Only within the last few decades have researchers and scholars started to focus seriously on the enigmatic majority (followers) in organizations. This chapter focuses on this enigmatic majority that makes up the bulk of the workforce, the real engine behind multiple economies around the world. This chapter will look at followership strengths and weaknesses, how the pieces of “organizational puzzles” fit together to create teams and workgroups. In addition, this chapter will attempt to identify the different followership perceptions using a new model called the 4-D Followership Model. By the end of this chapter, you should understand how each follower fits into groups, establishing a firm foundation of followership and developing great leaders, one follower at a time.

We all recognize that the world would become total chaos if every person demanded to be in charge. We would have no societies, no governments, and no progress. Simon and Garfunkle’s lyrics, “I am a rock, I am an island” would be commonplace; cooperation and teamwork would not exist. Language would never have developed if each of earth’s inhabitants had insisted on his or her own way to communicate. Although I have described an extreme situation, it portrays what the world could be like if no one allowed anyone else to lead him or her.

Schools teach children to sit still, be quiet, listen, and obey. They must not interrupt, disrupt, or even become too curious. Children must follow the lesson plan as the teacher presents it. Some fall into this peg hole easily, whereas others resist. These resisting children typically break out of their scheduled regimen of subordination, leading other children, role playing, and pretending to be in charge of some adventure. Many children express their desire to lead, whereas others openly wish to continue their role as follower.
In Phoenix, Arizona, a new Ford Explorer truck sported a license plate that read, “NO1HLPD,” which seemed to translate into “No One Helped.” The profound arrogance of this statement struck me. No matter what this license plate refers to, the statement cannot be true. Of course someone helped! Assuming the license plate was bragging about financial independence, a whole host of people (customers, coworkers, suppliers) helped along the way. If this license plate was talking about the buying of the truck itself, then who taught this driver how to safely control a vehicle? Who made the vehicle? How could this driver afford this truck without a job? Where did the skills come from to qualify for that job? Who gave this driver the opportunity to test-drive the truck prior to the purchase?

Many leaders stand in front loudly proclaiming, “NO1HLPD!” when discussing accomplishments and successes. This has been drilled into their minds since childhood. Our schools of advanced learning still profess this today. Two false mantras are being taught today in business schools: first, that followership is a part of leadership; second, that attaining a leadership position is the best way to measure success within the ranks of an organization. Both of these have received so much airplay that they seem to have become reality. Yet employees do a great deal more following than leading, even as leaders. For the most part, followership behaviors drive tactical successes. Leadership talents and skills propel strategic accomplishments.

Despite the volumes of writings illuminating leadership, most people have yet to understand the very fabric of this discussion. Followership is not a part of leadership—leadership is a part of followership. All people begin with the foundation as a follower and build up from there. A house must sit on a solid and firm foundation to withstand the elements outside. A strong house will last no longer than the foundation. To some degree, each person still maintains that status of follower. As long as this foundation holds, the ability to lead will flourish.

The research for this chapter began with my asking three critical questions about followership principles: (1) When are employees followers, and when are they leaders? (2) Can people occupy the space of both realities simultaneously, or do they exist in only one role at a time? (3) What kinds of followers are out there, and are these types measurable? Can we classify styles of followership?

Merriam-Webster Online defines followership as “Following, the capacity or willingness to follow a leader.” This definition seems too vague and broad for research purposes, so I needed to find one that suited the depth to which I hoped to go to find answers to this chapter’s questions.
Joseph Rost provided the best definition of leadership: “Leadership is an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes.”

This leads to a parallel definition that can apply to followership: “A follower shares in an influence relationship among leaders and other followers with the intent to support leaders who reflect their mutual purposes.” This would mean that collaborative employees (followership) would be the very support system leaders need to lead effectively.

I need to place a small disclaimer here. In a presentation at a recent conference (and in Chapter Three of this volume), Dr. Rost stated that he does not support the term followership. Leaders and followers cannot be separated. He played a segment of the John Lennon song “Power to the People,” demonstrating the intertwined relationships of leaders and followers. In application, this is true. However, when looking at leaders and collaborators, researchers view this relationship as two different sides of the same coin, but they have stared so long and hard at the leadership side that most have no idea what sits on the other side of that coin.

A study of followers, followership, collaborators, or even collaborator-ship indicates an initiative to finally look at the enigmatic masses that sit in the dark shadows of organizations. Followership is a conjured term, but it gives the average reader a mental picture with which to work, so I choose to use it.

---

**Enigmatic Majority**

A consistent theme keeps surfacing throughout the research and writings about both leadership and followership. Some researchers and scholars indicate that employees should always be leadership bound. They believe that everyone wants to have the opportunity to be a leader in one way or another, and that leaders need to give followers that opportunity. But some people feel punished for trying to participate, then when given the opportunity to lead, they shy away. Managers bypass other employees thinking they do not want to take on the mantle of leadership when in these employees’ hearts they want the opportunity to excel, though they may be afraid of repercussions. Still others do not want to take on a leadership role in the workplace, yet take on this role in social, community, or family settings. Why at times do people prefer to follow? While reading the available literature, I created a list of twelve perceptions (not all-inclusive)
that employees may have of themselves as followers; these may influence their choice.

**Followership Perceptions**  
**“Why do I choose to follow?”**

Personal values  
“I’m not the chosen leader, and I will respect that.”

Economic status  
“I make more money doing than leading.”

Personal goals or focus  
“I don’t have time; one day I plan on being . . .”

Humility  
“Why should I be in charge? I’m no better than . . .”

Lack of confidence  
“I don’t feel I am good enough to lead.”

Fear  
“What if I fail, or give bad directions?”

Ignorance or lack of comprehension  
“I don’t know how to take charge.”

Lack of trust  
“You have to pull a fast one to get promoted here.”

Lack of feeling of inclusion  
“I’m not part of their ‘clique.’”

Lack of conviction  
“It is not something I’m interested in now.”

Comfort or complacency  
“I’m happy here. I don’t need the headaches.”

Perceived social status  
“I’m not even in their league.”

Many employees (followers and leaders alike) use these excuses. While in this mode, employees seek to avoid becoming part of leadership, or higher levels of leadership, when their values (organizational, personal, or both) differ from those of the leadership or the organizational culture at that time. They decide that they do not want to lead that group of people, even if they have held leadership roles previously. Some would gladly lead others again when given the right opportunity. Realizing that employees exist in different categories of followership and leadership mind-sets all the time, I concluded that a way to measure these categories had to exist. The trick was to understand how these mind-sets would look on paper, which would serve both to easily identify and to clearly explain their relationships in the workplace. Considerable reading and observation on the subject of followership led to the development of the 4-D Followership Model.

Building on the prior personality typing of such researchers as Carl Jung, William Moulton Marston, and Walter Clark, I have identified four basic patterns of employee behaviors in an organization. Most of the
literature and research supports this assertion without putting a graphic tool in place to visualize the concept. The 4-D Followership Model attempts to explain the basic roles occupied by millions of people inside thousands of organizations large and small, for-profit and nonprofit alike. Before we look at the model, we need to examine a key organizational puzzle to understand the model’s descriptive value.

Organizational Puzzle

Organizations succeed or fail on the basis of the input and output of their people. However, employees succeed or fail based on the function of leader-follower relationships. These organizations measure success in one of (or in a combination of) three ways. First, companies measure success through financial growth and standing. Second, they evaluate the effectiveness of the leadership role within the ranks. Third, they measure success in terms of their ability to compete with (and conquer) the competition. It is here within these three measurables that the root of organizational change takes place. It is here that the organizational puzzle begins to take shape. Yet most people miss the followership piece that completes the organizational puzzle.

When managers focus on systems, they deselect the people and their needs. However, by focusing first on people, they in turn deselect the system. Managers and leaders tend to look at processes, costs, revenue, and end quality as prime qualifiers of success or failure. In focusing on those elements, they subordinate employee values, trust, attitudes, and relationships for the good of the company. To compensate, managers begin looking at their people from a leadership lens to fix those employees affected, thus deselecting the system at that point to focus time and energy on their people. What results is a mess of selecting and deselecting back and forth.

By balancing the focus equally on the organization and the people (and what these relationships might imply about the societies that constructed them), organizations are in constant conflict between continual change and perpetual stability. One end of the spectrum satisfies organizational needs; the other end satisfies individual needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on change</td>
<td>Focus on stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual growth</td>
<td>Pursuit of leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek for success in instability</td>
<td>Try to make job part of stability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reward for growth through change

Seeks rewards for mastering processes

Lawrence (Lawry) de Bivort has noted, “Organizations often blame employees for having inadequate attitudes when in fact those attitudes are appropriate responses to organizational and societal problems.”

We might also define “appropriate responses” as typical or common responses. And when people have been pressed long enough, their reactions become habitual.

When organizations implement change (whether focusing on market share, cultural communications, or restructuring), leaders often wonder why employees demonstrate stressful responses to the new change, often much more profound than anticipated. This stress can result from change itself. Stress can threaten an employee’s sense of ownership on the job.

Feelings of ownership are a natural part of the human conditioning, a psychological reality of which many leaders seem unaware.

Some people react openly to stress, whereas others hold their emotions in; regardless of the type of response, everyone reacts to stress. In fact, individuals react to their perceptions of what the team expects of them as much as to their perceptions of what they expect of the team. What kind of baggage does an employee carry around in an organization? Is this baggage useful or detrimental to the processes assigned? What does this baggage (these appropriate or habitual responses) look like? Most often this baggage manifests itself in nonverbal communication.

Physical science theorizes that dark matter holds the universe together, and that dark matter makes up as much as 90 percent of all matter in the universe; in much the same way, nonmanagerial employees make up a huge portion of the workforce, and the efforts of employees hold free enterprise together much the way that dark matter holds the universe together. Robert Kelley called this the organization in the shadows.

If managers and leaders were to fall by the wayside, some employees could step up to the task and keep the organization alive. However, if employees were to resign en masse, management alone would not be sufficient to sustain the life of the organization. Followership is that dark matter that allows leaders and managers to direct activities. People are the foundation on which all organizations are built.

Leadership studies have become the focus for business and market research, whereas the study of human behavior in organizations gets relegated to the social sciences. Basically, the two are the same, yet many
people devour leadership literature while passing up human behavior research as if it had no bearing on what makes organizations successful!

Some key social science research has looked at followers and followership under the names of workforce research, employee development, or human resource development. This research organizes the data for the use of managers and leaders, not the followers themselves. Focusing on followers as a distinct area of study entails looking at data that would be useful to both followers and leaders. This means establishing an active field of research that looks at human behavior from a follower’s perspective first.

Companies have spent 80 percent of their time and research efforts looking at the 20 percent (leadership) within organizations, while spending barely 20 percent of their time and energy focusing on the other 80 percent (followers). Most training budgets support only 20 percent of the organization, leaving the other 80 percent in the shadows. It is time to turn on the lights to see the real talent within organizations, the real success, the real heart and soul that drive economies around the world.

4-D Followership Model

The model, illustrated in Figure 11.1, is a visual representation of how employees view themselves within the workforce—not just how they feel about their current positions, but how they express their appropriate and habitual behavior patterns within their respective organizations and positions. Considering the quadrant principle, we can see four distinct employee characteristics.

1. **Disgruntled** employees typically have been slighted (whether from an actual or perceived event). They have decided that this organization is of little value to them and that they are of little value to the organization.

2. **Disengaged** employees see the value of keeping their present job and will do the minimum to ensure continued employment. These employees do not buy into the company’s mission or purpose. These employees’ attitude could reflect either a personal issue or a cultural issue pervading the organization as a whole, but in either case it hinders the individual’s progress within this person’s position.
3. **Doer** employees are motivated, excited to be part of the team. They are enterprising people, and overall are considered high producers. The only real issue with these employees is that no matter where they go in an organization, the grass always looks greener elsewhere. Turnover for career advancement is commonplace.

4. **Disciple** employees feel engaged; they are highly productive and plan to stay with the organization for a long time. There is little that will convince these employees that they are not in the right position at the right time. However, being team focused may mean that they miss great opportunities to excel individually as they help others along the way.

![Figure 11.1: The 4-D Followership Model](image-url)
The next few paragraphs are an explanation of the 4-D Followership Model. Keep in mind that these descriptions are examples of single-minded employees who do not share traits with other quadrants. In reality, people cross boundaries daily and share many traits (both positive and negative) among all four of the quadrants. Yet people’s most natural perceptions and tendencies fall within quadrants I or II (Disciple or Doer). When stress rises, behavior will move from the natural quadrant (I or II) to one of the stress quadrants (III or IV). Or, as is so often the case, employees share adaptable traits with the neighboring quadrants.

**Quadrant I: Disciple (Focus: Serving Others’ Needs)**

This quadrant is a natural place for many followers and leaders to be. The employee who perceives work from this quadrant could easily be called the company person. These employees sacrifice for the good of the company, at times even becoming martyrs. These are employees of whom we all dream. They are loyal and committed to the mission, they are willing to work extra hours with a smile, and they hope to better the organization as a whole through their efforts. They are fully engaged in their work.

Sound a bit Pollyannaish? To most people this is an unreal state of mind—but these employees do exist, even if for a few days; they are there in your organizations, sometimes receiving the appreciation they deserve but often getting laughed at, stepped on, laid off, and deprogrammed away from believing that commitment and hard work can get them anywhere. Who is doing such damage to these angels of productivity? Well, you are. Your systems, your processes, and your employees are doing it. You are all doing it to each other when, inadvertently or not, you deselect the people.

The following are expected identifiable attributes and attitudes of the disciple:

- Inclusive (invites others to participate and share talents)
- Open-minded (willing to learn from others, engage in self-development, build the skill base)
- Adaptable and forgiving (easily accepts guidance from multiple leadership styles)
- Friendly (engages in open and progressive communication)
- Integrity (consistency, honesty)
• Strong work ethic (determination and productivity)

• Team player (collaborator; spotlights others’ talents and helps others)

• Follow-up and follow-through (keeping on task even when others slack off)

**Quadrant II: Doer (Focus: Serving Own Needs)**

This quadrant is also a natural place for many followers and leaders to gravitate. Employees who perceive work from this quadrant could easily be called go-getters, productive, even aggressive. They have a strong commitment, and they seem like the disciples you were intent on hiring in the first place. They have a great work ethic. What could be better? Well, doers are always on the move: around, up, or out. The typical attitude of a doer is, “The grass is always greener,” ensuring that their resumes are continually updated. They typically do not desire to stay with one job for too long. Retaining doers in an organization may mean finding new opportunities with bigger and better projects for them to keep them excited, as they are more loyal to their career aspirations than to the organization they currently work for.

The following are expected identifiable attributes and attitudes of the doer:

• Competitive (may be inclusive when it serves a need)

• Partially open-minded (on the lookout for better opportunities)

• Adaptable (easily accepts guidance from multiple leadership styles)

• Engages in selective communication (seeks first for own opportunities)

• Integrity (may or may not be an issue)

• Strong work ethic (seen as a way to get ahead)

• Conditional team player (collaborator; spotlights own talents and may help others)
Follow-up and follow-through (keeps on task even when others slack off)

**Quadrant III: Disengaged (Focus: Passive Reactions to Stress)**

Disengaged is one of the two stress quadrants. When employees feel pulled away from their natural quadrant, they exhibit symptoms of stress. This quadrant identifies the passive response to stress. It may be difficult to observe at first, but grows quietly until it becomes difficult to control.

So much has been written of late about this kind of employee that I can add little, except to say that some people come to an organization with the intent to survive, whereas others come with the intent to thrive. Most employees begin as either disciples or doers, but soon realize that their expectations and reality were not quite in harmony with each other. Yet disengaged employees may become so detached that they just want to exist without expectations to lead, follow, or get out of anyone’s way. Disengaged employees justify their behavior by questioning the organization’s loyalty to them.

The following are expected identifiable attributes and attitudes of the disengaged:

- Noninclusive and nonresponsive (does not invite others to participate, holds talents inside)
- Not open-minded (does not want to learn or grow, yet not truly closed-minded)
- Not adaptable (dreads change)
- Engages in guarded communication (sees communication as a win-lose scenario)
- Integrity (may or may not be an issue)
- Weak work ethic (disinterested in the work, organization, or both)
- Solo player while thinking he or she is a team player (avoids any attention, positive or negative, about own accomplishments)
Little to no follow-up and follow-through (difficult time performing well)

Quadrant IV: Disgruntled (Focus: Active reactions to stress)

Disgruntled is the other of the two stress quadrants. Again, when employees feel pulled away from their natural quadrant, they exhibit symptoms of stress. This quadrant identifies the active response to stress. This behavior is easy to identify early on, and may be difficult to satisfy consistently. Some leaders and managers feel tempted to acquiesce to the vocal, aggressive employee. By catering to disgruntled traits, we validate negative behavior and open a Pandora’s box from which more behavior will flow.

There is plenty of literature about disgruntled workers. Unfortunately, most are news clippings about the afteraffects of raging incidents. Fortunately, the vast majority of disgruntled employees are merely upset, with chips on their shoulders, and they looking to leave their company. Some of these employees may be natural leaders who have not been given adequate opportunities to develop their talents, or have been punished for attempting to do so. These employees tend to be more reactive and ready to jump ship to find another organization with which to work. When the organization no longer provides attractive incentives or opportunities, these individuals’ attitude deteriorates into, “Any place is better than here.”

The following are expected identifiable attributes and attitudes of the disgruntled:

- Noninclusive (may be hyper-responsive, destructive, or both)
- Closed-minded (unwilling to listen to opposing viewpoints)
- Not adaptable, not forgiving (refuses to accept guidance from multiple leadership styles)
- Engages in combative communication (often escalates to an emotional level)
- Integrity (may or may not be an issue)
- Work ethic suffers (focused on negative emotions, not productivity)
- Solo player and proud of it (refuses to cooperate with team efforts)
- No follow-up or follow-through (has difficult time performing well)

---

**Practical Application**

Anecdotal evidence shows that the population group in each quadrant changes with succeeding generations. In the 1940s and 1950s, people were told that their jobs were good and that they should be glad to have them, and those who believed this could have been called the disciples of their organizations. In the 1960s and 1970s, the next generation grew very dissatisfied, even disgruntled with the establishment. By the 1980s, the disengaged worker overpopulated the workforce. Today, with the advent of rapid transit, rapid communication, the Internet, and a variety of other life-changing, barrier-smashing technologies, it seems that the doer has been the dominant employee base since the mid-1990s.

With this new understanding of the 4-D Followership Model, group members can identify and predict their own behavior and those of other followers and leaders. They can identify where individuals currently reside within the quadrants and determine the most suitable motivational strategies and organizational cultural actions and decisions to move valuable employees closer to their natural quadrants.

In exploring followership alignment, I recognized that people gravitate to a basic perception that they exhibit in their workplace behavior. The status quo comes into play when some followers make every possible effort to maintain it. Others stretch and expand their horizons, exerting their adaptable nature to try new and exciting things. Both kinds of employees can be invaluable to the success of an organization. When employees have found their aligning quadrant, they will be more productive. Employees in the doer quadrant will become most valuable in ways that employees from the disciple quadrant cannot, and vice versa.

The first information pressed into the human brain is the strongest, the source of the basic reactions exhibited in both productive and stressful situations. I could not find this referenced in his literature, and the link to his presentation exists behind a log in page, which will be inaccessible to the majority of readers. This translates to the natural quadrant that employees tend to move toward depending on the level of stress or opportunity facing them. This is what I call followership alignment.
People teach that the status quo is a bad place, a stagnant region in which talent decays and progress atrophies. They spend much of their time working to find alignment, but they rarely understand which is their natural quadrant and how to operate from within it. The following two examples of employee behavior will show how these behaviors fit into one of the four quadrants of the 4-D Followership Model.

**John Bean’s Typical and Current Behavior**

In this first scenario, look at the historical or typical behavior of the main character, John Bean, then compare it to his current behavior. Apply the 4-D Followership Model to create valid and lasting interventions and solutions.

**John Bean’s Typical Behavior**

John Bean has been with his organization for several years as an IT specialist. He knows the politics and the “ins and outs” of the culture, and he typically acts excited when he uses these connections to benefit the team (through a loose network of friends outside the team). John has always been a highly productive and industrious employee, accomplishing more than most would have expected from his laid-back demeanor. He is very supportive of his team members and enjoys participating in discussions as much as he enjoys working alone.

**John Bean’s Current Behavior**

Of late, John’s new manager has decided to hold the team on a tight leash. She believes that empowering others requires constant feedback. John adapted to this change at first. Lately, however, he seems less accepting of this new accountability, calling the manager Big Sister behind her back. Under the new conditions, his manager expects him to involve her in all of his communications with his established network. Predictably, he has not sought their assistance as much lately. John has scaled back his active participation in meetings. It seems that every time he shares an idea with the team, the new manager gives him that idea as an assignment and expects him to have an update ready for the next meeting. By now, John feels too busy to add anything to his schedule. He used to be a very productive employee, but his completion rate has become sporadic, he talks less to team members, and his once infectious motivation now seems absent.
Applying the 4-D Followership Approach to John Bean

Identify Natural and Stress Quadrants

Which quadrant fits John’s typical behavior, and which one fits his current behaviors? From the information we have, we can easily classify John as a natural disciple. He enjoyed the team atmosphere as well as providing solutions for others’ successes.

Compare Typical and Current Behaviors

What happened to John Bean, and what can he do to become a star employee once again? Note that this path to improvement cannot be a training program or even a strategically placed intervention. John’s return to his typical behavior must begin within. As a disciple, John hopes that he will be allowed to serve the team’s needs, to be a quiet hero. When this opportunity is restricted, John takes the passive route and becomes disengaged. He does not want to leave his job, and he reacts appropriately to the situation as a passive disciple.

Implement Potential Interventions and Solutions

What could John’s manager do to help him get back on track? If she understands how John views his role as a member of the team (using the 4-D Followership Model), she could realize that John’s need to serve is accompanied by a strong need to do it on his own terms. As John’s manager, she could return autonomy to John and allow him to serve as he has in the past. This may not sit well with her management style—thus the conflict. At this juncture, both John and his new manager need to stretch and give what they can. By recognizing what John is unwilling to give, his manager can see how far she herself should stretch to make this business relationship work. By seeing his manager make good-faith efforts to support his natural style, John can make good-faith efforts to meet her.
Mark Mook’s Typical and Current Behavior

In this second scenario, compare the typical behavior of the main character, Mark Mook, with his current behavior. Then apply the 4-D Followership Model to create valid and lasting interventions and solutions.

Mark Mook’s Typical Behavior

Mark Mook loves dealing with people, whether he is talking one-on-one or with large groups. He has this knack for getting what he wants from practically every conversation he has. His energy can be overwhelming at times, but he does very well in the sales arena. He is very good at giving direction respectfully, and has had three happy direct reports for years now. Mark is competitive, sticking persistently to a client until he gets the sale. He gladly shares the successes with his team, but rarely acknowledges the successes of other teams in his division (unless he uses them as the team to beat).

Mark Mook’s Current Behavior

For the past three months, Mark’s sales numbers have slowly dropped in response to largely unavoidable changes in the economy; his stats are now just above average for the organization. This has caused visible frustration for Mark and his team. He seemed to be resisting helpful suggestions from his manager, implementing them with vocal reservations. This month he began demanding that his team work an extra twenty hours each week to catch up to the top team in the company, causing significant upset. When Mark’s manager discovered this, he had a private meeting in Mark’s office. The team reported that they could hear only Mark, who was yelling about needing to get back on top. Mark had a few choice words for his boss’s leadership style as well.

Applying the 4-D Followership Approach to Mark Mook

Identify Natural and Stress Quadrants

Which quadrant fits Mark’s typical behavior, and which one fits his current behaviors? From the description of the situation, we can say that
Mark seems very energetic, excited, and competitive. Numbers and status are important to him, and as a strong-willed doer, he will try to get what he wants at any cost. His current behavior indicates that he seems to have a hard time coping with the impact of average sales numbers on his self-esteem. Everyone hears it, and everyone sees it. As a disgruntled manager, he can be difficult to work with.

**Compare Typical and Current Behaviors**

What happened to Mark Mook, and what can he do to become a star employee once again? Like John, Mark must change from within. From his current perspective, the best solution would be to get those numbers back up. In the face of reality, Mark needs to accept that he will not always be number one. Until he realizes this, everyone suffers, and an undesirable situation is made worse.

**Implement Potential Interventions and Solutions**

What could Mark’s manager do to help him get back on track? Understanding that Mark is an active doer will not by itself solve the team’s headaches. To Mark (as an active doer), his need to succeed comes first, even at the cost of relationships. The manager needs to know that this disgruntled behavior is Mark’s typical reaction to stress. In recognizing this, the manager can decide far in advance what he will and will not tolerate in workplace behavior and make this clear. As a doer, Mark may leave, or he may perceive the challenge to improve his team’s performance without transmitting undue stress as a growth opportunity, which doers thrive on. Conversely, in his role as a follower familiar with the 4-D model, if Mark perceived that his manager had become either disgruntled or disengaged, Mark could use his considerable energy and persuasiveness to help restore the manager’s natural typical style.

---

**Summary and Conclusion**

Existing thought on followership leans toward leadership, and research on the topic is derived from leadership principles. There is so much interplay and crossover between leadership and followership that the two cannot be studied completely independently of each other. The 4-D Followership Model is not a complement to older thoughts on this subject,
nor is it antagonistic toward them. This model takes followership in a new
direction, placing it in a new light with a reorganized taxonomy, seeing it as
the framework that builds leadership, not as an effect thereof.

Whether we define followership as a role or a behavior, employees
can occupy both follower and leader roles simultaneously. Whether we call
employees followers or collaborators, researchers can use the 4-D
Followership Model to type employees’ behavioral patterns and determine
their strengths and weaknesses (as well as potential stressors). Such
understanding and use of the model should help followers who aspire to
greater leadership roles do so, and should help leaders develop other leaders
one follower at a time.
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