SOUTHWESTERN ASSEMBLIES OF GOD UNIVERSITY

HARRISON SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

RESEARCH LITERATURE AND TECHNOLOGY

LDR 5213

INSTRUCTOR:

DR. ROBIN BLAKNEY

TITLE: Multisite: historical, biblical, and practical implications of using video venues to fulfill

the Great Commission

STUDENT DATA:

Name: Daniel De los Reyes

Semester: Fall 2021

Date: November 19, 2021

Abstract

A multisite church has a central location that serves as a hub for activities and service

contents. In addition, modern multisite churches employ video simulcasts to reach congregants in

several satellite locations. Critics of the multisite movement argue that the idea of one church in

multiple locations does not adhere to the original scriptural intent for the church. This research

paper aims to prove multisite as a viable route to develop believers into fully devoted followers

of Christ while at the same time maintaining a mentality to fulfill the Great Commission.

This work focuses on historical, biblical, and practical arguments for and against

multisite. Where can we find historical models that support multisite? Does multisite step outside

of the original intent for the church?

The paper finds that a historical background that supports multisite exists. It also finds

that New Testament ecclesiology leaves plenty of room for structural innovations and

exploration into new ecclesiastical methodologies for the church. Finally, this work also explores

the practical viability of video venues and the pastoral roles in multisite.

Definition of multisite

In their book *Multi-site church revolution*, Bird, Surratt, and Ligon define a multisite church as "one church meeting in multiple locations . . . different locations in the same region, or in some instances, different cities, states, or nations. A multi-site church shares a common vision, budget, leadership, and board" (2006, p. 4). Church leaders and authors have published hundreds of books about the topic of multisite. The current multisite movement grew from a handful of churches in the 1990s to thousands of congregations worldwide in the 2020s. Experts on this movement agree on the existence of five different models of multisite churches. Although these models suggest a level of uniformity, in reality, a church operating under one of these types could look completely different from another church working within the same model. This document does not delve into these models. However, in his master's thesis, *A multisite church model in the rural context*, Gerad Strong provides a synthesis that will serve as a reference for this paper:

> "The Gallery model is one church expanded to multiple services. The Franchise model is one church cloned to multiple sites. The Federation model is one church contextualized in multiple locations. The Cooperative model is one church made up of multiple interdependent churches, and finally the Collective model, which is a collection of churches collaborating as one church" (Strong, 2019, p. 10).

This research paper focuses primarily on multisite churches with video venues and the critiques against them as not biblically sound. Critics of the multisite model argue that multisite churches do not adhere to the original intent for the church. In his doctoral dissertation, *One church in one location: Questioning the biblical, theological, and historical claims of the multi-site church movement*, Darrell Gaines expresses that "a multi-site church that is not characterized by campus-wide gatherings does not have a sound biblical or theological basis for considering itself one church and is inconsistent with historic congregationalism" (2012, p. 2). The rapid

growth of video venues and the creation of multiple services within one location add weight to his critiques.

Since video preaching has increased in popularity as a sermon delivery method, some researchers even include video venues in their primary definition of multisite churches. For example, in the Heidelberg Journal of Religions on the Internet, Vitullo defines multisite churches as "a church with a central location that serves as a hub or production center for the church's activities and service contents, which are distributed to multiple sites in different locations through video or webcasts" (2019, p. 41). Multisite has a tremendous historical background and high current levels of acceptance that support its validity. Thus, while multisite might seem like a new fad, it appears that it will remain at the forefront of the church planting conversation for the near future.

History and background of the multisite model

One can argue that multisite formed part of the church from the start. Historically, the church met in multiple locations. For example, the apostles in the Jerusalem church instructed at the temple, but they also taught in their homes. House and Allison point out that in the temple, "the apostles preached and performed signs and wonders," but they also add that "in the smaller gatherings in homes, the apostles taught and did miracles" (House & Allison, 2017, p. 32). Thus, the Jerusalem church serves as an example of how the same leadership met and taught in different venues, most likely to other people, even though it operated under one umbrella. Later on, the church would be known as "one, holy, catholic, and apostolic" (House & Allison, 2017, p. 33). Though it existed in many locations, the Catholic Church considered itself one. This belief lasted for centuries.

<u>Though the church suffered fractures and divisions throughout its course, </u>most will

recognize Luther's reformation as a seismic change that started with his 95 theses on October 31,

1517. The emerging protestant church faced backlash from the Roman Catholic Church (House

& Allison, 2017, p. 34). However, House and Allison note that "as the church crossed the

Atlantic, imbibing the spirit of American autonomy and democracy, many churches became

characterized by a spirit of intense independence" (House & Allison, 2017, p. 34). This shift

turned protestant congregations into more autonomous churches, yet more denominations and

associations sprouted.

Methodist circuit riders in the 1700s and 1800s spread Methodism by horseback; these

pioneers formed classes within circuits. Classes operated as their version of the local church

within specific regions (Schaller, 1999, p. 174-175). "When the circuit rider was not there during

the week, the satellite had a class leader or layperson who kept things going. Then the circuit

rider would come in every once in a while, and fire people up" (Smietana, 2005). These were

churches in different locations but with one overseer over the region and localized leadership in

charge of the specific congregation. In a way, a new version of the circuit ride paradigm carried

over to the current modern model of multisite.

Pastoral roles in multisite

In modern multisite, the church leadership determines the roles of the lead pastor and the

campus pastor before launching a satellite church. One answer does not fit all, so a church

desiring to go into multisite must assess their strengths and characteristics regarding their

leadership style. Edwards argues that "the unique organizational challenge for multisite churches

is determining the balance between freedom and control in the relationship between the campus

pastor and the primary leadership team of the overall church" (2016, p. 7). Such dynamics will determine the success of their new endeavors.

Senior leadership teams in multisite

Three needs emerge as the responsibilities for the senior leadership team. First, senior pastors must transmit the central DNA. Second, they must ensure the legitimization of the campus pastor (Edwards, 2016, p. 4). Furthermore, lastly, they must not compromise the integrity of the campus by upholding calling and giftedness standards (Edwards, 2016, p. 10).

To impart the DNA of the church to a campus pastor, the senior pastor must give time and invest in the growth of this individual (D'Angelo & Stigile, 2016, p. 44). In addition, when the church establishes a new campus pastor, the senior team must bridge the gap to legitimize the campus pastor by establishing strategic meetings with key organizational stakeholders to inform them of the role change. Traditionally, lead pastors would function in three primary responsibilities, to preach the word, perform pastoral care duties, and disciple the church for the work of the ministry. Although lead pastors in multisite still have responsibilities outside the pulpit (Strong, 2019, p. 28), their duties look different. First, lead pastor off-stage responsibilities, such as pastoral care and disciple-making, move to care, and discipleship of the staff or lead volunteers. The campus pastor then takes on the responsibility to disciple and care for the rest of the people in the satellite campus.

Before launching a new location, the senior leadership team needs to ensure to "have the right campus pastor in place" (O'Dell, 2010, p. 176). Though subjective, this last qualifier will depend mainly on the structure of the new satellite location and the church launching it. In addition, high-level campus pastors need to operate with the freedom to make decisions at their satellite locations. To avoid perplexed and disgruntled campus pastors, Edwards recommends

senior leaders to give "the freedom to lead in such a way that his gifts are being sufficiently utilized" (2016, p. 8).

The role of the campus pastor in multisite

The responsibilities of the campus pastor then are not the same as the responsibilities of the senior pastor, even if the campus pastor functions as the key leader in a satellite location, even more so if the church follows the video venue paradigm. Selecting the correct campus pastor will determine much of the success of the satellite location. Although the campus pastor does not have the same responsibility or authority as the senior pastor, leadership cannot look at this role simply as a light version of the lead pastor. Also, church leaders should not consider the campus pastor position merely as a growth plan to develop a youth pastor into a senior pastor role; the campus pastor "is a unique role requiring specific gifts to lead within a specific ministry strategy" (D'Angelo & Stigile, 2016, p. 19).

According to D'Angelo and Stigile, a campus pastor must possess three critical qualities: highly relational connecting skills, proven ability to build teams, and solid executing skills (2016, p. 19-20). First, campus pastors act as the community shepherd of their location. D'Angelo and Stigile affirm that "most volunteers will join the team because they trust the campus pastor and feel that he or she has their best interest in mind" (2016, p. 44). So, the foundation of a satellite location lies in having a highly relational leader who can build teams.

The campus pastor position also requires managerial skills. Campus pastors must demonstrate their ability to manage projects from completion to end, often without much supervision from the central location. Bird et al. suggest that a campus pastor must have the traits of "a flexible entrepreneur" (2006, p. 144). By this, we can understand that campus pastors must

possess self-starting skills who can function independently but can choose to accommodate the vision from the central team or senior pastor.

To avoid frustration and failure, churches must plan and revise best strategies, but ultimately identifying the right leader for their satellite locations will prove crucial for their future success (D'Angelo & Stigile, 2016, p. 18). More complex church structures tend to demand more bureaucracy and systems. However, controlling and over-bureaucratized church systems may cause restrain at the campus level and create unhealthy levels of regulation that could culminate in potential disenchantment from the satellite campus leader (Edwards, 2016, p. 9).

Multisite technology

The modern multisite model relies heavily on technology, so one would need to give proper attention to discuss some of its implications. As Frye notes, "the development of the multi-site church construct is contingent upon human advancements in technology, … business practices, communication, and transportation over the last century" (2011, p. 191). These developments mean that more churches can afford the type of technology that enables multisite as we know it today.

Multisite churches usually do not shy away from utilizing technology and media in new ways. Because multisite churches maintain evangelism as a high priority, they often think they will employ any tactics short of sin to reach people. In their current state, multisite churches rely heavily on technology. "Because multisite churches are often enterprises driven by and dependent on technology, they raise interesting questions about how technology can transform religious practices and how technology can be shaped by users to pursue religious values"

(Vitullo, 2019, p. 46). First, however, the multisite movement needs to remain aware of the undetected effects of media in the church (Hipps, 2006, p. 152).

Arguments against the multisite model

The multisite movement has brought a tremendous revolution this century to the church by focusing intensely on the Great Commission. It embraces technology and new methods to go into all the earth and make disciples. However, opponents of the movement often categorize it as a model tailored for consumerism (Smietana, 2005). Besides the proneness to consumerism, some opponents believe categorizing multiple church gatherings as one church does not align with the model proposed in the Bible.

Suppose opponents take that argument to its logical conclusion. In that case, Frye concludes that critics would suggest that "churches with multiple services and multi-site worship gatherings are considered inappropriate and incorrect expressions of "church" because they do not gather the full assembly of the church for worship" (Frye, 2011, p. 220). Nevertheless, Gaines takes that argument to its logical conclusion. He poses that churches with multiple gatherings "cannot legitimately claim to be one church because their members are not characterized by gathering together at the whole church level" (2012, p. 3). This section explores biblical, philosophical, and practical arguments that opponents typically make against the multisite movement.

Multisite against the original scriptural intent for the church

From a scriptural standpoint, Gaines argues that multisite churches or single-building churches with multiple services, for that matter, do not adhere to biblical ordinances. He believes that a church meeting in numerous locations distorts the meaning of "ekklesia" in the New Testament. Gaines believes that "ekklesia," as found in Matthew 16:18, should serve as the basis

for our understanding of the Old Testament understanding of Israel as the "assembly of the

Lord" contextualized to the New Testament (Gaines, 2012, p. 10, 48). Gaines also points out

that, in Deuteronomy 28:64, God promised that he would scatter his people to the ends of the

earth as a punishment. He implies that this statement provided weight to his argument of a

physical "assembly of the Lord" (Gaines, 2012, p. 11). Furthermore, Gaines makes the

connection between Ephesians 2:6-7 along with Colossians 3:1-3 as an eschatological fulfillment

of Jesus gathering and reconstituting the "assembly of the Lord" (Gaines, 2012, p. 11).

> Just as inaugurated eschatology involves the kingdom of God breaking into the present
> age, so it also involves the heavenly and eschatological assembly breaking into the
> present age in the case of every local church. In this way, each earthly assembly should
> be viewed as a manifestation of the ultimate heavenly reality. Each earthly assembly has
> the status of a full-fledged, self-contained, earthly manifestation of the heavenly-
> eschatological assembly. Thus, what multi-site proponents consider a site or campus that
> is merely part of a church, the Bible considers a church in itself. (Gaines, 2012, p. 12)

A physical assembly does not merely constitute a church. Greear states that "the essence

of a New Testament local church, however, is not "assembly" but "covenant body" (2010). In

reality, it takes more than a common geographical space for a body of people to become a

church.

Opponents to the simulcast video model assume a gap between the preacher on screen

and the people on the seats. Hipps affirms that "the medium itself nurtures an elite priestly class

in which the preacher is set apart from the people" (Hipps, 2006, p. 152). Although that

argument could apply to preachers in general, it poses a couple of great questions. First, do

churches employ simulcast video because they could not find or prepare more preachers?

Second, do multisite churches believe that only a few have the necessary qualities to preach?

Finally, Hipps poses that churches that employ video venues inadvertently communicate that

"the authority to preach is derived from talent and celebrity, not character or communal

affirmation" (2006, p. 151). This argument implies that only multisite churches treat their lead pastor as a celebrity.

Modern society is inherently consumeristic and risks turning the church into a commodity. As Paterson explains the danger, "instead of working hard at creating a multi-cultural church that demonstrates the barrier-busting power of the gospel, multi-site can tend to divide a "church" into separate cultural streams" (2017 p. 70). Furthermore, Hipps argues that in a consumer-driven society, church and Christianity are valued only to the point that they strengthen the individual's relationship with Jesus (2006, p. 100), and not as an inherent element in their spiritual growth but just as a vehicle. Thus, the possibility for any church to develop a consumer mindset around their methods and program does exist. However, consumer mindsets also exist in churches outside of multisite (Frye, 2011, p. 234).

Opponents also criticize the multisite model because of a perceived lack of an ability to know the lead pastor. They argue that because community affirms character, people at the satellite locations will never honestly know the pastor (Hipps, 2006, p. 151). However, churches with more than a few hundred members would face such challenges, even if they met in the same auditorium. In addition, smaller churches with bi-vocational pastors who cannot make a personal investment in every single member of their congregation due to time constraints face similar challenges as the ones described before (Frye, 2011, p. 238). Therefore, a perceived lack of an ability to know the lead pastor also exists outside of multisite churches.

Viability of one church in multiple locations

There exist more concerned arguments against multisite from a practical standpoint, mainly financial. A multisite church grows to evident complexity. Moreover, as House and Allison affirm, "greater complexity costs more money" (2017, p. 176). Most multisite churches

do not initiate their multisite process to save money; most do it because they want to accomplish the Great Commission. However, proponents affirm that multisite can save finances by creating more efficient operational costs for the church. House and Allison argue that the lore of efficiency "is perhaps the greatest myth of multisite" (2017, p. 175). In the end, the finances that a church saves in one area of operation undoubtedly will increase in another area. (House & Allison, 2017, p. 176). This section will now look at the argument in favor of multisite.

Arguments in favor of the multisite model: a different approach to church

Multisite affords churches of all sizes and backgrounds to increase their goal to fulfill the Great Commission. For example, Shannon O'Dell, who pastors Brand New Church in a town of four hundred, recounts, "we realized that with proper use of technology, we could multiply what we were doing in different physical locations" (O'Dell, 2010, p. 175). O'Dell's recount affirms what Bird et al. declared in their first book on the topic that multisite church does not equal megachurch (2006, p. 14). Multisite churches possess a considerable focus to fulfill the Great Commission. They have an evangelistic heart and desire to grow the kingdom of God (McConnell, 2009 p. 6). This section explores biblical, philosophical, and practical arguments that proponents of multisite typically make.

Multisite in the light of New Testament Ecclesiology

Frye, quoting Giles' *Church Order, Government*, states, "many Christians still believe that the New Testament exclusively supports their ecclesiology." Additionally, "aspects of each ecclesiology are present in the Scriptures but not as one given pattern and not in any set form" (2011, p. 220). The openness of the New Testament about this topic invites us to create culturally relevant structures, as John Piper would call that, a "divine invitation" (Frye, 2011, p. 185).

New Testament congregations borrowed vocabulary from Hellenistic structures to create the early church structures. Frye affirms that when Paul uses the Greek word for gathering "ekklesia" over the Hebrew word "sunagoge," he tries to contextualize their understanding of the church to the culture of the day (Frye, 2011, p. 187). Although Paul gives many instructions to the body, neither he nor Jesus speak much about the topic of church structure (Frye, 2011, p. 185).

One can argue that Paul used technology as a tool to spread his teachings. Herrington states that "simulcast preaching is simply putting the unchanging message of the gospel in the most acceptable medium of the day" (Herrington, 2017, p.81). Frye alludes that if the apostles had access to these technologies, they would maximize their use to proclaim the gospel (Frye, 2011, p. 244-245).

Effects of simulcast video venues

Multisite video campuses through satellite technology allowed Brand New Church in Bargman, Arkansas, a town of four hundred, to reach thousands of people. In rural America, "almost everybody has a TV, but not everyone has a relevant church experience they can physically attend" (O'Dell, 2010, p. 180). In addition, the improvements in technology ensure that people across the nation and the world connect instantly.

Herrington, quoting Driscoll, states that since our society consumes many hours of video regularly, "it is foolish stewardship not to at least consider using some of those screens for the preaching of the gospel (Herrington, 2017, p.82). Humorously, O'Dell affirms that "God used a donkey to speak truth - so don't tell me that today God couldn't use a sound system, a satellite, or a podcast!" (O'Dell, 2010, p. 172).

Critics may label multisite churches, especially those that broadcast the lead pastor's message to all its satellites, as personality cults. The proponents of multisite would err not to address this issue. Some multisite churches may fall into cults of personality. However, this problem also exists outside the multisite church paradigm, "preacher veneration can take place in any kind of church, whether small or large or with many sites or one" (Frye, 2011, p. 234). In such cases, the lead pastor must make an effort to elevate other levels of leadership to assure the congregation that the church does not revolve around him.

Opponents of the video venue model criticize the gap between the communicator and the audience. However, Strong explains that the void they propose "assumes there is little to no engagement from the campus pastor who is typically appointed to shepherd the location receiving the sermon" (Strong, 2019, p. 29). As a result, one of the primary functions of the campus pastor is to contextualize the vision and message and bridge the gaps to the satellite location.

Conquering consumer mindset

Video venues serve as an avenue for multisite churches to reach more people and turn them into entirely devoted followers of Christ. O'Dell affirms that multisite made growth possible for them. Notable growth at the macro level extended to the individual level, "our growing congregants were now maturing into full-fledged servant leaders and pastors who could maintain our commitment to building congregants rather than congregations" (O'Dell, 2010, p. 176). From the outside looking in, multisite looks consumer-centric, but in reality, at the center, the model focuses on fulfilling the Great Commission.

House and Allison affirm that "in multi-church models, missional engagement is a personal investment" (2017, p. 183). Additionally, according to Strong, missional engagement

"may only happen through a healthy community that reaches beyond the weekend experience" (2019, p. 19). Moreover, "any church is at fault, whether single-site or multiple-site if it allows the leader to do the ministry while everyone else watches" (Bird et al., 2006, p. 206-207).

The reality that a large number of Christians do not share their faith should alarm the evangelical community. Multisite provides a way to move believers into action (Strong, 2019, p. 15). On the other hand, critics must beware of satanizing entertainment and enjoyable spectacles. However, as Hipps emphasizes, spectacles by themselves do not invalidate the mission; "rather, they are insufficient (2006, p. 150). Multisite churches sometimes utilize entertainment; however, entertainment has a place in this paradigm as long as it creates opportunities for people to take their next step in their walk with Christ.

Leadership accountability

The multisite church model embodies unity. According to Bird et al., some of the advantages of the multisite model include:

> "greater accountability, sharing of resources (stewardship), the infusion of trained workers, shared DNA (mission and core values), greater prayer support, a pre-established network for problem-solving, not needing to reinvent the wheel, in connection with others doing the same thing" (Bird et al., 2006, p. 40).

The campus pastor's role aids the church at the local level to achieve unity. "While there is not an "ideal" remedy to the incarnational concern, there is a partial one: the campus pastor model" (Frye, 2011, p. 244). If elevated, this position can answer concerns and alleviate issues of potential personality cults.

Practical response

Although critics provide valid arguments against the myth of automatic financial viability, multisite does help absorb some expenses. The fact that churches do not have to rehire

for positions already covered in the central location allows them to launch with a bigger team around the new campus to provide support. Independent new churches have to think about solutions to children's ministry teams, communication teams, and other logistical concerns; however, a new multisite campus already has access to those positions at the central campus. Those positions share knowledge, resources, and training to the new location.

Strong, who served as the lead pastor of Bethel Assembly with their broadcast location in Rapid City, South Dakota, launched seven campuses in three years. He states that "these shared resources of not only finances, but also trained workers, mission, core values, prayer support, and problem-solving are intangible resources that a church needs to be a successful organization of God's people" (Strong, 2019, p. 17). Therefore, in theory, it becomes more cost-efficient when a church launches additional campuses because they all share the burden to pay for these resources.

The future of multisite

Multisite transcends size and diverse backgrounds. As a result, more churches from different backgrounds embark on their multisite journey. Young church plants start their multisite journey frequently, as well as seasoned churches. According to the Barna Group, "one in four churches are over one hundred years old when they launch their first multisite campus or church plant" (Strong, 2019, p. 12-13).

In an interview for this research, Gerad Strong states, "I believe it has been in existence since the early church… The principle is we need to go to people instead of people coming to us" (G. Strong, personal communication, September 15, 2021). In 2005, Smietana published the finding "that once people drive more than 30 minutes one way to church, their involvement drops off dramatically." Therefore as Frye states, "multi-site churches should seek

simultaneously to increase the number of their worship gatherings (venues or sites) and decrease the size of their worship gatherings" (2011, p. 230). Additionally, in findings from 2020, "according to the Hartford study, the average US megachurch has 7.6 services a weekend, compared to 5.5 just five years ago" (Baer, 2020).

Bryan Jarrett, the lead pastor of Northplace Church in Sachse, Texas, makes a plea to his congregation as they expand into their fifth campus:

> "Back in the day, when you had a "burden" for someone, it meant your heart was heavy for them, you were concerned for them... Your heart was broken over where they might spend eternity… Without a burden for people far from God… all (this work) is just a project" (Jarrett, 2021).

Conclusion

Multisite churches face the challenge of developing their congregants to mature their spiritual depth while at the same time pursuing corporate growth. Critics believe that multisite churches focus too much on entertainment and create a consumer mentality. Furthermore, opponents believe that certain aspects of multisite do not adhere to the commands of the scriptures for the church. Yet as demonstrated, the New Testament does not place one ecclesiological method over another.

Multisite churches need to focus on fulfilling the Great Commission. While they might offer some spectacles, they do it intending to attract more to experience Christ. Therefore, to develop congregants spiritually, multisite churches must disciple them to cultivate, as Jarrett describes it, "a burden for people far from God." Moreover, congregants need to develop a personal emphasis to reach more people within their sphere of influence for Christ. Finally, multisite churches need to keep a resilient focus on the Great Commission to distinguish themselves as churches that aim to grow the kingdom of God.

Reference list

Baer, M. (2020, November 19). *US Megachurches Are Getting Bigger and Thinking Smaller*. CT Pastors. https://www.christianitytoday.com/pastors/2020/november-web-exclusives/us-megachurches-multisite-small-group-hartford.html

Bird, W., Surratt, G., & Ligon, G. (2006). *Multi-Site Church Revolution: Being One Church in Many Locations* (1st edition). Zondervan.

D'Angelo, D., & Stigile, R. (2016). *Multisite Church Pitfalls: 7 Dangers You Cannot Afford to Ignore*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Edwards, J. H. (2016). *Leadership structures and dynamics in multisite churches: A quantitative study* [Doctoral dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary]. http://www.proquest.com/pqdthss/docview/1797415201/abstract/34A556B98BC94292PQ/1

Frye, B. N. (2011). *The multi-site church phenomenon in North America: 1950–2010* [Doctoral dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary]. http://www.proquest.com/pqdthss/docview/868502632/abstract/54F67B1337D24A8BPQ/1

Gaines, D. G. (2012). *One church in one location: Questioning the biblical, theological, and historical claims of the multi-site church movement* [Doctoral dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary]. http://www.proquest.com/pqdthss/docview/1282125135/abstract/A8593189318E4782PQ/1

Giles, Kevin N. (1997) "Church Order, Government." In *Dictionary of the Later New Testament & Its Developments*. Edited by Ralph P. Martin and Peter H. Davis. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Groothuis, Douglas (1988, December). "Christian Scholarship and the Philosophical Analysis of Cyberspace Technologies." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 41.4: 631-640.

Herrington, R. (2017). *A Theological and Philosophical Evaluation of Simulcast Preaching*
within the Multi-Site Church Movement [Doctoral dissertation, Southeastern Baptist
Theological Seminary].

http://www.proquest.com/pqdthss/docview/1896530032/abstract/9EA128BCA0824378PQ/1

Hipps, S. (2006). *The Hidden Power of Electronic Culture: How Media Shapes Faith, the*
Gospel, and Church. Zondervan.

House, B., & Allison, G. (2017). *MultiChurch: Exploring the Future of Multisite*. Zondervan.

Jarrett, B. (2021, February 28). *Just One More—Vision Sunday 2021*.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=spfdQqgQoIs

McConnell, S. (2009). *Multi-Site Churches: Guidance for the Movement's Next Generation*.
B&H Publishing Group.

O'Dell, S. (2010). *Transforming Church in Rural America*. New Leaf Press.

Paterson, A. (2017). Multi-Site Church. *Foundations (Affinity)*, *72*, 61–75.

https://www.affinity.org.uk/foundations-issues/issue-72-article-4-multi-site-church

Schaller, L. E. (1999). *Discontinuity and Hope: Radical Change and the Path to the Future*.
Abingdon Press.

Smietana, B. (2005, August 31). *High-Tech Circuit Riders*. ChristianityToday.Com.

https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2005/september/24.60.html

Strong, G. (2019). *A Multisite Church Model In The Rural Context* [Master's thesis, Trinity
Bible College and Graduate School]. https://ruraladvancement.com/wp-
content/uploads/2021/01/Gerad-G.-Strong-Thesis-PDF.pdf

Strong, G. (2021, September 15). *Interview with a former lead pastor of a church with seven*
multisite locations. [Audio].

Surratt, G., Ligon, G., & Bird, W. (2009). *A Multi-Site Church Roadtrip: Exploring the New Normal*. Zondervan.

Vitullo, A. (2019). Multisite Churches: Creating Community from the Offline to the Online. *Online - Heidelberg Journal of Religions on the Internet*, *14*, 41–60. https://doi.org/10.17885/heiup.rel.2019.0.23947