



## Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education

A case for folletian interventions in public universities

Robert Duncan M. Pelly, David Boje,

### Article information:

To cite this document:

Robert Duncan M. Pelly, David Boje, (2019) "A case for folletian interventions in public universities", Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-05-2018-0079>

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-05-2018-0079>

Downloaded on: 18 February 2019, At: 15:40 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 55 other documents.

To copy this document: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 1 times since 2019\*

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by

Token: Eprints: GfmUSbFSmD3C9iUSDfAQ:

### For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit [www.emeraldinsight.com/authors](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors) for more information.

### About Emerald [www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com)

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

\*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

# A case for folletian interventions in public universities

Folletian  
interventions

Robert Duncan M. Pelly

*School of Business,*

*McMurry University, Abilene, Texas, USA, and*

David Boje

*Department of Management, New Mexico State University,  
Las Cruces, New Mexico, USA*

Received 6 May 2018  
Revised 19 August 2018  
Accepted 10 October 2018

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The purpose of this paper is to illustrate the ideological impasses between educationally minded faculty and neoliberal oriented university administrators. To bridge and benefit from these two perspectives, Folletian integration is introduced. Specifically, the ensemble learning theory (ELT) and entrepreneurship centers are illustrated as Folletian interventions and their reasons for success are discussed.

**Design/methodology/approach** – This paper is theoretical, but provides ethnographic anecdotes of the problems occurring during the rise of neoliberalism and academic capitalism in the public university. The successful use of the ELT and entrepreneurship centers is likewise explored anecdotally.

**Findings** – This paper illustrates the benefits of utilizing the ELT and entrepreneurship centers in two different university settings.

**Research limitations/implications** – While the sample sizes of this paper are small, the anecdotal examples provide the basis for reasoning by analogy.

**Practical implications** – This work illustrates two possible Folletian interventions that serve as a guide to assist university administrators and faculty to find common ground and better serve students and university communities.

**Originality/value** – The rise of academic capitalism and neoliberalism has devalued education and resulted in poorer educational outcomes and a modern generation with less intellectual capital. This is one of the first papers to utilize Mary Parker Follett's theories of education and apply them to the impending identity crisis of the public university. The result is a win-win for both neoliberal administrators and faculty in the face of an impending identity crisis for the public university.

**Keywords** Neoliberalism, Education, Academic capitalism

**Paper type** Research paper

## Introduction

In light of a rapidly changing contemporary environment, public universities are facing an identity crisis with potentially divergent solutions. University educators postulate the university's goal is to educate the populace in critical thinking and character development (Newman, 1982) as the foundation of a democratic society (Follett, 1918; Morse, 2006). Conversely, university administrators follow a neoliberal and academic capitalist agenda of developing institutions of higher learning into self-enriching profit centers that contribute to economic development. Certainly, this debate is not new – there are long-standing discussions of education as a means (Cicero, 1991; Jack and Anderson, 1999) or as an end (Locke, 2007; Jack and Anderson, 1999). Does a university survive on intrinsic or extrinsic value, or is there possibly a third way?

Moreover, there are distinct stakeholder groups advocating different approaches to ensuring longevity of universities. Academicians champion education that focuses on intergenerational learning and personal development for the good of society (Follett, 1970; Hackett, 2014; Newman 1982). While it may appear that these goals represent an ideological impasse, there may be a third solution that incorporates the best facets of university administrators' neoliberal and academic capitalist agendas with those of academicians who wish to promote the betterment of society. However, a purely coercive agenda with winners and losers (Follett, 1919, 1941) will endanger the existence of the university.



Within this climate, Mary Parker Follett's philosophies and their applications are germane to ensuring the university remains relevant, since they represent a third way to meet the needs of both educators and academicians. She purports that education should develop into a close relationality between student and teacher to bridge theory and practice for the betterment of society (Follett, 1918; Morse, 2006). She avouches is a law of the situation (Follett, 1919, 1941), or a singularity around which others can integrate. The student and teacher are united in a common goal of stimulating student imagination (Follett, 1970). Through properties of relationality, points of agreement can be achieved and a common path forged. If Follettian principles are utilized, fragmented public university educational systems with faculty and administrators engaging in an us vs them struggle may reach consensus on best practices and return to an educational system that focuses on the enhancement of societal, economic and educational norms.

Follett's educational principles are manifested through the ensemble learning theory (ELT) (Rosile *et al.*, 2013) and entrepreneurship centers (Maas and Jones, 2017) that harness constructive conflict (Follett, 1919, 1941) as the model for public universities. The divisions between the public, administrators, students and faculty are harnessed in the entrepreneurship centers introduced in this paper. All have a shared, mutually communicated and common interest derived through integration (Follett, 1919). The need for two distinct competencies, education and economy, cease to exist individually and coalesce for community benefit.

### **The downward spiral of the public university**

One of the seminal works on the university is that of Newman (1982), in which he portrays the university as a place where gentlemen are formed – their characters are developed, and they develop an appreciation for the intangible beauty in the world. Newman described a unity of knowledge that was supported through multidisciplinary study. He also bemoaned a trend in education toward specialization – while it was beneficial to a particular discipline, it had a negative effect on the mind of the specialist. Since the times of Newman, theology no longer takes this central role as a unifying object in academia (MacIntyre, 2009).

Following the Second World War, the university reduced its service to the elite (Scruton, 2015) in favor of providing knowledge as a public good (Stiglitz, 1999). Beginning in the 1940s, a cohesive democratic society and a strong economy required all social classes to participate in mass education (Noble, 2012). The public university served as an economic engine and educated millions of Americans. It was a virtuous cycle of accelerating new ideas, affluence and culture in order to live more intelligently and harmoniously (Bok, 2009). The prevailing zeitgeist during the 1950s–1970s was that society required strong universities as a public good, implying access without incurring student debt. The public university promoted high-quality competition in emerging fields of research, admitting the majority of those who applied. It provided free and open access, deep personal development, socioeconomic problem solving, skills-based training and egalitarian inclusion in a diversified curriculum. The goal was to provide an inclusive culture open to the masses (Scruton, 2015).

Until the 1980s, it appeared the public universities were set to “inherit the earth” in the postindustrial knowledge economy. However, beginning in the Thatcher/Reagan years, funding for public universities steadily declined (Newfield, 2008) and was no longer the primary source of revenue (Waks, 2004; Jessop, 2017). Education has become a commodity with a negotiated economic value (Sappey, 2005) designed to favor access by the elite (Noble, 2012) instead of a public good central to a democracy (Stiglitz, 1999). As a result, tuition has perpetually increased since the 1980s, and an undergraduate degree from a public university may lead to a lifetime of student debt.

This sociopolitical trend of defunding the university in favor of market control mechanisms is referred to as neoliberalism (Touraine, 1992), and is a politically imposed discourse that maintains hegemony in many western nations (Olssen and Peters, 2005).

---

Neoliberalism emphasizes economic liberalization, deregulation and privatization and promotes the commoditization of resources, favoring profit-making activities (Jessop, 2017). Neoliberalism removes many functions of the public domain to the private sector subjects them to market pressures – profitable public goods remain, and money drains are no longer publicly supported.

As a result of the surge in neoliberalism, the humanities fields lost economic confidence in its original mission: to instill individual agency that encouraged self-governed human development (Häyriinen-Alestalo and Peltola, 2006). In the 1980s and 1990s, the mission evolved to produce flexible, adaptable, innovative workers for the new market economy, but the vision of egalitarian development declined, and the democratizing mission was eclipsed by financial concerns of the 1990s and 2000s economic crises (Sappey, 2005; Noble, 2012). In the wake of this shifting political climate, the public university has resorted to academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997), which has promulgated the public university identity crisis, but has provided a degree of longevity for universities otherwise unable to survive.

### Academic capitalism

One of the consequences of neoliberalism in universities is the rise of academic capitalism. Academic capitalism transpires when universities perform “market and market-like activities” (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, p. 11). The commodification process occurs when a university education’s artifacts (i.e. professors, syllabi, lectures, lessons, videos and exams) have a market value that can be isolated from their original creator (Noble, 2012). These artifacts gain a value due to neoliberalism rationalization of education (Jessop, 2017), and intellectual property rights shift from public goods to objects with a market value. This focus on the market value of intellectual property stemmed from federal changes in research funding, which enabled universities to license intellectual property rights of inventions, materials and discoveries (Jessop, 2017). This trend of encouraging the monetization of intellectual property rights coincides with a movement to reduce government funding of public universities and encouragement to seek third party revenues – for example, from consulting, fund raising, endowment income and third mission activities (Jessop, 2017; Etzkowitz *et al.*, 1998; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). In other words, the collegial and democratic structure that emphasized research novelty and professional autonomy has eroded in favor of hierarchical models dictated by university administrators regarding workloads, performance, research outcomes and teaching plans (Olssen and Peters, 2005). The end result is that self-knowledge becomes less relevant and revenue generation gains priority (Noble, 2012).

Under academic capitalism, the goal of securing external funding and to “the influence of business ideals upon colleges and universities” (Bullard, 2007, p. vi, 1) becomes ever more important to compensate for shortfalls in public funding. Students are treated as consumers, faculty as knowledge producers and colleges as vendors of knowledge within the university economy. Student consumerism moves the university to “‘mallification’ as the university begins to resemble a shopping mall” (Shumar, 2008, p. 71). The process of commodification in the university (especially American universities) is beginning to reach new levels, dramatically transforming knowledge production, the knowledge itself, and the identities of those who produce that knowledge.

As capitalism faces repeated crises, wholesale commodification is entangled with the rise of neoliberal social and economic ideals. The neoliberalism doctrine for higher education “influences career and student pathways, how pedagogy provokes status conflicts and assessment induces new forms of anxiety and performance” (Collins *et al.*, 2008, p. xiii). This focus on business style thinking has negative long-term consequences, even from a neoliberal perspective – too much business style “innovation” breaks creativity and critical

thinking (Mansell, 2012, citation). In the academic profession, this is essentially career ending, since creativity in research can be more important than a focus on standardizing information (Mansell, 2012). The contemporary socioeconomic context of the public university and the macro sociopolitical context are subverting teaching, research, and service into a market economy (Olssen and Peters, 2005).

### Why academic capitalism

From an academician's perspective, the blame could be placed on university administrators who embrace academic capitalism. However, these administrators are responding to the surge of neoliberalism and the subsequent lack of public funding that is ever more becoming the norm. While public universities are viewed as a drain on resources, they are still encouraged to attract more students under a neoliberal agenda of strengthening national and economic development (Jessop, 2017). Public universities now aggressively marketed services to foreign students who pay the highest levels of tuition. Globally, public universities are radically changing with academic capitalism superseding all other requirements. The focus on profit making means that the university is no longer an independent moral force. Below are some examples of measures universities have taken in order to make a profit – yet none of these seems to have a relationship with learning for students or faculty.

California's public universities rallied "that educational development should not be determined by the long series of economic crises that the state's leaders had managed to produce" Christopher Newfield (2008, p. 2). The current climate in New Mexico parallels that in California. State leaders developed a taxation system dependent upon oil and gas revenues in order to stem economic tides.

In "Academic Capitalism," tuition increases are designed to offset the decline in-state funding because the university is considered a business (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). In addition, alternative profit centers are developed. The following examples depict academic capitalism at a large public university in New Mexico:

- (1) A shopping mall and hotel complex are being built along with expansion of the university golf course from 18 to 27 holes.
- (2) The athletic building used for basketball games and graduations is also used for music and wrestling events, with revenues of approximately \$1m per performance.
- (3) The football team loses more games than it wins and cannot fill its home stadium, but is paid a million dollars for its practice games with Big Ten conference teams in sell-out away games.
- (4) The State of New Mexico does not invest or contribute to faculty and staff salaries, and has reduced its support of student finances; however, it does invest in buildings and landscape.
- (5) The university foundation fundraises for scholarships and encourages faculty to contribute individual funds.
- (6) The university privatizes and outsources. As an example, it replaced the university bookstore with a Barnes and Noble, outsourced university food services to Sodexo, outsourced the health clinic to a local hospital and was considering outsourcing university housing to a private concern until they discovered the university would lose money.
- (7) Deloitte was paid \$622,700 for ten days of consultation with the Board of Regents to determine ways to implement business process reengineering (BPR) to address budget reductions and personnel downsizing. BPR is a context-less, abstractionist,

---

top-down administrative ontology because it separates praxis from the top-down change approach. In fact, reengineering's main appeal is abstraction, the principles of span of control, lean and mean, and is applicable to all organizations and experiences. The use of outside consultants and BPR is indicative of trends in public universities to operate under principles of New Public Management (Jessop, 2017).

New Mexico's experiences are not unique. In California, one university chancellor mandated no new academic programs be introduced unless developed through the executive education division. Executive education programs are preferable because tuition is not subsidized by the state; in other words, students pay full price for programs (or almost triple in-state tuition). These additional tuition dollars finance administrators' salaries in executive education. Furthermore, all executive education, summer and winter term classes, and study abroad courses are not state subsidized. These programs should provide flexibility and unique programs for students, but are cost prohibitive under the neoliberalism of executive education administrators. These programs were instituted during the eight-year period in which no faculty pay raises had occurred[1].

One California university campus is a particularly egregious example of the overarching neoliberal agenda. There are condemned buildings on the campus; the library has eliminated nearly two-thirds of its holdings, and a significant portion of its journal subscriptions. This particular campus hired a dean immediately following two separate votes of no confidence from his previous institutions. His recommendation to eliminate the economics department at a previous university because it was not a profit-generating discipline resulted in his dismissal. Upon his appointment at the California University, he immediately slashed faculty research and development budgets, cut faculty salaries, increased annual teaching loads by 90 h, and convened a committee to evaluate requests for building and office furniture repairs based upon a merit system. The savings accrued were used to pay the salary of a fundraiser with a \$300,000 budget (see footnote 1).

These examples are upsetting from an academician's perspective. The programs and measures mentioned above provide little value added to education for students, and, in fact, may be detracting from student achievement outcomes. However, in light of decreased funding, can university administrators be blamed for attempting to stabilize university finances? While the tension between faculty and administrators is suboptimal, it seems to be a necessary evil to ensure the survival of the public university.

### **Follett's orientation on education**

Follett's ideas are steeped in relationality and are devoid of dualism, embodying the diversity of human perspectives to unlock new possibilities (Follett, 1941; Morse, 2006). Relationality has no meaningful existence in pluralistic individualism or in domination via representational power-over (Follett, 1919). "Give your difference, welcome my difference, unify all difference in the larger whole – such is the law of growth. The unifying of difference is the eternal process of life – the creative synthesis, the highest act of creation" (Follett, 1918, p. 40). O'Connor (2000), Stout and Staton (2011) and others advanced the Hegelian dialectical synthesis grounding of Follett's concept of integration.

As a subset of relationality, integration represents the convergence of two or more ideas. Follett resolved conflicts through integrative unification, rather than domination or forcing "compromises." She stressed that genuine democracy stems from self-organizing and self-managing at the community level, not majority rule characterized by shallow voting. Her "law of the situation" (Follett, 1919, 1941) is a jointly studied investigation and agreement by all participants. This co-construction explores ways in which a situation emerges, changes and progresses. It celebrates diversity by treating cultural differences

as assets. “Follett’s views are in concert with feminist approaches to the ethical resolution of conflict, which focus on dialectical communication between participants to reach an integrative solution that considers the needs of all” (Monin and Bathurst, 2008). Follett’s doctrine grows power-with, avoids power-over, and recognizes self-empowerment. The situation is the “invisible leader” and through scientific co-study and joint-projects of inquiry, it is possible to create common purpose, the foundation of ensemble leadership (Rosile *et al.*, 2013) and entrepreneurship centers (Maas and Jones, 2017).

Follett (1941) briefly described what transpires when integration is not possible – when two sets of ideas are so far apart there is little or no relationality (Follett, 1941; Fry and Thomas, 1996). This may be due to a lack of desire (Morse, 2006), or intelligence to derive integrative solutions (Follett, 1941). Currently, there is an inability to integrate in public universities due to a lack of interest and an absence of relevant Follettian framework.

Follett-inspired educators bridge the analytical, artistic and emotional with the practical via the prosaic. Those with managerial experience frequently draw upon experiences to render an obscure concept believable and to stimulate the imaginations of students. Follett encouraged educators to share personal experiences with students to enhance applicability and harness intuition and potentiality (Rae, 2005). She further advocated that educators seek rich practical and managerial experiences to enhance pedagogy, and to apply the theoretical experiences for the betterment of society (Follett, 1970). According to Follett (1970), everything taught in a classroom should have two uses – practical (education as an end (Cicero, 1991; Jack and Anderson, 1999) or imaginative (education as a means; Locke, 2007; Jack and Anderson, 1999). Follett denounced a trend in education that disjoined life with intellectual adventures and produced inert knowledge that stifled freedom of thought (Follett, 1970). By thoroughly exploring all facets of a finite number of situations, concepts and theories could become more relatable to student experience (Rae, 2004; Yin, 2013), and hence enjoy greater applicability.

Irrespective of academic field, most educators perceive value in serving as a vector between student learning and the real world. In entrepreneurship this is described as the “plus zone challenge” (Hindle, 2007), whereby the professor transcends vocational aspects of entrepreneurship to stimulate the total person through imaginative activity. According to Weick (1995), people construct meaning through others’ contextual experiences to create their own reality. Imagination is important in any curriculum because it conjoins the positivistic or entitative with the artistic through emotion (Rae, 2005). Imagination elucidates the unpredictable and ungeneralizable antecedents of education (Jack and Anderson, 1999), including the tacit knowledge that comes with participation in an activity (Brannick, and Coghlan, 2007; Alvesson, 2003; Adler and Adler, 1987) and learning (Rae and Carswell, 2000). Perhaps, most importantly, imagination in education fosters the development of street smarts (Jack and Anderson, 1999) that have practical value.

Follett’s insights are germane to the conflict within the public university because they represent a process whereby educators encompass the needs of the university, community and student (Noble, 2012), embodying the principles of integration (Follett, 1918), its uses for civic development (Morse, 2006) and management within the organization (Follett, 1941). The specific application of Follett’s (1970) educational approach is the ELT (Rosile *et al.*, 2013), and its practical application is embracing the plus zone challenge of education (Hindle, 2007) embodied in entrepreneurship centers.

### **Possible Follettian-inspired socioeconomic interventions**

The current governance of the public university neglects to harmonize ongoing differences to generate constructive conflict (Follett, 1941). The university must ultimately resolve the conflict between intellectual property and intellectual commons (Jessop, 2017), which can be a challenge because universities in the neoliberal political climate need both learning and

---

profit making (Jessop, 2017). One proposed counter-strategy for higher education is called the ELT (Rosile *et al.*, 2013). The ELT finds harmony in differences, in diversity of voices and characters, and works through theatric performances of leadership as a process of becoming harmonized. Stated in Follettian terminology, the ELT interweaves differences in a process of becoming “self-in-and-through-others” (Follett, 1918, p. 68, as cited in Stout and Staton, 2011, p. 283). Using storytelling or a powerful narrative to communicate a criticality, the ELT can awaken social capital (Grint, 2005; Johannisson and Olaison, 2007). A combination of the ELT and Follett’s relational process ontology was successfully implemented in leadership, consulting, and sustainability development courses currently taught at a large public university in New Mexico. It is unfortunate that the ELT did not turn the tide of the neoliberal agenda at this university; however, it has certainly planted a seed for future integrative activities on the part of both students and faculty. Co-creation of the ensemble does not deny individual differences. Rather, through an ongoing process of ensemble-creation, working through conflicts, and harmonizing and integrating differences, the communicative expressions of each individual interweaves into an ensemble, a “process of harmonizing differences” and “constructive conflict” (Follett, 1941).

The ELT is a process of becoming that melds differences in everyday conflict resolution. Leading by togetherness complements Follett’s relational process ontology, to integrate differences into creative expression. The ELT is an alternative to the dominant individualist strategies of public universities.

Follettian ELT addresses public university functions. To exemplify, state funding and tuition and fees are negotiated amongst administrators, governments, and legislatures. Research attracts individuals from the private sector through grants and contracts. There is a give-and-take integrative process of interplay (as an alternative to domination and compromise) (Follett, 1918). This is in reference to Hegelian dialectical development process, or the “group spirit” in Follett’s terms (Follett, 1918).

### Creation of entrepreneurship centers

An embodiment of Follett’s application of constructive conflict is found in select university entrepreneurship and innovation centers (Maas and Jones, 2017). The entrepreneurship center is an embodiment of the ELT (Rosile *et al.*, 2013) and Mary Parker Follett’s integration (Follett, 1918, 1941) because it draws from the strengths of both educational and neoliberal traditions.

From an educational standpoint, Follett emphasized that academicians should provide sufficient intellectual stimulation so that students can apply lessons in the classroom for their own ways and means (Derrida, 1993). Her colleague Whitehead (1959) furthered her sentiment in that the university should be a place for intellectual adventures, but should also strive to produce knowledge that has a practical application – and the student should be the one best determining the application. Entrepreneurship centers allow academicians to focus on theory in the classroom, while simultaneously providing a laboratory for students and researchers to apply classroom lessons and research findings.

Entrepreneurship centers simultaneously embrace the principles of neoliberalism. One of the directives of neoliberalism is to intervene in the economy to encourage entrepreneurship (Olssen and Peters, 2005). One of the ideal ways to stimulate entrepreneurship is through local knowledge (Hayek, 2014), just like learning is also best achieved locally (Whitehead, 1959). It can even be argued from a neoliberal perspective that this local knowledge is more effective than any knowledge provided through central planning (Hayek, 1945), which furthers neoliberalism’s emphasis on individual initiative without state assistance.

A model of entrepreneurship that may describe the center’s role may be borrowed from Pelly (2016, 2017). The eternal object (Whitehead, 1978) or form serves as a metaphor for the abstractions taught in the classroom by educators. The actual objects (Whitehead, 1978) serve as a metaphor for local/contextual knowledge. The role of the



---

entrepreneurship center is to serve as a point of integration (Follett, 1919, 1941) between the orientations of the abstract or intellectual, and the real or applied. Through the center, students, educators and the state benefit from insights of faculty, students achieve the civic learning as advocated by Newman (1982), the economy benefits through the work of students and faculty through the center, students gain skill desired by industry, and centers can serve as a magnet for third party revenue. This coordination of theory and practice serves as the opportunity around which faculty and the public integrate. A few examples of these entrepreneurship centers follow.

At Lancaster University community, academic, and administrative interests are coalesced to satisfy both intellectual and neoliberal goals – fully embodying community-based integration perspective (Follett, 1918; Morse, 2006). In this center, administrators work with academicians to fundraise—epitomizing the neoliberal economic agenda. Funds from these centers are used to provide joint academic-practitioner collaborations – which include free programs and facilities for students and members of the community for training in entrepreneurship. These programs have greatly bolstered the economic well-being within the region as well as provided students the opportunity to work with practitioners and expand their professional network. In addition, these centers have served as a laboratory for academicians to test their theories and develop novel research. The center of Otago, New Zealand, is jointly owned by three universities along with the city which affirms the role of the state as an integrator (Follett, 1918; Morse, 2006) and bridges the ideal with the practical (Follett, 1970).

At one California public university, the center is used to generate positive student and faculty outcomes despite bureaucratic obstacles. Because it benefits from external funding, the center circumvents the university moratorium of launching new programs. These programs are free and open for everyone. The center hires leading visiting faculty, provides pop-up lectures and connects students with mentors. These programs enhance the center's (or university's) role as an equalizer and integrator. Because of the independent funding source, opposition to free programs for the community was negated and the university administration ultimately claimed credit for the programs instead of canceling them[2].

Building on the ensemble learning approach, these centers embrace differences between administration and faculty philosophies. Moreover, in innovation centers objectives are united, promoting the desire to integrate via common language and goals (Morse, 2006; Follett, 1941). The rewards are also evenly allocated. In many centers, faculty are compensated, administrators gain prestige for the university, and the community benefits from free programs and collaboration with students and faculty.

The centers illustrate “the complex reciprocal action, the intricate interweaving of the members of the group, is the social process” (Follett, 1918, p. 33). Follett articulates differences in the collective process. “Reciprocal adapting, the interknitting of differences, and its accumulated effect is the irresistible flow of life, our existence, and reaching a richer synthesis becomes a fresh difference leading to new unities in ever broadening fields of activity” (Follett, 1918, p. 35). In part, this is a Hegelian dialectical development. Heterogeneity, not homogeneity, in the social organization encourages difference during creative synthesis. “Difference in itself is not a vital force, but what accompanies it is – the unifying spirit” (Follett, 1918, p. 41). “It is the Spirit of democracy” (Follett, 1918, p. 43).

Follett focuses on human potential (human well-being), co-active participation (participative leadership), self-organizing teams and shared power in a system of organization adaptation to continuously shifting environments. Follett (1918, 1941) viewed organizational systems as communities of diverse individuals (and networks of self-managed teams) that need not have dominance over one another. The innovative ideas of Follett are an alternative to organizations facing ideological conflicts. In summary, Follettian ELT and entrepreneurship centers can serve as a way to incorporate the individualist urges of the neoliberal university with the community-oriented vision of academicians.

## Conclusion

The public university is currently at a crossroads with respect to its future path. Which road the university takes will ultimately determine not only its identity, but the very fabric of its existence. Under the current neoliberal political climate, the public university may cease to exist in its current form.

On one hand, faculty members follow an ideology of education, intellectual democracy and community development. They educate students and further their agendas in unique ways based upon their academic backgrounds and core competencies. This approach worked well when funding was abundant. In the face of reduced resources, the public university began searching for external funding, shifting to a neoliberal ideology. This model treats the university as a modern bureaucracy and as a business. In lieu of functioning as a supplement to the faculty, it has supplanted the interests of faculty and students.

Ideological conflict endangers the existence of the contemporary university. Two conflicting ideologies cannot compete within the same organization. In the face of this impasse, an orientation based upon Folletian ideals, such as the relational process ontology, may preserve the fabric of the university. Two applications of the relational process ontology are advocated in this work – ELT and entrepreneurship centers. The ELT communicates this impending upheaval through a robust narrative and can be used to harmonize differences and awaken social capital between actors in the university. Likewise, entrepreneurship centers should be encouraged to bridge disciplines of faculty members and work through universities to provide solutions for students, administrators, educators and the community at large. Irrespective of whether the public university can implement the ELT or develop entrepreneurship centers, it is imperative that this conflict be resolved.

## Notes

1. These data were acquired through interviews at the aforementioned California Public University.
2. This knowledge was obtained through the co-author's participation as an entrepreneurship center board member and center academic director.

## References

- Adler, P.A. and Adler, P. (1987), *Membership Roles in Field Research*, Vol. 6, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Alvesson, M. (2003), "Methodology for close up studies – struggling with closeness and closure", *Higher Education*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 167-193.
- Bok, D. (2009), *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Brannick, T. and Coghlan, D. (2007), "In defense of being "native": the case for insider academic research", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 59-74.
- Bullard, D.B. (2007), "Academic capitalism in the social sciences: Faculty responses to the entrepreneurial university".
- Cicero, M.T. (1991), *On Duties (De Officiis)* (Trans. MT Griffin and EM Atkins), Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Collins, J.L., Williams, B. and di Leonardo, M. (2008), "New landscapes of inequality: Neoliberalism and the erosion of democracy in America".
- Derrida, J. (1993), "Structure, sign, and play in the discourse of the human sciences", in Natali, J. and Hutcheon, L. (Eds), *A Postmodern Reader*, SUNY Press, Albany, NY, pp. 223-242.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A. and Healey, P. (Eds) (1998), *Capitalizing Knowledge: New Intersections of Industry and Academia*, SUNY Press, Albany, NY.
- Follett, M.P. (1918), *The New State: Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government*, Penn State Press, University Park, PA.

- Follett, M.P. (1919), "Community is a process", *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 28 No. 6, pp. 576-588.
- Follett, M.P. (1941), in Metcalf, H.C. and Urwick, L.F. (Eds), *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*, Harper and Brothers, New York, NY and London.
- Follett, M.P. (1970), "The teacher-student relation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 137-148.
- Fry, B.R. and Thomas, L.L. (1996), "Mary Parker Follett: assessing the contribution and impact of her writings", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 11-19.
- Grint, K. (2005), "Problems, problems, problems: the social construction of 'leadership'", *Human Relations*, Vol. 58 No. 11, pp. 1467-1494.
- Hackett, E.J. (2014), "Academic capitalism", *Science Technology and Human Values*, Vol. 39 No. 5, pp. 635-638.
- Hayek, F.A. (1945), "The use of knowledge in society", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 519-530.
- Hayek, F.A. (2014), *The Road to Serfdom: Text and Documents: The Definitive Edition*, Routledge, Abington-on-Thames.
- Häyrynen-Alestalo, M. and Peltola, U. (2006), "The problem of a market-oriented university", *Higher Education*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 251-281.
- Hindle, K. (2007), "Teaching entrepreneurship at university: from the wrong building to the right philosophy", in Fayolle, A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Entrepreneurship Education*, Vol. 1, Edward Elgar, Northampton, MA, pp. 104-126.
- Jack, S.L. and Anderson, A.R. (1999), "Entrepreneurship education within the enterprise culture: producing reflective practitioners", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 110-125.
- Jessop, B. (2017), "Varieties of academic capitalism and entrepreneurial universities", *Higher Education*, Vol. 73 No. 6, pp. 853-870.
- Johannisson, B. and Olaison, L. (2007), "The moment of truth – reconstructing entrepreneurship and social capital in the eye of the storm", *Review of Social Economy*, Vol. 65 No. 1, pp. 55-78.
- Locke, J. (2007), *Some Thoughts Concerning Education: (Including of the Conduct of the Understanding)*, Courier Corporation, North Chelmsford, MA.
- MacIntyre, A. (2009), "The very idea of a university: Aristotle, Newman, and us", *British Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 57 No. 4, pp. 347-362.
- Maas, G. and Jones, P. (2017), *Entrepreneurship Centers Global Perspectives on their Contributions to Higher Education Institutions*, Springer, New York, NY.
- Mansell, R. (2012), "Critical thinking: Kahneman and policy making", *Prometheus*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 461-464.
- Monin, N. and Bathurst, R. (2008), "Mary Follett on the leadership of 'Everyman'", *Ephemera-Theory & Politics in Organization*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 447-446.
- Morse, R.S. (2006), "Prophet of participation: Mary Parker Follett and public participation in public administration", *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 1-32.
- Newfield, C. (2008), *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class*, Harvard University Press.
- Newman, J.H. (1982), in Svaglic, M.J. (Ed.), *The Idea of a University*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN, pp. 1-19.
- Noble, D.F. (2012), *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education*, Aakar Books, New Delhi.
- O'Connor, E.S. (2000), "Integrating Follett: history, philosophy and management", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 167-190.
- Olssen, M. and Peters, M.A. (2005), "Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism", *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 313-345.
- Pelly, R.D.M. (2016), "A bureaucrat's journey from technocrat to entrepreneur through the creation of adhocracies", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 28 Nos 7-8, pp. 487-513.

- Pelly, R.D.M. (2017), "Entrepreneurial opportunity-a perspective from the theory of forms", *American Journal of Management*, Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 87-102.
- Rae, D. (2004), "Practical theories from entrepreneurs' stories: discursive approaches to entrepreneurial learning", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 195-202.
- Rae, D. (2005), "Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptual model", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 323-335.
- Rae, D. and Carswell, M. (2000), "Using a life-story approach in researching entrepreneurial learning: the development of a conceptual model and its implications in the design of learning experiences", *Education + Training*, Vol. 42 Nos 4/5, pp. 220-228.
- Rosile, G.A., Boje, D.M., Carlon, D.M., Downs, A. and Saylor, R. (2013), "Storytelling diamond: an antenarrative integration of the six facets of storytelling in organization research design", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 557-580.
- Sappey, J. (2005), "The commodification of higher education: flexible delivery and its implications for the academic labour process", in Baird, M., Cooper, R. and Westcott, M. (Eds), *Reworking Work-AIRAAANZ 19th Conference*, Association of Industrial Relations Academics of Australia and New Zealand, University of Sydney, Sydney, pp. 495-502.
- Scruton, R. (2015), "The end of the university", *First Things*, Vol. 252 No. 6, pp. 25-30.
- Shumar, W. (2008), "Space, place and the American university", in Canaan, J.E. and Shumar, W. (Eds), *Structure and Agency in the Neoliberal University*, Routledge, New York, NY and London, pp. 67-83.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L.L. (1997), *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, pp. 21218-24319.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (1999), "Knowledge as a global public good", in Kaul, I., Grunberg, I. and Stern, M. (Eds), *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*, Vol. 308, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 308-325.
- Stout, M. and Staton, C.M. (2011), "The ontology of process philosophy in Follett's administrative theory", *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 268-292.
- Touraine, A. (1992), *Critique de la modernité*, Fayard, New York, NY.
- Waks, L.J. (2004), "In the shadow of the ruins: globalization and the rise of corporate universities", *PolicyFutures in Education*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 278-298.
- Weick, K. (1995), *Sensemaking in Organizations*, Vol. 3, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Whitehead, A. (1978), *An Essay in Cosmology*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Whitehead, A.N. (1959), "The aims of education", *Daedalus*, Vol. 88 No. 1, pp. 192-205.
- Yin, R.K. (2013), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

### Further reading

- Bathurst, R. and Monin, N. (2010), "Shaping leadership for today: Mary Parker Follett's aesthetic", *Leadership*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 115-131.
- Usher, R., Johnston, R. and Bryant, I. (2004), *Adult Education and the Postmodern Challenge: Learning Beyond the Limits*, Abington.
- Whyte, W.H. (2013), *The Organization Man*, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA.

### Corresponding author

Robert Duncan M. Pelly can be contacted at: [duncan.pelly@gmail.com](mailto:duncan.pelly@gmail.com)

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

[www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm](http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm)

Or contact us for further details: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)