CHAPTER 4

Come, See, Do: Igniting the Spark that Energizes Followers

Jane Caulton

Introduction

Nearly two thousand years ago, an itinerant Jewish preacher introduced a new religious practice, which became known as "The Way" (Edwards & Edwards, 1997). The concept sparked a movement that grew into what is commonly known as the Christian church, thus making it one of humanity's oldest organizations. This organization has outlasted civilizations as it has continued to grow through two millennia, in spite of the fact that its founder was executed before it was ever fully established. The Center for Global Christianity reported that more than 2.4 billion people—one third of the world's population—are followers (Zurlo et al., 2019). Christianity exists in many forms, and can be found on all continents and in most countries, even in secret communities (Edwards & Edwards, 1997; Oosthuizen & Lategan, 2015). One segment, The Movement International,

J. Caulton (✉)
Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA, USA
e-mail: janicau@mail.regent.edu

D. J. Dean and R. B. Huizinga (eds.), *Followership and Faith at Work*, Christian Faith Perspectives in Leadership and Business,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-90614-6_4

is busily at work establishing churches in areas that do not have access to technological innovations such as the Internet or television (http://www.themovementintl.org/). Many of these places can only be reached on foot traveling across tough terrain. Like The Movement's ancient predecessors, its followers establish churches in homes, disciple new members, and empower these converts to do the same. As a result, The Movement International has won thousands of souls and established many churches in approximately seven nations.

The Movement International's blueprint for operation was established by the organization's founder, Jesus Christ, and instituted by twelve men traveling from Israel to Samaria and the rest of the world according to Jesus' command (Acts 1:8). These men fought determinedly to complete their assignment of spreading the gospel, as their leader had directed. Thus, without such followers, "The Way" would have been just another chapter in Jewish history. This perspective of followership leads me to consider the research question, "What can contemporary leaders learn from observing the followers of Christ and how can they apply such lessons in their operations?" This chapter will consider this question through a socio-rhetorical analysis of Matthew, Chapter 10, highlighting Jesus' leadership style and its effect as represented by the Apostle Philip. Philip, viewed from the Gospel of John, was one of the first disciples that Jesus called and is always listed in the top five (McDowell, 2015; Zavada, 2020). He was noted as curious, faithful, and outspoken, whereby his character provides a model for the followership theories of Chaleff (2009), Kelley (1988), and Kellerman (2007). Examining the apostle's response to Jesus' leadership is applicable for developing like-minded followers, the efficacy of which is manifest through contemporary organizations such as The Movement International, which are yet following Christ's instructions to spread the gospel.

Literature Review

Leadership Theory

Followership is a product of leadership; for without followers, one cannot be a leader. It is important, however, to note that leadership and management are not one and the same. Rost (1991) emphasizes that "leadership and management are not synonymous terms, [*sic*]one can be a leader

without being a manager … Conversely one can manage without leading" (Rost, 1991, p. 101). While both are decision-making roles, leaders must make the critical decisions that provide organizational direction and their major power is influence. Leaders provide the vision for the mission while managers execute it. Thus, leaders engage interactively with others to bring about change. Their techniques are persuasive rather than coercive, personal rather than mechanical. They engage their followers and enable them to see themselves as important in organizational goals.

Follower-centric leadership is practiced by those who wish to empower their subordinates. Such leaders "treat employees as the most valuable organizational assets, investing available resources in them" (Maslennikova, 2007, p. 3). They treat their staffs as equals and involve them in the decision-making process. Favorable perceptions of leaders determine leader effectiveness (Yukl, 2006). Those who practice encouraging their workers through praise, rewards, and support are most likely to receive high approval. They are considered follower-centric because they are concerned about the development of their people; their leadership style may be charismatic, servant, or transformational.

Charismatic leadership theory is one of the earliest reverse-pyramid (leaders at the bottom) theories. Prior to these, most theories emphasized the importance of the leader. But in 1947, sociologist Max Weber used the term "charisma"[1] to describe follower response to a favorable perception of their leaders. Over the years, the theory has been developed through empirical studies but leaders who espouse change from the current status and are unconventional in their processes are generally considered as charismatic. These leaders demonstrate self-sacrificing behavior and inspire support through emotional appeal. Klein and House (1995) posited that charisma resides in the leader–follower relationship, rather than the person. They described charisma as "a fire that ignites followers' energy and commitment, producing results above and beyond the call of duty" (p. 183). It has three elements: spark, flammable material, and oxygen. The leaders provide the spark in their articulation of vision, communication of confidence in the follower's ability to excel, and the projection of a collective identity over an individual one. Doing so in the proper environment (oxygen) ignites the flammable material (spark) of follower engagement, consciousness, and commitment.

[1] The term comes from the Greek, meaning "divinely inspired gift" (Yukl, 267).

The resulting fire—charisma—charges the organizational environment, resulting in success.

Robert Greenleaf also associated organizational success with follower engagement (Washington et al., 2014). In 1977, he proposed the servant leadership theory that emphasized the value of people, authenticity, and community. He proposed that leaders should place interest in the good of all over the good in themselves and should see themselves as servants of followers rather than followers as their servants. He advocated that followers should be seen as constituents and that power should be shared with them. Greenleaf stressed the importance of developing followers: "The new ethic requires that growth of those who do the work is the primary aim, and the workers then see to it the customer is served and that the ink on the bottom line is black. It is their game" (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 121). Such action strengthens and allows followers to participate in decision-making as paramount to increasing organizational quality. Practicing servant leadership, according to Greenleaf, ensures corporate growth.

Corporate growth is also the goal of transformational leadership, a theory introduced by James McGregor Burns in 1978 (Yukl, 2006). This follower-centric approach also highlighted empowering followers and increasing their ability to make decisions independently. Yukl said "transformational leadership appeals to the moral values of followers in an attempt to raise their consciousness about ethical issues and to mobilize their energy and resources to reform institutions" (p. 267). Burns opined that increasing follower awareness of the significance of their roles improves performance and that providing incentives is more effective than coercive tactics, such as penalizing (Yukl).

Transformational leaders are considered change agents who focus on revitalizing, creating new vision, and normalizing change (Morse, 1996). Transformational leaders operate in four dimensions of follower interaction (Bass & Avolio, 1994). They serve as role models (idealized influence), they motivate and inspire others (inspirational motivation), they stimulate creativity and innovation (intellectual stimulation), and they are attentive to the professional developmental needs of their constituents (individualized consideration). These efforts create a relationship that nourishes the intrinsic needs of followers while promoting a growth environment that is profitable for the total organizational community.

Followership Theory

Followership is an innate projection of nature, which craves order (Kellerman, 2008). Order produces results with minimal conflict and is most clearly seen in the animal kingdom, where hierarchies are natural. This social order enables groups to work together, in which someone leads and others follow. Kellerman said "the virtues of ranking include the efficient division of labor, the stability of the group organization, and the maintenance of order" (p. 52). Therefore, most people agree to follow a leader, who may be selected by a group or self-appointed.

People have been bred to embrace leadership from the womb, where they enter into a preset hierarchy headed by their parents (Kellerman, 2008). This arrangement provides comfort, security, and stability. Humans then learn that acquiescing to authority benefits them. Kellerman said "(a) leaders provide individuals with safety, security, and a sense of order; (b) leaders provide individuals with a group, a community, to which they can belong; and (c) leaders provide individuals with someone who does the collective work" (p. 56). Thus, the leader–follower relationship is beneficial collectively as well as individually; groups can more efficiently accomplish a purpose and are more effective with leaders. Everyone does not follow willingly but some resist leadership for a variety of reasons, which can cause variance and stall efforts (Kellerman, 2008). However, those followers can be brought back into alignment by their fellow followers. "Followers" said Kellerman, "model their behavior on others similar to themselves" for the same reasons that they follow leaders: the need for stability, security, order, meaning, and belonging (p. 56).

Followers may be better understood by their roles rather than their positions (Kellerman, 2007). Traditionally, followers are perceived as those who report to someone who has more authority, power, or influence. They execute assignments and relay results to those who have the power to make decisions. Kellerman said "they may comply so as not to put money or stature at risk" (p. 2). However, with the technological and cultural changes of the twenty-first century where the boundaries of work space have been altered by virtual spaces and teams spanning the globe, followership can be perceived differently. These workers now have the power to make decisions quickly in the service of customers on behalf of their organizations. The workplace is an environment where knowledge has become more important than position; and therefore, followers are deciding what is necessary to achieve organizational goals.

Followership has thus become a subject worthy of attention as companies now realize that their success or failure depends on the character and behavior of their representatives at the bottom of the chain as well as the top. Kellerman (2007) proposed that the best means of assessing the value of followers is to consider their levels of engagement. The author proposes that they will fall into one of five categories: isolates, bystanders, participants, activists, and diehards. The most dangerous of these to an organization are the first two—the isolates and the bystanders. These two groups of people evidence no investment in the organization, its mission, or its leaders. Their primary focus is personal survival. Isolates have separated their interests from day-to-day issues and events while bystanders are aware but determined not to participate. They do not report problems, but wait to see what will happen. These two groups are like speed bumps in the road; they slow down growth and innovation through the absence of contribution.

On the other hand, the last three—participants, activists, and diehards—are jewels in the organizational crown. They are the ones who keep the company moving forward and their leaders looking good. The difference in the three is the level of their investment, with participants having the lowest and diehards having the highest. Each of these followers will take steps they feel necessary for organizational advancement; however, if they disagree with or disapprove of their leaders, they can become a problem as they may become saboteurs rather than supporters—and that can have negative outcomes. Companies seeking growth must ensure that its front line is strong, so leaders must periodically observe the character, behavior, and contributions of followers and consider how best to encourage and improve their activities (Kellerman, 2007). Suggestions for incentivizing range from appealing assignments to increased responsibilities with monetary rewards and/or compensation.

Organizations that embrace the creative abilities of their followers effectively and efficiently combat stagnancy (Jaussi et al., 2008). They value their employees as individuals and allow them to shape and pursue ideas that promote and expand the organizational good. Jaussi et al. (2008) explained "creative organizations are extremely people-centric, and they recognize that creativity is an essentially human endeavor. They understand that ideas originate in individuals, and groups of individuals shape, develop, and lead new ideas to fruition" (p. 292). As a result, such organizations are continually evolving as they allow their followers to take them to new heights. Organizations must allow followers to function as

individuals who have different interests, different degrees of abilities, and different degrees of passion. All followers will not operate in the same way, but all have something to contribute to the mission.

Kelley (1988) defined effective followers as "enthusiastic, intelligent, and self-reliant" participants in pursuit of an organizational goal while in a subordinate position (p. 3). Though these people may value their positions and may even find them virtuous, their motivations and perceptions vary as some find satisfaction in supporting a person or a goal, others in the context of a role, and still others as a means of personal achievement. Kelley theorized that follower behavior can be identified by their ability to think critically and independently and their pattern of engagement ranges from passive to active. Five patterns emerged from Kelley's theory: sheep, yes people, alienated followers, survivors, and effective followers.

Sheep are the least engaged followers who perform their tasks and wait for their next assignment (Kelley, 1988). They are not likely to take initiative, but will most likely do the work. "Yes" people look to their leaders for inspiration and direction. They do not veer from the leader's vision and may be servile in their performance, which does not advance the agency. Alienated followers can be described as passive-aggressive as they have their own opinions but do not engage. They are cynical but not oppositional; they have disengaged. Survivors are those who go along to get along while effective followers are the organization's most valuable employees. They are energetic, motivated, interested, and participative. Kelley said "effective followers are well-balanced and responsible adults who can succeed without strong leadership" (p. 4). These followers are star performers who work in partnership with leaders in advancing the organization. Star performers are those who manage themselves well; are committed to the organization, purpose, principles, and others. They build their competence and focus their efforts for maximum impact and are courageous, honest, and credible. They are mature and able to handle delegation with efficiency, effectiveness, and aplomb. They can be depended on to accomplish their assignments and support the organizational mission.

Followers have a responsibility to their organizations to assertively respond to leadership (Chaleff, 2004). The organization best prospers when all ideas are brought to the table and properly aired. Conversely, the organization suffers when followers bow to the will of leaders in the interest of self-preservation. Chaleff said "Those who work most closely

with the leader, the senior 'followers' if you will, need to assume responsibility for keeping their relationship with the leader honest, authentic and courageous. 'Yes men' need not apply" (p. 1). Followers must avoid personal survival games and be willing to participate in helping the organization to accomplish its goals and execute its mission. On the other side, leaders must create environments where follower contribution is welcome. Such environments are shaped by integrity, respect, open communication, and interest in the common good which breeds self-confidence, information sharing, and strong morale.

Both leaders and followers need to take time to examine their goals and motives. They must ask themselves the hard questions about the reasons for their choices, which will bring about transformative action. Chaleff (2004) posited that "at the heart of all transformation of relationships lies transformation of ourselves. This is both where we have the most power to create change and the most reluctance to confront the need for it" (p. 2). When both leaders and followers engage in self-improvement, the organization prospers.

Though the role of follower is often diminished by society's focus on the leader, organizational success is the responsibility of both leaders and followers (Chaleff, 2009). The stronger a follower is the stronger the leader will be; therefore, the follower has a responsibility to the leader and to the organization. To be effective, followers must be aware of and accept their power, appreciate their leaders, and understand and counteract the seductiveness of power. This type of followership takes courage (Chaleff, 2009). Courageous followers, according to Chaleff, are those who assume responsibility, serve, participate in transformation, speak to leadership, and take moral action.

Followers assume responsibility when they take the organizational mission and vision as their own. Chaleff (2009) said "courageous followers discover or create opportunities to fulfill their potential and maximize their value to the organization" (p. 6). They serve by using their strengths to support their leaders by ensuring that they can perform their roles without distraction. And sometimes doing so, means that followers must sometimes challenge policies and behaviors that do not support organizational integrity. Chaleff said "they are willing to stand up, to stand out, to risk rejection, to initiate conflict in order to examine the actions of the leader and group when appropriate" (p. 7). In this way followers participate in transformation, as well as working with leadership and championing the recommendations for change. They do not shrivel

in the process or become divisive. When necessary, they take moral action by making tough calls according to their convictions. In such situations, morally conscious followers must be prepared to determine their own conscience and choose a direction that may lead away from the group or organization, which requires a high level of maturity.

The maturity of followers often determines the level of leadership interaction (Hersey et al., 1979). The less mature a follower is the less courage will be demonstrated and more interaction with leaders will be required. Follower maturity may fall into one of four basic categories of maturity: low, moderate, moderate to high, and high, and may be managed accordingly (Hersey et al., 1979). Attention, however, must be paid to follower disposition or readiness, (Hersey & Blanchard, 1997). Readiness may be categorized as (a) able and willing (confident), (b) able but unwilling (insecure), (c) unable but willing or confident (deficient), and (d) unable and unwilling or insecure. The first category of follower maturity, low maturity, indicates a need for more guidance, requiring leaders to maintain a high-task/low-relationship behavior engaging one-way communication in order to define activities and expectations. At the second category of follower maturity, moderate maturity, followers may be prepared but insecure and thus, require more direction. Leaders engage in a high-task/high-relationship involving two-way communication to provide support and build confidence. The third level of maturity allows leaders to engage a high-relationship/low-task leader strategy, wherein leaders may relax communication as followers are willing to accomplish goals. Finally, the high-maturity follower can be trusted to accomplish goals with little interaction with the leader. The leader may delegate assignments with confidence of effective efficiency. Thus, understanding the follower's maturity level assists leaders in determining the level of required interaction.

Follower maturity level, of course, determine their attitudes and behaviors, which are often shaped by environmental influences, including conscience, culture, peers, roles, world events, and language of followership (Kelley, 2008). Each area yields a plethora of possibilities for consideration, such as what cultures may shape sheep, what qualities allow people to serve as followers, and how does leadership shape the leader–follower relationship. Kelley posited that much is to be learned from the study of followership and such study may shape better leaders.

Method: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis

To explore the research question "What can contemporary leaders learn from observing the followers of Christ and how can they apply such lessons in their operations," I will use socio-rhetorical analysis, which allows the examination of scripture from a variety of positions and allows the investigation and creation of picturesque themes to inform audiences. Robbins (1996) theorized that the substance of a biblical text extends beyond the words on the page to a consideration of the rich textile formed by all the elements of life, including language, culture, and social relationships. Through socio-rhetorical interpretation, readers can view the biblical manuscript under five textural lenses: inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, ideological texture, and sacred texture (Robbins, 1996). Inner texture is concerned with the texts as intended by authors and experienced by readers, whether implied or actual. Intertexture considers the relationship of the texts to other disciplines, social and cultural texture considers the relationships of the characters to each other and their society, ideological texture considers the relationship of voices to the power structures of their period, and of course, the sacred texture considers the relationship of the text to God (Henson, 2014; Huizinga, 2016; Oginde, 2011). An interpreter may examine a text through one or multiple textures, depending on how rich a project is undertaken.

Making a case for the necessity of leadership, Henson (2014) conducted a thorough intertexture analysis of the book of Titus. He explored all four sub textures of intertexture—oral-scribal, historical, social, and cultural—to land upon some interesting observations about Paul's perspective on leadership. This study found that leaders are the pivotal element in group dynamics. In times of conflict and opposition, groups look to the leader for solutions. Leaders, however, must deal with their own internal conflicts as Henson found that leaders often manifest a dual nature wherein the human propensity for behavior struggles with the spiritual tendency for good. As leaders mature, they lean more toward their spiritual nature as they engage the process of becoming authentic leaders. Henson said "Paul elevated honesty, sincerity, and authenticity as characteristics of godly ecclesial leaders" (p. 199). Authentic leaders must be self-aware, moral, transparent in their relationships, and able to make decisions objectively.

Oginde (2011) teased out the requirements of good Christian leadership using socio-rhetorical analysis of the first seven verses of 1 Timothy 3.

He concluded that leadership requires willingness, discipline, and demonstration. Explaining that leaders should have a higher concern for others than themselves and be willing to make sacrificial decisions, Oginde said leaders must "be disciplined in character, maintaining high moral standards. This leadership is identified with a commitment to self-control and mastery of passions; and practicing restraint where money, wine, or violent temper is concerned" (p. 30). These characteristics, he opined, are the minimal requirements for successful leadership.

Huizinga (2016) conducted a socio-rhetorical examination of the biblical book 1 Peter to explore the value of humility in leaders. Using sociological intertexture, he explained that Peter encouraged the first-century church to maintain humility and longsuffering and he used historical intertexture to show that their conversion had brought them into the family of God. Through ideological intertexture, Huizinga noted that Jesus' predisposition for humility presented an example for the new Christians to follow and that humility places one "under God's direct protection, not God's judgment" (p. 37). Leaders who embrace humility strengthen their positions as they are more inclined to acknowledge, recognize, and celebrate other organizational contributors. They are more concerned about their organizations than themselves and are therefore more in tune to their abilities and achievements. They acknowledge their mistakes, are open to new ideas, and a greater appreciation for the world (Huizinga).

Veiss (2018) used an intertextual analysis of 2 Timothy 3:10–17 to determine the strategy Paul used to develop his follower, Timothy. She found that the text demonstrated modeling as the most influential method of change. Paul followed Jesus' positive-modeling example and advised Timothy to do the same. Veiss said "positive modeling is further informed by Paul's ability to show Timothy virtuous living, model fortitude, practice sound teaching, and serve through benevolent deeds" (p. 164). Her findings align with contemporary followership theory, which are also demonstrated in Christ's relationship with his followers.

Method

Intertexture Analysis: The Leadership of Jesus as Demonstrated in Matthew 10

Jesus had surely and carefully prepared the disciples for rejection and persecution (McDowell, 2015). Following him would be costly, as they would be rejected, persecuted, and eventually killed. In Matthew 10:24–25, Jesus emphasized

> The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?

Yet, he also told them that their work was important for building the kingdom (Henry, 1708–1714). Having been with Jesus a while, the disciples had seen the gospel in action. They had listened to his teaching, saw him heal people, raise the dead, and cast out demons; and now in Matthew, Chapter 10, their Master was giving them the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of their call (Henry, 1708–1714; Maxwell, 2002).

Matthew 10 begins with the identification and ordination of the Twelve, as they are often called in scripture:

> Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphaeus, and Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus; Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him. (Matthew 10:2–4)

He did not call them as a group but recognized each individually, signifying personal responsibility for their response to His call. Henry (1708–1714) noted that this commission drew them closer into the Lord's confidence as they now shared His ministry, as well as His life.

In Matthew 10:5–42, Jesus then commissioned them to use their gifts, defined their assignment, set clear objectives, and presented a clear message (Maxwell, 2002). He provided guidance for engaging with others, while instilling confidence by assuring them of their ability to complete the mission. He cautioned them to be wise but to avoid

offending others, even as he warns them that their journey will not be easy. They will endure hardships, persecution, and threats to their lives, yet they will know what to say at the right time. He tells them not to be afraid and assures them that they have his support and can depend on His presence. In Mark's account (6:7–11), He then sends them out in pairs; Barnes (1847–1885) explained that "this was a kind arrangement, that each one might have a companion, and that thus they might visit more places and accomplish more labor than if they were all together." The Master carefully and compassionately crafted and executed the apostles' first assignment. Thus, Matthew, Chapter 10, demonstrates that Jesus took a follower-centric approach in leading the disciples (Chang, 2013; Maslennikova, 2007; Maxwell, 2002).

Three follower-centric styles are easily identified in the chapter: charismatic, servant leadership, and transformational leadership. As a charismatic leader, Jesus endeared himself to the apostles by spending time with them and creating personal bonds. He was unconventional in choosing the apostles on two levels: (1) followers normally chose the rabbi that they would follow and (2) disciples were trained in the scriptures from their youth (Greenwold, 2007; McDowell, 2015). Jesus chose his followers and empowered them by building relationships and commissioning them to carry out His work, though they had little formal training, if any. He communicated a vision for a cultural and spiritual change. His practice of empowering his followers, developing his disciples, and sharing power is also characteristic of servant leadership. Servant leaders seek the best for all, which Jesus excelled at in all facets of His life. His practice of providing counsel and guidance to the disciples in executing their mission was demonstrative of transformational leadership. He modeled the vision, instilled confidence, and provided his disciples an opportunity to use their training (Table 4.1).

Intertexture Analysis: The Call and Service of the Apostle Philip; Preparation for Service

Though the term "disciple" in Christendom is most closely associated with the followers of Jesus, it was customary for Jewish rabbis to have followers (Bivin, 1988; Daugherty, 2013). Even the prophet Isaiah, references his "disciples" (*limmûd* in Hebrew, meaning "instructed") in Isaiah 8:6 (Strong, 1996, p. 413). In first century, A.D., those disciples were totally committed to the person whom they chose to follow (Bivin, 1988;

Table 4.1 Leadership style of Jesus according to theory

Pericope	*Action*	*Leadership style*
Matthew 10:1–4	Identifies and empowers followers Builds relationship with followers Presents a collective identity	Charismatic Transformational
Matthew 10:5	Commissions followers to serve Articulates vision Provides opportunity to serve	Servant Transformational
Matthew 10:6–14	Instructs them on execution Explains handling acceptance and rejection Provides clear instruction	Servant Charismatic
Matthew 10:16–23	Warns that they will suffer but God will be with them Shares power Provides a clear vision	Servant Charismatic Transformational
Matthew 10:24	Admonishes followers to emulate their leader Provides a model for service	Charismatic leadership Servant

Daugherty, 2013). The teaching of their sage was more important than anything, including family. Bivin (1988) explained that "this form of discipleship was a unique feature of ancient Jewish society" (para. 3). Studying was the priority and the teacher was to be held in the esteem of a father, and unless the natural father was a scholar, the rabbi was to be given higher regard (Bivin, 1988; Daugherty, 2013). Disciples were apprenticed to their sage, and expected to emulate them. This sentiment was marked even by Jesus, who admonished that following him meant leaving family and possessions (Luke 9:61; Luke 14:28–33).

John 1:43–48 presents the call and conformance of the disciple who would become known as the Apostle Philip. Jesus had been baptized by John in Bethbara and called Philip to discipleship as he left the area for Galilee (McDowell, 2015). Philip did not flinch at his call but recognized Jesus as the Messiah for whom Israel had been waiting. Philip was not new to discipleship but had been a follower of John the Baptist (McDowell, 2015; Zavada, 2020). He may even had been at the baptism of the Lord and witnessed the Holy Spirit commission him as the Son of God. The disciple quickly emulated his master, bringing his friend Nathanael along. At Nathanael's reluctance, Philip challenged him, "Come and see"

(John 1:46; McDowell, 2015). Nathanael did and Jesus received him, thus becoming Philip's first recruit in the new kingdom.

Philip's eagerness to share truth with others landed him in the auspicious group of twelve who would follow Jesus through his ascension (Matthew 10:2–4; Luke 6:13–15). Always listed in the fifth position when the apostles are named, Philip may have had leadership responsibilities within the group (McDowell, 2015). His decisive recruitment of Nathanael is the first indication of his desire to emulate his sage. As a member of the twelve, he often learns at the feet of Jesus (Mathew 10:2–4; Mark 3:17–19; Luke 6:13–15). Gentz (1986) describes the apostle's followership of Christ as ideal, thus aligning him with Kelley's (1988) description of a star performer and Kellerman's model of a die-hard follower. Philip's commitment to Christ never dimmed, even when he failed to understand the divinity of his sage. Jesus explained that by knowing him, the apostles had known the Father. Philip challenged, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (John 14:8). McDowell explained that

> Having determined in his thinking that the Father of whom Jesus spoke must be the Ultimate Absolute, Philip demanded that he and his associates might see him. Philip was materialistic; apparently abstractions meant little to him. Nevertheless, he had a deep desire to experience God for himself. (p. 195)

Philip certainly does not fit Kelley's description of a "yes" man, as scripture demonstrates that the disciple shared his opinions openly and honestly. In John 6:7, Philip responded frankly to Jesus' inquiry about acquiring food for the multitude that had come to learn from the Master: "we don't have the resources." McDowell (2015) noted "Philip perceives the problem entirely on a human level, hopelessly wondering how they could produce the means to feed all the people" (p. 194). Chaleff (2009)'s model identifies Philip as a courageous follower as he demonstrated courage in speaking frankly to his leader, but servitude in remaining with him and learning how the task could be accomplished through faith. Though Philip's name does not appear in many gospel stories, Acts 1:13 names him among the apostles who met in the Upper Room after Christ's ascension, showing that his level of commitment held study.

Table 4.2 Followership style of Philip according to theoretical models

Pericope	*Action*	*Model*
John 1:43–48	Witness to Nathanael	Star performer (Kelley, 1988)
John 12:20–22	Assistance to Greek seekers of Christ	Enthusiastic Self-confident Intelligent Diehard (Kellerman, 2007) Highly invested Supportive of leader and the mission Courageous Follower (Chaleff, 2004) Participates in transformation
John 6:7	Advises leader of insufficient funds	Courageous Follower (Chaleff, 2004)
John 14:8–9	Requests accountability from Jesus	Makes tough call Morally conscious

According to church tradition, Philip was the missionary who carried the gospel to Greece, Syria, and Phrygia, which aligns him with Kelley's description of an effective follower (Nelson, 2016). The earliest traditions, according to Nelson, point to him being martyred in Hierapolis, whereupon he would fit Kellerman's (2007) die-hard model. (McDowell [2015] questions whether the apostle has not been confused with Philip the Evangelist, appointed as a deacon in Acts 6 and who figures prominently in the rest of the book.) Undoubtedly, however, the Apostle Philip traveled Asia preaching the gospel as he was a witness of Christ's resurrection, his response to Jesus demonstrates a missionary mindset, and he was willing to bear the consequences of his call to follow the Master (Nelson, 2016; RCL Bensiger Saints Resource, 2020; Zavada, 2020) (Table 4.2).

Conclusion: Application to Contemporary Workplace

An organization's leader determines the direction of the organization. The leader's vision sets the paradigm of operations for those who follow. Jesus demonstrated the importance of sharing that vision with followers and his onboarding process set the foundation for kingdom organizational operations. Turner (2013) said "he was able to deploy the Apostles

to effective service because they ultimately desired nothing more than building this new form of organization" (p. 5). His follower-centric approach ignited a spark in His followers, the Apostles, that has been transmitted through the ages.

Followers like the Apostle Philip therefore committed their lives to spreading the gospel. Though unlearned, they responded to the charisma of Jesus, accepting His call, receiving the vision, and carrying out the mission. They were so inspired by their connection with Jesus that they continued even after separating from him. And they did it the way that Jesus did. Consider the instructions of the Apostle Paul in writing the Philippian church: "The things which you learned and received and heard and saw in me, these do, and the God of peace will be with you" (Philippians 4:9). The work initiated by the followers of Jesus is still carried on today.

Believers in Christ can be found on every continent. The message Christ taught is echoed in pulpits around the globe in a plethora of languages and new converts are won every day. Most amazing, followers of Christ still carry the gospel into the hinterlands where technology does not reach. One such group is headquartered in the United States, but operating in Asia and Northern Africa. Established in September 2015, the Movement has 100,000 people in 5,000 churches in nine nations (Ryan Brubaker, personal communication, 8/26/20; The Movement International, http://www.themovementintl.org).

Converts come into the local church established by The Movement International, which meets in a believer's home, where they are trained to take the gospel to surrounding villages and locales. Lisa Brubaker, Director of Operations, said "our church planters started 10 new house churches in different unreached villages that are now filled with over 250 former Hindus and Buddhists that are being discipled in their new faith every day. In just 6-months, almost 50,000 people have heard the Gospel for the first time, and we doubled the amount [*sic*] of churches and Christians in that district" (Personal communication, July 8, 2020). Just as Christ ignited His followers' spark and lit the fire that fueled the spread of the gospel, The Movement International is using the same follower-centric approach of building relationships, providing guidance and training, and giving followers opportunity to perform. As a result, follower energy is ignited by the leader's vision, empowerment, and confidence in them.

These are the practices handed down through the generations that have enabled Christianity to outlive empires and they provide a framework for contemporary leaders. The follower-centric approach used by Christ is applicable in today's society. It involves knowing your followers, understanding their strengths and weaknesses, developing their skills and talents, giving them an opportunity to perform, building their confidence, and rewarding their efforts. Followers then experience the pleasure of belonging, a sense of security, and the benefit of stability which creates, as the Apostle Philip demonstrates, passion and loyalty which promotes organizational prosperity.

Five Chapter Takeaways

1. Followers play a major role in organizational success.
2. Followers operate in a variety of roles with just as many characters, aspirations, and dispositions.
3. Successful leaders maintain an acute awareness of their followers' level of engagement and incentivize appropriately.
4. Jesus sets a model as a follower-centric leader while the Apostle Philip represents organizational benefits of such leadership.
5. Follower-centric leadership produces successful organizations.

Five Reflective Questions

1. This chapter presents three theories of organizational followers. How are they alike? How do they differ?
2. Describe leadership's responsibility to followers. What results will it breed?
3. What theories support follower-centric leadership? What is their organizational application?
4. How do successful leaders conduct themselves? Highlight the operative characteristics.
5. Describe the follower-centric leadership characteristics found in Matthew 10. How might you apply them in your workplace?

References

Barnes, A. (1847–1885). *Barnes' noted on the Bible*. Retrieved from Studylight.org. http://biblehub.com/commentaries/hebrews/11-21.htm

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. In G. R. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (pp. 135–140). Sage.

Bivin, D. (1988). Jesus' education. *Jerusalem Perspective*, 14–15. https://www.jerusalemperspective.com/555/

Chaleff, I. (2004). *Courageous followers, courageous leaders: New relationships for learning and performance—Ideas for leaders*. https://www.courageousfollower.net/wp-content/uploads/Courageous-Followers.pdf

Chaleff, I. (2009). *The courageous follower: Standing up and for our leaders* (3rd ed.). Berrett-Kohlers Publishers. https://www.bkconnection.com/static/The_Courageous_Follower_3rd_EXCERPT.pdf

Chang, P. (2013). The consummated harvest of Jesus' follower-centric approach in the last chapter of the Gospel according to John. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership, 5*(1), 115–141. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol5no1/7chang.pdf

Daugherty, J. (2013). *Discipleship is Jewish*. Heart of God Israel, a ministry of Heart of God International. https://heartofgodisrael.org/messianic-messages/discipleship-is-jewish/

Edwards, G., & Edwards, D. L. (1997). *Christianity: First 2000 years: The first two thousand years*. Orbis Books.

Gentz, W. H. (1986). *The dictionary of Bible and religion*. Abingdon.

Greenwold, D. (2007). *Being a first-century disciple*. Bible.org. https://bible.org/article/being-first-century-disciple

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership in business. In G. R. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (pp. 115–129). Sage.

Henry, M. (1708–1714). *Matthew Henry commentary on the whole Bible (complete)*. BibleStudyTools.com. http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/matthew-henry-complete

Henson, J. D. (2014). Getting God's house in order: An intertexture analysis of Titus. *The Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership, 6*(1), 176–200. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol6no1/12Henson.pdf

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1997). Situational leadership. *Dean's Forum, 12*(2), 5. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.201.4096&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=4

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., & Natemeyer, W. E. (1979). Situational leadership, perception, and the impact of power. *Group & Organization Studies, 4*(4), 418–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/105960117900400404

Huizinga, R. B. (2016). An understanding of humility-based leadership impacting organizational climate. *Emerging Leadership Journeys, 9*(1), 34–44. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol9iss1/2ELJ-Huizinga.pdf

Jaussi, K. S., Stefanovich, A., & Devlin, P. G. (2008). Effective followership for creativity and innovation: A range of colors and dimensions. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *Art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 291–307). Jossey-Bass. https://b-ok.cc/book/697418/b703c7#:~:text=The%20Art%20of%20Followership%3A%20How%20Great%20Followers%20Create,play%20and%20their%20often%20complex%20relationship%20to%20leaders

Kellerman, B. (2007). What every leader needs to know about followers. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(12). http://thebusinessleadership.academy/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/What-Every-Leaders-Need-to-Know-About-Followers.pdf

Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Harvard School Press.

Kelley, R. E. (1988). In praise of followers. *Harvard Business Review Case Services*, 142–148. https://www.kquattrin.com/uploads/2/5/8/7/25876455/kelley_1988.pdf

Kelley, R. E. (2008). Rethinking followership. In R. E. Riggio, I. Chaleff, & J. Lipman-Blumen (Eds.), *Art of followership: How great followers create great leaders and organizations* (pp. 5–16). Jossey-Bass. https://b-ok.cc/book/697418/b703c7#:~:text=The%20Art%20of%20Followership%3A%20How%20Great%20Followers%20Create,play%20and%20their%20often%20complex%20relationship%20to%20leaders

Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 183–198. http://www.management.wharton.upenn.edu/klein/documents/Klein_House_1995.pdf

Maslennikova, L. (2007). Leader-centered versus follower-centered leadership styles. *Leadership Advance Online*, 14. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/lao/issue_11/pdf/maslennikova.pdf

Maxwell, J. C. (2002). *Maxwell leadership Bible*. Maxwell Motivation Inc.

McDowell, S. (2015). *The fate of the Apostles: Examining the martyrdom accounts of the closest followers of Jesus*. Ashgate Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315558196

Morse, M. (1996). *The relationship of wisdom to transformational leadership: Illustrated by the historical Jesus* (Dissertation). George Fox University. https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1047&context=gfes

Nelson, R. (2016). Who was Philip the Apostle? *The Beginner's Guide*. https://overviewbible.com/philip-the-apostle

Oginde, D. A. (2011). Antecedents of Christian leadership: A socio-rhetorical analysis of 1 Timothy 3: 1–7. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership, 3*(2), 23–31. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol3no2/JBPL_Vol3No2_Oginde_pp23-31.pdf

Oosthuizen, A. J., & Lategan, L. O. K. (2015). "Managing the household of God": The contribution from management sciences to the sustainability of the church as an organization. *Stellenbosch Theological Journal, 1*(2), 551–568.

RCL Bensiger Saints Resource. (2020). *Philip the Apostle*. http://saintsresource.com/philip-the-apostle

Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian discourse: Rhetoric, society, and ideology*. Psychology Press.

Rost, J. C. (1991). Leadership and management. In G. R. Hickman (Ed.), *Leading organizations: Perspectives for a new era* (pp. 97–114). Sage.

Strong, J. (1996). *The new Strong's complete dictionary of Bible words*. Nelson Reference & Electronic Publishing.

Turner, C. K. (2013). *Prototypical Jesus? A discussion of followership development from John 6*. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/lao/issue_23/turner1.pdf

Veiss, S. D. (2018). Follower development: Paul's charge to Timothy. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership, 8*(1), 150–167. https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jbpl/vol8no1/Vol8Iss1_JBPL_12_Veiss.pdf

Washington, R. R., Sutton, C. D., & Sauser, W. I., Jr. (2014). How distinct is servant leadership theory? Empirical comparisons with competing theories. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics, 11*(1). https://studydaddy.com/attachment/98472/How+Distinct+is+Servant+Leadership+Theory+Empirical+Comparisons+with+Competing+Theories.pdf

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. Prentice Hall.

Zavada, J. (2020, February 11). *Philip the Apostle—Follower of Jesus Christ*. https://www.learnreligions.com/philip-the-apostle-follower-of-jesus-701070

Zurlo, G. A., Johnson, T. M., & Crossing, P. F. (2019). Status of global Christianity, 2015. In the context of 1900–2050. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research, 39*(1), 29. https://www.gordonconwell.edu/center-for-global-christianity/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2020/01/Status-of-Global-Christianity-2020.pdf