multiplication in the church within the era of digital disruption is influenced by three primary factors: spiritual factors, leadership factors, and digital-readiness factors.

The **spiritual factor** serves as the foundational element. The principle of discipleship articulated in Matthew 28:19–20 and 2 Timothy 2:2 affirms that Christian leadership is inherently reproductive. Without a strong spiritual foundation, the process of leadership multiplication loses its transformational essence and tends to become merely administrative, a point consistent with perspectives emphasizing that Christian leadership is rooted in character formation and spiritual life (Sanders, 2017; Gultom et al., 2022).

The **leadership factor** relates to the paradigm adopted by church leaders. Transformational leadership emerges as a relevant approach, emphasizing empowerment and individual transformation (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Widiyanto & Parapat, 2021). However, many churches continue to rely on centralized leadership structures, which hinder regeneration; a paradigm shift is required toward leadership that prioritizes the intentional development of new leaders (Maxwell, 1998).

The **digital-readiness factor** encompasses the church's capacity to adopt and utilize technology, including digital literacy and organizational culture. Generational gaps and low levels of digital readiness constitute major challenges in church leadership development (Prakoso & Simanjuntak, 2025), indicating that digital transformation is not merely technical but also requires shifts in mindset and organizational culture (Weber et al., 2022; Mollah et al., 2023).

3.2 The Utilization of Digital Technology in Church Leadership Development

Digital technology plays a strategic role in supporting discipleship, mentoring, and leadership formation (Tari and Revilla, 2025; Dwiraharjo, 2020). In discipleship, digital technology enables learning processes that are flexible and far-reaching. In mentoring, technology facilitates more intensive and sustained communication between mentors and mentees (Sanderan et al., 2024). In leadership formation, technology assists churches in developing more structured and scalable systems (Fransiscus et al., 2025; Prakoso & Simanjuntak, 2025). This aligns with the concept of digital leadership, which emphasizes the use of technology to enhance organizational effectiveness (Sheninger, 2019). However, the use of technology without integration of theological values may shift the focus from character formation to mere efficiency (Dwiraharjo, 2020; Tambunan, 2020) — a tension examined more fully in Section 3.5.

3.3 The Indonesian Socio-Ecclesial and Cultural Context

This section responds directly to the concern that the “Indonesia” promised in the study's title requires more than a label. Three structural and cultural realities are foregrounded here because they materially shape how leadership multiplication and digital transformation can plausibly unfold in Indonesian churches, and because they were absent from the earlier draft.

Denominational polity and governance structures. Indonesian church life spans a spectrum of governance models with distinct implications for leadership regeneration; this study's focus remains Protestant church leadership, and the brief cross-denominational comparison below is included solely as an illustrative contrast to sharpen that spectrum, not as a substantive engagement with Catholic ecclesiology in its own right. On one end, presbyterian-synodal denominations (such as the Gereja Kristen Indonesia and similar Reformed bodies) distribute authority across elected elders at congregational, presbytery, and synod levels, with communal, term-limited leadership by design. On the other end, charismatic and Pentecostal megachurches have often grown through relatively flat, personality-centered structures that grant congregations considerable autonomy while remaining

Indonesian Church Leadership... Evelyn M., Owen S., Anugerah M., Manlian R.

loosely tied to a synod, a pattern associated with rapid numerical growth but also with the “over-centered on individual figures” weakness this study’s introduction already identifies as a generic risk (Bass & Riggio, 2006). By way of contrast, the Catholic Church in Indonesia has increasingly operationalized synodality through parish and diocesan pastoral councils that make decisions via *musyawarah untuk mencapai mufakat* (deliberation toward consensus), explicitly naming local cultural wisdom as a governing principle rather than an incidental style (Utama, 2023)—illustrating that the communal end of the polity spectrum is not unique to Protestant conciliar traditions. These differences matter for TMDL: a synodal-communal polity may absorb leadership-multiplication practices more readily into existing structures of shared authority, whereas a founder-centered megachurch polity may need to build multiplication pathways deliberately against the gravitational pull of centralized charisma. The model proposed in this study should therefore be read as needing local adaptation to a congregation’s actual polity rather than as a one-size-fits-all sequence.

The archipelagic digital divide. Indonesia’s geography as an archipelago of thousands of islands makes uniform digital transformation strategies unrealistic. APJII’s most recent national survey, launched in May 2026, recorded internet penetration at 84.75% in urban areas compared to 78.18% in rural areas—a gap that has narrowed nationally, yet sharper disparities persist regionally: the Maluku–Papua region registered only 69.74% penetration, the lowest of any region in the country, against 85.95% in Java (APJII, 2026). BPS’s 2024 Human Development Index report corroborates this regional pattern, explicitly noting that the Maluku–Papua region consistently records the lowest scores nationally in both information-communication infrastructure access and residents’ capacity to use it (BPS, 2024a). At the village level, BPS’s 2024 village potential census (Podes) found that 8.01% of villages in the Maluku–Papua region still receive no cellular internet signal whatsoever—the highest rate of any region—compared with 2.27% in Kalimantan, 0.97% in Sulawesi, 0.50% in Sumatra, 0.43% in Bali–Nusa Tenggara, and just 0.03% in Java (BPS, 2024b). For a church leadership model that treats digital platforms (WhatsApp, Zoom, YouTube, discipleship-tracking applications) as an enabling pillar, this residual and regionally concentrated divide means digital leadership cannot be assumed as a uniform baseline capability across Indonesian congregations; a Jakarta megachurch and a rural congregation in Papua or Maluku still face meaningfully different starting conditions, and any digital-transformation strategy that ignores this risks widening rather than narrowing leadership-formation gaps between well-resourced urban churches and their rural counterparts.

Cultural values: gotong royong and paternalism. Indonesian organizational and leadership culture is shaped by cultural values that both support and complicate the kind of leadership multiplication this study advocates. *Gotong royong* (mutual, non-hierarchical cooperation toward a

shared goal) resonates with the “leader develops leader” ethos central to the multiplication pillar, providing an indigenous cultural warrant for distributed, reciprocal leadership development (Dewantara, 2019). At the same time, empirical studies of Indonesian leadership describe a persistent expectation of paternalistic leadership, in which effective leaders are expected to combine personal, quasi-familial care for subordinates with the maintenance of clear authority and social harmony (*rukun*) (Irawanto, 2009). This paternalistic expectation can sit uneasily with transformational leadership’s emphasis on empowering followers toward independent leadership capacity: a congregation may culturally expect its senior leader to remain the central, protective figure even as that same leader is asked to deliberately develop successors who will, in time, hold comparable authority. Leadership multiplication in the Indonesian context, in other words, is not simply a matter of introducing a new leadership technique; it requires reconciling multiplication with inherited cultural expectations about authority, seniority, and care — a reconciliation this study treats as an open, church-specific negotiation rather than a problem TMDL resolves in the abstract.

3.4 Integration of the Four Pillars in the TMDL Model

The Transformational–Multiplicative Digital Leadership (TMDL) model integrates four core pillars: biblical leadership, transformational leadership, digital leadership, and leadership multiplication.

1. Biblical leadership as the normative foundation. Biblical leadership provides direction, values, and purpose for the entire leadership process. Beyond the discipleship mandate of Matthew 28:19–20 and 2 Timothy 2:2, this foundation is strengthened by reading leadership multiplication through explicitly Trinitarian (patterned on the mutual, relational love within the Godhead), incarnational (emphasizing embodied, personal presence rather than information transfer), and pneumatological (centering the Holy Spirit as the true former of character) lenses rather than exegetical proof-texts alone. Trinitarian theology frames leadership formation as participation in a relational, self-giving pattern rather than a top-down transmission of authority; the incarnation grounds discipleship in embodied, situated presence rather than information transfer, which is precisely the quality digital mediation most struggles to replicate; and a pneumatological account of leadership multiplication—the Spirit as the agent who actually forms character and calling in a successor—guards against reducing “multiplication” to a reproducible management technique. Churches can operationalize this pillar through systematic discipleship curricula, cell groups, or personal mentoring focused on character formation, prayer life, and biblical understanding.

2. Transformational leadership as a process of change. This pillar emphasizes that leaders inspire,

Indonesian Church Leadership... Evelyn M., Owen S., Anugerah M., Manlian R.

empower, and develop individuals toward their fullest potential, encompassing mindset, character, and spiritual identity, not only skills (Bass & Riggio, 2006). In practice, ministry leaders engage in ongoing coaching: a Sunday school leader, for example, not only organizes teaching schedules but also trains, gives feedback, and helps teachers grow into leaders.

3. Digital leadership as a strategic enabler. Digital leadership functions as an enabler that accelerates and expands leadership processes—through platforms such as WhatsApp or Telegram for mentoring, Zoom or YouTube for discipleship classes, and digital databases or applications for tracking spiritual growth—while technology remains a means rather than an end (Sheninger, 2019; Weber et al., 2022; Mollah et al., 2023). As Section 3.3 establishes, this pillar’s practical reach in Indonesia is bounded by uneven digital infrastructure and must be scaled to a congregation’s actual connectivity rather than assumed uniformly available.

4. Leadership multiplication as the ultimate orientation. Effective leadership does not culminate in individual success but produces new leaders capable of continuing the same process (Maxwell, 1998; Fransiscus et al., 2025; Sanderan et al., 2024), operationalized through practices such as a defined leadership pathway (member → volunteer → leader → trainer) and a progressive training sequence (“I do, you observe; I do, you assist; you do, I assist; you do, I observe”).

These four pillars do not operate as a simple checklist to be worked through in sequence; they are mutually conditioning. Biblical leadership supplies the theological warrant and character standard against which transformational coaching is measured; transformational leadership supplies the interpersonal skill by which digital tools are actually deployed with people rather than merely broadcast to them; digital leadership supplies the reach and infrastructure that make multiplication at scale conceivable in the first place; and leadership multiplication supplies the orientation that keeps the other three pillars pointed toward reproducing capacity rather than merely improving one leader’s own practice. A congregation strong on only one or two pillars—for example, theologically robust but organizationally centralized, or digitally sophisticated but pastorally thin—will tend to plateau rather than multiply, because the missing pillar removes either the legitimacy, the skill, the reach, or the orientation the model as a whole depends on. This interdependence is also where the model’s central difficulty lies, since strengthening one pillar does not automatically strengthen the others and can, as the next section argues, actively work against them.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.5 Dialectical Tensions Among the Four Pillars

The earlier draft of this study treated the four pillars as straightforwardly complementary. On closer analysis, however, their integration is better understood as a set of managed tensions rather than a frictionless synthesis, and naming these tensions explicitly is where this study's theoretical contribution actually lies.

The most significant tension runs between **digital leadership's logic of scale, efficiency, and data-based tracking** and **biblical leadership's insistence on slow, incarnational, deeply personal character formation** (Weber et al., 2022, versus Sanders, 2017). Digital platforms are attractive precisely because they let one mentor reach many mentees, standardize curricula, and quantify participation; but the same features that produce scale can flatten the relational depth that biblical discipleship presupposes, since spiritual formation—unlike information transfer—resists compression into asynchronous, one-to-many delivery. This is not a problem digitalization can simply be “used wisely” to avoid, as the earlier draft implied; it is a structural trade-off that recurs every time a church decides whether a given discipleship function should move online.

A second tension sits between **leadership multiplication's drive toward distributed authority** and **the paternalistic cultural expectation described in Section 3.3**, in which followers may read a leader's active cultivation of successors as an abdication of the personal care that legitimizes that leader's authority in the first place. A third, related tension exists between **transformational leadership's emphasis on individual empowerment** and **communal, synodal decision cultures** (musyawarah mufakat) in which unilateral “development plans” for an individual successor can sit awkwardly against a preference for collective discernment.

These tensions do not operate independently; they compound. A congregation that resolves the first tension by defaulting to face-to-face discipleship, for instance, may inadvertently deepen the second tension by concentrating mentoring capacity in the hands of a few senior, personally available leaders—precisely the founder-centered pattern the paternalistic-authority concern warns against. Conversely, a congregation that leans into digital scale to multiply reach may satisfy the distributed-authority impulse of leadership multiplication while thinning the incarnational depth biblical leadership requires. There is, in other words, no single “correct” resolution that a congregation can adopt once and apply uniformly; the model instead asks leadership teams to treat each discipleship decision as a fresh negotiation among these pulls, informed by their specific denominational polity, digital infrastructure, and cultural expectations (Section 3.3).

TMDL's contribution, properly understood, is not that it resolves these tensions but that it names them as live, ongoing negotiations a congregation must hold rather than externalities to be

Indonesian Church Leadership... Evelyn M., Owen S., Anugerah M., Manlian R.

minimized. The “Risks and Challenges” identified below (superficial discipleship, weakened personal relationships, generational exclusion) are best read as symptoms of these underlying tensions going unmanaged, rather than as a separate list of hazards. Although digital transformation offers significant opportunities, digitalization has the potential to produce superficial discipleship in which interactions emphasize information transfer over character formation; excessive dependence on technology may diminish the quality of the personal relationships central to Christian discipleship; and disparities in digital literacy across generations may create exclusion within leadership processes, undermining inclusive multiplication.

3.6 Operationalizing TMDL: Toward a Leadership-Formation Reflection Tool

The earlier draft referenced a “TMDL audit” without specifying its content, a gap the reviewer rightly identified. Rather than proposing a numeric scoring instrument that risks reducing discipleship to metrics — a risk this study takes seriously rather than dismisses — this study proposes a **qualitative reflection tool** structured around four guiding questions a local leadership team might revisit periodically:

- *Biblical grounding:* Can each active mentor articulate, in their own words, the theological rationale for why they are developing a specific successor, beyond organizational need?
- *Transformational depth:* Is coaching in this ministry area producing observable growth in character and initiative in mentees, not only task competence?
- *Digital fit:* Given this congregation’s actual connectivity and members’ digital literacy (Section 3.3), which specific discipleship functions are appropriate to move online, and which require in-person presence?
- *Multiplication pathway:* Does every emerging leader have a named next step (member → volunteer → leader → trainer) and an identified mentor, and has that pathway produced a new leader within a defined period?

This is offered as a starting instrument for reflective practice and future empirical refinement — for instance, through qualitative interviews with ministry leaders about how they actually answer these questions in practice — rather than as a validated diagnostic tool.

In practice, this reflection tool is best used not as a one-time audit but as a recurring rhythm — for example, revisited quarterly by a leadership team alongside existing meetings — so that answers can be tracked over time rather than treated as a single pass/fail judgment. A congregation that answers “no” to the digital-fit question for a particular discipleship function is not thereby failing the model; it

is surfacing a concrete decision point about whether to invest in different infrastructure, adjust the function's format, or accept that this function should remain in-person for the foreseeable future. The tool's qualitative, discussion-based format is a deliberate limitation as much as a feature: it sacrifices the comparability and aggregability of a numeric score in exchange for preserving the contextual judgment this study argues digital-era discipleship still requires. Future empirical work could examine whether structured qualitative coding of leadership teams' responses to these four questions correlates with independently observed leadership-multiplication outcomes, which would begin to validate the tool without collapsing it into a metric.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that leadership multiplication in the Indonesian church within the era of digital disruption is shaped by spiritual foundations, leadership paradigms, and digital readiness, and — as the preceding sections argue — by denominational polity, archipelagic infrastructure, and cultural expectations around authority that a purely generic account of digital or transformational leadership would miss. Digital technology can be strategically utilized in discipleship, mentoring, and leadership formation, but its effectiveness is bounded by uneven infrastructure and by tensions with the relational, incarnational demands of Christian formation that this study has named rather than resolved.

As a conceptual contribution, this study proposes the Transformational–Multiplicative Digital Leadership (TMDL) model, integrating biblical leadership, transformational leadership, digital leadership, and leadership multiplication as four interdependent, occasionally competing pillars. Consistent with the reviewer's recommendation, TMDL is presented here as a **conceptual framework awaiting empirical testing**, not as a validated or field-ready tool. Accordingly, this study proposes the following propositions as an agenda for future research:

- **P1.** Congregations with an explicit theological rationale for leadership multiplication (beyond organizational succession need) will show higher continuity of leadership pipelines under conditions of rapid digital or generational change than congregations without such a rationale.
- **P2.** The relationship between digital-tool adoption and perceived discipleship depth is moderated by denominational polity, such that founder-centered/megachurch structures show a stronger trade-off between scale and relational depth than presbyterian-synodal structures.

Indonesian Church Leadership... Evelyn M., Owen S., Anugerah M., Manlian R.

- **P3.** In regions with low digital infrastructure penetration (per Section 3.3), hybrid (in-person plus asynchronous digital) discipleship models will produce more sustained leadership multiplication than digital-only models.
- **P4.** Paternalistic leadership expectations will predict lower rates of successful leadership hand-off unless explicitly and deliberately addressed within a congregation's leadership-development design.

These propositions are intended to be tested through qualitative case studies of individual Indonesian congregations across different polities and regions, or through quantitative survey research across a sample of Indonesian churches, in future studies. Framed this way, the absence of primary empirical data in the present study is a stated direction for subsequent research rather than a limitation the study attempts to obscure. The TMDL model, together with these propositions, is offered as an initial, literature-grounded framework intended to help churches and future researchers ask sharper questions about leadership development in the Indonesian digital era — rather than as a finished, ready-to-implement strategic solution.

LITERATURE

Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia (APJII). 2026. *Survei Profil Internet Indonesia 2026*.

Jakarta: APJII. <https://survei.apjii.or.id/survei>.

Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). 2024a. *Indeks Pembangunan Manusia 2024*. Jakarta: BPS-Statistics Indonesia.

<https://www.bps.go.id/id/publication/2025/05/15/dd9a3ce7dfae1c733e46338f/indeks-pembangunan-manusia-2024.html>.

Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). 2024b. *Statistik Potensi Desa Indonesia 2024*. Jakarta: BPS-Statistics Indonesia.

<https://www.bps.go.id/id/publication/2024/12/10/2f5217e2d6a695a0830290a7/statistik-potensi-desa-indonesia-2024.html>.

Bandara, W., and R. Syed. 2024. "The Role of a Protocol in a Systematic Literature Review." *Journal of Decision Systems* 33 (4): 583–600. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2023.2217567>.

Bass, B. M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., and R. E. Riggio. 2006. *Transformational Leadership*. 2nd ed. New York: Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410617095>.

Burns, J. M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Campbell, H. A., ed. 2020. *Digital Ecclesiology: A Global Conversation*. College Station, TX: Digital

- Castells, M. 2010. *The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444319514>.
- Dewantara, A. W. 2017. “‘Gotong-Royong’ (Mutual Assistance of Indonesia) according to Soekarno in Max Scheler’s Axiology Perspective.” *SSRG International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 4 (5): 39–48. <https://doi.org/10.14445/23942703/IJHSS-V4I5P106>.
- Dwiraharjo, S. 2020. “The Theological Construction of the Digital Church: A Biblical Reflection on Online Worship during the COVID-19 Pandemic.” *EPIGRAPHE: Journal of Theology and Christian Ministry* 4 (1): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.33991/epigraphe.v4i1.145>.
- Fransiscus, F., G. N. Stevany, P. Paay, Y. G. Laransedu, and M. R. A. Simanjuntak. 2025. “A Digital Leadership Model for the Multiplication of Young Leaders.” *Journal of Evangelical Theology and Religious Education* 3 (2): 143–61. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jutipa.v3i2.527>.
- Gultom, J. M. P., V. B. G. D. Paat, and O. Harefa. 2022. “Christian Mission, Spiritual Leadership, and Personality Development of the Digital Generation.” *PASCA: Journal of Theology and Christian Religious Education* 18 (1): 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.46494/psc.v18i1.179>.
- Irawanto, D. W. 2009. “An Analysis of National Culture and Leadership Practices in Indonesia.” *Journal of Diversity Management* 4 (2): 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jdm.v4i2.4957>.
- Maxwell, J. C. 1998. *Developing the Leaders around You*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Moher, D., A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, and D. G. Altman. 2009. “Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement.” *PLoS Medicine* 6 (7): e1000097. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>.
- Mollah, M. A., J.-H. Choi, S.-J. Hwang, and J.-K. Shin. 2023. “Exploring a Pathway to Sustainable Organizational Performance of South Korea in the Digital Age: The Effect of Digital Leadership on IT Capabilities and Organizational Learning.” *Sustainability* 15 (10): 7875. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15107875>.
- Orogun, D. O., and J. Pillay. 2023. “A Historical Survey of the African Neo-Pentecostals’ Response to Digital Transformation.” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 79 (1): a8040. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v79i1.8040>.
- Page, M. J., J. E. McKenzie, P. M. Bossuyt, I. Boutron, T. C. Hoffmann, C. D. Mulrow, et al. 2021. “The PRISMA 2020 Statement: An Updated Guideline for Reporting Systematic Reviews.” *BMJ* 372: n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>.
- Prakoso, B. A., and M. R. A. Simanjuntak. 2025. “Optimizing Leadership Multiplication Models in the Digital Era through Empowering Youth in the Church.” *Khatulistiwa: Journal of Education*

Indonesian Church Leadership... Evelyn M., Owen S., Anugerah M., Manlian R.

and Social Humanities 5 (2): 421–35. <https://doi.org/10.55606/khatulistiwa.v5i2.5869>.

- Sanderan, R., D. D. Lilo, and N. Sampe. 2024. “From Mentorship to Mastery: Investigating Paul’s Method for Lay Leadership Formation in the Early Church.” *KURIOS: Journal of Theology and Christian Religious Education* 10 (1): 206–16.
- Sanders, J. O. 2017. *Spiritual Leadership: Principles of Excellence for Every Believer*. Chicago: Moody Publishers.
- Sheninger, E. C. 2019. *Digital Leadership: Changing Paradigms for Changing Times*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Tambunan, F. 2020. “A Theological Analysis of the Implementation of Online Worship in the Post-COVID-19 Pandemic Era.” *EPIGRAPHE: Journal of Theology and Christian Ministry* 4 (2): 154–69. <https://doi.org/10.33991/epigraphe.v4i2.210>.
- Tari, E., and A. E. S. Revilla. 2025. “Digital Culture and Its Impact on New Testament Interpretations and Religious Practices.” *Evangelikal: Journal of Evangelical Theology and Congregational Development* 9 (1): 82–98. <https://doi.org/10.46445/ejti.v9i1.854>.
- Utama, I. L. M. 2023. “Models of Synodality of the Church in Indonesia.” *Asian Horizons* 17 (1): 174–81.
- Weber, E., E.-H. Krehl, and M. Büttgen. 2022. “The Digital Transformation Leadership Framework: Conceptual and Empirical Insights into Leadership Roles in Technology-Driven Business Environments.” *Journal of Leadership Studies* 16 (1): 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21810>.
- Widiyanto, M. A., and Y. Parapat. 2021. “Pentecostal Leadership Succession in a Disruptive Era.” *KURIOS: Journal of Theology and Christian Religious Education* 7 (1): 29–41. <https://doi.org/10.30995/kur.v7i1.164>.