



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Digital Evangelism and the Mediatization of Nigerian Pentecostalism: New Media and the Transformation of Religious Communication in the Twenty-First Century”

Submitted: 22 March 2026

Accepted: 26 July 2026

Published: 31 July 2026

Corresponding Author: Victor Taiwo Odewale

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n20p76

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Manotar Tampubolon
Universitas Kristen, Indonesia

Reviewer 2: Julius Gathogo
University of South Africa, South Africa

Reviewer 3: Adugnaw Chekole Gashie
Assosa University, Ethiopia

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Accept Submission

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is concise, clear and accurately reflects the core focus and the scope of the manuscript .

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

Abstract (Page 1): Textual Redundancy

On page 1, the abstract contains a near-verbatim repetition that should be streamlined. The sentence, 'The Pentecostal churches have been particularly innovative in adopting digital media for evangelistic outreach and global religious engagement,' immediately echoes the preceding phrase. It is recommended to delete or merge these lines to ensure academic conciseness.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Methodology Section (Page 3): Methodological Scope

On page 5, under the qualitative analysis description, the text notes that the study can be carried out using 'thematic analysis, discourse analysis, and digital ethnography.' While the subsequent coding table on page 8 excellently demonstrates thematic content analysis, the explicit parameters of discourse analysis and digital ethnography are not clearly operationalized in the results. Please refine these lines to match the actual analytical steps taken. Additionally, remove the repetitive scaffolding lines on page 5: 'The analytical process follows several stages: The qualitative analysis followed four major stages:'

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

Result, Discussion & Challenges Section: Expanding Contemporary Examples

On page 10, under the Doctrinal Fragmentation subheader, the author introduces an excellent, high-profile case study regarding Pastor Enoch Adeboye's recent public retraction and apology regarding tithing doctrines. This paragraph is highly insightful but brief. Expanding this section by just a few lines would greatly enrich the paper, demonstrating exactly how open digital spaces can pressure traditional, hierarchical religious structures.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion effectively summarizes, the core findings. However, the closing recommendation for future research is somehow generic. The author is encourages to explicitly link these future

research pathways to unique themes raised in the context, such as how virtual worship impacts African traditional concepts of Ubuntu.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

Duplicates:

Remove the duplicate book entries for Allan Anderson (2013/2014) and Asonzeh Ukah (2008) listed twice.

Formatting:

Standardize the citation entries (Eg. ensuring all book entries contain city and publisher information, and journal entries like Cheong 2017 Or Ukah 2020 include volume, issues , and page numbers) under a single consistent style guide.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript explores a highly relevant and dynamic phenomenon within contemporary African Christianity: the intersections of digital communication technologies and the institutional evolution of Nigerian Pentecostalism. Utilizing qualitative content analysis, the author examines how four major ministries, the Redeemed Christian Church of God (RCCG), Living Faith Church, Christ Embassy, and Mountain of Fire and Miracles Ministries (MFM), leverage social media, streaming, and digital platforms to reshape religious authority, foster transnational community, and fuel a digital religious economy.

The paper is well-conceptualized and relies on an appropriate triple-theoretical framework (mediatization, globalization, and religious economy theories) that effectively illuminates the competitive, borderless, and media-driven logic of modern Pentecostal expansion. The inclusion of structural diagrams (Figure 1) and comparative matrices (Figure 2) enhances the clarity of the presentation. The manuscript requires only minor structural adjustments, textual polishing, and clarification of its methodological scope before it is fully ready for publication.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The characters in the title are too high, as characters with no spaces are 133 while characters with spaces are 152. Why not reduce the title so as to keep only 85 characters for both title and subtitle?

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

With 163 words, the abstract looks OK.
Introduction has to have all the paragraphs merged into one paragraph.
The section on COMPARATIVE OBSERVATIONS lacks adequate analysis

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Grammar is fine

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Yes, its OK

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

Analysis on findings not fully analysed

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion remind us what the article set out to achieve. Then give out a summary of how the agenda was executed. Then summarise the key findings, and suggest the way forward.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

its OK but can do well be reviewing articles that view media as part of science and technology.

1.

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Julius-Gathogo-2/publication/369641495_The_Missionaries%2527_Engagement_with_Science_and_Technology_in_Colonial_Kenya_1887-1963/links/643002a34e83cd0e2f979711/The-Missionaries-Engagement-with-Science-and-Technology-in-Colonial-Kenya-1887-

1963.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECBgQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1iMuOeSpaDLJ4LVcZA_oya

2. [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/items/fe09a326-00d2-437f-8ec5-](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/items/fe09a326-00d2-437f-8ec5-2a3c04832194&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECB4QAQ&usg=AOvVaw29LA-5TW_OctZDKo4dFizT)

[2a3c04832194&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECB4QAQ&usg=AOvVaw29LA-5TW_OctZDKo4dFizT](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://ir-library.ku.ac.ke/items/fe09a326-00d2-437f-8ec5-2a3c04832194&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECB4QAQ&usg=AOvVaw29LA-5TW_OctZDKo4dFizT)

3.

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://unisapressjournals.co.za/index.php/SHE/article/view/12782&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECB8QAQ&usg=AOvVaw2vc5Jf4W3fk7Vb5Qqwaf9K

4.

[https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Julius-Gathogo-](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Julius-Gathogo-2/publication/369641495_The_Missionaries%2527_Engagement_with_Science_and_Technology_in_Colonial_Kenya_1887-1963/links/643002a34e83cd0e2f979711/The-Missionaries-Engagement-with-Science-and-Technology-in-Colonial-Kenya-1887-1963.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECBgQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1iMuOeSpaDLJ4LVcZA_oya)

[2/publication/369641495_The_Missionaries%2527_Engagement_with_Science_and_Technology_in_Colonial_Kenya_1887-1963/links/643002a34e83cd0e2f979711/The-Missionaries-Engagement-with-Science-and-Technology-in-Colonial-Kenya-1887-](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Julius-Gathogo-2/publication/369641495_The_Missionaries%2527_Engagement_with_Science_and_Technology_in_Colonial_Kenya_1887-1963/links/643002a34e83cd0e2f979711/The-Missionaries-Engagement-with-Science-and-Technology-in-Colonial-Kenya-1887-1963.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECBgQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1iMuOeSpaDLJ4LVcZA_oya)

[1963.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECBgQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1iMuOeSpaDLJ4LVcZA_oya](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Julius-Gathogo-2/publication/369641495_The_Missionaries%2527_Engagement_with_Science_and_Technology_in_Colonial_Kenya_1887-1963/links/643002a34e83cd0e2f979711/The-Missionaries-Engagement-with-Science-and-Technology-in-Colonial-Kenya-1887-1963.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwi8_OPb1ZiVAxVT0QIHHC3aBSEQFnoECBgQAQ&usg=AOvVaw1iMuOeSpaDLJ4LVcZA_oya)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

Yes

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The abstract has a few notable weaknesses. For one, it repeats itself when discussing how Nigerian Pentecostal churches are innovatively using digital media, which makes it less concise and clear. The methodology isn't clearly outlined, leaving readers a bit confused about the research approach. Moreover, the research objective comes off as more descriptive than analytical, and there's no clear research question to guide the reader. The findings also feel too general and lack specific empirical evidence. While the assertion that virtualized, worship disrupts African community life is important, it doesn't have enough support within the abstract to really back it up.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

Yes:

Incorrect

Media, thus become a space

Correct:

Media thus become a space

Incorrect

creat religious legitimacy

Correct:

create religious legitimacy

Incorrect

Anthony Gidden describe

Correct:

Anthony Giddens describes

Incorrect

These theoretical perspectives help explain how Pentecostal churches use digital media to build transnational religious network.

Correct:

...transnational religious networks.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

No.

a)The methodology section could use a bit more detail to really showcase the rigor and reliability of the qualitative content analysis. Here are a few specific points to consider:

b)The sampling strategy needs clarification. The article doesn't specify how many sermons, livestreamed services, Facebook posts, YouTube broadcasts, online crusades, or other digital

materials were chosen for analysis.

c) There's no mention of the timeframe for data collection. It's unclear if the data was gathered over a specific period, like 2020–2022, 2023–2024, or even a longer stretch covering several years.

d) The size of the dataset is also missing. There's no information on how many documents were analyzed, the total hours of video content reviewed, or the number of social media posts examined.

e) Lastly, the article doesn't adequately address coding reliability. It lacks details on the coding procedures, the analytical software used, how the codes were developed, or what measures were taken to ensure intercoder reliability and consistency in the methodology.

The results are clear and do not contain errors.

No.

The Results and Discussion section could use some improvement in its structure. Right now, the findings and interpretations tend to blend together, which makes it tricky to tell where the evidence ends and the analysis begins. A lot of the statements come off as more theoretical than based on actual data, and it would really benefit from including some concrete examples like sermon quotes, social media posts, screenshots, or frequency counts. The repetition of themes related to digital evangelism also muddles the clarity of the section. Additionally, some parts feel more appropriate for a literature review or discussion rather than being included in the results. To enhance academic rigor and transparency, it would be great to see a stronger empirical foundation and a clearer distinction between analysis and findings.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

No.

The manuscript has a few citation and referencing issues that need to be sorted out. To start, there are several scholars mentioned in the text who are not listed in the reference section. This includes key figures like Anthony Giddens, Roland Robertson, Arjun Appadurai, Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, and Laurence Iannaccone, all of whom play a vital role in the theoretical discussions around globalization and religious economy. Including their foundational works would really bolster the academic foundation of the study.

There are also a number of references in the bibliography that do not appear in the text at all, such as Anderson and Tang (2005), Berelson (1952), Burgess (2008), Campbell and Garner (2016), Cheong (2017), Gaiya (2002), Gifford (2004), Hackett (1998), Horsfield (2015), Jenkins (2011), Maxwell (2006), Ojo (2006), Omenyo (2011), Robbins (2004), Smith (1998), Stout (2012), Turner (1969), and Walls (2002). There are some duplicate references, especially for Anderson's *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* and Ukah's *A New Paradigm of Pentecostal Power*, which need to be merged. Moreover, several empirical claims are made without proper citations, particularly those regarding global audiences, digital evangelism, and media sophistication.

The methodology section is missing some crucial methodological references. It would be beneficial to include foundational works by Braun and Clarke (2006), Krippendorff (2018), and Kozinets (2020) to back up the use of thematic analysis, content analysis, and digital ethnography.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the RESULTS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):
