

# **FOLLOWERSHIP BEHAVIOR IN NIGERIA AND USA PENTECOSTAL CHURCHES: A STUDY OF SELECTED CHURCHES**

**Seth Akhilele, Followership Development Institute (FDi) & House of  
Purpose-TA**

## **ABSTRACT**

*The study examined the followers' behavior in some pentecostal churches in Nigeria and the USA. The design for the study was a cross-sectional one. It involved using convenience sampling technique at the same time from two churches in the USA and two in Nigeria. The participants for the study were 97 in number. The hypotheses for the study were (a) there is a difference in followers' Independent Critical Thinking (ICT) between Nigerian and USA Pentecostal churches (b) there is a difference in the followers' Active Engagement (AE) between Nigeria and USA Pentecostal churches. The study used Ghislieri, Gatti, and Cortese's (2015) followership scale. It is a brief scale for measuring followership behaviors. The data obtained from the field were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test statistical model. The study revealed a difference in the followers' AE for the examined pentecostal churches in Nigeria and the USA. There was no difference in follower's ICT behavior among Pentecostal churches examined. Therefore, one can suggest that the result might help those who want to worship, lead, and follow in these two cultures (Nigeria and USA). The study results have implications for theory and practice for employers of labor and Pentecostal church leaders in different cultural settings.*

*Keywords: Pentecostal, followers, leaders, power distance, democratic culture.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

Ghislieri et al. (2015) argued that followership is a pervasive but understudied phenomenon in organizations. Gatti et al. (2017) claimed that positive followership behaviors impact the relationship between leader and follower and the interpretation of followers' roles. It is an individuals' behavior or actions relative to a leader (Carsten et al. 2010). Riggio et al. (2008), while reviewing Kelley's work, described the model follower as one who takes part in a shared process of achieving a shared drive. Here follower's behavior is considered along the line of participation or engagement. It is what is done by the follower to motivate fellow followers, leaders and help the organization advance.

Gatti et al. (2017) claimed that followership behaviors are essential in achieving goals and improving organizational well-being because leaders' and followers' work styles can influence each other. Yukl (2013) argued that the increasing globalization of organizations makes it more important to learn about effective leadership in different cultures. Leaders are now frequently confronted with the need to influence people from other cultures, and strong influence needs a good understanding of these cultures. The study explains how culture can influence

leaders and followers, and examples of cross-cultural studies on leadership are described, including the multinational GLOBE project (Yukl, 2013). The study explored followers Active Engagement (AE) and Independent Critical Thinking (ICT) creativity and innovation in the USA and Nigerian settings (Kelly, 1992).

The study was about followers' behavior in some Pentecostal Churches in Nigeria (House of purpose-TA, Lekki, Lagos and Tower of Victory assembly, Lagos) and the USA (Redeem Christian Church of God, Upper Marlboro, Maryland and Randallstown House of Power, Maryland). Looking at followers' work attitudes or behavior, one wanted to know the extent of work engagement or participatory behavior in the churches. The study aimed to understand if the different cultures in Nigeria and the USA would make followers behave differently to the leaders or the Church as an organization. One hoped that the study help understands followers' behavior in the churches in different countries, such that leaders can best manage them in the growth of a local church.

### **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The followers' behavior in some Nigerian churches and that of the USA churches was perceived as different, as reflected in church activities' attitudes. Followers' active engagement and independent critical thinking were the focus of the study. It appears these are not the same with churches in different countries. Leaders may have a challenge with dealing with followers as they work with followers when they find themselves in a nation different from theirs. Followers may also have challenges working with leaders from new nations. The outcome of the study may help prepare leaders to work with followers from different nationalities and cultures.

#### **Purpose of the Study**

The study set out to determine if followers' behavior differs among Pentecostal Churches in the USA and Nigeria and attempt to proffer solutions.

#### **Objectives**

To establish if there was a behavioral difference between Pentecostal Church followers in the USA and Nigeria. On issues of active engagement: Getting things done, getting on church work, taking initiatives; On independent critical thinking: looking at analytical thinking, ability to solve problems, open-mindedness, asking provoking and thoughtful questions, and analytical thinking.

#### **Significance of the Study**

The study will benefit Pentecostal Churches in understanding followership behaviors in diverse cultures. It will also help advise followers interested in residing, working, and worshipping in other national cultures.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

In the review of related materials to the study variables, there was an examination of various aspects of the subject matter. It included topics such as understanding followership, Nigeria high-power distance, USA democratic culture, followership in USA Pentecostal churches, and followership in Nigeria Pentecostal churches.

### **Understanding Followership**

Kelley (1992) conceptualized that followers are strong individuals who are honest and courageous enough to chase societal goals such as fame and status, frame their meaning of life, choose to follow leaders to achieve set goals. It implies that they may not take the lead; others do while they follow.

Siegel (1993) examined the works of Kelley (1992), a management consultant. He found that most followers do not believe the stereotype of sheep or yes-men. Instead, followers fall into five types: passive followers, conformist followers, alienated followers, practical followers, and exemplary followers. Siegel claimed that people usually combine two or more types. Exemplary followers display two seemingly mutually exclusive qualities: they exercise critical thinking, independent of the group and its leader, and at the same time apply their talents with the benefit of the larger enterprise in mind. In other words, they make a positive difference in accelerating the organization toward its goals but do not necessarily want to be responsible for vision or final judgment. Essentially, Kelley claimed that followership does not mean accepting a minor role but finding fulfillment outside the narrow definition of traditional power. Kelley's (1992) point is that everyone is a follower some of the time. One needs to acknowledge both parts; he claimed that emphasizing leadership to exclude followership breeds limiting conformism.

Lundin and Lancaster (1990) argued that the longer and harder one looks at leadership, the more it is realized that great leaders' success rests on their ability to establish a base of loyal, capable, and knowledgeable followers. He also claimed that nurturing effective followership requires doing away with the misconception that leaders do all the thinking while followers merely carry out the commands. They claimed that followers play vital roles in an organization.

Looking at leadership and followership from the Church worldview, Dale (1987) argued that the relationship between leaders and followers is the most intensely practical issue in Baptist life. Like all Christian community challenges, the solution is not at the national, state, or even associational level. Ultimately, leadership and followership relationships boil down to the nuts-and-bolts workings of the local Church. He claimed that no group or organization functions well without leadership. Leaders are necessary for families, teams, businesses, armies, classrooms, or congregations to show effectiveness and efficiency. Opinions vary, however, on the practice of leadership in local churches. However, Dale (1987) argued that followership is the forgotten dimension of leadership. He claimed that the Bible does not make the mistake of overlooking followership and that the Bible identifies various types of followers.

Considering the sample of followers and leaders: Blood-kin clansman followed the patriarchs and tribal chiefs. Obedient soldiers followed the judges. Loyal subjects followed the kings. Faithful worshipers followed the priests. Responsive listeners followed the prophets.

Eager pupils followed the sages and the rabbis. Ministering congregants followed the pastors. Believing converts followed the missionaries and evangelists. None of these followers would have functioned that well without their special leaders; none of these leaders would have worked that well without their compatible followers (Dale, 1987).

Dale (1982) argued that followership is as essential in congregations as leadership. Dale (1982) believes that leadership and followership are related functions; they are two sides of the same coin. Leadership and followership are roles lived out in interdependent relationships. Also, that effective leadership strengthens followers, and effective followership strengthens leaders (Dale, 1982). Dale (1982) also claimed that followers are frequently leaders-in-training and that if every member of a given church is tired of leading or all decided not to follow, there would be neither leadership nor followership. Dale (1982) is of the view that training can enhance both leadership and followership. Ironically, religious groups who affirm the minister hood of all Christians have primarily forgotten or overlooked the importance of followership.

Dale (1987) observed that leaders could not be discussed seriously without a parallel exploration of followers in looking at interdependency. He is of the view that without subordinates, there are no leaders. Also, that without leaders, there are no subordinates. Leaders and followers live in reciprocal relationships. Therefore, interdependency is a fundamental dynamic in a healthy and effective congregational life. He argued that healthy interdependency helps leaders and followers relate in ways that advance the kingdom of God. That interdependent leader-follower mix remains one of the fundamental challenges in today's congregations. Bringing our individual and corporate lives under the rule of God, Jesus' description of God's kingdom at work is possible and probable when leaders and followers serve each other in local churches.

### **Nigeria high-power distance and USA democratic culture**

A summary of the power distance culture in Nigeria and the USA:

#### **Power distance culture in Nigeria**

Power distance comprises the acceptance of an unequal distribution of power and status in organizations. In high-power distance cultures, people expect the leaders to have greater authority and are also likely to comply with rules and orders without questioning or challenging them (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Michelson, 2003). Subordinates (followers) are less willing to challenge bosses or express disagreement (Adsit, London, Crom, & Jones, 1997). More formal policies and rules and managers consult less often with subordinates when making decisions (Smith, Peterson, Schwartz, Ahmad, & Associates, 2002).

Participative leadership is a more favorable leadership attribute (for followers) in low power distance cultures such as Western Europe, New Zealand, and the United States than in high-power distance countries such as Russia, China, Taiwan, Mexico, and Venezuela (Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004). In low-power distance countries, transformational (supportive and inspirational) leadership is more likely to be combined with a participative decision-making style (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, & Associates 1999). In contrast, in high-power distance countries, it is likely to be combined with a directive, autocratic decision-

making style. In developing countries with a high-power distance culture, people often prefer a "paternalistic" style that combines autocratic decisions with supportive behavior (Dickson et al., 2003; Dorfman., Howell, Hibino, Lee, J. Tate, & Bautista, 1997).

### **USA democratic culture**

Nancy (2006) defined democracy as an ordinary being, founded on the mutual realization of fellow men and on each group's independence in sharing this realization. Nancy claimed that democracy is a matter of thinking through the space that separates the public from politics. There is also the likelihood for organizations in this type of government structure (culture) to emulate this kind of culture (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, & House, 2012). The democratic culture is an egalitarian, participatory one, where people's culture is not exclusive, elite, or aristocratic. Kohut and Wike (2009), commenting on the USA image's positive aspects, claimed that the nation's popular culture and democratic values remain its most appealing features.

### **Followership in USA pentecostal churches**

The USA democratic culture can be said to fit into what GLOBE studies described as autonomous leadership: a newly defined global leadership dimension that refers to independent and individualistic leadership attributes (Dorfman, House, Hanges, Javidan, & Gupta (2004).

May (1994) argued that people associate being a follower with being passive in the American Christian church. He reviewed the works of Wills that rightly emphasize the ongoing responsibility of followers. He believed that the stakes on this issue are high, particularly in political and ecclesiastical leadership and that passive followers do not inevitably hold an exalted view of their leaders. On the contrary, their passivity tempts citizens and parishioners to heap disproportionate blame on leaders since passive bystanders accept no responsibility for their community's failures. Active citizenship (followership) requires that people develop the art of acting in concert with others for the common good. As the founders defined it, such public-spiritedness requires a readiness to sacrifice some measure of self-interest for the common good. May (1994), also reviewing Wills' book, argued that Wills acknowledged that followers' complicity with their leaders is timely.

Foland (2003) reviewed the book "The courageous followers" by Ira Chaleff, which he recommended for severe leaders who want effective followers and severe followers who wish to be effective leaders. He claimed that it should include all pastors and lay leaders who desire better pastor-laity relations. He highlighted the challenge with the power of followers' reaction when badly treated and their threat to withdraw support if leadership actions violate their values. The challenge leaders might have been that it is essential to remember that followers possess the power to decide to follow a leader's decisions or not.

Kellerman (2007) argued that followers are as significant as leaders. Defining followers as subordinates who have lesser amounts of power, authority, and influence than their superiors, who usually, but not always, fall in line, she noted that everyone is a follower at various points in time. Kellerman (2007) argued that when followers get bolder and more strategic are less likely to know their place and affect workplaces for mixed results. She identifies five types of followers based on the level of engagement: isolate, participant, bystander, activist, and diehard. With

examples extending from Nazi of Germany to Merck, she explored each type of the U.S. military's Operation Anaconda in Afghanistan. She also explored the relationships between leaders and followers, who, Kellerman (2007) argued, should be understood as inseparable. Followership is not about varying the rank of followers, he stated, but instead about changing their response to their rank, their superiors, and the situation at hand.

### **Followership in Nigeria Pentecostal churches.**

Ikeh (2011) examined team leadership of leaders and followers in a Pentecostal church, using "The Tidings of Faith Ministries International Incorporated, Jos" as a case study. The research revealed that the institutional leadership had failed to address the all-important question of leadership distance between the clergy and the laity (high-power distance). It showed that the clergy has the cumbersome work of running almost every aspect of the ministry responsibility while the laity(followers) becomes spectators. He also found out that there is no conscious attempt within the ministry to train and make competent some outstanding members of the laity (followers) by involving them in everyday leadership to developing leadership continuity in the 21st century. As a credible alternative, the research proposed team leadership mode as an effective and 21st-century friendly option for the Tidings of Faith in the years ahead. These include strategies to manage conflict and moral issues and training for laity (followers), and mentoring programs for the next generation of church leaders. In other words, to overcome this obvious challenge, leaders' and followers' power distance gap can be closed through training and mentoring.

Ogbueli (2005), a leading pastor in Nigeria, argued that a local church's challenge with members(followers) would include finding trained and untrained followers in the Church. He claimed that most churches have 90% untrained and un-disciplined people and less than Ten percent of trained people and that less than two percent are involved in training others. Oladimeji (2009) argued that the Church leaders in Nigeria could effectively reach out to only 200 people within their Church. Ogbueli (2005) also claimed that to deal with this challenge or limitation; there will be a need to train a few to train others. In Nigeria, where one large Pentecostal Church that seats 30 000 to 60 000 on a single Sunday, one pastor as a lead pastor having one-on-one contact with one's pastor as a follower would be challenging. Oladimeji (2009) admonished Nigeria church leaders to adopt the use of home cell groups to grow their churches. However, in these large Nigeria Pentecostal churches, for followers to have counseling, mentoring and an appointment with the lead pastor of the church and other church leaders is a huge challenge.

The current changes in the world of organizations demand leaders who can face the challenges of uncertainties, and to influence their subordinates' change readiness, and develop followers who can provide backing in these challenging times (Ghislieri et al., 2015). Ghislieri et al. (2015) argued that several scholars are of the view that followers are a precondition for successful organizations, a position supported by Agho's (2009) results: that more than 98% of 302 research respondents agree with statements regarding the influence that effective followers have on the organization. However, Kelly (1992) drew attention to the active engagement and independent critical thinking of followers. Ghislieri et al. (2015) argued that active and independent followership is related to different personal and organizational variables. On

personal features, Tanoff and Barlow (2002) examined leadership traits by employing a tool that adopts the Five-Factor Model. The personality features showed a positive relationship with the Two Factors of Followership as stated by Kelley's (1992) scale, conscientiousness (Conscientiousness) was above all.

In respect to organizational variables, Blanchard, Welbourne, Gilmore, and Bullock (2009) examined the well-being and motivational pointers about followership proportions. A sample of university personnel found that AE positively links to organizational commitment (affective and normative) and job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic). The same study found that ICT has a positive link with intrinsic job satisfaction but not positively linked to extrinsic job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In this study, one aimed to determine if AE and ICT were different between Nigeria and the USA.

### **Research hypotheses**

There is a difference in followers' independent critical thinking (ICT) between Nigerian and USA Pentecostal churches.

There is a difference in the followers' active Engagement (AE) between Nigerian and USA Pentecostal churches.

### **Theoretical framework**

The study used Kelley's (1992) work on followership as a theoretical framework. He operationalized the followership work along two main dimensions: a. Active Engagement (AE) – a propensity to take the initiative, participate actively and be self-starters, especially in the relationship with the leader; b. Independent Critical Thinking (ICT) – offering constructive criticism and showing the ability to think for oneself with creativity and innovation. Kelley (1992) also advocates that active and independent followership is related to different personal and organizational variables. The study used Kelly's work to see followers' behavioral dimensions along with AE and ICT lines. The followership scale adopted was Kelley's (1992) reviewed followership scale by Ghislieri et al. (2015). It is a brief scale for measuring followership behaviors.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study used a survey methodology. Surveys are important method of studying behavior. It helps to study relationships among variables and how attitudes and behavior change over time (Cozby & Bakes, 2015). The study used a non-probability purposive sampling technique. It was a quantitative study using a cross-sectional design. It involved studying the participants at the same time (Cozby & Bakes, 2015). The research relied on the research questions generated and lend themselves to investigation using a deductive approach. The study used the questionnaire for the data collection. The questionnaire was presented in written format, while respondents wrote the answers. They are appropriate because they are less costly than the interview approach and allowed the respondent to be completely anonymous (Cozby & Bakes, 2015).

**Research design**

The adopted cross-sectional research design data involved collecting samples of persons of different ages and studied only at one point in time (Cozby & Bakes,2015). It implied that followers from the sample populations from the churches in Nigeria and the USA were of different age brackets. The study was within the allocated three weeks. Though this study design has its advantage, it might have a cohort effect (Cozby & Bakes, 2015).

**Population**

The population of the study consists of all the adults who are followers, each from the two Pentecostal Churches (House of Purpose-TA and Tower of Victory) in Nigeria and all the adults who are followers each from the three Pentecostal churches (Randallstown House of Power, Maryland and Redeem Christian Church of God, Kettering MD) in the USA. Participants were adults who are workers in the churches that were studied.

**Sampling**

Purposive sampling of 52 followers from the two churches in Nigeria and 52 followers from the USA's two churches were used (total sample size of 104). The resources available were enough to study the said sample. The sample size was arrived at using a sample size calculator with a confidence interval of five, a confidence level of 95%, and a population of 142. (Associations,2016). The study focused on respondents from these churches' entire population due to the observed commitment and loyalty concerns. Those who met the commitment/loyalty concerns were the ones that were studied. They could be called the information-rich workers for this research (Patton,2015).

**Instrumentation**

The followership scale adopted was Kelley's (1992) reviewed followership scale by Ghislieri et al. (2015). It is a brief scale for measuring followership behaviors. Their study evaluated the followership scale's principal psychometric properties based on Kelley's (1992) model. They used Kelley's (1992) followership scale that consists of eight items. The study used 559 nurses in Northern Italy. The EFA results show a two-factor solution (active engagement and independent critical thinking), confirmed by confirmatory factor analysis where both subscales showed adequate reliability. The scale used for this purpose consisted of four items in a 5-point Likert format extending from 1 (very unsatisfied) up to 5 (very satisfied), and the questionnaire created by Pejtersen, Kristensen, Borg, and Bjorner (2010). Cronbach's alpha for the scale in this study was .85 (M = 16.53, SD = 3.55). They found the scale to be a useful tool for training and organizational research. They administered questionnaires to followers on issues that bother on both scales. (Please see details in the appendix).

**Data collection**

This study's data were collected using Kelley's (1992) reviewed followership scale by Ghislieri et al. (2015) and analyzed with SPSS.



### Data analysis

The data gotten were analyzed using a two-tailed t-test statistical model. The study employed a t-test for testing the Significance of difference between the means of the two populations (In this case, Nigeria and the USA) based on the means and distributions of two samples (Williams & Monge, 2011).

### Results

The study drew a total of 104 participants from Nigeria and the USA. The questionnaires returned by the participants were 97. There were 50.50% of the population from two Pentecostal churches from Nigeria (HOP-TA and TOVA) and 49.50% from two Pentecostal Christian churches (RCCG AND Randallstown House of Power. Overall, 97 returned questionnaires meant 95.2% success. They were 104 participants from a convenience sample made available through personal contact with the senior pastors of these local churches in Nigeria and the USA. In both countries, the copies of questionnaires distributed yielded 49 from Nigeria and 48 from the USA. Two questionnaires came back from the USA participants unfilled. Table 1 and 2 highlight participant demographics for the 97 respondents from the United States and Nigeria.

Table 1

*Frequency representation in Nigeria and USA participants*

	Country	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Nigeria	48	50.50	50.00	50.00
	USA	49	49.50	49.50	100.00
	Total	97	100.00	100.00	

Table 2

*Frequency for gender distribution in Nigeria and USA participants*

	Gender	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	45	46.40	46.40	46.40
	Female	52	53.60	53.60	100.00
	Total	97	100.00	100.00	

Also, worthy of note is the frequency report on gender participation. The number of male participants in the study was 45, which is 46.40%, while the number of female participants was 52, which is 53.60%.

Table 3

*Group Statistics for AE and ICT in Nigeria and USA*

	Country	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
AE	Nigeria	48	2.74	1.11	0.16
	USA	48	3.34	1.28	0.18
ICT	Nigeria	49	3.70	0.84	0.12
	USA	48	3.95	1.06	0.15

The group statistics box provides some important relevant information such as: the number of participants (N) in each country is shown for AE for Nigeria 48, while USA is 48. Also, for ICT the number of participants(N)for Nigeria is 49, while USA is 48. In the SPSS analysis, for Nigeria, one sees the mean condition in AE for Nigeria is 2.70, while that of USA is 3.30 and the standard deviation for Nigeria and USA are 1.10 and 1.130 respectively. Also, for ICT, for Nigeria the mean condition is 3.70, while that of USA is 3.90; the standard deviation for Nigeria and USA came to 0.80 and 1.10 respectively.

### t-test Results

Table 4  
T-test analysis result for AE and ICT

confidence the		Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance		t-test for Equality of Means			95% interval of Difference			
							Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	
		f	Sig	t	df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	
Upper AE	Equal variances assumed	1.39	0.24	-2.43	94	0.02	-0.60	0.24	- 1.08	- 0.11
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.43	92.32	0.02	-0.60	0.24	- 1.08	- 0.11
ICT	Equal variances assumed	2.80	0.10	-1.23	95	0.22	-0.24	0.19	0.62	0.15
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.23	89.49	0.22	0.24	0.19	- 0.63	0.15

\* p < .05 Value is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Looking at AE, since the significance value is greater than 0.05,  $p = 0.2 > 0.05$ .one will read from the top row. It indicates that the variability of the two countries is about the same. It implies that the scores in Nigeria do not vary too much than the scores in the USA for the hypothesis AE. Also, for ICT, since the significance value is greater than 0.05,  $p = 0.098 > 0.05$ , one will read from the top row. It indicates that the variability of the two countries is about the same.

Since the row to read from have been shown above, from the Significance (2-Tailed) value one can see the t-test implications of the study. For AE, looking at the significance (2-Tailed) value since the significance (2-Tailed) value is less than 0.05,  $p = 0.017 < 0.05$ ; thus, the hypothesized difference by country was found to be statistically significant. It indicates that hypothesis (H2), there is a difference in the followers’ active Engagement (AE) between Nigerian

and USA Pentecostal churches is supported. So, hypothesis 2 predicts that there is a difference in the followers' active engagement (AE) between Nigeria and USA Pentecostal churches.

Also, for ICT the Significance (2-Tailed) value is greater than 0.05; that is  $p = 0.2 > 0.05$ . It implies that the hypothesized difference by country was not found to be statistically significant. between your two conditions (Nigeria and USA). It means the hypothesis (H1), 'there is a difference in followers' independent critical thinking (ICT) between Nigerian and USA Pentecostal churches' is not supported.

## Discussion

The present study aimed at determining if there is a difference in the followers' active Engagement (AE) between Nigerian and USA Pentecostal churches. The results indicate a difference in followers' independent critical thinking (ICT) between Nigerian and USA Pentecostal churches. In partial agreement with the previous theoretical and conceptual framework, one can say that this study's result on followers' active engagement conforms with Kelly's (1992) position. It implies that followers have the propensity to take the initiative, participate actively and be self-starters, especially in the relationship with the leader. However, concerning the same conceptual framework of this study, the result of ICT is not in agreement with Kelly's (1992) position that followers have Independent Critical Thinking (ICT) – offering constructive criticism and showing the ability to think for oneself with creativity and innovation.

Ghislieri et al. (2015), while reviewing the work of Kelly (1992) on AE and ICT, argued that the instrument is valuable not only for inquiry but also for training and development. They claimed that self-evaluation of followership conduct could contribute to training, developing a critical learning procedure about this aspect, and discover a "better way to be a follower" in a specific organizational context. What is even very important for theory and practice is the AE result from the two countries (Nigeria and the USA), which shows the difference and an important factor to consider in cross-cultural adaption (Moodian, 2009).

On the difference of followers AE in Nigeria and USA, one might want to review Nigeria's power distance culture where subordinates (followers) are less willing to challenge bosses or express disagreement with them (Adsit, London, Crom, & Jones, 1997). One may say that though followers might not be bold enough to challenge their superiors, it might affect how actively engaged they are. The difference in AE in the USA churches might be associated with the democratic culture in the USA that fit into what GLOBE studies described as autonomous leadership: a newly defined global leadership dimension that refers to independent and individualistic leadership attributes (Dorfman, House, Hangs, Javidan, & Gupta (2004).

One might also say that the noticed difference in AE would mean that a follower emigrating from one country to the other might need training to effectively follow the leader in the new location where there is a different work culture (Ghislieri et al.2015).

Also, reviewing the results of ICT in which there was no statistical difference in the mean of the Nigeria population and that of the USA, one may say that it shows that the followership behavior about their leaders is similar. So, the implication for theory and practice, in this case, would be that the Pentecostal Church in both countries might not need to worry over followers'

adaptability to contemporary work culture. The similarity ICT of followers from both countries may then be seen as possible strength that leaders can rely on in the Church's growth.

### **The implication of the study in the formulation of theory and practice**

First, the study showed that on the followers' active Engagement (AE) between Nigerian and USA Pentecostal churches, the study results indicate an agreement with the previous theoretical and conceptual framework. One can say that this study's result on the active engagement of followers to their leaders conforms with Kelly (1992). It means that followers tend to take the initiative, participate actively and be self-starters, especially in the relationship with the leader. Also, that organizations could have difficulty with the follower's ability to follow. It implies that this can be resourceful for scholars, consultants, leaders, and members (followers) thinking of worshiping in Nigeria or the USA.

Secondly, on the result of ICT not in agreement with Kelly (1992), followers have Independent Critical Thinking (ICT) – offering constructive criticism and showing the ability to think for oneself, with creativity and innovation; it may help stakeholders think of how to adapt. Also, researchers could study to see how ICT can be encouraged in a new Church location.

### **Limitations of the study**

The study involved two Pentecostal churches in Lagos, Nigeria, and two Pentecostal Churches in Maryland, USA. The time available for the study was a constraint extending the study to more than one state in both countries. So, the result of the study might not be easily generalized. In the future, scholars might consider extending the study to more states in both countries and involving more research subjects. Though the time and resources available could only allow studying 52 followers from both countries each, the result could give an idea to anyone who wants to settle and be a part of any Church in the studied countries. The results could also guide leaders of churches domiciled in these countries on behaviors followers may likely have.

## **CONCLUSION**

One can conclude that since great and successful organizations consist of leaders and followers, understanding followers' behavior becomes imperative. Furthermore, for a good cross-cultural adaption to follow leaders, the leaders themselves should appreciate followers' behaviors across different cultures, such as in the USA and Nigeria, as in this study. So, while this study revealed that followers AE is different for some pentecostal churches in Nigeria and the USA, the study showed no difference in ICT behavior among the followers examined in Nigeria and USA pentecostal churches. The result can assist people who might want to worship or work in other cultures to know what to expect as an expatriate worker. Most importantly, the study results can help pastors (leaders) from both cultures know what to expect from followers in a new location.

## REFERENCES

- Adsit, D. J., London, M., Crom, S., & Jones, D. (1997). Cross-cultural differences in upward ratings in a multi-cultural company. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8, 385–401.
- Agho, A.O. (2009). Perspectives of senior-level executives on effective followership and leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 16, 159-166. doi: 10.1177/1548051809335360.
- Carsten, M.K., Uhl-Bien, M., West, B.J., Patera, J.L., McGregor, R. (2010). Exploring social constructions of followership: A qualitative study. *Leadership Q.* 21(3): 543–562.
- Cozby, P. C., Bates, S. C. (2015). *Methods in behavioral research*. McGraw-Hill Education, New York.
- Associations (2016) *Creative research systems*. Bookmark.
- Dale, R. D. (1987). Leadership - followership: the Church's challenge. *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, (29),2 Spr 1987, 23-28.
- Dale, R. D (1982). Leadership and Followership: Changing Conditions and Styles," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* (18), 3.
- Dorfman, P. W, House R. J, Hanges, P. J, Javidan, M., Gupta, V. (2004) Review: Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, (49),4 (Dec. 2004), 641-647
- Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Associates (1999). Culture specific and cross culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are the attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 219–256.
- Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., Michelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress a raising new question. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 729–768.
- Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8 (3), 233–274.
- Gatti, P., Ghislieri, C., & Cortese, C. G. (2017) Relationships between followers' behaviors and satisfaction in a sample of nurses. *PLoS ONE*. Vol. 12 Issue 10, p1-16.
- Ghislieri, C., Gatti, P., Cortese, C. G. (2015). A brief scale for investigating followership in nursing. *BPA - Applied Psychology Bulletin (Bollettino di Psicologia Applicata)*. (63),272, 25-32.
- Foland, T. E. (2003). *The courageous follower: standing up to & for our leaders*. San Francisco:Berrett-Koehler.
- Kelly, R.E. (1992). *The Power of Followership*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Kelley, R. E. (1992). *The power of followership: How to create leaders people want to follow, and followers who lead themselves*." *Broadway Business* (1992).
- Ikeh, J. C. (2011). *Team leadership: The twenty-first-century challenge, a case study of the tidings of faith ministries Inc. Jos, Nigeria*. Theological Research Exchange Network (TREN): Theses & Dissertations. 2011, preceding 1-195.
- Kellerman, B. (2007). Followership: How Followers Are Creating Change and Changing Leaders. *Publishers Weekly*. 12/3/2007, (254)48, 61-61.
- Kohut, A., Wike, R. (2009). Positive Aspects of US Image. *Harvard International Review*. Winter2009, (3), 4, 68-72.
- Lundin, S. C., Lancaster, L. C. (1990). Beyond leadership, the importance of followership. *Futurist*, (24) 3 May-Jun 1990, 18-22.
- May, W. F. (1994). Virtue in action: Leaders and followers. *The Christian Century*, 111 26 Sep 21 - 28 1994, 854-857.
- Moodian, M. A (2009) *Contemporary Leadership and Intercultural Competence: Exploring the Cross-cultural Dynamics Within Organizations*. SAGE Publications
- Nancy, J. (2006). On the Meanings of Democracy. *Theoria: A Journal of Social & Political Theory*. Dec2006, 111, 1-5.
- Ogbueli, D. (2005). *Discovering your ministry*. Rehoboth publishing. Lagos.
- Oladimeji, S. (2009). *Growing your Church from within*. Mimshack Publishing house Lagos.
- Patton, Q. M. (2015) *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. SAGE Publications.

- Siegel, A. (1993). The Power of Followership. In *Trust*, (4), 2 1993, 30.
- Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F., Schwartz, S. H., Ahmad, A. H., & Associates (2002). Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior: A 47-nati study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33 (2), 188–208.
- TanOff, G.F., Barlow, C. (2002). Leadership and followership: Same animal, different spots? *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 54 (3), 157-167. doi: 10.1037/1061-4087.54.3.157.
- Williams. F., Monge, P (2001). Reasoning with statistics: How to read quantitative research. Thomson higher education. USA.
- Yukl G. A. (2013) Leadership in Organizations. Pearson Education-Prentice Hall.

## APPENDIX

English and Italian Versions of Brief Followership Scale For each question, indicate How often it applies to you as a follower of your supervisor

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

1. When starting a new assignment, do you promptly build a record of successes in tasks that are important to your departmental chairperson?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

2. Do you take the initiative to seek out and successfully complete assignments that go above and beyond your job?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

3. Do you independently think up and champion new ideas that will contribute significantly to your departmental chairperson's or your department's goals?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

4. Do you try to solve the tough problems (technical or organizational), rather than look to your departmental chairperson to do it for you?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

5. Do you make a habit of internally questioning the wisdom of your departmental chairperson's decision rather than just doing what you are told?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

6. When your departmental chairperson asks you to do something that runs contrary to your professional or personal preferences, do you say 'no' rather than 'yes'?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

7. Do you act on your own ethical standards rather than your departmental chairperson's or your department's standards?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

8. Do you assert your views on important issues, even though it might mean conflict with your group or reprisals from your departmental chairperson?

(0 = never; 1=very rarely, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes 4=frequently, 5=very frequently, 6 = always)

© Robert Kelley (1992). Reproduced and translated with kind permission of