

PARADIGMS OF GLOBAL SPIRIT-EMPOWERED LEADERSHIP

ERIC N. NEWBERG

Spiritus 7.2 (2022) 169–98
<https://doi.org/10.31380/2573-6345.1275>

© The Author(s) 2022

Keywords *Spirit, charismatic, leadership, paradigms*

Abstract

Spirit-empowered leaders employ different paradigms of leadership. The aim of the article is to identify, explain, and critique these paradigms. Spirit-empowered leadership is conceived of as belonging to the category of charismatic leadership. Following Max Weber, charismatic leadership is understood as flowing from charisma or giftedness, which is attributed to the leader by his or her followers. The article starts with the findings of theorists concerning charismatic leadership. Then it delineates five paradigms of Spirit-empowered leadership—the apostle, prophet, healing evangelist, pastorpreneur, and teacher/scholar. Examples are offered from global contexts. Last, a summative assessment of the paradigms is conducted, using criteria formulated by theorists of charismatic leadership theory.

Introduction

A paradigm is a typical example or pattern of something, that is, a model. In this article, derived from a forthcoming book by the same title, we will take a typological approach in our analysis of prevalent models of Spirit-empowered leadership. We hold that Spirit-empowered leadership can be aptly categorized as types of charismatic leadership. Following Max Weber, we are conceiving of charismatic leadership as flowing from charisma or giftedness, which is attributed to the leader by his or her followers.

Spirit-empowered leaders employ different paradigms in their exercise of leadership. The purpose of this article is to identify, explain, compare, and critique these paradigms. We will start with the findings of theorists concerning types of charismatic leadership. Second, we will summarize five paradigms of Spirit-empowered leadership and give examples of each from diverse global contexts. Last, we will conduct a summative assessment of the Spirit-empowered paradigms using criteria formulated by the theorists of charismatic leadership theory.

Charismatic Leadership Theory

Prior to expounding five major paradigms of Spirit-empowered leadership, we delve into charismatic leadership theory and elucidate the basic characteristics of charismatic leaders. Max Weber established three kinds of authority for leadership: traditional, legal-rational, and charismatic. He defined charisma as being “set apart from ordinary people and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities . . . regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader.”¹

It was not until the 1970s that Weber’s theory of charismatic leadership was taken up by theorists of organizational leadership. Robert House formulated a theory of charismatic leadership starting from the premises of Weber’s sociological concepts.² House hypothesized that based on certain leader behaviors followers attribute extraordinary or heroic leadership ability to those leaders. Other researchers worked with House’s theory to define key characteristics of charismatic leadership. House (1977) and Shamir, House, and Arthur (1992) delineated the following characteristic behaviors of a charismatic leader: (1) articulating an ideological vision³; (2) referring to distal rather than proximate goals; (3) behaviorally modeling the values implied in the vision by personal example; (4) expressing high performance expectations of followers; (5) communicating a high degree of confidence in followers’ ability to meet such expectations; and (6) demonstrating behaviors that selectively arouse unconscious achievement, power, and affiliative motives of followers when these motives are specifically relevant to the attainment of the vision.⁴

Conger and Kanungo (1988) expanded the terrain of charismatic leadership theory by developing a widely accepted framework, holding that charismatic leadership is typified by four key characteristics: (1) possessing and articulating a vision; (2) willing to take risks to accomplish the vision; (3) exhibiting sensitivity to the needs of followers; and (4) demonstrating novel behavior.⁵ Informed by the findings of David C. McClelland in his study of the inner dimension of power (1975), House and Howell define two types of charismatic leadership: personalized and socialized.⁶ The categories of personalized and socialized charismatic leadership will serve as criteria for our analysis of the paradigms of Spirit-empowered leadership in the final section of this article.

House and Howell defined *socialized* charismatic leadership as leadership that (a) is based on egalitarian behavior, (b) serves collective interests and is not driven by self-interest of the leader, and (c) develops and empowers others. McClelland and his colleagues reported their finding that socialized leaders tend to be altruistic, to work through legitimate established channels and systems of authority when such systems exist, and to be self-controlled and follower-oriented rather than narcissistic. House and Howell

defined *personalized* charismatic leadership as leadership that (a) is based on personal dominance and authoritarian behavior, (b) serves the self-interest of the leader and is self-aggrandizing, and (c) is exploitative of others. Personalized leaders rely on personal approval or rejection of followers to induce others to comply with their wishes. They show disregard for the rights and feelings of others and they tend to be narcissistic, impetuous, and impulsively aggressive. These two types of charismatic leadership are not mutually exclusive. A leader can simultaneously display characteristics of both of these leadership types.⁷

With the findings of the research of House, Howell, and Kanungo, we have sufficient criteria from which to assess the paradigms of Spirit-empowered leadership. Before engaging in the assessment piece, we will exposit the five global paradigms of Spirit-empowered leadership. Then we will conduct a summative assessment.

Apostle Paradigm

Are there modern-day apostles?

The apostle is the first of the leadership gifts in Ephesians 4:11. There is no universal agreement in the Spirit-empowered Movement concerning the inclusion of the “position” of apostle in contemporary leadership. There are, however, several Pentecostal and Charismatic groups that view the apostolate as integral to their scheme of leadership. These would include proponents of the New Apostolic Reformation (NAR), to be discussed below. Other groups, such as the American Assemblies of God, have chosen not to incorporate apostle in their leadership nomenclature, due to a concern voiced by Donald Gee, who stated, “It is a sorry fact that grave errors and extravagances quickly marred both the use of the prophetic gift and the office of the self-styled ‘apostle’ leader.”⁸

While some Pentecostals are hesitant to endorse the office of apostle, nevertheless, there is wide agreement on the apostolic dynamic of Spirit-empowered Christianity. This agreement stems from the early Pentecostals who aspired to restore the apostolic faith and power of the New Testament church. Hence, the apostolic paradigm pertains whether or not a Spirit-empowered group views the position of apostle as currently viable. This is evidenced, Warrington avers, by his observation that “many Pentecostal leaders function analogously to the early apostles in their leadership of churches and denominations.”⁹ Below we will describe the components of the apostle paradigm and offer a brief formative assessment.

Components of the Apostle Paradigm

The apostle paradigm rests on the assumption that the function of the apostle extends beyond the context of the New Testament church. The strongest advocates for the contemporary office of apostle are affiliated with a movement known as the New Apostolic Reformation (NAR), a name coined by C. Peter Wagner, former Professor of Church Growth at Fuller Theological Seminary's School of World Missions. According to Wagner, the NAR is made up of "loosely structured apostolic networks" emerging in "virtually every region of the world," constituting the "fastest growing segment of Christianity."¹⁰ The NAR is largely but not exclusively made up of Pentecostals and Charismatics. Wagner claims that around 2001 the church entered the "second apostolic age."¹¹ He believes that in this second apostolic age the offices and functions of apostle and prophet (Eph 2:20) are being restored.

David Cannistraci defines an apostle as "one who is called and sent by Christ to have the spiritual authority, character, gifts and abilities to successfully reach and establish people in Kingdom truth and order, especially through founding and overseeing local churches."¹² Cannistraci and Wagner believe that apostolic leaders will rise to prominence on the merit of their integrity, Christ-like character, and powerful supernatural gifting and authority. The extent of the NAR is far reaching, with millions of participants accounted for in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.¹³ When Wagner wrote *Churchquake!* in 1999, he contended that the NAR consisted of at least 40,000 "apostolic" churches representing approximately 8 to 10 million members in the USA.¹⁴ He asserted that the NAR is rapidly growing in all of the six continents and is the "greatest change in the way of doing church since the Protestant Reformation."¹⁵ In the Global South, a wide configuration of Pentecostal-Charismatic churches was (as of 2013) aligned with the NAR, including the following groups: Judah Kingdom Alliance (JKA), New Covenant Ministries International (NCMI), Grace International (GI), Congress World Breakthrough Network (C-WBN), and International Strategic Alliance of Apostolic Churches (ISAAC).¹⁶ Taking into account the many Independent/Non-Denominational churches that are affiliated with NAR-type networks, the movement boasts a staggering "369 million" participants.¹⁷

Perhaps the most intriguing aspect of the NAR is its version of dominion theology, rooted in the seven-mountain mandate, which originated in the Latter Rain Revival of 1948. Wagner states, "Several apostolic networks advocate forms of what some call 'dominion theology,' meaning that Christians are expected to infiltrate social structures at all levels and, once there, use their influence to inculcate biblical values throughout their society."¹⁸ Wagner outlines the strategy for marketplace transformation, and makes an appeal for leaders to take dominion over seven spheres or mountains of culture, encompassing the home; church; school; government and

politics; media, arts, entertainment, and sports; commerce; and science and technology.¹⁹ Wagner describes how each of these seven mountains or spheres will become an “apostolic sphere.” Apostles “are the only ones who will be able to change the power structure at the top of each mountain.”²⁰ How will these apostles accomplish this? These seven spheres or mountains are perceived as having “principalities and powers that control” them. The only way to occupy them will be through high level spiritual warfare, not political activism.

Our primary concern relates to the shape of leadership in the NAR. The NAR is composed of “apostolic networks.” Each network is led by an apostle whose ultimate authority is recognized by the collective of all participating churches and organizations within it. The apostles are the highest authorities and the ones who provide leadership and direction to the network. Using Ephesians 4 as a biblical justification, they assert their leadership role based on the spiritual gifts identified by Paul, who ranks apostles as the highest gift. Next to the apostles are the prophets who are God’s spokespersons, imparting divine counsel and wisdom to God’s people. These prophets, however, are accountable to the apostles while working alongside them to carry out the mission of the movement.

Who are the recognized apostles in the movement? The leading apostle of the NAR is the founder Dr. C. Peter Wagner; others among the staff of recognized apostles are Doris Wagner (wife of Peter Wagner), Samuel Rodriguez, Ed Silvano, Jim Ammerman, Cindy Jacobs (top ranking female apostle), Os Hillman, Julius Oyet, Pat Francis, Bill Haman, Lou Engle, Harry Jackson, Lance Wallnau, and John Benefiel. Todd Bentley ranks among the leading prophets.²¹ Earlier in 1998 Wagner edited a book called *The New Apostolic Churches* where he listed nineteen groupings of proponents of the NAR. Their leaders included: Professor C. Peter Wagner, Apostle John P. Kelly, Apostle John Eckhardt, Pastor Michael P. Fletcher, Bishop Wellington Boone, Larry Kreider, Pastor Roberts Liardon, Rice Brooks, Bishop Bill Hamon, Pastor Billy Joe Daugherty, Pastor Dick Iverson, Pastor Ralph Moore, Dr. David (Kwang Shin) Kim, Pastor Lawrence Khong, Pastor Paul Daniel, William F. Kumuyi, Bishop Dr. Eddie C. Villanueva, and Dr. Joseph C. Wongsak.²²

What do apostles do? Cannistraci delineates seven responsibilities of an apostle. Apostles plant churches, oversee and strengthen churches, develop leaders, ordain elders and deacons, supervise and coordinate ministries, manage crises, and network with other leaders and their ministries. The roles they play can be synthesized as establishing, nourishing, communicating, teaching, preaching, writing, imparting, fathering, and networking.²³ What they do not do is micro-manage a local church or ministry site. Apostles think of themselves as servants who lead by cooperation and consultation instead of control and domination.²⁴ Yet they see their authority as extensive, based on divine certification proven by an ability to draw large audiences, impart supernatural

power, convey vision through revelation, pray for healing, cast out territorial spirits, decree judgment of evil and sin, and raise the dead.²⁵ This is heady stuff!

Of all the radical claims made by the apostle, Wagner regards the most radical of all as the amount of trust that is afforded to leaders, which is founded upon spiritual authority delegated by the Holy Spirit to local level pastors and translocal level apostles.²⁶ In the apostolic paradigm the pastor (whether local or translocal) sets the vision, focuses on leadership rather than management, makes policy decisions and delegates the rest, forms the management team, holds his/her position for life, and selects his/her successor.²⁷ It is up to the apostle himself or herself to start a network, and if this is done, the number of churches per network must be kept at a manageable level so that the apostle can devote sufficient attention to mentoring upcoming charismatic leaders, hence forestalling routinization of charisma. The same principle is applied to the multiplication of networks.²⁸

Formative Assessment

In closing, let us look to Michael Brown's balanced analysis. He acknowledges that there are *not* modern-day apostles akin to the apostles of the New Testament. Yet, if one takes the term "apostle" in its general sense as an emissary of the gospel, one can affirm the existence of modern-day apostles. These would include not only those who have pioneered movements and planted churches, but also those who preach the gospel and serve as denominational superintendents. Brown believes that the ascension leadership gifts in Ephesians 4:11, including the apostle, given to the church by the risen Christ, were intended to continue until the church arrives at maturity in the faith, which clearly is a goal in the process of being accomplished.²⁹ As stated earlier, perhaps it is best to think of the ministry of modern-day apostles in the general sense of apostolic ministry as adumbrated by Brown, rather than in terms that equate them with the Twelve.

Prophet Paradigm

Are there modern-day prophets?

The prophet is the second of the leadership gifts in Ephesians 4:11. The prophet paradigm is founded on the assumption that prophecy is an essential component of Spirit-empowered leadership. This assumption is grounded in the tradition of biblical prophecy and the place of prophecy in the history of Pentecostalism. In the interest of understanding how the prophet paradigm is currently practiced, we will describe the components of the prophet paradigm. Second, we will delineate two forms of prophecy, making correlations to leadership. Third, we will offer a brief formative assessment of the paradigm.

Components of the Prophet Paradigm

The prophet paradigm is based on the biblical assumption that “no prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet’s own interpretation; for prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit” (2 Pet 1:20–21). The prophet paradigm is also informed by the Luke-Acts narrative of Pentecost in Acts 2 and 10 and the Pauline discourse on the charisms of the Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians 12–14, including the charism of prophecy. The prevailing view of Pentecostals is captured by Amos Yong:

From the days of Azusa Street onward, Pentecostals have understood the modern outpouring of the Holy Spirit as a fulfillment of prophecy. If the original day of Pentecost was foretold by Joel, it was only the “early rain” awaiting the abundant showers of a “latter rain” (Joel 2:23). Insofar as modern Pentecostalism was understood to fulfill this prophecy of a “latter rain” revival anticipating the last days, the template for organizing and explaining this later experience has been drawn from the early Christian experiences recorded in the book of Acts.³⁰

Mark Cartledge notes that “a broad definition of prophecy should start with the revelatory experience through which Christians believe that God communicates.”³¹ Cartledge explains that this means that contemporary revelatory experiences, e.g., the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, the discernment of spirits, and the interpretation of tongues, are integral to the practice of prophecy.³² In the prophet paradigm, the prophetic mode of intermediation is epiphanic in the sense that the deity is revealed, not only through the revelatory message, but also through the divine presence that is experienced as an awe-inspiring power that empowers the human recipient to speak the revelatory message.³³

The charismatic manifestation of prophecy is thus an embodiment and expression of the divine presence that is experienced through a sacramental encounter with the Holy Spirit. According to Frank Macchia, professor of theology at Vanguard University, the speaker becomes a human channel of divine grace as the Spirit flows into and through one in an immediate, intimate, and, sometimes, intense fashion. This observation has profound inferential significance in that, not only does the prophetic leader sacramentally participate in divine presence, but he or she also becomes a sacrament, or a sacramental channel of the charism of prophecy through whom the hearers participate, sacramentally, in the divine presence.³⁴ The charismatic spirituality of the prophetic leader mediates a revelatory experience of divine presence in congregational settings, often presaged by visionary experiences, voices within or words coming to mind. A charismatic encounter is often a prerequisite for the manifestation

of a prophetic revelation in the setting of worship, and the sharing of that prophecy serves to enliven a congregation with revelatory edification, encouragement, and consolation.

As Mel Robeck states, prophecy continues to play an important role in the spirituality of contemporary renewal movements.³⁵ However, the world view of the Spirit-empowered Movement not only makes room for the prophetic, but also cherishes the prophetic as a core value in leadership, through which the Holy Spirit uses a human vehicle to speak a divine word. Prophetic revelations may come through visions, dreams, impressions, divine coincidence, or verbal proclamations. The functions of prophecy are to edify, encourage, and comfort; provide correction and warning; and guide and direct ministers and leaders.

Forms of Prophecy

According to Pentecostal sociologist Margaret Poloma, the major forms of prophecy found in contemporary Pentecostalism are two-fold: (1) a democratized charism available to all Spirit-baptized persons; and (2) an ecclesiastical office that is being restored to leaders.³⁶ The prophet paradigm of leadership directly pertains to the latter form, but as we will see the two are interconnected.

Democratized Charism

The form of prophecy as a democratized charism is aptly represented in Roger Stronstad's highly regarded work, *The Prophethood of All Believers*. Stronstad's thesis is that all believers are prophets and the church is meant to be a community of prophets. Jesus, "a prophet in word and deed" (Luke 4:19), passed his prophetic mantle to the church as Elijah did for Elisha.³⁷ At the end of his ministry, Jesus transferred the Spirit to the church, empowering Christians to be mighty in word (prophetic speech) and power (signs and wonders).³⁸ As the prophethood of all believers was a lived reality in the early church, so it is now. Stronstad locates the basis for his view in "Luke's portrait of the people of God of the new age, who, by virtue of having the Holy Spirit poured forth upon them, have become the eschatological community of prophets upon whom Jesus, himself the eschatological prophet, has poured forth the Spirit of prophecy—both for their own generation, for their children's generation, and for each succeeding generation."³⁹

Lee Roy Martin complements Stronstad's perspective by looking to the Old Testament in formulating a broad democratic vision of prophetic speech that also conceives of the church as a community of prophets. Moses had wished that all of God's people would be prophets (Num 11:29), and Joel had promised that the prophetic Spirit would rest upon sons and daughters, old and young, and even upon

servants (Joel 2:28 [3:1]). The gospel narrative portrays Jesus as the prophet par excellence, who then calls his church to be a prophetic community. For Pentecostalism, prophecy emerges not from individuals but from within the body of Christ. Therefore, the leader is one prophet among many.⁴⁰

Ecclesiastical Office

Poloma credits the democratization of the charism of prophecy with contributing to the development of a second form of prophecy.⁴¹ As waves of neo-charismatic renewal were sweeping through the globe in the 1990s, a trend emerged with the appearance of prophetic ministries and publications on the restoration of the ecclesiastical office of the prophet. Leaders of these ministries, such as Cindy Jacobs, Dutch Sheets, Chuck Pierce, Ted Haggard, and Bill Hamon, attested to having received a call to the office of prophet. They not only served as teachers and role models of prophetic ministry, but also insisted along with Peter Wagner that God was restoring the ecclesiastical office of prophet. Further, they claimed that as holders of the gift of prophet, they were divinely tasked with imparting prophetic messages on behalf of the church. Of these claimants, Bill Hamon stands out as a leading proponent. Cindy Jacobs, herself a widely acknowledged prophet, describes Hamon as a pioneer of prophetic leadership.⁴² Hamon sees the office of the prophet as one of the five leadership gifts (Eph 4:11) that Christ Jesus imparted for the building up God's people and maturing them to the full measure of Christ.

There is an interconnection between the leadership office of the prophet, reserved for a select few, and the democratic charism, available to all believers. All Spirit-filled believers have the potential to move in the prophetic realm (Stronstad), but only some are accorded the leadership office of prophet (Hamon). The difference resides in the span of authority and influence. Individuals or groups of believers can edify one another with their prophetic words. Yet a leader who is recognized as a prophet has a wider span of gifting and authority. It is the second form of prophecy that has prevailed in the Global South.

The prophet paradigm flourished in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, yet African soil has proven to be the most fertile for the prophet paradigm. The advent of the office of prophet in African Christianity can be traced back to two points of origin. The first would be the Aldura (praying) churches, which originated outside of a traditional missionary context. An example of a leader of an Aldura movement would be Samuel Bilewu Joseph Oshoffa (1909–1985), the prophet-founder of the Celestial Church of Christ (CCC) in Nigeria in 1947. Oshoffa had visions in which God showed him how to organize a purified church based on a distinct liturgy, organizational structure, and code of rigorous ethical and doctrinal principles.⁴³ The second point of origin would be the churches that remained in the orbit of Western missionaries. An example of a

prophetic leader who traces his heritage to missionaries would be Ezekiel Guti, founder and leader of the Zimbabwe Assemblies of God. Guti established the Highlands Revival Centre, near Harare. His followers regard Guti as an apostle and prophet. He claims over a million adherents in Zimbabwe. Churches affiliated with Guti are found in Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique, and other African countries. Outside of Zimbabwe his movement is known as Forward in Faith.⁴⁴ Both of these wings of Spirit-empowered Christianity in Africa embraced the prophet paradigm of charismatic leadership.

Formative Assessment

Lee Roy Martin observes that in pursuit of the prophetic ideal, Pentecostal preachers have traditionally relied upon the Holy Spirit to supply themselves with inspired messages appropriate to unique occasions. Pentecostal preachers, therefore, believe themselves to be proclaiming an inspired message, a word from the Lord, given for a specific time and place. However, a leader's claim of prophetic inspiration can open the door to abusive practices. The leader who claims divine inspiration may be tempted to assert infallibility and unquestioned authority. For this reason, a strong ecclesiology is required that insists upon accountability of leaders to the community of faith and includes a system for ensuring the theological orthodoxy and ethical integrity of ministers and leaders. No leader should be allowed to operate outside the authority and accountability of the church as a whole.⁴⁵

Healing Evangelist Paradigm

The evangelist is the third of the leadership gifts in Ephesians 4:11. The healing evangelist paradigm is an expression of the Pentecostal conception of the full gospel. Many early Pentecostal leaders coupled healing and evangelism as key components of the full gospel. For Pentecostals evangelism involves more than simply seeking conversions. It entails empowerment with the Holy Spirit as the source for proclaiming Christ's victory over sickness and demonic oppression, i.e., healing. According to Allan Anderson, "The Pentecostal understanding of the full gospel meant that these 'signs and wonders' should accompany the preaching of the Word, and divine healing in particular was an indispensable part of the Pentecostal evangelical methodology."⁴⁶ In this section we will begin by briefly highlighting the major components of the paradigm. Then we will trace the global mediation of the healing evangelist paradigm by means of its two most formative leaders, Oral Roberts and David Yonggi Cho. Finally, we will offer a formative assessment.

Components of the Healing Evangelist Paradigm

In her study of global Pentecostal and Charismatic healing, Candy Gunther Brown finds that “Pentecostalism attracts adherents primarily through its characteristic healing practices.”⁴⁷ Based on case studies of leading healing evangelists in a variety of global contexts, Gunther Brown argues that “divine healing is the single most important category—more important than glossolalia or prosperity—for understanding the global expansion of Pentecostal Christianity.”⁴⁸

Gunther Brown’s viewpoint is confirmed by the findings of the Pew Spirit and Power survey of Pentecostals and Charismatics in ten countries (2006). The data revealed that in the USA 62 percent of Pentecostals claimed to have witnessed or experienced divine healing, compared with 46 percent of Charismatics and 28 percent of other Christians. The same pattern was found in three countries in Latin America, except that the percentage of Pentecostals who had witnessed or experienced divine healing was higher, 77 percent in Brazil, 77 percent in Chile, and 79 percent in Guatemala. In Africa, the survey found that the percentage of Pentecostals who had witnessed or experienced divine healing was 87 percent in Kenya, 79 percent in Nigeria, and 73 percent in South Africa. In Asia the percentages were slightly lower, with 74 percent in India, 72 percent in the Philippines, and 56 percent in South Korea.⁴⁹ This corroborates the finding of the Pew Study that a disproportionately higher percentage of Pentecostals and Charismatics believe in praying for healing and deliverance than their non-Pentecostal/Charismatic Christian counterparts.⁵⁰

Global Mediation of the Healing Evangelist Paradigm

Oral Roberts

Oral Roberts (1918–2009) had a deep influence on Pentecostalism in Africa by means of his healing evangelism campaigns in South Africa, Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria, and his worldwide media ministry of radio, television, and distribution of cassette tapes, books, and magazines. Through these visits and media, Oral Roberts inspired and influenced many leading Pentecostal leaders in Africa, including the late Archbishop Benson Idahosa of Nigeria, a protégé of Oral Roberts. Idahosa and his wife were both recipients of honorary doctorates from Oral Roberts University. It was Roberts’ influence that led the Idahosas to establish All Nations Bible School in Benin City, Nigeria. Many contemporary Pentecostal pastors were trained in that institute, including Archbishop Nicholas Duncan-Williams of Ghana, a Word of Faith preacher and pioneering founder of the Action Chapel International.⁵¹

Oral Roberts visited South Africa in 1955 and it was reported that his meetings attracted up to 125,000 people and reportedly gained more than 20,000 conversions to

Christ. Roberts popularized the idea of the “healing crusade” in Africa. In 1988, Oral Roberts visited West Africa, including Ghana. A report in the publication *West Africa* put the figure attending his crusade in Ghana, held at the sports stadium in the capital Accra, at about 70,000 people.⁵² His media ministry influenced many of the pioneering founders of neo-Pentecostal churches in Africa. Hence, Roberts is credited with the Pentecostal/Charismatic theology of seed faith, which purports that a person’s blessing is directly related to the level of giving in tithes, offerings, and gifts “sown” in the lives and ministries of the anointed of God. Asamoah concludes, “One of the most enduring legacies of Oral Roberts in Africa is his influence on the preaching of prosperity messages, especially the formulaic theologies of sowing and reaping. This legacy, however, leaves more questions than answers regarding the workings of the grace of God. Oral Roberts will remain a historical figure of great importance in the development of world Pentecostalism, including its African versions.”⁵³ Roberts’ international impact was not confined to Africa, but also extended to Asia via his relationship with David Yonggi Cho, pastor of the Yoido Full Gospel Church in Seoul, South Korea.

David Yonggi Cho

Of the Asian healing evangelists, David Yonggi Cho is considered by far the most influential in terms of the productivity of his leadership. His charismatic leadership extended beyond Korea to the worldwide Spirit-empowered Movement. Cho’s full gospel theology clearly falls within the purview of the healing evangelist paradigm. Like other healing evangelists, Cho’s experience of healing set the tone for his ministry of healing. He formulated an indigenous Korean theology that aligned the full gospel of Pentecostalism to the context of the Korean culture. Cho formulated two constructs that have been immensely significant in the development of an indigenized Korean theology. These are the three-fold blessing (salvation, healing, prosperity) and the five-fold gospel (redemption, fullness of the Holy Spirit, blessing, divine healing, second coming). According to Hyeon Sung Bae, the five-fold gospel serves as the theological theory in Cho’s doctrine of the full gospel, whereas the three-fold blessing is the practical application of it.⁵⁴ Cho writes, “The Gospel deals not only with the hope of eternal life and the salvation of spirit and soul but also with prosperity in life and physical health and wellness that would keep the balance between spirituality and reality.”⁵⁵

Cho conceived of the miracle of healing as “a sign of God’s sovereignty in this present life” and “a sign of the coming of the kingdom of God to the earth.” According to Cho’s successor, Sang Yun Lee, this means that the experience of healing can be seen as a means of experiencing the kingdom in the here and now of this life.⁵⁶ Whereas the Christian hope points to a future dimension, it also has a present reality. Cho’s holistic

message tracks with other healing evangelists in that it is based on 3 John 2: “Dear friend, I pray that you may enjoy good health and that all may go well with you, even as your soul is getting along well” (NIV). Some have suggested that Cho derived his teaching on prosperity from Oral Roberts and that the provenance of his theology is found in American Pentecostalism. However, Cho himself insists that his brand of the full gospel is the product of a revelation he received in 1958, giving rise to his preaching and ministry since that time.⁵⁷ Allan Anderson paints a sympathetic picture of Cho, averring that no matter its source, his theology is typically Pentecostal and should be seen as a key factor in the worldwide growth of Pentecostalism. There is little question concerning the influence of Cho as a pacesetter in the dissemination of the healing evangelist paradigm of Spirit-empowered leadership.

Formative Assessment

As Allan Anderson sees it, Cho and likeminded healing evangelists proclaim “a salvation that encompasses all of life’s experiences and afflictions, and they offer an empowerment providing a sense of dignity and a coping mechanism for life.” This message has played well in the Global South, so much so that Anderson states, “The main attraction of Pentecostalism in the Majority World is still the emphasis on healing and deliverance from evil.” Because it is a message that promises solutions for present felt needs, the full gospel of Pentecostal preachers has been readily and widely accepted.⁵⁸ However, in spite of its wide appeal in many sectors of the Spirit-empowered Movement, the holistic dimension of the full gospel has come under a penetrating critique for its materialistic implications, as seen in prosperity theology. Critics asserted that the full gospel preached by Cho and others focuses primarily on material possessions, physical well-being, and success in this life, abundant financial resources, good health, clothes, housing, cars, promotion at work, success in business, as well as other material benefits. Further, critics take umbrage at the claims proffered by many healing evangelists, beginning with Oral Roberts and Cho, that believers have the right to the blessings of health and wealth and that they can obtain these blessings through positive confessions of faith and the “sowing of seeds” through the faithful payments of tithes and offerings.

Sang Yun Lee, a staff pastor at Cho’s church, offers a balanced critique of prosperity theology intended not as a declamation but as a corrective, noting that “Christian faith cannot be reduced to being equivalent with a secularized desire or a selfish wish for a prosperous present life since there is also the kingdom to come with the second advent of Christ.”⁵⁹ He contends, “However, it is necessary to resist the idea that the kingdom of God can be reduced to prosperity theology and what humans need and want.” Lee calls for balance between the kingdom here and now and the kingdom

to come. To maintain this balance, he suggests that Korean Pentecostals ought to take to heart three theological affirmations: (1) The kingdom is not intended solely to fulfill personal desires for a prosperous life; (2) Suffering can be used by God to grow faith in his people; and (3) What is most important is to participate in the eternal now of the kingdom, not to claim the promises of health and prosperity in the present life.⁶⁰ While the judicious critique of Sang Yun Lee is theologically astute, it may fall short of getting to the heart of the problem with prosperity theology.

Pastorpreneur Paradigm

The pastor is the fourth leadership gift of Ephesians 4:11. The pastorpreneur paradigm of Spirit-empowered leadership represents an adaptation of the fourth ascension gift to a new situation. The pastorpreneur combines traditional functions of the pastoral office with entrepreneurial savvy and business acumen, an amalgam that resonates with today's consumer society. The upsurge of megachurches in the 1970s necessitated a rethinking of the shape of pastoral leadership. Previously, the role of the pastor in Pentecostal circles focused on the pastoral care of constituents in a congregation of small to medium size.⁶¹ The organizational complexity of the megachurch called for a shift in thinking about the role of the pastor. The Hartford Institute of Religion Research defines a megachurch as a Protestant church with regular attendance of 2,000 or more adults and children.⁶² Pastors of megachurches came to recognize the pragmatic value of business models of leadership and the acquisition of entrepreneurial skills. Increasingly the success and notoriety of pastors of megachurches set the bar for the aspiration of most pastors to grow their churches.

In this section we will first define the term "pastorpreneur" and explicate its evolution. We will then delineate the components of the pastorpreneur paradigm and present two case studies of notable leaders in the Spirit-empowered Movement who are considered to be pastorpreneurs. Finally, we will offer a formative assessment of this paradigm.

Components of the Pastorpreneur Paradigm

The notion of the pastorpreneur is associated with the explosion of megachurches, which can be classified as growth churches.⁶³ Mark Jennings reasons that this is not surprising, given that growth churches are typically led by powerful entrepreneurial figures. "Pastorpreneur," a portmanteau of "pastor" and "entrepreneur," is a neologism coined by John Jackson.⁶⁴ Jackson defines a pastorpreneur as "a pastoral innovator and creative dreamer who is willing to take great risks in ministry in the hope of great gain for Christ and his kingdom."⁶⁵ He states, "I believe a Spirit-led burst of entrepreneurial

activity will lead the church into greater cultural impact than ever before. Even now, God is calling a church-transformation and church-planting movement into being across the country that demonstrates an entrepreneurial passion to reach the lost in our generation.”⁶⁶ Although not acknowledged by most scholars who investigate the pastorpreneur phenomenon, Jackson’s model is the product of a well-established trend in pastoral leadership.

The pastorpreneur paradigm did not appear out of nowhere. It was an outgrowth of sustained attempts at redefining pastoral leadership. We will review a series of proposals for updating the traditional biblical/theological conception of pastoral leadership with secular, psychological, and sociological theories.⁶⁷ Over recent decades, the focus of publications on pastoral leadership has shifted from tending the flock by means of enabling and equipping leadership to visionary executive leadership as the primary responsibility of the effective, successful pastor. Pastors have turned to resources beyond an ecclesial context, gravitating toward leadership literature inspired by methods derived from the corporate business culture.

In bringing the notion of the pastorpreneur to the discussion on pastoral leadership, John Jackson had no qualms about dependence upon business acumen. He calls for risk-taking entrepreneurial leaders to develop innovative and effective strategies for reaching the culture, beginning with an unmistakable call from God and a bold vision that addresses the needs of those we hope to reach. Jackson states, “Entrepreneurs know they must do this to conduct a profitable business venture, and pastorpreneurs must likewise see the community around them in human terms.”⁶⁸ He recalls a comment made by Bill Hybels of Willow Creek Community Church at a leadership conference: “It is a blight on the church that the average McDonald’s owner knows more about his community than we do.”⁶⁹ Jackson’s point is that methods of ministry must be constantly adapted to be relevant. These methods must be fashioned in a way that is appealing and memorable. For instance, Jackson notes that the church he pastored in Nevada found Rick Warren’s baseball model to be helpful in articulating a strategy for faith development, from which Jackson came up with a three-step plan: Invite—Connect—Serve.⁷⁰ Hence, pastorpreneurs will lead the church to embrace entrepreneurial strategies to reach people without ever compromising the message.⁷¹ Jackson delineates five basic strategies: (1) Grab the community’s attention; (2) Build strategic partnerships; (3) Conduct big faith-building events; (4) Challenge people to find their niche; and (5) Multiply your impact.⁷² Each of these strategies is explained in detail in Jackson’s book, with practical examples and action plans that can be adapted to a local context.

We will turn to a case study to demonstrate the extent to which Jackson’s strategies have been replicated on a global scale in the Spirit-empowered Movement.

Case Study: Southeast Asia

Terrence Chong⁷³ provides an analysis of Spirit-empowered leaders in Southeast Asia in “The State of Pentecostalism in Southeast Asia: Ethnicity, Class and Leadership.” He posits the thesis that charismatic leaders in Pentecostal churches enjoy great deference and sway over large congregations. He identifies two main types of leaders of Pentecostal churches in Southeast Asia: the Joshua Generation Leader and the Redemption Story Leader. The former type describes those who are passing the torch from older to young leaders, akin to Joshua succeeding Moses. The latter type includes those with a dramatic redemptive life-story, involving a background of vice, immorality, serious illness, and/or socio-economic deprivation, who then find Christ and proceed to lead life anew. Chong finds the leadership style of both to be authoritarian, because “the charismatic leader is supposedly entrusted to articulate God’s will and vision for the church.”⁷⁴ Chong provides sketches of both types.

Kong Hee, a Joshua Generation Leader, founded City Harvest Church in Singapore in 1989, starting with twenty members. When Kong Hee returned to Singapore after completing a doctorate in theology in the United States, Harvest Church began to grow rapidly. In 2009 it opened a megachurch facility that cost 34 million dollars. Kong Hee was well connected in the upper echelon of Spirit-empowered leadership, as a board member of Dr. David Yonggi Cho’s Church Growth International (South Korea) and Dr. Luis Bush’s Transform World (Indonesia). Kong Hee was a protegee, friend, and mentee of Phil Pringle, the founder and senior pastor of C3 Church Global (Australia) and advisory pastor to City Harvest Church. Sadly, Kong was implicated in unscrupulous business practices that landed him in jail. His story serves a cautionary tale for leaders with a ministry model based on a linkage between the Pentecostal megachurch and the upwardly mobile middle class.

Philip Mantofa, an Indonesian Redemption Story Leader, had a childhood of illness, suffered ethnic marginalization, and drifted into crime before he heard the voice of Jesus calling out to him at the church altar, where he experienced evil spirits leaving his body. In her research on clashing orientations of emerging trajectories of Javanese religion, Chao En-Chieh describes the context of Mantofa’s rise to prominence.⁷⁵ Mantofa earned a degree in theology from Columbia Bible College, British Columbia, Canada. Since 1998, he has served as lead pastor of Mawar Sharon Church, a growing church of 30,000 in Surabaya, Indonesia. Currently, he is the assistant head of the Gereja Mawar Sharon denomination, which has a network of seventy local churches. Since his youth, he has brought more than 100,000 souls to Christ. His passion is to ignite the fire within the younger generation to become pastors and spiritual leaders all around Asia. According to Chong, such biographies of redemption are powerful cultural models for congregations. They serve as crucial narratives for Pentecostal

conversion among the Indonesian Christian youth where sin and sickness are replaced by salvation, and are thus attractive to young urban youths lost in the market economy or the cosmopolitan jungle.

Whether a “Joshua Generation” or a “Redemption Story” leader, it seems that charismatic leaders in Southeast Asia tend to fit the pastorpreneur paradigm. Power and authority are attributed to the head or senior pastor who is entrusted to articulate God’s will and vision for the church. In this manner, the charismatic leader’s legitimacy is beyond question because it lies with God who has chosen him (usually a male) to shepherd the flock over matters of theological direction, administrative organization, and even business decisions. The charismatic leader will thus not tolerate dissent or alternative views that may undermine or reduce the ethical integrity of his leadership position.

Formative Assessment

Miranda Klaver posits that the kinds of churches that pastorpreneurs plant depend heavily on the leadership of the pastorpreneur. Such churches are “personalized and embodied” in that they become shaped in the image of their leaders.⁷⁶ Hence, pastorpreneurs, ready to risk all to follow the bold call of God, both models for their congregations the risky neoliberal individual and implicitly valorizes risk itself.⁷⁷ It is clear from the leadership literature in recent decades the role of pastor has been recast from shepherding and servanthood into a trope of leading and power wherein the pastor is depicted as the chief executive officer of a congregation. Shawchuck and Heuser state that “the metaphors for leadership most often used by Jesus—Servant and Shepherd—seem not to fit well with current understandings and practice of church leadership.”⁷⁸ They credit Peter F. Drucker, whom they regard as “. . . the master without peer in the fields of leadership and management” for his influence upon their thinking and writing.⁷⁹ Shawchuck and Heuser define leadership as “. . . seeing to it that the right things are done.”⁸⁰ In attempting to shift the pastoral role from one of management to one of leadership, they quote Warren Bennis and Bert Nanus to describe how leadership differs from management: “By focusing the attention on a vision, the leader operates on the emotional and spiritual resources of the organization, on its values, commitment, and aspirations. The manager, by contrast, operates on the physical resources of the organization, on its capital, human skills, raw materials, and technology.”⁸¹

It should be readily apparent that recent leadership studies heavily favor a personalized and directive style of pastoral leadership. The business model prevailed due to the wide influence of more pragmatic approaches to pastoral leadership, which

privileged the importance of a take-charge leader and set the stage for the emergence of the pastorpreneur paradigm.

Teacher/Scholar Paradigm

The teacher/scholar paradigm is adapted from the fifth leadership gift of Ephesians 4:11—teachers. I will explicate the teacher/scholar paradigm by differentiating two distinct approaches to leadership. On the one hand we have the *pragmatic* teacher/scholar and on the other hand the *academic* teacher/scholar. In early Pentecostalism most of the teacher/scholars were of the pragmatic sort, whereas today we are seeing an upsurge in the academic sort of teacher/scholars. The difference between the two relates to the level of formal education.

In this section we will start by exposing the components of the *pragmatic teacher/scholar*. We will discuss the challenges of anti-intellectualism in the discourse of early Pentecostalism, resulting from a distrust of formal academic education and critical scholarship. Then we will shift to the *academic teacher/scholar*, exposing its components and narrating the transition in the Spirit-empowered Movement from rudimentary Bible institutes to accredited universities and seminaries, academic societies, journals, scholars, and publishers. We will conclude with an assessment of the success of academic teacher/scholars in cultivating a research culture in the Spirit-empowered Movement.

Components of the Pragmatic Teacher/Scholar

As stated above, there are two sorts of teacher/scholars in the Spirit-empowered Movement—the pragmatic and the academic. Both sorts of leaders are highly gifted and capable, yet each brings different skill sets and assets to the table. By the close of this section, it is hoped that the reader will understand not only the value of the pragmatic teacher/scholar but also the need for its counterpart, the academic teacher/scholar.

Early Pentecostalism was blessed by a preponderance of leaders who exemplified the pragmatic teacher/scholar paradigm. Early Pentecostal leaders may not have been academic scholars, yet many were scholars nonetheless in a practical sense, in that they were knowledgeable students of the Bible who engaged in creative theological reflection as they probed the meaning of the Pentecostal experience. According to Grant Wacker, “The plain truth is that the pentecostal sky was studded with stars, luminaries of the flesh and blood variety, and their trajectories both illumined and ordered the world around them. Together they defined the movement’s identity more than most imagined.”⁸² Wacker names several such leaders who were the founders and heads of

Pentecostal denominations, including Eudorus N. Bell of the Assemblies of God, Florence Crawford of the Apostolic Faith, G. T. Haywood of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, Joseph H. King of the Pentecostal Holiness Church, Charles H. Mason of the Church of God in Christ, Aimee McPherson of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, and A. J. Tomlinson of the Church of God (Cleveland).⁸³ These leaders were pragmatic teacher/scholars who published treatises laying out the formative doctrines of their confessional communities.

While we can credit the pragmatic teacher/scholars of early Pentecostalism for their creativity in the literary fete of constructing classical Pentecostal doctrine, we also must acknowledge a problem that was endemic in the outlook of pragmatic teacher/scholars toward academic scholarship. The founders of early Pentecostal schools were so deeply affected by belief in the imminent return of Christ that they focused on preparing students as quickly as possible for deployment in local churches and the mission field. They saw no need for formal education and opted for schools that offered basic practical training in Pentecostal beliefs and experience. Often the only faculty member was the founder of the school and the only textbook was the Bible. Hence, these schools were known as Bible institutes. The method of instruction was indoctrination rather than intellectual development. Courses were designed to encourage faith in the power of the Word as opposed to critical analysis.⁸⁴ The merits of early Pentecostal education must be weighed against an inherent limitation, namely, an attitude of anti-intellectualism. Its proponents ensconced this attitude within the mindset of early Pentecostal thought leaders, largely because of a distrust of academic scholarship. Had the pragmatic teacher/scholars acquired a more sanguine attitude toward academic research, they might have been equipped to diagnose the root of the problem of anti-intellectualism and offer a corrective remedy to it.

Many Pentecostal scholars maintain that contemporary Pentecostalism still harbors an ethos of anti-intellectualism. Pentecostal theologian James K. A. Smith writes, "Pentecostal faith and practice is strongly opposed to any intellectualizing of the faith."⁸⁵ Olson takes the view that the allegation of anti-intellectualism is difficult to shed.⁸⁶ Russell Spittler states, "Abiding anti-intellectualism is one of our flaws."⁸⁷ Veli Matti Kärkkäinen argues that Pentecostalism is marked by a strong anti-intellectualism that persists to this day.⁸⁸ Wolfgang Vondey acknowledges, "Continual education and dedication to the life of the mind were simply not practical aspects of Pentecostal worldview and spirituality."⁸⁹ Lee Roy Martin finds this to still be the case, given that Pentecostal ministers are the least educated group within the Christian ministry. Hence, he proposes an approach to theological education that prizes the competencies of a Pentecostal world view and provides a safe place in which to engage the philosophies and questions of modern culture.⁹⁰ Pentecostal anti-intellectualism abated to a certain extent with the development of Pentecostal scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s. The

Society of Pentecostal Studies (SPS) was founded in 1970, coinciding with an increase in research on Pentecostal biblical studies, theology, and church history. Pentecostal scholars must navigate a course between succumbing to the rigorous claims of secular academics on one hand and regressing to the old ethos of Pentecostal anti-intellectualism on the other hand. The best way forward may be a concerted renewal of the Pentecostal distinctive of thinking in the Spirit, which leads to our analysis of the academic teacher/scholar.

Components of the Academic Teacher/Scholar

The second sort of teacher/scholar in the Spirit-empowered Movement is the academic. Above we hypothesized that the problem of anti-intellectualism in Pentecostalism could be remedied by means of critical scholarship. The aim of this section is to test that hypothesis against the outcomes of the emergence of academic scholarship in Pentecostalism. To begin, we will acknowledge a few of the first generation of academic teachers/scholar in the Spirit-empowered Movement and recognize the legacy these leaders left for subsequent teacher/scholars in the Pentecostal academy. Then we will consider newer global developments in the development of a research culture in the Spirit-empowered Movement. By the close of this section, it is hoped that the reader will appreciate the important role played by academic teacher/scholars as counterparts to pragmatic teacher/scholars.

From the 1970s on, there has been a significant increase in the development of Pentecostal teacher/scholars. The first generation of academic scholars in the Spirit-empowered Movement published academic articles and books, and were recognized as leaders who showed the way for others to follow. There are many that could be mentioned, yet the most notable would include Walter Hollenweger (1927–2016), Vinson Synan (1934–2019), Kilian McDonnell (1921–2019), Gordon Fee (1934–2022), Stanley M. Burgess (1937–), and Russell P. Spittler (1931–). The first wave of leading academic teacher/scholars in Pentecostalism laid the groundwork for the development of a research culture in the Spirit-empowered Movement. Subsequent teacher/scholars in the Spirit-empowered Movement have carried on the legacy of the first wave and built institutions that prize the value of a research culture.

A research culture encompasses the behaviors, values, expectations, attitudes, and norms of a given academic community. It influences the importance afforded to the production of research, accessibility to research tools and facilities, and the provision of opportunities to publish that research. It shapes researchers' career paths and determines the way that research is conducted and communicated. Dave Johnson writes, "The school's leadership must be committed to the vision of a research culture and be willing to provide the time and resources necessary to make that dream a reality. . . . Creating a

research culture can be costly.”⁹¹ The leadership of two schools in the Spirit-empowered Movement, Regent University and Oral Roberts University, demonstrates a requisite level of commitment to the development of a research culture by allocating significant resources for the initiation and accreditation of PhD programs. The author of this article is closely acquainted with both of these programs. The Regent program reconceptualizes the study of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements as “Renewal Studies,” launching in 2003 with tracks in theology and church history, then adding biblical studies. The ORU PhD focuses its program design on “Contextual Theology,” aimed at Spirit-empowered theological initiatives in the Global South, launching in 2019 with a single track. Both of these PhD programs are accredited by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) for modular format with a combination of online instruction and short-term residencies.

The process of building a research culture is underway in many areas of the world other than the USA. Academic teacher/scholars are developing graduate programs in the UK, Africa, Latin America, and Asia. Notable examples include Dave Johnson in the Philippines, Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu in Ghana, Opoku Onyinah in Nigeria, Peter White in South Africa, and Wolfgang Vondey in England. The development of a research culture in Spirit-empowered circles is reflected in the appearance of academic journals, the first of which was the *EPTA Bulletin*, which originated in 1985 and was renamed as the *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* in 1996. Next came *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, established in 1979 with the aim of publishing five types of articles, including exegetical, historical, theological, social science, and practical. Other journals appeared afterward, including the *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* in 1992, *Pneuma Review* in 1998, the *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* in 1998, *Australasian Pentecostal Studies* in 1999, *PentecoStudies*, the journal of GloPent, the European Research Network on Global Pentecostalism, in 2002.⁹² *Spiritus: ORU Journal of Theology* relaunched in 2017 after the publication of a single issue in 1985. Asamoah-Gyadu observes, “PentecoStudies offers a distinctly interdisciplinary forum for the study of Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity. Authors from the social sciences, the humanities, cultural studies, religious studies and theology are welcome to submit research on global expressions of Pentecostalism defined in its broadest sense.”⁹³ Since that time a number of digital platforms for dissemination of research on global Pentecostalism by non-Western scholars have appeared in the Global South. Wolfgang Vondey surmises from this that “Pentecostal scholarship seems poised to become a central player in the theological academy.”⁹⁴ This is a significant development when one considers the former “persistent stance of anti-intellectualism, a rejection of higher education and learning, and criticism of the academic world.”⁹⁵

Formative Assessment

While we have credited the pragmatic teacher/scholars of Pentecostalism with significant positive accomplishments, they were also responsible for a number of negative effects, namely, a strain of anti-intellectualism found in attitudes toward education. As Daniel Topf has pointed out, Western Pentecostal missionaries brought these limitations with them when they established institutions of theological education in the mission fields of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.⁹⁶ These limitations hindered the development of a research culture in both the United States and the Majority World. Nevertheless, as of today academic teacher/scholars are making progress in addressing the problem of anti-intellectualism in the global Spirit-empowered Movement. In fact, some would agree with Asamoah-Gyadu that the “virtual rejection of intellectual approaches to life and hostility demonstrated toward theological education at the academic level by Pentecostals in the past have changed dramatically.”⁹⁷ Yet more work remains to be done by today’s teacher/scholars. It is incumbent on those of us who are engaged in educating the next generation of Spirit-empowered leaders to carry forward the work of building a research culture in the Spirit-empowered Movement.

Summative Assessment

Two Pentecostal scholars weighed in on the research on charismatic leadership theory. Roger Heuser and Byron D. Klaus, formerly faculty members of Southern California College (now Vanguard University), an affiliate of the Assemblies of God, published an article entitled “Charismatic Leadership Theory: A Shadow Side Confessed.” While acknowledging that charismatic leaders often succeed in accomplishing extraordinary feats, there is also “a potentially darksome side to leaders who employ leadership charisma.” Pointing to recent research by leadership theorists, Heuser and Klaus contend that a charismatic leader whose interior life is unexamined can “potentially take on a dark side that is eventually projected on to the entire organization.” Such leaders “come to a place where they embrace dispositions and practices that are not from God.”⁹⁸ It is evident to Heuser and Klaus that Pentecostal/Charismatic leaders are at the forefront of a global movement that is authentically liberating, yet “it also yields a potential opportunity for abusive leaders to thrive.” They raise concerns about “non-accountable dynamic leaders who fashion a following with the ‘sound bites’ of God-like utterances in the context of manipulative phenomenology, thus creating an image of powerful ministry leadership.”⁹⁹ Hence, the authors conclude, “The mixed bag of phenomenal growth world-wide and the shadow side of charismatic leadership is a paradox that needs to be acknowledged and subsequently addressed.”¹⁰⁰

Stephen Fogarty, Principal of Alphacrucis College in Australia, adopts the terminology of Conger (1990) in his analysis of the “dark side” of charismatic leadership. Fogarty’s analysis is particularly relevant to our study because he is affiliated with the Spirit-empowered Movement. While acknowledging the strong positive effects that charismatic leaders can have on organizations, Fogarty states that charismatic leaders can also “produce significant negative outcomes” to the detriment of both the leader and the organization. Working from House and Howell’s typology of personalized and socialized charismatic leadership, Fogarty compares the characteristics and consequences of personalized and socialized charismatic leadership, and then offers strategies for minimizing the risks of the dark side of charismatic leadership.

Fogarty observes that personalized charismatic leaders are typically authoritarian and narcissistic. Their goals serve their own interests and they manipulate followers to get their way. Hence, they can be exploitative. They have an extreme need for power. They demand that followers identify with and support their leadership. They display low regard for legitimate channels of authority, and they are likely to pursue courses of action that enhance their power within the organization and attract credit for their achievements.¹⁰¹ In contrast, socialized charismatic leaders govern in an egalitarian manner and serve the interests of the organization and their followers. They seek to empower followers and govern through established channels to accomplish their goals. Their relationship with followers is focused less on the personality of the leader and more on the leader’s message about the organization and its ideals and goals. Followers are able to place constraints on the leader’s influence. They are considered non-exploitative and concerned for their followers’ needs.¹⁰²

Fogarty summarizes the negative consequences of personalized charismatic leaders: they tend to have an undue need for power, negative life themes, and narcissistic tendencies, contributing to a view of the world where personal safety is achieved through domination of others. The negative consequences include unethical and destructive leadership behavior. Unethical charismatic leaders have a desire to produce dependent and compliant followers. The resultant outcomes include the nurture of blind loyalties and the suppression of criticism.¹⁰³ When these behaviors become systemic and repeated, they are classified as destructive.¹⁰⁴

Fogarty offers a strategy for minimizing the risks presented by the dark side of charismatic leadership. The long-term solution would be to cultivate socialized as opposed to personalized charismatic leaders. However, this is not always feasible, given the need for more immediate counter measures. Fogarty draws upon the research of Diane Chandler, professor of leadership studies at Regent University, who finds that leadership failure can be attributed to (a) unresolved childhood needs, (b) personality determinants, (c) moral values and character weakness, and (d) internalized success stressors.¹⁰⁵

In view of Chandler's findings, Fogarty offers three proactive safeguards that are intended to maximize the unique contributions of the charismatic leader while minimizing potential negative consequences. First, Fogarty suggests that an effective *accountability structure* should be put in place at the time of appointment of the leader. Effective accountability measures might include careful oversight by a board of directors, agreement on financial and decision-making parameters, and enactment of a system of checks and balances. Leaders who are held accountable are more likely to consider the consequences of unwise actions and consider the interest of the organization and its members. Second, Fogarty commends a viable *support system* for the leader. This could include personal confidantes, developing mentoring relationships, formal and informal training (including ethics education), and the provision of personal and professional development opportunities. A support system can prevent the demise of an otherwise successful leader due to isolation. Third, Fogarty insists that the *selection process* should include an assessment tool that differentiates between socialized and personalized charismatic leaders. Other assessment tools could measure such leadership orientations as need for power, negative life themes, and narcissism.¹⁰⁶

To conclude, succession of leadership in charismatic circles is often hampered by a lack of insight into the dynamics of power motivation. It would be in the best interest of the organization to transfer leadership to a leader who has a socialized power motivation corresponding to Jesus' teachings on servant leadership (Matt 20:25–28). As Fogarty puts it, "A socialized charismatic leader is likely to create an organizational culture which is egalitarian, non-exploitative, and altruistic."¹⁰⁷

In the five affiliated articles that follow, ORU PhD students will apply the preceding summative assessment to case studies of notable Spirit-empowered leaders in diverse contexts. It is my hope that their work will bring to light both the upsides and downsides of the paradigms of global Spirit-empowered leadership, and, as we pursue corrective measures where fitting, our movement will be better served.



Eric N. Newberg (enewberg@oru.edu) is Senior Professor of Theological Historical Studies, College of Theology and Ministry, Undergrad, Graduate, & PhD Faculty at Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA, and Ordained Minister of Word and Sacrament with the Evangelical Covenant Church.

Notes:

- ¹ Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, edited with an Introduction by Talcott Parsons, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: The Free Press, 1947), 358–59.
- ² R. J. House, “A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership,” in *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*, eds. J. G. Hunt and L. L. Larson (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University, 1977).
- ³ An ideological vision specifies a better future in terms of such values as human rights, peace, freedom, order, equality, and attainment of status and privileges that are claimed to the moral right of followers.
- ⁴ Robert J. House and Jane M. Howell, “Personality and Charismatic Leadership,” *Leadership Quarterly* 3:2 (1992), 83.
- ⁵ J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo, eds., *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1988).
- ⁶ David C. McClelland, *Power: The Inner Experience* (New York: Irvington, 1975); Robert J. House and Jane M. Howell, “Personality and Charismatic Leadership,” *Leadership Quarterly* 3:2 (1992), 81–108.
- ⁷ House and Howell, “Personality and Charismatic Leadership,” 84.
- ⁸ Donald Gee, *The Pentecostal Movement: A Short History and an Interpretation for British Readers* (London: Elim Publishing Co., 1949), 117–18, quoted in Keith Warrington, *Pentecostal Theology: A Theology of Encounter* (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 140.
- ⁹ Warrington, *Pentecostal Theology*, 140.
- ¹⁰ C. Peter Wagner, *Churchquake! How the New Apostolic Reformation Is Shaking Up the Church as We Know It* (Ventura: Regal, 1999), 6.
- ¹¹ C. Peter Wagner, *Dominion: How Kingdom Action Can Change the World* (Grand Rapids: Chosen Books, 2008), 22.
- ¹² David Cannistraci, *The Gift of Apostle: A Biblical Look at Apostleship and How God Is Using It to Bless His Church Today* (Ventura: Regal Books, 1996), 29.
- ¹³ R. Douglas Geivett and Holly Pivec, *A New Apostolic Reformation? A Biblical Response to a Worldwide Movement* (Wooster: Weaver Book Company, 2014), 9.
- ¹⁴ Wagner, *Churchquake!*, 8.
- ¹⁵ C. Peter Wagner, “Year in Review: The New Apostolic Reformation Is Not a Cult,” *Charisma News*, 24 August 2011, n.p., <https://www.charismanews.com/opinion/31851-the-new-apostolic-reformation-is-not-a-cult> (25 September 2022).

- ¹⁶ Irving G. Chetty, "Origin and Development of the 'New Apostolic Reformation' in South Africa: A Neo-Pentecostal Movement or a Post-Pentecostal Phenomenon?" *Alternation* Special Edition 11 (2013), 194.
- ¹⁷ Todd M. Johnson and Ken R. Ross, eds., *Atlas of Global Christianity* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 78–79.
- ¹⁸ Wagner, *Churchquake!*, 198.
- ¹⁹ C. Peter Wagner, *The Church in the Workplace: How God's People Can Transform Society* (Ventura: Regal Books, 2006), 113.
- ²⁰ Wagner, *The Church in the Workplace*, 114.
- ²¹ Trevor O'Reggio, "The Rise of the New Apostolic Reformation and Its Implications for Adventist Eschatology," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 23:2 (2012), 135.
- ²² C. Peter Wagner, *The New Apostolic Churches* (Ventura: Regal Books, 1998), 4–6.
- ²³ Cannistraci, *The Gift of Apostle*, 100–3.
- ²⁴ Cannistraci, *The Gift of Apostle*, 147–49.
- ²⁵ Cannistraci, *The Gift of Apostle*, 163–71.
- ²⁶ Wagner, *Churchquake!*, 75.
- ²⁷ Wagner, *Churchquake!*, 86–89.
- ²⁸ Wagner, *Churchquake!*, 146.
- ²⁹ Michael Brown, "Are There Modern-Day Apostles?" *Ask Dr. Brown Podcast*, 24 May 2016, n.p., <https://askdrbrown.org/library/are-there-modern-day-apostles> (25 September 2022).
- ³⁰ Amos Yong, *Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 83.
- ³¹ Mark Cartledge, *Practical Theology: Charismatic and Empirical Perspectives* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018), 157.
- ³² Cartledge, *Practical Theology: Charismatic and Empirical Perspectives*, 157.
- ³³ Samuel W. Muindi, "The Nature and Significance of Prophecy in Pentecostal-Charismatic Experience: An Empirical-Biblical Study," (PhD thesis, University of Birmingham, 2012), 2.
- ³⁴ Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006), 74–75, 247–56.
- ³⁵ Cecil M. Robeck, "Gift of Prophecy," in *New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements* eds. Stanely M. Burgess and Eduard M. van der Maas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 1010.
- ³⁶ Margaret Poloma, "The Millenarianism of the Pentecostal Movement," in *Christian Millenarianism: From the Early Church to Waco*, ed. Stephen Hunt (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 169.

- ³⁷ Roger Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 46.
- ³⁸ Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 81.
- ³⁹ Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers*, 145.
- ⁴⁰ Lee Roy Martin, "Towards a Biblical Model of Pentecostal Prophetic Preaching," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 37:1 (2016), 8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1456>.
- ⁴¹ Margaret M. Poloma, "The Pentecostal Movement," *Christian Millenarianism*, 6.
- ⁴² Cindy Jacobs, *The Voice of God* (Ventura: Regal Books, 1995), 28.
- ⁴³ Jeffrey D. Carter, "Celestial Church of Christ," *NIDPCM*, 467.
- ⁴⁴ D. Garrard, "Ezekiel H. Guti," *NIDPCM*, 683.
- ⁴⁵ Martin, "Pentecostal Prophetic Preaching," 5.
- ⁴⁶ Allan Anderson, "Pentecostal Approaches to Faith and Healing," *International Review of Missionary Research* 91:363 (2003), 525.
- ⁴⁷ Candy Gunther Brown, ed., "Introduction: Pentecostalism and the Globalization of Illness and Healing," *Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Healing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 8.
- ⁴⁸ Brown, "Introduction," 14.
- ⁴⁹ Pew Research Center, "Spirit and Power: A 10 Country Survey of Pentecostals," *Pew Research Center*, 2006, n.p., <https://www.pewforum.org/2006/10/05/spirit-and-power/> (25 September 2022).
- ⁵⁰ Pew Research Center, "Spirit and Power," 18.
- ⁵¹ J. Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu, "'Your Miracle is on the Way': Oral Roberts and Mediated Pentecostalism in Africa," *Spiritus: ORU Journal of Theology* 3:1 (2018), 7, 14.
- ⁵² Asamoah-Gyadu, "Your Miracle is on the Way," 15.
- ⁵³ Asamoah-Gyadu, "Your Miracle is on the Way," 25.
- ⁵⁴ Hyeon Sung Bae, "Full Gospel Theology and a Korean Pentecostal Identity," in *Asian and Pentecostal: The Charismatic Face of Christianity in Asia*, eds. Allan Andersson and Edmond Tang (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 432–33.
- ⁵⁵ David Yonggi Cho, *The Story of Fivefold Gospel for Modern People* (Seoul: Logos, 1997), 18.
- ⁵⁶ Sang Yun Lee, "The Kingdom of God in Korean Pentecostal Perspective," in *Global Renewal Christianity: Spirit-Empowered Movements, Past, Present and Future, Vol. 1: Asia and Oceania*, eds. Vinson Synan and Amos Yong (Lake Mary, Fla: Charisma House, 2016), 151.
- ⁵⁷ David Yonggi Cho, *Salvation, Health and Prosperity* (Altamonte Springs, Fla: Creation House, 1987), 11–12.

- ⁵⁸ Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 234.
- ⁵⁹ Lee, "The Kingdom of God in Korean Pentecostal Perspective," 153.
- ⁶⁰ Lee, "The Kingdom of God in Korean Pentecostal Perspective," 157.
- ⁶¹ H. Vinson Synan, "Role of the Pastor," in *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, eds. Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1988), 663.
- ⁶² Warren Bird and Scott Thumma, "Megachurch 2020: The Changing Reality in America's Largest Churches," *Hartford Institute for Religion Research*, 2020, 2, http://www.hartfordinstitute.org/megachurch/2020_megachurch_report.pdf (25 September 2022).
- ⁶³ Mark Alan Charles Jennings, "Great Risk for the Kingdom: Pentecostal-Charismatic Growth Churches, Pastorpreneurs, and Neoliberalism," in *Multiculturalism and the Convergence of Faith and Practical Wisdom in Modern Society*, ed. Ana Maria Pascal (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2017), 242.
- ⁶⁴ Jackson holds an MDiv from Fuller Theological Seminary and a PhD in public administration with emphasis in organizational behavior and leadership from the University of California in Santa Barbara. He currently serves as the President of Will Jessup University in Rocklin, California.
- ⁶⁵ John Jackson, *Pastorpreneur: Creative Ideas for Birthing Spiritual Life in Your Community* (Colorado Springs: Biblica Publishing, 2011), 2; see "Pastorpreneur," *Leadership Journal*, Fall 2003, n.p., <http://www.christianitytoday.com/le/2003/fall/7.59.html> for Jackson's initial publication.
- ⁶⁶ Jackson, *Pastorpreneur*, 7.
- ⁶⁷ David Fisher, *The 21st Century Pastor: A Vision Based on the Ministry of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 1.
- ⁶⁸ Jackson, *Pastorpreneur*, 36.
- ⁶⁹ Jackson, *Pastorpreneur*, 36.
- ⁷⁰ Jackson, *Pastorpreneur*, 130.
- ⁷¹ Jackson, *Pastorpreneur*, 44.
- ⁷² Jackson, *Pastorpreneur*, 52–55.
- ⁷³ Chong is Senior Fellow and Coordinator of the Regional Social and Cultural Studies Programme (terencechong@iseas.edu.sg).
- ⁷⁴ Terence Chong, "The State of Pentecostalism in Southeast Asia: Ethnicity, Class and Leadership," *ISEAS Perspective* 53 (25 September 2015), 1. This paper draws from ongoing research at the ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute on Pentecostalism in Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, Surabaya, Jakarta, and Manila.

- ⁷⁵ En-Chieh Chao, *Entangled Pieties: Muslim-Christian Relations and Gendered Sociality in Java, Indonesia* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 31–55.
- ⁷⁶ Miranda Klaver, “Pentecostal Pastorpreneurs and the Global Circulation of Authoritative Aesthetic Styles,” *Culture and Religion: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 16:2 (2015), 149.
- ⁷⁷ Mark Alan Charles Jennings, “Great Risk for the Kingdom: Pentecostal Charismatic Growth Churches, Pastorpreneurs, and Neo-Liberalism,” in *Multiculturalism and the Convergence of Faith and Practical Wisdom in Modern Society*, ed. Ana Maria Pascal (Hershey, PA: IGI Global, 2017), 242–43.
- ⁷⁸ Norman Shawchuck and Roger Heuser, *Leading the Congregation: Caring for Yourself While Serving Others* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 19.
- ⁷⁹ Shawchuck and Heuser, *Leading the Congregation*, 13.
- ⁸⁰ Shawchuck and Heuser, *Leading the Congregation*, 21.
- ⁸¹ Shawchuck and Heuser, *Leading the Congregation*, 22.
- ⁸² Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 144.
- ⁸³ Wacker, *Heaven Below*, 145.
- ⁸⁴ Lewis F. Wilson, “Bible Institutes, Colleges, Universities,” *NIDPCM*, 373–75.
- ⁸⁵ James K. A. Smith, “Scandalizing Theology: A Pentecostal Response to Noll’s *Scandal*,” *Pneuma* 19:2 (1997), 226.
- ⁸⁶ Roger E. Olson, “Pentecostalism’s Dark Side: Troublesome Teachings and Practices,” *Christian Century* 123:5 (2006), 27–30.
- ⁸⁷ Madison Trammel and Rob Moll. “Grading the Movement: Three Leaders Talk Frankly about Pentecostalism: the Good, the Bad, and the Unpredictable,” *Christianity Today* 50:4 (2006), 38. This article is an interview with Derrick Hutchins, Lee Grady, and Russell Spittler.
- ⁸⁸ Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, “Pentecostal Hermeneutics in the Making: On the Way from Fundamentalism to Postmodernism,” *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 18 (1998), 80.
- ⁸⁹ Wolfgang Vondey, *Pentecostalism: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 135.
- ⁹⁰ Martin, “Towards a Biblical Model of Pentecostal Prophetic Preaching,” 7.
- ⁹¹ Dave Johnson, “Creating and Expanding a Research Culture at Pentecostal and Charismatic Seminaries and Graduate Schools in the Majority World,” in *Pentecostal Theological Education in the Majority World: The Graduate and Post-Graduate Level*, eds. Dave Johnson and Rick Wadholm, Jr. (Baguio City: Asia Pacific Theological Seminary Press, 2022), 76.
- ⁹² Glen W. Menzies, “The First Fifty Years of the Society for Pentecostal Studies: A Brief History,” *Pneuma* 42 (2020), 349.

- ⁹³ J. Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu, “‘I Will Not Leave You Orphaned’: Select Impactful Contributions of Global Pentecostalism to World Christianity,” *Pneuma* 42 (2020), 383–84.
- ⁹⁴ Vondey, *Pentecostalism*, 134.
- ⁹⁵ Vondey, *Pentecostalism*, 139.
- ⁹⁶ Daniel Topf, “Pentecostal Theological Education in the Majority World: A Century of Overcoming Obstacles and Gaining New Ground,” in *Pentecostal Theological Education in the Majority World: The Graduate and Post-Graduate Level*, eds. Dave Johnson and Rick Wadholm, Jr. (Baguio City: Asia Pacific Theological Seminary Press, 2022), 120–21.
- ⁹⁷ Asamoah-Gyadu, “‘I Will Not Leave You Orphaned,’” 381.
- ⁹⁸ Roger Heuser and Byron Klaus, “Charismatic Leadership Theory: A Shadow Side Confessed,” *Pneuma* 20:2 (1998), 166.
- ⁹⁹ Heuser and Klaus, “Charismatic Leadership Theory,” 168.
- ¹⁰⁰ Heuser and Klaus, “Charismatic Leadership Theory,” 169.
- ¹⁰¹ Stephen G. Fogarty, “The Dark Side of Charismatic Leadership,” *Australian Pentecostal Studies* 13 (2010), 10.
- ¹⁰² Fogarty, “The Dark Side of Charismatic Leadership,” 10.
- ¹⁰³ Fogarty, “The Dark Side of Charismatic Leadership,” 12.
- ¹⁰⁴ Fogarty, “The Dark Side of Charismatic Leadership,” 13.
- ¹⁰⁵ Diane J. Chandler, “The Perfect Storm of Leaders’ Unethical Behavior: A Conceptual Framework,” *International Journal of Leadership Studies* 5:1 (2009), 74.
- ¹⁰⁶ Fogarty, “The Dark Side of Charismatic Leadership,” 15–16.
- ¹⁰⁷ Fogarty, “The Dark Side of Charismatic Leadership,” 16.