



# Istanbul Management Journal

RESEARCH ARTICLE / ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

## Mary Parker Follett's Footprints in the Management Principles of Today and the Future

Nurcan Akbaş<sup>1</sup> , Bahar Taner<sup>2</sup> 

### Abstract

Mary Parker Follett's management philosophy and principles at the beginning of the 20th century exhibit the characteristic of management models of the past, present and future, and they appear to be linked to current theories of management. The aim of this research is to define the connection between Mary Parker Follett's management philosophy and past, present and expected future management approaches and to make a contribution to the science of management in this sense. For this purpose, this study seeks to investigate the relationship between, and similarities of, Follett's management principles of those of matriarchal societies as the first social structures in ancient times. The study also seeks to evaluate the basic concepts of management theories which have emerged since the industrial revolution. A narrative approach was applied in this study. The research findings indicate that Mary Parker Follett's management philosophy serves as a link between the management practices of the past, present and future and presents solutions to today's organizational, industrial, societal and international management problems. Through adopting Follett's management philosophy, humanity might be able to open the doors to a world with more freedom, peace, justice, equality and sharing. This in turn might give way to more happiness, more peacefulness, and high value of creativity in society.

### Keywords

M. P. Follett, Management, Power, Conflict, Integration, Ethics

Jel Codes: M19

**1 Corresponding author:** Nurcan Akbaş, (Dr.), Mersin Üniversitesi, S.B.E. İşletme A.B.D., Mersin, Türkiye, email: nakbas07@mersin.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-6871-6449

**2 Bahar Taner, (Prof. Dr.),** Toros Üniversitesi, Güzel Sanatlar, Tas. ve Mimarlık Fak., Gastronomi ve Mutfak Sanatları, Mersin, Türkiye, email: bahar.taner@toros.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-4169-6716

**To cite this article:** Akbas, N., & Taner, B. (2022). Mary Parker Follett's footprints in the management principles of today and the future. *Istanbul Management Journal*, 93, 89-123. <http://doi.org/10.26650/imj.2022.93.005>



*The activity of co-creating is  
the core of democracy,  
the essence of citizenship,  
the condition of world-citizenship.*

*Birlikte yaratma etkinliđi  
demokrasinin temeli,  
vatandaşlıđın özü, dünya  
vatandaşlıđının koşuludur.*

## **Introduction**

Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933) was a management scientist who made important contributions to the democratic and participatory management of organizations, societies and countries. In Follett's time the classical management school (1880-1930) and the neoclassical management school (1930-1960) emerged. The three approaches within the classical management school were the scientific management approach based on more effective and efficient exploitation of labour and machines by scientific perspective, the process management approach formed on the notions of envisagement of a good organization, and the bureaucratic management approach based on organizational design and structure. The neoclassical management school is essentially a human relations approach based on the importance of human behavior and the human element at work.

The scientific management approach, also called Taylorism, was an important part of the classical management movement. Taylorism and Fayolism movements went through a process that complemented each other in 1925 and took their place in the management field. Elton Mayo, who started the human-focused management movement with Hawthorne research, produced a study on the facts underlying employee behavior (Berber, 2013).

A review of the literature reveals the widespread view that Follett put forward a management philosophy far beyond the management views that were common in her time and that she formed the basis of both today's management principles and those of the future (Newman & Guy, 1998). Although Follett was confronted with a classical management approach that identifies humans with machines in a masculine-dominated society and advocates a rational, ideal and effective structure that does not change according to individuals in organizations (Koçel, 2010, p. 226), her views point to the present and the future, and she still leads the way (Héon, Damart & Nelson, 2017, p. 1).

The patriarchal management approach which carries the features of a male dominant society came into existence in 3500 BC and extends from written history to the present. It excludes women from a society which is dominated by men (Berkday, 2010, p. 19). In patriarchal management, there is a history of management written by men, in favour of men and about men, and these masculine discourses are still valid today (Ađlargöz, 2018, p. 12).

Metcalf and Urwick state that Follett defines the basic problems of society and uses a creative and strong explanation in her works while adapting social sciences to

society, government, sectoral management and organizations with a keen foresight and dedication to human nature. Although Follett wasn't an active businesswoman in the business world, Metcalf and Urwick note that her clear and guiding ideas offer peerless improvements and valuable approaches to human relations issues and organizations. The many industry leaders she came into contact with made the following comments about her: *"Follett's concepts are ahead of her time and still ahead of current management thinking, are a goldmine for anyone who has problems establishing and maintaining cooperation in the running of an organization, and contain extraordinarily simple and clear statements"* (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942).

Although she lived at the beginning of the twentieth century, it is stated by leading management theorists that Follett unveiled today's contradictions and dilemmas for managers, made recommendations for their solution, and played a leading role in management. We can see this in the explanations of Drucker, Graham and Kanter. Management approaches after Follett confirm that Follett was a *"management phenomenon"* (Drucker, 1995, p. 1). If there had been studies that had taken into account her ideas from the beginning to the present, the process of formation of management movements could have been faster (Graham, 1995). Today, when we face various management dilemmas, Kanter proposes Follett's philosophy for changing management and creating the ideal organizations of the future (1995).

For example, according to Follett's proposed state law, an invisible leader is one who activates the basic concepts of power, integration and coordination together, and enables followers to join the leadership by facilitating their participation in the group (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 288; Follett, 1949;). Follett introduced the concept of the invisible leader who frees subordinates to make decisions, implement and control, thus becoming the person consulted. According to Follett, anyone who has the necessary competencies for the current conditions can be a leader (McLarney & Rhyno 1999: 294).

For Metcalf and Urwick, the management philosophy that Mary Parker Follett built is impressive and straightforward. It is remarkable that this management philosophy has a fundamental importance and value in solving national and international problems of the past, present and future, and that it contains enormous depth. According to Follett's philosophy, in a lasting society a continuously productive industrial organization must be based on the motivation of the individual and the group. Follett fought for the organization and governance of groups, industries, states and nations with honesty, equality and justice. She also fought for the realization of the democratic way of life and the integration of different perspectives. According to Follett, differences should be integrated and unity should be achieved. For this, the individual should be integrated, mobilized and directed both with his/her group and society (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942). In this respect, it is seen that the main duty and responsibility given to managers is to

strengthen, motivate and integrate individuals, groups and stakeholders on the basis of democracy, equality, justice and cooperation.

In Follett's philosophy, it is very important to identify and satisfy the desires and wishes that motivate the individual and the group; management should embrace the differences. Follett associates the science of management with the practices of managers who try to find solutions to problems, and gives social messages for the acceptance of differences. "*We must face life as it is and understand that differences are its most essential feature. ... Fear of differences is actually fear of life itself*" (Follett, 1924, p. 232).

As can be seen from the explanations made so far, as early as the beginning of the 20th century Mary Parker Follett had described the management of today and even of the future. Follett's explanations are far beyond the scientific management, process management, bureaucratic management, and human relations approaches that were popular during her lifetime and which continued after her death. It might also be thought that Follett's management philosophy based on equality, justice and participation bears similarities with the management structure of female-dominated matriarchal societies based on maternal lineage dating back to the prehistoric era or to a period prior to written history.

There are several articles claiming that Follett's philosophy explains the past and the future and these have focused on a certain topic rather than on a general point of view that follows Follett's traces in management approaches from the past to the present. In general, it is stated in the studies that Follett offers and guides a perspective far ahead of her time, but these perspectives are limited in content by focusing on a single approach. For example, this limitation is seen in important studies that relate Follett's philosophy with power, freedom and authority (Melé, D., & Rosanas, 2003), stakeholder theory (Schilling, 2000), leadership approach (Monin & Bathurst, 2008; Gibson & Deem, 2016), organizational behavior (Parker, 1984), visionary leadership and strategic management (McLarney & Rhyno, 1999), and empowerment (Eylon, 1998).

### **Purpose, Data and Method**

The following issues are noteworthy in terms of management literature about Mary Parker Follett:

1. Revealing today's contradictions and dilemmas for managers and making recommendations for their solution,
2. Limited studies that focus on her ideas from the time in which she lived until today,

3. Various opinions about the rate of formation of management approaches being adversely affected because their ideas and explanations are not sufficiently taken into account.

It is possible that by examining Follett's management philosophy and tracing her footprints in the past, current management approaches might make significant contributions to those of the future. The aim of this research is to reveal the relationships between approaches and to contribute to the science of management by tracing Mary Parker Follett's management approach within past, present and future management approaches. In the research, a narrative approach was adopted for three chronological processes in management: before Follett, the period in which Follett lived, and after Follett. The narrative plot is below:

- Follett's management approach
- The traces and relation of the management approach of matriarchal societies in Mary Parker Follett's philosophy
- Traces of Follett's philosophy in later management approaches
- Follett's recommendations for management in the future.

The secondary information sources that constitute the data sources of the research are the main works prepared by Follett as well as the books, articles, other works and web resources of various authors about Follett.

In the analysis process of the research, the traces of Follett's management approach in past and present management approaches as well as their relations with expected management approaches in the future were explained, and judgements were made on the basis of the comparative tables. Several factors were taken into account in the selection of the chronological processes before and after Follett in the narrative plan as shown in the following section.

For an understanding of past management, matriarchal management practices dominated by women in ancient times were preferred. The factors that play a role in this preference are that management practices are as old as social life (Baransel, 1993, p. 5), that matriarchal societies are the first hierarchical and naturally organized form of social management (Fişek, 2015, pp. 50-51), that matriarchal societies are as old as social life (Baransel, 1993, p. 5), and that their values of freedom, equality, fraternity, sharing and moral values (Engels, 1978; Morgan, 1969 II) are similar to the management philosophy of Follett (Follett, 1918; 1924; Metcalf & Urwick, 1942). Follett (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942) developed a universal perspective by combining her interest in religion, music, painting, nature, history and travel with management principles. From

this perspective, together with industry, state and nation management, she offers a socio-economic-political order in which every individual can have the opportunity to use the life, growth and development capacity given to her/him by God to the full.

Follett (1868–1933) explained her management philosophy in the 19th and 20th centuries. Matriarchal societies were artificially destroyed in about 3000 BC and after that societies were ruled by heroic kings and commanders who fought and conquered for centuries. Administration was viewed as an apprenticeship based on intuition and experience and as an art that could be learned, but not as a science (Baransel, 1993:105). It may be stated that these management practices, which are based on social classes, slavery and male domination and created in an artificial way, do not have anything in common with Follett's libertarian and egalitarian management philosophy.

Later with the invention of the steam engine, the industrial development (1760-1840), which was the most important landmark in the progress of management science, revealed the need for management science and management theories (Baransel, 1993:105). On this basis, this study examines the connection between the management theories from the industrial revolution to the present and Follett's management philosophy.

Searching for the traces of Follett in the huge body of knowledge that has emerged since the industrial revolution may be too wide to fit into the content of a single article. For this reason, a general point of view was developed on the basis of the comparative tables by comparing the characteristics and key concepts of management approaches with the definitions in Follett's philosophy.

The research is restricted to the data and comments provided by the literature. In the narrative plan which follows here Follett's management philosophy is first introduced.

### **Mary Parker Follett and Her Management Philosophy**

Mary Parker Follett's ideas and work should not be considered under one school of thought as they are applicable to different fields. In Follett's view of philosophy, we can see an understanding of social work, activism, laborers, politics and management. The contribution from various disciplines such as psychology, social sciences, politics, economics, biology, mathematics, physics, chemistry, philosophy and art can easily be seen in her studies (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942). She does not discriminate between public and private sector management in her works. Follett believes that the essence of good management lies in the integration of individuals and groups. Follett's contribution to management science is of great importance, especially in terms of conflict resolution and group processes.

Mary Parker Follett was born in 1868 in Boston, Massachusetts. She received her primary education at Thayer Academy, then at Radcliff College, also called Harvard's

women's extension, where she studied economics, politics, and philosophy. Follett dedicated her life to researching the psychological aspects of individual behavior and the foundations of public administration, political science, business and scientific management, and psychology. Follett's original, penetrating analyses and ideas about leadership, power and authority, conflict and group behavior form the basis of today's organizational management (Tonn, 2003:1). Follett's most important works are given below:

- The Speaker of the House of Representatives (1896)
- The New State: Group Organization – The Solution of Popular Government (1918)
- Community is a Process (Article, 1919)
- Haldane Introduction to the New State (1923)
- Creative Experience (1924)
- The Law of the Situation (extract from The Giving of Orders, 1925)
- The Teacher-Student Relation (Speech, 1928)
- Freedom and Coordination (Book, Collection of Lectures, 1949).

Follett's management philosophy can be introduced by means of the following titles: integration; giving orders; power with authority and control; planning; coordination and leadership.

### ***Conflict in Organizations***

Organizations are a system of groups of members working together for mutual targets. Therefore, when two or more persons work together, it is natural for conflict to arise. Conflicts can hinder the growth of the organization or lead to organizational inefficiency. According to Follett (1918, 1924), the organization is a social system where conflicts may arise, but conflicts can have a constructive result even if they are problematic.

Follett (1924: 301) sees conflict not as a wasteful explosion of discord but as a process where differences enrich the whole. She defines it as "Reconstructive Conflict". *"One of the greatest values of conflicts is their explanatory nature, revealing real problems and the possibility of reconciliation. Conflicts between employers and employees are often an opportunity to balance rather than disrupt the balance. While our inappropriate ethical statements prevent clear thinking, we should not blame chemical conflicts that provide mutual harmony and influence. If we see social conflicts as a fact of life, we can make great strides in our world of thought. Vital movement takes place through the release of energy, which psychology calls integration. Social conflicts are constructive*

*in normal processes such as the release of energy and the same movement taking itself to a higher level”.*

Follett advocates liberation, cooperation, creativity, integration, the avoidance of fighting and the acceptance of differences. She defines three methods in organizational conflicts: domination, reconciliation and integration (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 2).

1) Dominance: A situation in which one side gains superiority over the other. Although it may seem like an easy way to deal with conflict, this method is not sustainable as the person who loses the argument will be divested of and denied her/his desires and may enter into conflict with others. Domination may be a momentary solution, but eventually it may lead to deadlock and even confrontation.

2) Compromise: In this method, the groups partially give up on their desires, but this is an unsatisfactory situation. Compromise is temporary and insufficient. When compromises are reached in a conflict, a situation may arise where one can win or lose. Through reconciliation, although the conflict may seem resolved, it creates pressure on individuals, the suppressed individual gives up his/her desire to solve the conflict, and worse outcomes may occur.

3) Integration: This is a positive method in which the wishes of the groups are integrated. In this method, the groups are not expected to sacrifice their desires. Conflict is resolved by uniting individuals rather than crushing them. This method has advantages that enable the emergence of new values. However, integration requires high intelligence and leadership ability with an adequate knowledge base to deal with conflicts. In integration, the problem is solved fundamentally and permanently, it also saves time and resources since the conflict will not arise again. Follett (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942:5) argues that the desire of individuals to solve the problem through integration is encouraging. On the other hand, Follett (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942: 8) states that integration is not feasible in every instance, that integration will not occur when two men want to marry the same woman, and that integration generally does not happen when both children want the old family house:

*“There are many such cases, some minor, some very serious. I’m not expressing that there is no calamity in life. All I’m expressing is that if we could take advantage of it, we could often integrate rather than compromise”.*

### ***Fundamentals of Integration***

Follett describes three key steps to achieve integration as given below:

1) According to Follett (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942:8), the first step is to reveal differences instead of suppressing them. *“We cannot hope for integration unless we*



*know what our differences are*". What is needed is therefore to uncover, identify and understand the real issues involved in a conflict.

2) The second step is to dismember the unit, that is, considering the requests of the groups which have entered into conflict and breaking them down into its components. This requires examining what the symbols and the language used mean. According to Follett, the language used is symbolic and for that reason it is very important to know what is symbolized. Integration does not only involve the disintegration of the whole, occasionally it may be imperative to carry out the converse. It is important to articulate the real demand, obscured by various petty claims or ineffective presentations.

3) The third step is conflict anticipation. This is not the same as conflict avoidance; it is differential response or reply. For Follett, integration is like a game of chess. The expectation of response or reply alone is not enough, preparation is needed for making a response, and certain attitudes should be formed in individuals.

Under normal circumstances, people adapt to dominance behavior according to their character and wants. For this reason, it is not easy to adopt the idea of integration. Effective integration usually requires high intelligence, keen perception, discernment, and creativity.

Follett describes an integrated life with progressive ethics and loyalty in her work "New State". According to Follett (1918:52-57), far from self-interest, which is a goal that comes out in the germinating social process, we gain a concept of commitment to goals and rights. She states that, unlike the old ethical teachings, we have developed an ethical system which includes the three concepts of right, conscience and task. This ethical system is about creating the truth rather than following the truth, there is no private conscience, the duty of the person is not for one person alone but for the whole. Integration emerges from an integrated life; a progressive ethic teaches not only loyalty to task but also loyalty to the kind of life that develops the task. In the new ethical system, there are integrated individuals performing duties to benefit the whole; *"Integrated individuals reveal an ethical idea that acts as a whole, develops integrated ideas, works for integrated ideals; the new consciousness is a whole"*.

### ***Giving Orders***

The issuance of orders is based on the 'Law of Situation', not on individual authority (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 32-40). The way an order is given has an impact on how the task is performed. Follett explains the four basic principles of giving orders:

1) Conscious Attitude: Realizing the principles that make it possible to take action on any issue.

- 2) Responsible Attitude: Deciding which of the principles should be acted upon.
- 3) Experimental Attitude: Polling and monitoring applications.
- 4) Combine the results.

In short, giving orders based on conscious attitude is all about the acceptance of principles; giving orders based on responsible attitude has to do with deciding which principles should be acted on; giving orders based on experimental attitude is about finding out and analyzing success and failure. If the existing methods are found to be insufficient, the combined results should be looked at to understand to what extent and in what way the methods of giving orders may need to change.

Follett states that the general expectation is for orders to be obeyed without question and that the giving of orders is in fact quite troublesome. Moreover, some habit patterns and mental attitudes affect the giving of orders. *“The past life, our basic education, our experiences, our emotions, our beliefs, our prejudices, and every desire we have; formed certain habits of mind that psychologists call habit patterns, action patterns, activating clusters. You don’t change people unless you change their habits”* (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 25).

Follett recommends three steps in bringing about change:

- 1) Formation of certain attitudes.
- 2) The release of these attitudes.
- 3) Increasing the response revealed in practice.

The employer must find ways to enable employees to form the habit of accepting orders. Four important steps to establish this habit are: i) Employees should be induced to see that a new method is necessary; ii) Office rules should be changed to enable employees to adopt the new method; iii) The person who is an example for others should be persuaded beforehand and others should be encouraged to follow the new method, and iv) Concentration should be given to the new method. For Follett, these steps ensure that both the acceptance of orders and the way orders are given are of equal importance.

Harassment, bullying and oppressive behavior from authorized employees is the main reason for numerous conflicts. Language used regardless of employees’ feelings and dignity will lead to strikes and troubled industrial relations. The more a person patronizes, the more opposition to the boss develops (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 31).

To avoid such situations, Follett (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 32) proposes *“to keep orders separate from persons, to associate entirely concerned persons in a case study*

*and to abide by it” and (1924: 122), “The two processes always go together in the social environment: the adaptation of human to human and adaptation of human to situation” reminds the law of the situation through its explanation. “One individual should not give orders to the other, both should agree to take orders from the situation. If orders are only a part of situation based, there is no problem for giving orders and accepting orders, both parts accept the orders given on situation based; employers accept orders from situation based and employees accept orders from situation based” (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942 33).*

### ***Power, Authority and Control***

According to Follett (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 76), power is interpreted as “the capacity for duty, a causal agent to initiate change”. Follett clarified the concept of power by distinguishing between “*dominant power*” and “*power with*”. “*Dominant power*” means coercion whereas “*power with*” expresses common power. Follett (1924: xiii) states that transfer of power is the way of progress. Real power can be increased, it will slip away from the ruthless hand that holds it and real power is not forced but joint control. While forced power is the damnation of the cosmos, common power is the enrichment and advancement of the human spirit. The power that is created together is a self-improving phenomenon that supports better understanding, reduces friction and conflict, and encourages collaborative action and participatory decision making.

Follett (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 84) states that avoidance of dominant power is unlikely, but its effect can be reduced. She suggests three ways in which this can happen: “*i) integration, ii) accepting that everyone must abide by the law of the situation, and iii) making the work more and more functional*”.

For Follett, authority is vested power, and the person in authority has the right to develop and use authority. Follett states that authority does not come from ownership or legitimate position in an organization, it belongs to the business and stays there (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 130). Therefore, authority comes from function, not position; it cannot be delegated, and a delegated authority is defined as an outdated expression. Responsibility also comes from function and situation. Rather than the question of “responsible to whom”, Follett raises the question of “responsible for what?”. She believes in the pluralist concept of responsibility or cumulative responsibility, and rejects responsibility for consequences, seeing it as an illusion (1942:142).

Like authority and responsibility, control is an essential element in achieving organizational goals. Unlike other classical thinkers, Follett endorses “*situational control rather than individual control*” and “*linkage control rather than imposition control of the controller*” and proposes that control in the organization should be pluralistic and cumulative (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942:289). Situation control is control

of the situation rather than the individual meaning that the chairman and the principals are both subject to an impersonal control; the principals do not receive an arbitrary order from the upper level, but examine both the analysis and comments depending on the situation. Follett talks about situation control and collective control, and states that in the best managed businesses the chief executive's authority is not an arbitrary authority imposed from above, but a combination of many authorities at different points in the corporation. In relation to this, cumulative control is not result control or superior control, but the gathering of all responsibility, making several person and group liabilities further influential by creating a system of cross-relationships.

Pluralism being "co-containing" or "complementary", domination belongs to the group, and as groups combine to form another group, they evolve into more inclusive group domination (Follett, 1918: 300). One of the main guidelines of organizing is a pluralistic responsibility. Authority and responsibility depend on the functions, not the hierarchy of titles, and this concept should be applied to executives as well as to subordinates. Functional authority is not that one manager is above the other, but that each person has a separate task, not because of the hierarchical position of individuals in management, but on account of of the job they do. Functional authority is the type of authority applied to workers and managers' relations with workers (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942: 157).

### ***Planning and Coordination***

According to Follett (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 295), coordination is the harmonious ordering of parts. Planning is the process for self-adjustment and self-coordination of various interests, and the process of self-adjustment is possible only through coordination. Follett's coordination principles are as follows:

1) Coordination in the Early Stages: Coordination should start from the very infancy of the workflow. It should involve the lower-level organization in policy formulation rather than policy implementation. When this is put into practice in the early stages, the organization will benefit from increased motivation and morale. This principle completely invalidates the concept of central planning.

2) Coordination with Direct Control: According to this principle, the responsible person in the organization will communicate directly with the subordinates regardless of his/her post and hierarchical position. Follett believes that horizontal communication is as major as the vertical chain of command.

3) Coordination with the Interrelation of All Factors in a Situation: The basic goal of coordination is to bring the various activities, skills, attitudes and efforts of the employees of the establishment into a harmonious whole. Actions and processes in

the organization are interconnected. In this context, Follett refers to an institution as a system of interconnected parts.

4) Coordination as an Ongoing Process: Coordination is not a sole activity, it is a constant procedure in which activity is planned and future plans are made from the activities. Follett highlights the need for a permanent machine to solve problems rationally.

### *Leadership*

According to Follett, leadership is a necessary management skill. Follett's leadership styles are functional, not authoritarian. The leader is not the head of the department, but "the person who can deal with all sides of a situation, see it in relation to certain goals and policies, see it evolve into the next situation, understand how to move from one situation to another". In addition, a leader is someone who "energizes his/her group, knows how to encourage initiative, knows how to leverage the capacity of his/her followers", and can "show that giving orders is an integral part of the situation" (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 268).

Follett (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 286) explains that the three critical functions of the leader are coordination, definition of purpose, and expectation. She states that one may not be born a leader, but leaders emerge through appropriate education and training in organization and management. A leader not only influences his/her group but is also influenced by the group. Follett describes this reciprocal relationship as a "cyclical response". Follett describes the following three types of leadership:

- i) Position leadership: Leader has the position of legitimate authority.
- ii) Personality leadership: Leader has strong personal qualities.
- iii) Functional leadership: Leader has both a legitimate position of authority and strong personal qualities.

Follett argues that only people with functional knowledge can lead in modern organizations, not those who have legitimate authority or strong personal qualities. Follett relates leadership to the law of situation by saying, "The person who has the knowledge required by a particular situation becomes the leader of the moment, other conditions being equal, in the best-managed business". The success of any organization depends on "being flexible enough to allow functional leadership to fully operate and to allow those with the knowledge and technique to control the situation" (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942:287). The power of leadership is the power of integration. This is the power that creates society (Follett, 1918: 227).

The basic dynamics that Follett emphasized in her management philosophy are exhibited in Figure 1 below.



*Figure 1: Basic Dynamics in Follett's Management Philosophy*

When the basic dynamics of Mary Parker Follett's management philosophy are evaluated, democracy, socialism, collective consciousness, cooperation, participation, sharing, ethics, morality, equality and harmony come to the fore. In the following section, the management approach of matriarchal societies in ancient times is examined and compared with Follett's management philosophy.

### **Management Approach of Ancient Matriarchal Societies Before Follet**

The first period of human history was organized in a natural hierarchy. Those were matriarchal (<http://www.tdk.gov.tr/index>) societies based on the domination of women. Researchers J. J. Bachofen, L. H. Morgan and F. Engels explain that women in matriarchal societies have higher social status than men, dominate social, economic, political and religious life, and are the mother goddess who represent the continuation of the lineage. This type of management order can be seen in the Paleolithic period (between 2.5 million and 10,000 BC), in which the biological, social structure and division of labor of humanity were shaped. It is also seen in the Mesolithic period (between 12,000 and 6,000 BC) in which the matriarchal social order was formed and in the Early Neolithic period (between 6,000 and 3,000 BC) in which the matriarchal social order developed further. Finally it is seen throughout the period of written history, which started with cuneiform writing in the 3,000s BC until it was ruined by the patriarchal social structures under male domination.

The feature that sets matriarchal societies apart from other societies is that that they were cultures of truthfulness and honesty in which women served as conscientious

guardians of mystery, justice and peace. In this respect, matriarchy is the sign of cultural progress, the source and guarantee of benefit, a necessary period in the progress of humanity, and the fulfillment of a natural law that governs individuals and community (Bachofen, 1967: 91). The elements of this natural law are universal brotherhood, love, freedom, equality, fidelity, compassion, peace, politeness and harmony. Freedom, equality and fraternity are the values of the motherhood principle. These values form the basis of compassion for all people in a community without social boundaries, so that female-dominated managements promote peace and harmony for communities (Bachofen: 1861:5).

In female-dominated matriarchal societies there is no individual property, no monogamous family, and no state. An egalitarian understanding, collective production and sharing principles are dominant and individuals receive an equal share from production. A woman is a guide and a principal, she is respected by everyone in the community, she maintains peace, manages religious ceremonies alone, judges men who do not perform their duty and those who do evil to other individuals, and gives severe punishments (Bebel, 1910:24-25). Although women assume these roles in community, they represent democracy and justice, not oppression and authority.

Bachofen states that matriarchy does not precede culture, it is a cultural stage, it expresses agriculture and the regular tillage of the land (1967: 134). In matriarchal societies, cultures are hierarchical because women, and especially mothers, have a deep intuitive sense of God. This feeling, combined with their love of children, put women in a position above men in early human history. Because of their natural predisposition to the supernatural, divine, and miraculous, women have had the greatest influence on the development of civilization throughout the ages. Equipped with religious authority, women have overcome the physical rudeness of men, and by opposing violence with peace, hatred with love, and bloody hostility with reconciliation, they led the lawless and savage peoples of ancient times toward a culture with gentler tones. It is evident that women ruled this high culture as agents of divine will. The connection between women and religion can be seen in their magical power to reconcile warring parties and pacify the fiercest anger among men in ancient communities. So the dominance of women was indisputable as it represented the divine law in antiquity (Bachofen, 1861:6).

As mentioned above, women are strict guardians of mysteries, justice and peace. They are associated with the first emergence of civilization and orderly existence and they have a natural ability to understand the secrets of life. Therefore, they initially led the human race from barbarism to civilization and formed the first concepts of natural forces, confronting the horrors of death and the expectation of life after death. Feminine domination combined with fertile motherhood became the source of culture and built the foundations of the history of humanity based on a natural law that governs both

society and individuals. In this sense, the materialistic laws of nature were created and governed by female dominance. In matriarchal societies, people feel the natural unity of life and the harmony of the universe (Bachofen, 1861:7).

Matriarchal management was ruined by male domination in 3000 BC and transition to patriarchal management took place. After this, the history of humanity met the last part of antiquity, first age, medieval age, new age and recent age. At the beginning of written history, the first written legal regulations were made in the Sumerian period (2,375 BC). With the effects of the Crusades and the development of commercial activities, the definition of leadership based on organizational pressure was put forward by Machiavelli (1469-1527). After this, A. Smith's views on the division of labor, control and efficiency in his work "The Wealth of Nations" (1776) had some effect on the evolution of management thought. The industrial revolution (1760-1840), which started after the invention of the steam engine, and its social effects had a revolutionary effect on the emergence of management science (Baransel, 1993).

The following sections of this paper deal with the similarities of Follett's philosophy with matriarchal societies in ancient times and the relationship between scientific management theories and Follett's philosophy.

### **Relationship between the Management Approach of Matriarchal Societies and the Philosophy of Mary Parker Follett**

Follett's views on integration, 'power with', state law, coordination, and leadership that she proposed for management at the level of states, nations, organizations, and groups have traces in, and similarities with, matriarchal community management practices. In the table below, the management characteristics of matriarchal societies, the characteristics of Follett's management philosophy, and the similarities and relations between them are explained in detail.



Table 1  
*Comparison of Matriarchal Societies and Follett's Philosophy of Management*

<b>Management Characteristics of Matriarchal Societies</b>	<b>Features of Follett Management Philosophy</b>	<b>Similarity And Relationship</b>
A culture that includes truth, justice and honesty	We need a human relations technique based on the protection of the integrity of the individual. Law is the basis of our experience, thoughts and ideals. Belief in what is right, certainty about the satisfaction of desires, the concept of what is right being the satisfaction of all our desires and the absolute right appearing in eternity are all features of Follett's teaching (Follett, 1924: 273).	Follett's longing for human relations based on individual integrity and her belief in law and right reflect the principles of truthfulness, justice and honesty in the management of matriarchal societies.
Universal fraternity, love, freedom, equality, loyalty, compassion, peace and harmony	Discovering and applying the principles of collective action ensures individual freedom (Metcalf and Urwick 1942: 299). Equal power is the stage for a fair fight, together power is a growing power; it is the goal and the unifier that eliminate strife while allowing infinite difference (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942: 94). Love of work includes satisfaction with work well done (115). Loyalty to the invisible leader provides a strong bond of unity and establishes sympathy (281).	While explaining the principles of integration, power with and leadership, Follett describes the characteristics of a matriarchal society.
The principles of mass production and sharing are dominant, meeting the needs of the members of the society is basic, and individuals receive an equal share from production.	Industrial democracy is the sharing of power by owners and managers with workers (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 89). Work practices that help increase the sense of collective responsibility are the development of group responsibility (Follett, 1949:49). Either responsibilities should be shared or the game should be exited (239).	At the core of Follett's concepts of power with, integration, law of situation, coordination and leadership are the participatory, collaborative and sharing practices of the matriarchal society.
Culture of politeness	It can be a science of cooperation, it's just a matter of goodwill (Metcalf & Urwick 1942:103). Leadership requires great qualities such as sensitivity, politeness, imagination, understanding, courage, and faith (254).	For areas such as the development of business management, leadership and expertise, Follett also suggests a culture of politeness, as in matriarchal societies.
Natural law that governs society and individuals	The law is a manifestation of interacting life forms and is part of human experience, and should be based on vital forms of association; therefore, in practice, men and women must establish written forms of law in concrete life. The conflict in legal science today should not be between the conscious and unconscious evolution of law, but between a mechanical and evolving theory of law. A dynamic psychology and a creative jurisprudence are on the same foundation (Follett, 1924:299).	Follett builds a bridge with the natural law structure of the matriarchal society by suggesting the formation of law through the interaction of life, and the creative law science.

<p>To feel the natural unity of life and the harmony of the universe</p>	<p>Integration is the fundamental law of life, the combination of those who give orders and those who take orders, the integration of persons and situations; the integration and law of situation must evolve with developments, orders must contain cyclical behavior rather than linear (Follett, 1925: 6). Linear behavior is passive acceptance, cyclical behavior includes feedback, expresses the continuity of experience and takes into account external stimuli (107).</p>	<p>Follett's law of situation and integration concepts aim at natural unity and harmony.</p>
--	--	--

Table 1, which was prepared by information obtained from the literature, shows that Follett established her management philosophy on the basis of organic or natural structures, and she claims that the success of the structures formed on this basis continues for generations. She states that the actors perform best when each of them knows their own role and when the maestro is in a consciousness that integrates the process, that is, when the directors allow each of the actors to share their own comprehensive consciousness (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942).

Based on these explanations, it seems likely that we can associate the maestro and the directors who fulfill Follett's integration process with the women who provided for and ruled the order in the matriarchal societies in ancient times. Follett (1924:65) argued that permanent success will be achieved with organic organizations. These statements of Follett could almost describe the power of the matriarchal administrative structure regulating society, natural unity in life, universal peace and harmony.

### **Relations of Management Theories with Follett's Philosophy**

When you have a resource at your disposal that tells you the facts and what should be done for the future, you can take advantage of it, see the future, and shape the present and the future perfectly and quickly by making use of this resource. However, the practices in the history of the management did not follow such a course. Follett's ideas were reproduced by different theorists at different times and under different names as if Follett did not exist, and her management philosophy and approaches were ignored. Follett was appreciated, albeit late (Graham, 1995, p. 1; Kanter, 1985, p. 11), but she also faced some criticism (McLarney & Rhyno, 1999, p. 302; Nohria, 1995, p. 150). The indifference shown to Follett is mainly due to periodic developments such as the development levels of communities, various economic depressions and wars, and difficulties faced by managers in human capital development reforms. Ağlargöz, (2018, p. 9) in his article "The Forgetting of Mary Parker Follett: Which Mary?" addressed the same topic.

The classical management school, which includes a rational point of view in management, the behavioral school that emphasizes social process, the quantitative

school that takes into account numerical research, the integration school that includes contingency and the modern school that emphasizes the complex point of view were all developed in parallel with the development levels of humanity. It can be observed that each of the developments in management schools is related to Follett's management philosophy. For example, the circuitous journey to know and formulate conflict resolution in management could have been accelerated had Follett's ideas been accepted and adopted (Fisher, Ury & Patton, 2011).

Management theorists try to make up for lost time. It is possible to see this in the explanations of Michele Simms (2009:352). According to Simms, "Follett explained her foreknowledge of systems theory, action research, and leadership far ahead of her time," and associates it with Peter Drucker, Kurt Lewin, Warren Bennis, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Lawrence and Lorsch, and Blake and Mouton. Management theorists and practitioners in organization systems as well as managers and employees have switched to Follett's point of view. The transition from scientific management to people-oriented behavioral management has made this evolution necessary. Although Follett's perspectives and deep explanations were available from as early as the first half of the 20th century, it is as if Follett never existed. In fact, management theorists of that time formed their own approaches on the basis of Follett's ideas without paying attention to her.

The courses that led to the advancement of today's 'win-win' negotiations had already been described by Follett in the 1920s. While Japanese business experts such as Juran (1995) and Enomoto (1995) were appreciated for their ideas on quality management, teamwork, and systems theory, Follett was ignored. The 75-year history since Coase (1937)'s theory of the firm includes Follett's concepts. Follett considers firm evolution as a tool that coordinates the care of partners (Freeman, 1984; Freeman & Evan, 1990) and states that corporate social responsibility should be a part of management policy (Scherer & Palazzo, 2007; 2011). Follett's desire for social justice leads to a broader social contract where communities and business support each other, do no harm, and help when necessary (Matten & Crane, 2005).

Follett believes that work is the most important contribution an individual can make to society, whether at the level of top manager or at the lowest level of employee. When this contribution is part of a cyclical process, the end result is the organic growth of the whole, with the development of the individual and the group being the vehicle of this development (Phipps, 2011). Therefore, treating individuals as a tool will never yield anything better. The cyclical reaction process occurs when both the person and the party succeed better. Where tension occurs, the individual should consider whether her/his own interests harm the interests of the group, should be able to understand that it is not possible to achieve better if it does harm, and the tension should be abandoned.

Thus, Follett combines two seemingly incompatible theories such as individualism and collectivism (Ryan & Rutherford, 2000).

Follett's ideas offer clear answers to the complexity of world problems. This is particularly evident in the contradictory coexistence of concepts such as integration, which governs diversity, and power with, which governs conflicts. To discover Follett, it is necessary to realize that constructive conflict is a force for well-being and creativity because it energizes, leads to diversity, and drives innovation and growth. Thus, conflicts between business and society can be exploited for greater good, and all business management becomes a part of social work (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 27-32).

Follett's (1924: 78-91) suggestion of domination, reconciliation and integration as a method of resolving conflicts was later adopted by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton (1964), Richard Walton and Robert McKersie (1965), Paul Lawrence and Jay Lorsch (1967), Ralph Kilmann and Kenneth Thomas (1977) (Héon et.al., 2017: 12).

Thomas-Kilmann, Instrument (TKI) extended Follett's method of conflict resolution to five conflict resolution methods: competition, avoidance, accommodation, compromise, and cooperation. In other methods, the individual is concerned with fulfilling her/his own interests against the interests of the other party. In cooperation, however, the concern for fulfilling the interests of the other party as well as one's own interests is at the highest level, so conflict resolution takes place at the highest level, and this represents the integration approach, which Follett (1924: 78-91) defines as conflict resolution based on interest.

Roger Fisher, William Ury, and Bruce Patton (2011), the first directors of Harvard's Negotiation Project, refer to Follett's (1918: 89) interest approach in integration as principled negotiation. The goal is to go beyond making concessions in a collaborative environment where parties can maximize the solution to mutual advantage. Today, scholars and practitioners from a wide variety of intellectual and professional traditions associated with Harvard's Negotiation Program characterize their approach as 'interest-based' (Sebenius 2013: 163), abiding by the philosophy of Mary Parker Follett in their research and practice.

Follett's group vision of co-creation can be used today as a roadmap for groups to work productively as innovative entrepreneurs. Follett (1918: 367) explains the group process using the concepts of collective idea, collective feeling and collective will, and considers collective thought as an act of creation, arguing that this process will bring about collective life and self-governing society. She states that time spent developing group spirit is time spent creating the dynamic power of our civilization. This perspective of Follett describes contemporary approaches to collaborative management and organizational change, such as Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider & Whitney 1999, 2005) and Discovering Common Ground (Weisbord 1992).

The table below summarizes how the various management theories put forward during and after Follett's life are related to Follett's philosophy.

Table 2

*Comparison of Follett's Philosophy with Management Theories during and after Follett's time*

Theories And Key Concepts	Key Concepts Of Follett's Philosophy	Similarity And Relationship
<p><b>Classical Management</b> This is based on rationality. F. Taylor (1856-1915) emphasizes how the human element can be used more effectively in addition to machines in daily work from a scientific point of view. H. Fayol (1841-1925) and M. Weber (1864-1920) focus on the formation of a formal organizational structure. The key concept is structure. At its core, there is a mechanical logic and efficiency for doing business disregarding the initiative of the employee (Mcgrath, J., &amp; Bates, B., 2017).</p>	<p>Efficient production conditions are provided not by orders from a distance, but by face-to-face propositions (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942: 27). Coordination disorder in departments reduces operational efficiency (Metcalf &amp; Urwick 1942: 67). Scientific management is mandatory due to the following conditions: -Efficiency should be essential in the use of scarce resources, -Intensity of competition, shortage of labor (labor force), increasing ethical understanding in human relations and the spread of understanding that sees businesses as public activities serving the principle of efficiency (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942:102).</p>	<p>Follett sees businesses as integrating associations, emphasizing close relationships and propositions rather than giving orders for efficiency. Follett gives the convincing message that scientific management is an obligation in the development of business management. For Follett, close relations and propositions are important, as opposed to mechanical operating logic and giving orders.</p>
<p><b>Neoclassical Management</b> This is the trend that emerged as a result of the Hawthorne Studies (1924-1930) conducted by academicians affiliated with Harvard University. It is a behavioral management approach that takes into account "human" relations in organizations. Group behavior, motivation and leadership are the basic concepts (Mayo, 1933; McGregor, 1950; Likert, 1932; Argyris, 1964; Lewin, 1938). (Mcgrath, J., &amp; Bates, B., 2017).</p>	<p>In industry, we do not only produce goods, but also regulate human relations (1924: 283). Liberating human energy means achieving human high potential (1924: 303). The motivational desires of the individual and the group must be known and applied in an enduring society, a continuously productive industrial organization (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942).</p>	<p>Follett emphasizes in management the development of human relations and the liberation of human energy to provide high potential. Sustainability can be ensured by knowing and applying the desires and hopes that motivate individuals and groups. This shows that adopting the human relations approach is at the macro level.</p>
<p><b>Systems Approach</b> The internal and external environment that affects the organization is an open system, and all sub-systems of the organization must be evaluated in order to achieve the organizational goal. Any change in one part of the system is in a dependency relationship that affects the others and explains to what extent the activities of the organization will be affected by external factors (Bertalanffy, 1940; Boulding, 1962; Miller, 1978). (Baum, 2005).</p>	<p>Social interactions are a cyclical response as concurrent influence dynamics, and this view has two implications for change: social systems are in constant motion and change is essential to any shared system (1924:62-63). As the organizational system evolves from goal to goal through increasing levels of conflict and integration, the effective leader facilitates the continuous integration and learning of the living system (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942: 262).</p>	<p>Follett deals with the system approach at the level of social interaction, change, conflict, integration, evolution, learning. She emphasizes the importance of the effective leader in the organizational system and brings the concept of evolution provided by integration to the organizational system.</p>

<p><b>Contingency Approach</b> It is necessary to apply the most appropriate model to each organization's own structure, situation and environment. Organizational structure, technology, social behavior and environment are the basic concepts (Chandler, 1962; Lawrence &amp; Lorsch, 1967; Thompson, 1967; Fiedler, 1993). (Baum, 2005).</p>	<p>We have multiple responses to the interaction between organism and environment, as well as to the fact that the organism grows in response to the environment. The reactions never stop. The organism identifies itself with the larger objective environment through physical vision, response, and situational integration, and with greater awareness we see the birth of new perceptions (1924: 208).</p>	<p>Follett states that as a result of mutual interaction with the environment, the organism realizes a situational integration, defines itself to a wider environment and new perceptions emerge. She explains the contingency approach in terms of stimulus from the environment, reaction to the environment, development and growth, interaction between people, interaction between people and environments.</p>
<p><b>Transaction Costs</b> The existence of the firm depends on the cost of using the price mechanism (Coase, 1937). Limited rationality, opportunism, asset specificity, and vertical integration are the basic concepts (Williamson, 1990).</p>	<p>We need to see exactly at what point mergers occur in the easiest, most natural and most efficient way. As the situation changes, we should expect our representatives to maintain an integrative relationship with the representative group. But integrating wills does not provide us with the democratic process because true unity must be based on control at the state, national and international industry level (1924: 256).</p>	<p>Although Follett does not refer to the price mechanism, she signals the point where the most productive conditions occur in mergers. A control-based union of forces is proposed by targeting the democratic process with a broader perspective beyond transaction costs.</p>
<p><b>Agency Theory</b> This focuses on imperfect contracts and their costs, information asymmetry, avoidance of duty, unethical behavior arising from the relationships between the principal and the agent (Jensen and Meckling 1976; Mahoney, 1992).</p>	<p>The agreement of the conflicting parties and the reassessment of interests are important. In the conflict of groups we must monitor each reassessment to see how much mutual aspirations have changed, for this shows how much it has changed the conflict (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942: 12). We must understand the creative conflict process and trust that this process is all inclusive and that everyone gets their share (1924: 288).</p>	<p>Follett suggests developing integrative policies by re-evaluating the conflicts and the interests of the parties, emphasizing the constructive and creative aspects of conflicts. These explanations seem to be a solution point for the problems between principal and agent.</p>
<p><b>Resource-Based Approach</b> A firm's unique resources give the firm a competitive advantage. Resources include both tangible and intangible assets (Penrose, 1959, Wernerfelt, 1984, Barney, 1996).</p>	<p>A competitive business person is a good chess player. The real conflict between two good chess players is the conflict of possibilities that takes place in the game; it is not necessary to make all the moves to achieve business integration (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942: 16). Competitive sales provide competitive power (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942: 78).</p>	<p>In Follett's definitions, the 'power with' principle that provides competitive advantage based on the tangible and intangible resources of the companies involves the business person making successful moves and competitive sales by evaluating the conflict possibilities. This firm is associated with its resource base, human talent and power with.</p>

<p><b>Firm Behavior Theory</b> A human being has limited rationality. This theory is based on the effect of human behavior, motivation and leadership on the axis of psychology, sociology and culture (Barnard, 1938; Simon, 1947; Cyert and March, 1963).</p>	<p>The observer has limited opportunity to find facts, and the participant-observer often reveals different facts, so experimentation is the best way to arrive at the facts (Metcalf &amp; Urwick 1942: 4). Integration involves invention, and the smart thing is to recognize this and not let one's thinking fall within the confines of two mutually exclusive alternatives (1924: 13).</p>	<p>Follett suggests participation, observation and experimentation against limited rationality and states that truths can be arrived at this way. For motivation and leadership, Follett draws attention to the integration developed on the basis of expertise, experience and free thinking.</p>
<p><b>Life Cycle Theory</b> Firms are born, develop and end like living organisms. Technology, innovation, product life cycle, entrepreneurship, vertical integration and sectoral competition are effective in this cycle (Boulding, 1950; Schumpeter, 1980; Gort &amp; Klepper, 1982).</p>	<p>The organism is a form determined by the placement of elements in the structure. We see this in social reorganization. The reorganization changes the character of the existing organism. The regrouping of European nations has an effect on every nation. The organism has a self-regulating and governing character (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942: 188).</p>	<p>In this theory, Follett is grounded on the notion of organism. Follett states that the organism is self-regulating and governing, and she associates this with social reorganization; these regulations seem to be related to technology, innovation, product life cycle, entrepreneurship, vertical integration and sectoral competition.</p>
<p><b>Strategic Management</b> This covers the measures and regulations of organizations that can control the changing internal and external environment and adapt to this change. Top managers of the organization, vision, mission and goals of the organization, external environmental factors and resources, strengths and weaknesses of the organization, opportunities and threats, competitive advantage are the basic concepts (Barnard, 1938; Drucker, 1954; Chandler, 1962; Ansoff, 1965; Porter, 1980; Mintzberg, 1987).</p>	<p>A time and a location are available to find the truth; facts must be produced at strategic moments (1924: 15). The main aim in the rebuilding of society should be to take what each person has to give, to bring the unknown millions to light and put them into action. A collective society's belief in a constructive vision gives the individual the highest value ever given. We recommend individual value as the foundation of democracy, individual expression as its process, and individual responsibility as the driving force (1918: 74).</p>	<p>Follett's definitions of strategic management can be expressed as facts produced in strategic moments, a collective society, constructive vision, full evaluation of human power, uncovering unknowns, democracy shaped by individual value, freedom of expression and taking responsibility.</p>
<p><b>Networks and Property Rights Theory</b> The firm is a legal entity with contractual relationships, the degree of perfection of contracts determines the limits of firm behavior (Demsetz, 1967; Jensen &amp; Meckling, 1976; Hart &amp; Holmstrom, 2016).</p>	<p>Informing the employee about the general business and trade policy, such as adjusting the supply and demand, forward-looking contracts, and opening new markets will make the employee's view on production processes more valuable. There are conflicts between the union of the organization and its members arising from the violation of the contract (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942: 66, 182).</p>	<p>Follett deals with conflicts of contracts and property rights arising from breach of contract. She draws attention to issues such as ensuring the integration of the employee with the business by raising awareness about the general business policies.</p>



<p><b>Feminist Management Theory</b>                  Relationship-oriented, supportive, egalitarian, teamwork, democratic, transformational, participatory, community-oriented and sharing are the basic concepts in feminist management (Calás &amp; Smircich, 1996; Lorber, 1986; Bendl, 2000; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt &amp; Van Engen, 2003).</p>	<p>The most progressive view of today’s worker representation in terms of democracy is participation, not consent, of the governed (Metcalf &amp; Urwick, 1942: 154). Participation is the right foundation for all social relationships. The only cooperation that will be successful against capitalism is one that starts from the bottom and engages every member in its activity (1924: 198). Teams show us the true community of nations, the correlation of interests, international ethics, the creation of international will, self-development of high fidelity, and that each nation is responsible for the well-being of the other (1918: 349).</p>	<p>Follett’s concepts such as integration, power with, situational law, leadership and coordination are based on feminist management concepts. The concepts of feminist administration are seen in all of Follett’s explanations, such as cooperation instead of authority, shared power, those having the capacity being required by the situation to use the authority required by the situation.</p>
---	---	---

Table 2 reveals Follett’s footprints in all management theories put forward since the industrial revolution. Follett’s management philosophy provides important clues for future management structures. We can see this in Follett’s guiding statements given in the following section.

**Follett Still Leads the Way**

The twenty-first century is a century with increasing complexity, diversity and difficulties in the effective management of democratic institutions. In Follett’s narratives, there are some explanations that can help us understand and manage change in all areas of life and they still guide us. This guidance can be seen in Follett’s explanations for the harmonization process in creativity and the barriers to integration.

*Adaptation Process in Creativity*

Follett explained the adaptation process in creativity in the frame of relationships among bios and their environment, which we define as ecology or environmental science today. According to Follett (1924: 130), the “release of energy” discourse of physiologists and psychologists who study the functions of cells, tissues and organs of living things and how these tasks are fulfilled is a fundamental idea for social sciences. Every sociological concept should be the basis, economics should accept this fact, and political science should see it as the basis of every establishment. The task of politics, economics and legal science is to find relationships that release this spiritual energy enabling us to have strong will in our daily lives.

Follett expresses emancipation as being the call and stimulus response through release of energy. She states that energy can only be released through relationships that liberate, integrate and create. For Follett, the problem is not how to obtain the will, but how to open the way to create relationships between individuals. Opening the



way to create relationships is attainable by advancing an environment of education, intuition, cooperation and discussion. It is also the process of creating one's own will through the release of energy. As in physiology and psychology, releasing energy and integration takes place in the same process in human relations.

If the biological goal is harmony, its functional counterpart in the social process is the right in an ethical sense, justice in a legal sense, freedom in a political sense, and the satisfaction of wants in an economic sense. Follett assumes that there is a blessed relationship between self and conditions, that developing integration brings development in the soul and self, that the greatest spiritual nourishment comes from meeting conditions, and that the only way for the soul to rise comes from the sanctity of life and the fulfillment of these conditions. She states that the holiness that ensures the existence of the self is lived through every day (1924:131).

The ecological philosophy that Follett put forward a hundred years ago is still alive today. Kanter (1995) offers a recipe for managing change and says, "*Even though we know the limits of belief in human goodness today, we must rise on Follett's shoulders to see the possibility of perfect organization*".

### ***Barriers to Integration***

While Follett's integrative philosophy continues to exist as a useful legacy that manages today's organizational change, it may be stated that the main difficulties she sees in ensuring integration are also among the important problems of today. The obstacles to integration, which Follett stated a hundred years ago, should be reviewed as a useful practice for management in the present and future. Her advice concerning integration is given below:

1. Follett sees integration as a creative attitude by which every individual should be in integrity with herself/himself and with those nearby. She characterizes human relations in terms of creative integration that combines common desires and aspirations and that can create "win-win" solutions. Follett turned her transformational leadership vision, which unites around a common will, into a leadership vision that combines cooperation and co-creation. (1924:5).

Follett focuses on dynamic and active relationships in management and proposes new ideas about how management should strive for human relations and social processes. In Follett's management cycle, ideal management must be interactive and dynamic so that an organization can be sufficiently open to the circulating situation, and aware of current or potential problems (1924:53).

According to Follett, there are no linear relationships and variables such as individuals, actions and concepts in organizations (1924:69). Follett creates a conceptual bridge

between the organizational structure and social sciences, natural sciences and physical science (Mendenhall, Macomber & Cutright, 2000: 200). A non-linear approach in organizations is beneficial due to unexpected situations and facts change value over time (Follett, 1924:73; Boje and Rosile 2001: 102). In Follett's nonlinear process, integration cannot occur until problems such as the demand to be dominant over others and the demand to have power over others are resolved.

2. Another impediment to integration is that our lifestyle has made most of us enjoy being dominated. Integration is challenging for many individuals, and attainment does not provide the excitement of victory (Metcalfe and Urwick, 1942, p. 18). Follett states that the conquest or subjugation of oneself on another is not legitimate and leads to fiasco in the brief and prolonged period, underlining that only individuals can liberate each other and this is the tenet and sense of all relationships (1924: 130).

Follett's egalitarian management philosophy goes far beyond the traditional hierarchical vision proposed by contemporaries such as Elton Mayo. John Child (1995, p. 88) states that when British management researchers, including Urwick, tried to arrange the notions of Follett and Mayo in a common management philosophy, they firstly adopted a patriarchal, top-down hierarchical management vision from Mayo and his colleagues and that hierarchical vision is unfamiliar with Follett's basic suggestions. For Follett, self-management is a creative process; the target of democracy should be integrative desires, an effort to create unity and togetherness (1924: 209).

3. One more impediment to integration is that the subject in discussion is often theorized rather than treated as a suggested activity (Metcalfe & Urwick, 1942:18).

Mary Parker Follett believes that theory and practice should provide the goal of the ethical and communal advancement of the human community. Follett states that learning what might happen and which possibilities might arise can only be discovered by trying, and that observation and experiment, which are the methods of physical science, should also be methods of social sciences (1924). In her work "Creative Experience", Follett emphasizes the aim of suggesting a route in which desires may be intertwined, seeking a method that will ensure the full integrity of the human being. She endeavours to produce great spiritual values from daily experiences with social progress (Follett, 1924). Therefore, according to Follett, social science research should ensure an active social community transformation (Mendenhall et al., 2000:203).

Follett (1924:57), who stated that integration is an active, experimental and pragmatic interaction and intertwining, was highly appreciated by management scientists such as William James, Kurt Lewin and John Dewey (Kolb, 2014).

4. Follett states that a serious barrier to integration which every business person should consider is the language used, emphasizing the necessity of making a conscious

preparation for the language that the parties will use for the most appropriate attitude to integration (Metcalf and Urwick, 1942 :19). As in every field, Follett is in a pioneering position for highlighting the significance of language in a socio-constructive management approach and in managing organizational change and conflict (Cooperrider & Srivastva 1987; Gergen 1982; Weick 1979).

5. Follett sees the excessive influence of leaders on integration as one of the basic impediments to integration and rebels against ruthless manipulation on the one hand and the suggestibility of the human masses on the other (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942, p. 47). With this view, Follett reaffirms that she sees the group process above and beyond any arbitrary form of power or crowd of people.

Follett bases her philosophy on an enduring society and on a continuously productive industrial organization, on the recognition of the desires that motivate the individual and group. Follett endeavored to reach a democratic way of life shaped by the effective organization and management of state and industry. Every individual should be mobilized to achieve this democratic way of life; individuals ought to be able to form an efficient part of coteries and of the world as a total, and for this, full integration of all perspectives should be ensured (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942). Follett gave the leader the responsibility of discernment and vision. In this process, the invisible leader should make certain that the followers utilize their strength and unification capacity effectively, participate in the coordination with self-confidence and belief, and conform to the law of the situation. In this way, the leader and followers should move in line for the common goal (Monin & Bathurst, 2008: 447-448).

6. Follett states that the biggest obstacle to integration is the lack of training to achieve integration, and she criticizes that we always try to hit the alternative side in our university debates, stating that there should be discussion classes aimed at teaching the art of collaborative thinking. According to Follett, training and practice are necessary to master the technique of integration, even if there is no self-interest, prejudice, rigidity, belief-based dogmatism and routine obstacles dominated by ignorance (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942:21).

Follett describes the highest democratic progress we have in terms of self-education, learning to apply the study of experts, being willful, training our will, and integration (1924:5). Follett's early work in social entrepreneurship and the creation of community centers across the country is evidence of her opinion regarding the need for group education in democratic life.

At the end of her recommendations on integration Follett mentions some impediments and how to come through these impediments so that the standard of living rises not merely with date, but also with research. She points out that research is extremely important for business management: "*It is unfeasible to create a map of the future, but*

*every business should always study the evolving situation and she/he must know the share of her/his own activity in this developing situation”* (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 21). This indicates that although Follett expresses the infeasibility of designing a map of the future, she talks about a guiding integration that brightens the future of nations in her statements about groups, capitalist ethics and worker ethics.

According to Follett, the “right” arises from the links in the group, and there is one fundamental law which separates the group from other shapes of association, and this has many implications. *“We must accept right as a social product, a group product, and have groups that unite interests and standards. Law and politics cannot be built on anything but vital relations”*. To summarize her views on legislation:

- 1) Legislation must be the output of a group.
- 2) We must have distinctive groups.
- 3) A political method must be applied in which group law shapes legislation.

Follett (1918: 275) states that capitalist ethics and worker ethics are usually against each other, but groups that will unite interests and standards should be protected. She further states that legislation and diplomacy cannot be built on anything other than vital forms of association. *“The group process shows us that a true community of nations is the integration of interests, the development of an international ethic, the creation of an international will, the development of a higher commitment, and each nation taking full responsibility for the well-being of the other.”* (1918: 349).

## **CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Findings and Evaluation**

In this paper the main points of discussion have centered around the management philosophy of Mary Parker Follett and the relations of this philosophy with the matriarchal management structures of ancient times and with various management theories from the Post-Industrial Revolution to the present. The issues raised by Follett that shape the future were also discussed. The findings and evaluations are outlined as follows:

1. Mary Parker Follett’s view of management is of an exceptional nature. It contains definitions which include those that relate to the past, present and future. Follett’s mindset is easy to understand, simple and clear and is of fundamental importance and value in solving both industrial problems as well as today’s national and international problems.

2. The relationship between Mary Parker Follett's management approach and matriarchal societies in the past is explained in Table 1. Follett (Metcalf & Urwick, 1942: 310) considers concepts such as right, freedom, service, and sacrifice as lofty ideals in life and states that these ideals will provide individual freedom through collective control in the new age, and thus, one is able to get rid of the present chaos. According to her, the collective idea, collective feeling and collective desire reveal the group process, collective life and self-governing society. This view of Follett's self-governing society goes far beyond the modern management concept of 'self-autonomous teams'.

Egalitarian, democratic, and free principles, including universal fraternity, gender freedom, moral principles based on maternal love and affection, matriarchal management understanding based on love, peaceful, benevolent, and common participation, horizontal authority and sharing principles are in harmony with Follett's philosophy. This is also compatible with Morgan's (1969) and Engels' (1978) definitions of the principles of matriarchal society.

3. The relationship between Mary Parker Follett's management approach and management theories developed from the post-industrial revolution to the present is shown in Table 2. It can be observed that the basic concepts of management theories developed since the industrial revolution are quite relevant to the basic notions of Follett's management philosophy, which are integration, power with, coordination, law of situation and leadership. These findings are parallel to the evaluations of important management scientists such as Drucker (1995), Graham (1995), Kanter (1995), Simms (2009) and Fisher et al. (2011).

4. Mary Parker Follett put forward a management philosophy that includes quite striking and bold statements in a context that includes the management approach of a non-masculine society in ancient times, and years later, a management approach dominated by men. It can also be seen that Follett's bold philosophy is fed from very early social orders and is strong enough to form a basis for various concepts and situations that will form the basis for all subsequent management approaches. This management philosophy is a bridge between the past, present and future. Follett's bold approach and unwavering belief in human nature form the basis of this bridge. Today's understanding of management, which is accepted as contemporary, is still not perfect, does not meet social expectations and contains contradictions. Follett also points out a two-probability contradiction that cannot be accepted or preferred definitively in management. The historical processes that have been and are being experienced already show these contradictions in management. To be more precise, Follett offers advice on solving today's accepted contemporary dilemmas and those that are not yet finalized. These contemporary dilemmas are that the current system of management is far from meeting societal expectations; all segments of society long for a different

management system. Although it did not contain a scientific basis before Follett, the relationship between the characteristics of the matriarchal society, which were the first management organizations in human history, and the management approaches after Follett, along with Follett's philosophy is an important proof of this advice. Follett describes this management model, which meets social expectations, as detailed below.

5. In today's world, humanity faces oppression, control, competition, aggression, discrimination, limitation of freedoms, wars, income inequality, corrosive risks and scandals, and longs for a new social structure. This fact has emerged with a global research conducted by Gerzema and D'Antonio (2013). Based on the same longing, Follett made the following suggestions (1924:130-131):

- Free will should be revealed by matching the adaptation process in creativity with an ecological approach.
- Creativity should remove barriers to integration.
- Democracy-based integrative desires and efforts help to create unity and solidarity.
- Social science research that aims to transform society into an active social community is vitally important.
- Using language that manages change and conflict is necessary.
- Leaders should provide motivation that mobilizes individual power.
- Education arrangements that teach the art of collaborative thinking are to be encouraged.

It can be interpreted that Follett's suggestions reveal a management structure that today's societies long for, and that her ideas still guide humanity. Mary Parker Follett, in a sense, guides the future with her explanations and recommendations on the harmonization process in creativity and the barriers to integration.

Follett (1924:303) states that the essence of experience and the law of relationship is mutual liberation, and that this is the rock and essence of the human soul. As human beings, our roots extend to the unknown, where there are endless potentials, and these potentials become visible by being stimulated by the effect and reaction of one to the other. Follett emphasizes that all new forms of human relations, which have not been imagined before, must be realized through action-reaction connotations from each other and that non-connotative relations should be avoided as this is the law of the universe. "The test of the validity of any social process is whether the connotation is between one and the other, between capital and labor, between nation and other nation". In this foresight, Follett states that the realization of the connotation is the

validity test of any social process and should be the test of industrialists, lawyers and statesmen. She argues that liberating the energy of the human spirit means revealing the high potential of all humanity.

The prominent scientist Hawking (1988: 89) states that we know all the laws managing the behavior of humans today except for the most extreme conditions, but we have not yet succeeded in making predictions about human behavior according to mathematical equations, nor have we managed to fully understand what is happening around us and our own existence. Accordingly, it may be concluded that Follett (1924) proposes a management theory that predicts a universe full of differences by making an abstract evaluation of logic. We can see these suggestions of Follett in the explanations of integration, the law of situation, power with, conflicts and creative experiences that emerge with differences. Hawking (2010: 149) defines the real miracle as “the abstract evaluations of logic reaching a unified theory that predicts and describes the universe full of surprising differences” and these definitions seem to confirm Mary Parker Follett’s management theory miracle.

### **Contribution of Results to Practice and Literature**

Both Follett’s works and the comments and appreciations of various management theorists about Follett explain her important place in the management literature. The similarities of her management approach with the management structures of the matriarchal societies in ancient times are important findings. In this article, which includes the principles of Follett’s management philosophy and the theories in the management literature, an attempt has been made to reveal the similarities and relations between the two management structures mentioned above. Thus, it is believed that this article makes an important contribution to the management literature.

Follett’s concepts can be seen as a constitutional guide for international, national and industrial authorities and practitioners in managerial decision-making. This guidance can contribute to practices in solving problems, revealing opportunities and creativity, and building a stronger democracy, based on justice and peace. Today, in Harvard studies, various scholars and practitioners are researching the views of Mary Parker Follett (Fisher et al., 2011; Bennis, 1995; Child, 1995; Drucker, 1995; Enomoto, 1995; Graham, 1995; Kanter, 1995).

When Follett’s management philosophy is implemented, humanity can open the doors of a world with more freedom, peace, justice, equality and sharing. This can lead to happier and more peaceful communities of human beings with superior values. Hence, it may be concluded that Follett’s management philosophy has the potential to realize the objectives of protecting natural life, ensuring ecological balance, progress and development, a fair and equitable distribution of resources, a resolution of tensions and conflicts, thus ensuring peace.



At the start of the 20th century, Follett revealed the facts known today through her statements about the past, present and future, and these facts can help humanity move on along a safer path without losing any more time. Consequently, according to Follett, “*Co-creation activity is the foundation of democracy, the core of compatriotism, the provision of world compatriotism*” (1924: 302). Based on Follett’s foresight, we can propose that instead of trying to rediscover the facts, it might be wiser to put the previous determinations about them into practice to make a contribution to world peace.

---

**Peer-review:** Externally peer-reviewed.

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

**Grant Support:** The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

**Author Contributions:** Author Contributions: Conception/Design of Study- N.A., B.T.; Data Acquisition- N.A., B.T.; Data Analysis/Interpretation- N.A., B.T.; Drafting Manuscript- N.A., B.T.; Critical Revision of Manuscript- N.A., B.T.; Final Approval and Accountability- N.A., B.T.

---

## References

- Ağlargöz, O. (2018). Mary Parker Follett’in yönetim düşüncesi. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 51(1), 1-26.
- Argyris, C. (1977). Double Loop Learning in Organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 55(5), 115-125.
- Bachofen, J. J. (1967). *Myth, Religion, and Mother Right*, trans. Ralph Manheim. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Bachofen, J. J. [1861] 2006. *Mother Right: An Investigation of the Religious and Juridical Character of Matriarchy in the Ancient World*, Translated by David Partenheimer. Newyork: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Baransel, A., (1993). *Çağdaş Yönetim Düşüncesinin Evrimi*. İstanbul: İ. Ü. İşletme Fakültesi Yayını No: 257.
- Barnard, C. (1938; 1968 [30th anniversary edition]). *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Baum, J. A. (2005). *Companion to Organizations, The Blackwell companion to organizations*, Oxford: Blackwell Business.
- Bebel, A. (1910). *Woman and Socialism*, trans. Meta L. Stern, (HEBE). Newyork: Socialist Literature Co.
- Bennis, W. (1995). The Essentials of Leadership in P. Graham (Ed.). *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of Management*:163-177. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Berber, A. (2013). *Klasik Yönetim Düşüncesi: Geleneksel ve Klasik Paradigmalarla Klasik ve Neo-klasik Örgüt Teorileri*. İstanbul: Alfa.
- Berktaş, F. (2010). *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Boje, D. M., & Rosile, G. A. (2001). Where’s the power in empowerment? Answers from Follett and Clegg. *Journal of Applied Behavior Science*, 37(1), 90–117.
- Child, J. (1995). *Commentary on Follett: Constructive Conflict*. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett, prophet of management: A celebration of writings from the 1920s* (pp. 87–95). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Coase, R. (1937). The Nature of the firm. *Economica* 4 (November) 386 – 405.



- Cooperrider, D. L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 1, 129–169.
- Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (1999). *Appreciative Inquiry*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative Inquiry: A Positive Revolution in Change*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Drucker, P. F. (1995). Introduction, Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of Management. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett, Prophet of Management: A Celebration of Writings from the 1920s* (pp. 1–9). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Engels F. (1978). *Ailenin, Özel Mülkiyetin ve Devletin Kökeni*, Ankara: Sol Yayınları.
- Enomoto, T. (1995). The individual in the group. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of Management: 240-246*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eylon, D. (1998). Understanding empowerment and resolving its paradox: Lessons from Mary Parker Follett. *Journal of Management History*, 4(1), 16-28.
- Fayol, H. (1988). *General and Industrial Management*. London: Pitman.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W. L., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving in*. New York: Penguin Groups.
- Fişek, K. (2015). *Yönetim*. Ankara: SBF Yayınları.
- Follett, M. P. (1896). *The Speaker of the House of Representatives*. London and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company.
- Follett, M. (1918). *The New State, Group Organization and the Solution of Popular Government*. New York: David McKay Co.
- Follett, M. P. (1919). Community is a process. *The Philosophical Review*, 28(6), 576-588.
- Follett, M. P. (1923). *Haldane Introduction to the New State*. USA: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Follett, M.P. (1924). *Creative Experience*. New York: Longmans, Green Co.
- Follett, M Parker (1925). *The Law of the Situation*. New York: Longmans.
- Follett, M. P. (1928). The Teacher-Student Relation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(1), 1970, 137-48.
- Follett, M. P. (1949). *Freedom and Coordination: Lectures in Business Organization*. Garland, New York.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: a Stakeholder Approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman.
- Freeman, R. E., & Evan, M. (1990). Corporate governance: A stakeholder interpretation. *The Journal of Behavioral Economics*, 19, 337-359.
- Gergen, K. (1982). *Toward Transformation in Social Knowledge*. New York: Springer.
- Gerzema, J., & D'Antonio, M. (2013). *The Athena Doctrine: How Women and the Men (Who Think Like Them) will Rule the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gibson, J. W., & Deem, J. (2016). Leadership lessons from the past: Examining the work of Mary Parker Follett and Lillian Gilbreth. *International Leadership Journal*, 8(1), 3-26.
- Graham, P. (Ed.). (1995). *Mary Parker Follett, Prophet of Management: A Celebration of Writings from the 1920s*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hawking, S. W. (1988). *A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes*. London: Bantam Press.

- Hawking, S., & Mlodinow, L. (2010). *Grand Design*. Newyork: Bantam Books.
- Héon, F., Damart, S., & Nelson, L. (2017). Mary Parker Follett: Change in the paradigm of integration. İçinde *D. Szabla, W. Pasmore, M. Barnes ve A. Gibson (Eds)*. The Palgrave Handbook of Organizational Change Thinkers, pp.1-22. HAL: Post-Print hal-01629684.
- Juran, J. (1995). *Managerial Breakthrough: The Classic Book on Improving Management Performance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kanter, R. M. (1985), Drucker: the Unsolved Puzzle. *New Management*, 2(1), 10-13.
- Kanter, R. M. (1995). Preface. In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett, prophet of management: a celebration of writings from the 1920s* (pp. xiii–xxix). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kolb, D. A. (2014). Foundational scholars of experiential learning [PowerPoint slides]. Presented at the Power of Words, the 74th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Philadelphia.
- Koçel, T. (2010). *İşletme Yöneticiliği*, 12. basım. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.
- Machiavelli, N. (1993). *Prince*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions.
- Matten, D., & Crane, A. (2005). Corporate citizenship: Toward an extended theoretical conceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 166-179.
- Mcgrath, J., & Bates, B. (2017). *The Little Book of Big Management Theories and how to use them*. Harlow UK.: Pearson.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- McLarney, C., & Rhyno, S. (1999). Mary Parker Follett: visionary leadership and strategic management. *Women in Management Review*, 14(7), 292-304.
- Melé, D., & Rosanas, J. M. (2003). Power, freedom and authority in management: Mary Parker Follett's 'power-with'. *Philosophy of Management*, 3(2), 35-46.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Macomber, J. H., & Cutright, M. (2000). Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of chaos and complexity. *Journal of Management History*, 6, 191–204.
- Metcalfe, H. C., & Urwick, L. (Eds). (1942). *Dynamic Administration: The Collected papers of Mary Parker Follett*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.
- Monin, N., & Bathurst, R. (2008). Mary Parker Follett on the leadership of everyman. *Ephemera-theory & Politics in Organization*, 8(4), 447-461.
- Morgan, L. H., (1969, II). *Ancient Society*. New York: Meridian Books.
- Newman, M. A., & Guy, M. E. (1998). Taylor's triangle, Follett's web. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 20(3), 287-297.
- Nohria, N., (1995), "The Basis of Authority 141 Commentary Mary Parker Follett's View on Power, the Giving of Orders, and Authority: An Alternative to Hierarchy or a Utopian Ideology?", In P. Graham (Ed.), *Mary Parker Follett, prophet of management: a celebration of writings from the 1920s*, (pp. 141-162). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.141-162.
- Parker, L. D. (1984). Control in organizational life: The contribution of Mary Parker Follett. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(4), 736-745.
- Phipps, S. T. A. (2011). Mary, Mary, quite contrary. In a male-dominated field, women contributed by bringing a touch of spirituality to early management theory and practice. *Journal of Management History*, 17, 270-281.

- Ryan, L., & Rutherford, M. (2000). Mary Parker Follett: Individualist, collectivist? Or both? *Journal of Management History*, 6(5), 207-223.
- Scherer, A., & Palazzo, G. (2007). Toward a political conception of corporate responsibility: Business and society seen from a Habermasian perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 1096-1120.
- Scherer, A., & Palazzo, G. (2011). The new political role of business in a globalized world: A review of a new perspective on CSR and its implications for the firm, governance and democracy. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48, 899-901.
- Schilling, M. A. (2000). Decades ahead of her time: advancing stakeholder theory through the ideas of Mary Parker Follett. *Journal of Management History*, 6(5), 224-242.
- Sebenius, J. K. (2013). What Roger Fisher got profoundly right: Five enduring lessons for negotiators. *Negotiation Journal*, 29(2), 159-169.
- Simms, M. (2009). Insights from a management prophet: Mary Parker Follett on social entrepreneurship. *Business and Society Review*, 114(3), 349-363.
- Smith, A. (1776). *The Wealth of Nations*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Tonn, J. C. (2003). *Mary P. Follett Creating Democracy, Transforming Management*. London: Yale University Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1979). Cognitive processes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 41-74.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1992). *Discovering Common Ground*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

