CHAPTER 7

The Metaphors for the Academic Organisation

Introduction

Images of Growth and Development

Images of Organisational Structure

Machine-Organism

Business Corporation-Collegium

Administrative Culture-Democratic Culture

The Organisation as Political System

The Organisation as Machine, as Body, and as Organism

Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the images and metaphors which relate to organisational phenomena as, for example, the distribution of authority and decision-making power, the development of the organisation, etc. Much of the imagery to be examined refers specifically to the characteristics of the organisation of which the subjects themselves are members.

The chapter begins with a discussion of images of organisational growth and development. This is followed by a discussion of images through which the structure of the organisation is portrayed. Some commonly juxtaposed metaphors are then examined. These include the following three pairs: machine - organism, corporation - collegium, administrative culture - democratic culture. The metaphor of the organisation as political system is then considered and the chapter closes with an examination of three subjects' interpretations of the following metaphors: the organisation as machine, as body and as organism.

Images of Growth and Development

In Chapter Five (pp.182-83), the metaphor of growth as it applied to the individual was discussed. There it was noted that the purpose of university education was to nurture the growth and development of the individual. Used thus, the metaphor of growth implies a perspective on university education which is 'person-centred', one focused on the needs of the individual. There are also occasions, however, when the metaphor of growth is applied to the organisation. When used in this latter way, the growth metaphor goes hand-in-hand with an emphasis on the role of the university in the wider society.

There are numerous references to the organisation as an entity that "grows" and "develops." Moreover, the metaphor of growth often occurs in the context of a discussion of environmental pressures, a university being seen as an organisation which must adapt to these pressures in order to survive. For one subject, the "success" of a university is largely measured in terms of how well it "grows" and "develops" in response to these environmental pressures.

These passages are strongly imbued with the notion of corporate darwinism and in them the underlying conception of the university as a biological organism is particularly apparent. Thus "the newer universities" are described as "hybrid places trying to evolve." They are said to be "like headless chickens...not quite sure of where they are going." The organisation to which the subjects belong is seen as a fledgling university. It is, in the words of one, an organisation endeavouring to become "a full-fledged university." Again, it is described as an organisation "struggling to become a university."

As a living organism, the university is very much a temporal phenomenon as the many references to its "evolving" nature imply. It is described specifically by one subject as an "organism evolving in time." It is not only the organisation as a whole that is seen as evolving, but also parts of it. Specific changes, such as the introduction of a more collegial decision-making style, are described as taking time to evolve. There is, for example, one subject who states that "changing the decision structure to a more collegiate style has to be an evolutionary process over perhaps two years..."

Again, as a temporal phenomenon, universities are seen as having "stages of development." The university studied is frequently depicted as being in a transitional stage and as going through "a very, very difficult time." That administrative action must take into account the specific stage of development is a recurring statement. Indeed leadership is judged according to how well it matches a particular stage of development. Thus the leadership approach of the former Vice-Chancellor, is described as a "boots and all" approach. It is considered appropriate to the time in which it occurred, but is deemed inappropriate for the future. The future leader, says

this same subject, should demonstrate a different approach, should be one who "exudes education in the fullest sense of the word."

It is noteworthy that the emphasis placed by one subject on expansion, growth and development is such that the word 'develop' and its cognates occurs in his language twenty-three times. This subject speaks of the development of courses, the development of academic graduates, the development of society, the development of an academic standard and the development of research. As an academic administrator, he is concerned with adjusting the growth of the organisation. He comments, for example, that he may have "to cut back on one [function] in order to develop the others."

Images of Organisational Structure

If an organisation is seen as an entity in time, it is also true that it is depicted topographically, that is, as an entity existing in space. There are many references to "the structure" of the organisation and this structure is described as having different shapes. Sometimes it is seen as a 'flat' structure, although much more frequently it is seen as a 'vertical' one. In the following passage, in which a Dean is speaking, both the 'vertical' and the 'flat' aspects of the organisation's structure are emphasised. This subject comments:

> The other things I felt were important was that, to me, the Dean - the Dean is the pinnacle of what is in one sense a hierarchical structure, but I tried to operate a structure in which it was both hierarchical but also a flat structure as much as possible. Where responsibilities were spread out and where - let the pinnacle of power only became necessary in extreme circumstances.

Here the Dean views his formal position as representing "the pinnacle" of the structure, but he also attempts to "spread out" responsibilities, thus implementing a "flat structure."

Whilst some subjects concede that there is a movement towards a greater degree of devolution of decision-making power, there is no doubt that the organisation is seen as being pre-eminently vertical. It is repeatedly emphasised that its structure features a "top-down design." As one subject puts it:

> At the moment we are very tightly managed, very tightly managed with a top-down design. The Vice Chancellor's Executive Committee consists of essentially the Deans and the Pro Vice Chancellors, and they have a very tight management structure. Some of the decision making and funding - well, actually, a lot of it has been devolved to the Deans already - that's been a change in the last year, that the schools actually now have control over funds, over their own funds. That's been a downwards devolution of decision making authority that's occurred in the last year. I just want to see it go another step further and go down to the discipline areas ..so we have a very tight management structure.

In this description, as in many others, power and decision-making are said to be located in the upper levels of the organisation's structure. "The pinnacle," as it were, predominates over the lower levels of the structure.

If the organisation is seen as being centralised, it is also said to be "run" in a "very autocratic" way. Thus another subject comments:

> I'd say that the way it's run, it's very autocratic. With all real power and power through..through knowledge and through decision-making being centred in one person..now I don't know that..that that has in fact been the intent of the person - whether, you know, it has been deliberately created that way - but it is certainly I feel [that's] the way that it runs...

He explains further this autocratic approach as follows:

> all..everyone else who..who assumes a role that supposedly has power or..associated with it..it's only power as distributed by the...by the one central person in the institution I feel. You know..this doesn't mean to say that that power can't be exercised, you know. The Dean, for example, is, can, make decisions. However, only because...and to the extent that they are allowed to make decisions...by the Director. I would..hope that..that you know, that I would think that a

better model would in fact involve participation. As I said
before, not necessarily..total democracy ...

As this statement makes clear, "a better model" would be, in this subject's view, one involving a more participatory, democratic approach.

Machine-Organism

The two types of structure commonly mentioned - the 'vertical' and the 'flat' - are also highlighted through certain pairs of metaphors, such as the machine-organism pair. In the following extract, the machine and organism metaphors are said to apply to different levels of the organisation. Thus one subject comments:

> At the moment I would view this place as an organism from
> the school levels down. From say the Associate Dean level
> up, you look more like a regulated mechanistic style
> structure, so there's a real difference I think.

Here the organisation is depicted as a dual-type structure. At the upper levels, it resembles a machine, whilst the remainder resembles an organism.

The dual nature of the structure causes this subject to add to his remarks the following comment:

> It's like a two layered cake this university, and I would like to
> see it more, more like an organism where the different parts
> relate to all the different other parts. For example, the idea
> that the Vice Chancellor should teach and do research, that
> enables them to have more contact with the reality of the
> day-to day life of the institution; and same with Deans, they
> should be more involved in teaching and research. They
> should get around and talk to the tutors more. So it's more
> like an organism that I'd be looking for, connections between
> all [the parts]....like a neural network to put it in computing
> terms.

The controlling metaphors in this description of the organisation's structure

are the machine and organism metaphors. Nevertheless, the speaker also enlivens his description with other apt comparisons. Appropriately, because of its dual nature, the organisation is likened to a "two-layered cake." In itself this image emphasises the predominantly vertical nature of the present structure. What the subject would prefer, however, is a more horizontal structure. Thus his idea of a preferred structure is conveyed through two metaphors. Firstly, there is the metaphor of an organism, wherein the organisation is viewed as an entity displaying connections between all of its parts. Secondly, there is the metaphor of the organisation as "a neural network," the latter being a figure drawn from the language of computer science.

The passages quoted above provide a good example of the close-textured nature of much of the language. Within the one passage there can be several images layered upon each other, as it were.

Business Corporation-Collegium

The business corporation-collegium pair of metaphors is also used to convey ideas about organisational structure and especially about the location of decision-making power. In the next extract, the speaker identifies his institution as being organised "like a corporation." He elaborates on the differences in organisation between a corporation and an academic institution, making clear that these differences pertain to the locus of decision-making. Thus he comments:

> It's more like a corporation and I'd like to see it more like an academic institution ..You see, there's a difference between a corporation and an academic institution. In a corporation, the shareholders - the, the board are responsible to the shareholders for funds that are spent, and most of the developments within that corporation, or private company, come from the top, because that's where the expertise is and the workers on the shop floor are there to do the work, whatever the board of directors wants.

In an academic institution it's different. Most of the ideas come from the shop floor, from the workers, the academics. They're the ones that are developing the course ideas, they're the ones doing the research; that's where the future lies with the shop-floor in an academic institution. So I'd like to have the academic assemblies having more say in the way we run the place. So I'd like to see the tight structured downward passage of decisions changed so that the academics have more say in decision-making.

On this subject's view, the locus of decision-making should be linked to the source of expertise. In the business corporation, expertise lies with a board of directors, hence it is appropriate for decision-making to be centralised in such a board. In an academic institution, however, academic staff are the source of ideas and the locus of decision-making should reside in them.

Whilst the above subject is at pains to distinguish between a business corporation and an academic institution, the controlling metaphor in the description quoted is, nonetheless, the business corporation metaphor. The university, analogised to a corporation, consists of a Board of Directors (the Vice Chancellor's Executive Committee) and shop-floor workers (the academic staff members). Whereas the locus of decision-making, especially in the past, has been the Board (that is, the Vice Chancellor's Executive Committee), it ought to lie more fully with the shop-floor workers (that is, with the academic staff).

It is not surprising that this particular subject's preferred metaphor is the organisation as collegium. The phrases, "a collegiate structure," "a collegiate model," and "a collegiate management structure" recur in his language. Whereas the corporation metaphor is associated with a "top-down" decision-making structure and a "tightly managed" style, the collegium metaphor is associated with a decentralised, flatter structure. In particular, the collegial mode of organisation is seen as most appropriate because it allows academic staff, the source of expertise, the full expression of their ideas. The business corporation mode too often inhibits these ideas.

Administrative Culture-Democratic Culture

As the passages quoted to this point indicate, it is the structural aspects of an organisation that the subjects emphasise most. There are only a few who mention the notion of organisational culture, and of these only one speaks of it at length.

The focus of this subject's attention is the culture of his own organisation. His descriptions of this, however, turn out to be very similar to other subjects' descriptions of the organisation's structure. Thus he speaks of a "two-class culture," a "top-down culture" and a "one-way downward..management style." In the following extract, he is discussing the organisational culture of his particular school. He comments:

> Overall..I believe it [the organisational culture] is very Dean centred, and Associate Dean centred, and I believe that is a poor thing, and the reason that I believe it is a poor thing is I believe that it is cumbersome. I believe that the source of good ideas tends to be seen as being located at the top, and the ideas from other sources throughout the school don't seem to be taken up with the alacrity that one would wish. It's not really a sense of a democracy of ideas and learning whereby anybody might come up with a brilliant idea; there's more a sense of 'we'll do the leading; you do the following' and I often see that is evident and I feel that it's a shame.

This description, whilst it echoes that of other subjects, introduces the image of the organisation as a "democracy of ideas and learning." At present, in this subject's opinion, the centralised nature of the organisation constrains the flow of ideas from various sources and precludes the possibility of such a democracy.

It is this same subject who also describes the existing organisational culture as an "administrative culture," and more specifically, as a "culture of control." In the context of elaborating his vision for the future, he states:

> I would like to see the administrative culture, the corporate culture, that was quite deliberately created as a culture of control by the previous VC, I would like to see that finally laid to rest...

It is also noteworthy that it is this same speaker who had favoured the image of the academic administrator as professional. Not surprisingly then, what he envisions in the future is a more "democratic culture," a culture in which the "empowered" ones would be the academic, not the administrative staff. On this point, he notes that

> I would like to see the university staff more empowered to do their jobs. I would like to see less of a two class academic culture where you have got the managers - you know, like the Heads of Program upwards and the rest of the lecturing staff - I would like to see that go. I would like to see far more - I would like to see academic freedom become far more the major platform, and I believe if that were to come into being this university would be strengthened immensely because students tend to know quality, and they tend to know what they are looking for and if this place increases academic strength then I think it would be a much better place.

In this kind of future, the "culture of control" would be replaced by one which is both more "democratic" and more "professional."

The Organisation as Political System

There are very few examples in these data of images which construe the role of the academic administrator in political language. The statesman image occurs only once, for example, and then only with respect to the Vice-Chancellor's role. In contrast, there are many examples of phrases and images which picture the organisation itself as a type of political system.

One subject, for example, after noting that he views the organisation as a political system, explains his perception as follows:

> As a political system I tend to see it, in terms of kings,
> princes, plebs and proletariat...

And he adds to this, somewhat wryly, the comment, "especially the latter" [i.e. the proletariat].

For another subject, politics is accepted as being an integral aspect of all organisations. When he compares the organisation to a political system, this comparison is seen to be particularly apt, given the very nature of organisations. That is, the comparison is made in a neutral kind of way.

Much more frequently, however, political images are used to recount situations or experiences which are viewed negatively. The descriptions of these situations and experiences are replete with terms such as "bunfights," "games," "lobbying," "agendas," "manouevring," "facades," "cliques," "factions," "competition" and "jockeying." Some of these descriptions are coloured with a sense of frustration and futility. One subject, for example, speaks of "the sense of futility" he experiences when political machinations are substituted for a rational response to educational problems and issues. He recounts an incident in which, as a Head of Programme, he is involved in "arguments couched in educational terms" but which constitute only a "facade" for "hidden agendas."

Aspects of political behaviour involving competition and conflict are emphasised, rather than those involving negotiation and compromise. In particular, there are some vivid accounts of the effects of politics within organisations. One subject comments:

> The organisation..is a political system. Politics is high - is
> high on the agenda. Lobbying. Everything that's in politics
> exists in the tertiary institution at the moment.

This same subject then proceeds to picture the effects of politics in his own organisation. He comments:

> I think it's a shame. I think it's destructive. I describe this
> place at the moment as basically seven little schools, all
> guarding their little pile of dirt and trying to rip whatever
> they can off someone else...Politics in the place is all

consuming... It's seven schools all going their own separate ways, little cliques or allegiances which change. There's no university perspective.

Here, as in other examples which could be adduced, political behaviour is seen as being detrimental to the health of the organisation. On balance, images of the organisation as a political system occur much more frequently in a negative, than in a positive context. They are used to register disapproval of practices which are seen as divisive and fragmenting.

The Organisation as Machine, as Body, and as Organism

What has been discussed so far is imagery that pictures the organisational characteristics of the subjects' own institution. It might be recalled from Chapter Three (pp.125-26), that each of the subjects, on completion of an interview, was shown a list of organisational metaphors. These were the metaphors explained in Morgan's (1986) *Images of Organization.* Each subject was then asked to select the metaphor that best summarised his view of an academic organisation. In what follows the responses of three of these subjects to metaphors on the list are discussed. The responses of these subjects are examined here because they not only selected a metaphor, they went on to discuss the particular metaphor (or metaphors) chosen. They presented the reasons for their choice and, in some instances, they proposed a variation to a particular metaphor.

Of the two subjects who chose the machine metaphor, one explains his choice in the following way:

> As an administrator it [his preferred organisational metaphor] would have to be machine I suppose. Because that's..that's the way I think..I believe that the institution has a certain...certain role to play. It has a certain function ..and all the elements within that should operate towards achieving that goal. My orientation as a student would be entirely different I think. I would see it as a mixture of those,

as some of those things and certainly more..more emphasis on culture and perhaps organism as well. But as someone who's in a lecturing and also a..a management position, I'd see it..I'd see it as a machine.

The vocabulary of the above passage conveys a fairly standard interpretation of the machine metaphor as applied to an organisation. An organisation has certain roles and functions and these should contribute to the accomplishment of a goal or goals.

It is worth noting at this point that the metaphors chosen by subjects from the list are entirely consistent with images and metaphors used by these same subjects elsewhere. The previously quoted subject's choice of a machine metaphor does not contradict images contained in his other comments. Elsewhere he speaks of his preference for a "rational model" and of his difficulty in dealing with "personal" concerns. On these points, he notes that:

I..I tend to operate on a fairly, what I would regard as a rational model, so if..you know if I go about making changes to a curriculum, they are changes based on sound academic reasons..[and] in many ways I get irritated by people whose concerns are more personal and..less professional - put it that way. OK. So..I have difficulty in..dealing with situations where that..that comes about. Because you can't talk at a professional and academic level and argue and convince people at that level, when their..when obviously their..their concerns are at a more..are at a more personal level.

This is a statement which would be seen by many as being consistent with a machine view of an organisation. It is perhaps also noteworthy that this same subject elsewhere mentions his dislike of collegial, democratic modes of decision-making.

Two subjects chose a variant of the organism metaphor, namely, the metaphor of the body. In the following statement, one of these subjects, a Dean, is explaining how he sees an organisation. He notes that:

I don't think it's a machine, because I think that's too robotic; it doesn't take into account people's feelings, emotions, aspirations, and all those other elements that go in to make

up a person's total being. On the other hand, I..I'm not sure that it's a brain because a brain is not the total picture of any individual.

He then elaborates on his view of the organisation as "a body" in the following way:

> I like to think of it as a body, because every body has got..[there is] a part to play. You've got a head, you've got eyes, you've got ears, you've got hands, and..I think when the intellectual..group, which I guess you could say is the brain, says to the administrative group in the school, which is the hands and fingers actually doing, that we're better than you, we have no need of you - there's been a certain element of that and I think any school has that, the academics think themselves a class above the administrators..Then I think they're not functioning effectively as a team in partnership with each other, recognising each other's complementary skills and so on. So I think..it's best described as a body...I'd like to think of it as a body, all [the parts] working in concert with each other, recognising what our..respective responsibilities and roles and functions are.

Clearly the body metaphor, as used here, highlights qualities of cohesion and integration. Each member of the body is seen as having a specific function to perform and in so doing it contributes to the functioning of the whole. An organisation should function in a similar way.

What is especially interesting in the previous statement, moreover, is the way in which two groups of staff are pictured. The academic staff ("the intellectual group") are construed metaphorically as "the brain," whilst the administrative staff, the doers as it were, are "the hands and fingers."

The Dean's use of the body metaphor is paralleled by a Programme Head's use of the organism metaphor. This latter subject notes that he "looks at" an academic organisation as "an organism" and then elaborates on this metaphor in the following way:

> As an organism - It's.. part of it being the heart and part of it being the brain. That sort of thing.

> I think that probably, the, I'd see it more as a..having

> multiple hearts.. and one fairly large brain! I think that the heart.. I think I would probably associate more with the schools and with the.. the centres.. I'd certainly say that the brain was the central administration - that's where I'd see the brain maintaining a fairly strong control over everything else. The heart - I'd say probably within the sub-central administrations in each school. Often bleeding!

The organisation is thus pictured metaphorically as having one large brain (the central administration) and this brain is surrounded by a series of hearts (the schools and their academic administrators).

The speaker would appear to be referring to the actual organisation of which he is a part and there is no doubt that he pictures it as highly centralised. The various "hearts" are, for example, peripheral to "the brain," the latter being, metaphorically speaking, the central executive group. Moreover, "the hearts" (or schools) are pictured as "bleeding." They are suffering as a result of the control imposed by the "one fairly large brain."

The Programme Head goes on to discuss, from the same metaphorical perspective, the role of Deans. He adds to the above remarks the following comment:

> ...[Deans] are sort of called to the central thing and then come back and it's their job to sort of soften the message that sort of comes through.. you know, you get the heart factual sort of thing and it's the role of the Dean and the school..to mitigate that and sort of make it palatable..to the fingers or whatever else you might call those..the blood cells.

Here the Dean is pictured as a kind of intermediary between "the brain" (the central executive group) and "the hearts" (that is, the schools). It is the Dean who must communicate disappointing decisions to the other members of the body (the fingers, the blood-cells).

Moreover, the decisions which the Dean must convey to the schools are often "hammer blows." This same subject comments further:

> ... many of the sort of things that come through are..would in fact be ..be hammer blows, unless there was some..something there to in fact absorb some of the..strength of them.. You

know, you..when your budget's cut short or your staffing is
cut.. a lot of those sort of stuff comes through the central sort
of thing .. it's the bleeding heart sort of concept that you
know.. you..I can't really help it..type of [thing] you
know..I've done my best..to do battle..and we've lost again...

The Dean's role is thus seen as one of softening the blow associated with
certain decisions. On this view, the Dean is someone who attempts to
mitigate pain and disappointment.

Although there is a broad similarity between the two metaphors just
discussed (the metaphor of the body and the metaphor of the organism),
there are also clear differences. In the Dean's version of the body metaphor,
the organs highlighted are those of the brain, the hands and the fingers.
Thinking is distinguished from doing. In the Programme Head's version of
the organism metaphor, the organs highlighted are the brain and the heart,
with thinking being distinguished from feeling.

Again, in the first example, the academic staff are pictured as "the brain" and
the administrative group as the "hands and fingers" of the body. On the
other hand, in the second example, it is the central executive group who are
viewed, metaphorically, as "the brain," with the schools and their academic
administrators being seen as "the hearts." Finally it might be noted that, in
the first example, the body metaphor highlights cohesion and inter-
relatedness but, in the second example, the organism metaphor highlights a
centralised system of organisation and the pain and disappointment
experienced within it.

Conclusion

In this chapter some examples of images and metaphors for the academic
organisation have been discussed. Most of these picture characteristics of the
subjects' own organisation. Three pairs of metaphors, in particular, were
noted: machine-organism, business corporation-collegium and

administrative culture-democratic culture.

The organisation is described as being predominantly mechanistic, in the sense that it is characterised by a centralised mode of decision-making. However, it is also noted by some that the organisation is beginning to develop more organic characteristics. The use of the organism metaphor, or variants of it such as the metaphor of the body, are used to highlight the importance of a shared mode of decision-making, as well as qualities of cohesion and integration. The organism metaphor is also used to highlight the experience of pain and disappointment. That the organism metaphor has such a variety of applications in itself suggests that it is one of considerable richness.

A familiar metaphor in administrative science is that of the organisation as political system. This metaphor is reflected in a number of descriptions of organisational life. It occurs, more often than not, in a negative context, with political behaviour being viewed as divisive and fragmenting.

The subjects' own organisation is also portrayed as a an entity in time and in space. Images of growth and development convey a sense of the organisation as an entity in time. However, the organisation is also pictured, in spatial terms, as both a vertical or "top-down" structure and as a horizontal or "flat" structure.

This chapter concludes the presentation of examples of the leading metaphors. Metaphors for the role of the university, the role of the academic administrator and the nature of the academic organisation have now been discussed. From this discussion the reader will already have gained some idea of the range of metaphors used and of the similarities and differences between the identified metaphors. Thus far, there has been no attempt to comment specifically on the range of metaphors used. Similarly, there has been no attempt to indicate the distribution of the metaphors, either according to individual user or according to sub-culture. These topics - the range and distribution of the metaphors - will be addressed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 8

The Range and Distribution of the Metaphors

Introduction

Metaphors for the Role of the University
  Range
  Distribution of Metaphors (Positive Context)
  Distribution of Metaphors (Negative Context)
  The Pattern of Metaphor Use

Metaphors for the Role of the Academic Administrator (Conceptual)
  Range
  Distribution of Metaphors (Positive Context)
  Distribution of Metaphors (Negative Context)
  The Pattern of Metaphor Use

Metaphors for the Role of the Academic Administrator (Experiential)
  Range
  Distribution

Metaphors for the Academic Organisation
  Range
  Distribution (Positive Context)
  Distribution (Negative Context)
  Metaphors Selected by Subjects
  The Pattern of Metaphor Use

Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of the present chapter is to provide information on the range and distribution of the metaphors. This information is presented in tabular form for the three major groups of metaphors identified: the metaphors for the role of the university; the metaphors for the role of the academic administrator; and the metaphors for the academic organisation.

Five tables in all are included, their purpose being to show: (a) the range of metaphors identified (b) the distribution of the metaphors within each sub-culture and across the three sub-cultures (c) the users of the metaphors (which academic administrators used particular metaphors) and (d) the frequency with which a metaphor is used by a particular subject. The tables are also intended to highlight the similarities and differences between the identified metaphors - firstly, within each of the three sub-cultures and, secondly, across the three sub-cultures.

Within each of Tables 1-4, the metaphors are arranged under the headings 'positive' and 'negative'. These headings refer to the context in which a particular metaphor is used. Certain metaphors could be used in a favourable way, indicating the subject's acceptance of the metaphor. These are indicated under the heading 'positive'. On the other hand, a subject might use certain metaphors in a pejorative or an unfavourable sense. These metaphors are indicated under the heading 'negative'. It was noted in Chapter Four (p.149) that any attempt to identify the metaphors needed to take into account this aspect of their use. Whilst the tables cannot give the reader a full appreciation of the way in which a particular metaphor is used, nevertheless the arrangement of metaphors under the headings 'positive' and 'negative' goes some way towards indicating the context in which a metaphor was used.

Within each of the cells in Tables 1-2 and 4-5, abbreviations are used to indicate the approximate frequency of a subject's use of a particular

metaphor. The abbreviations that are used indicate whether the metaphor occurred frequently, to some extent, seldom, or not at all. This indication of frequency is a guide to the degree of importance a subject attaches to a particular metaphor, although it is not absolute. The reader will note that the indication of frequency has been omitted from Table 3. Table 3 contains the experiential images and these, being somewhat novel, tended to occur only once.

The eighteen subjects are identified in each table by number. Numbers 1-4 refer to the subjects from the Arts sub-culture, numbers 5-11 to the subjects from the Information Technology sub-culture, and numbers 12-18 to the subjects from the Education sub-culture. An indication of each subject according to role designation (Dean of Arts, for example) is provided in Appendix C.

The reader will recall that, in Chapters Five to Seven, the writer chose *not* to reveal which academic administrators use the metaphors discussed. For information on the users of the metaphors explained in Chapters Five to Seven, the reader should now consult Appendix D.

Metaphors for the Role of the University

This section contains information on the range and distribution of the first major group of metaphors identified - the metaphors used for the role of the university.

Range
Table 1 (on next page) shows the range and distribution of the metaphors used for the role of the university.

TABLE 1

Metaphors for The University Used by Academic
Administrators from Three Sub-Cultures

Metaphors	Arts				Information Technology							Education						
POSITIVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Producer	F	F	N	N	TSE	F	F	F	N	N	F	F	F	F	F	F	N	N
Business Corporation	F	TSE	N	N	F	F	F	F	N	N	F	F	F	F	F	TSE	N	N
Nurturer	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	F	TSE	N	N	N	TSE	TSE
Institution, Preserving, Transmitting & Creating Knowledge	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F
Interpreter and Translator of Disciplines	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Agent of Social Change	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Monastery	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Path	N	N	SLM	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N
Quest	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE
Journey	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
NEGATIVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Producer	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F
Business Corporation	N	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F
Institution Preserving, Transmitting & Creating Knowledge	N	N	N	N	TSE	TSE	TSE	F	N	N	N	F	TSE	N	N	N	N	N
Agent of Social Change	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Monastery	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Ivory Tower	TSE	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Still Stasis of Permanence	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Temple of Knowledge	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Fountain of Knowledge	N	N	N	N	TSE	TSE	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Key: F = Frequently   SLM = Seldom   TSE = To Some Extent   N = Never

Key to Numbers:

1	Dean	6	Assoc. Dean (Academic)	11	Head of Prog. (Infor. Sci.)	16	Head of Prog. (Grad.Dip.Except. Child.)
2	Assoc. Dean (Academic)	7	Assoc. Dean (Resources)	12	Dean	17	A/Head of Prog. (Bach. of Educ.)
3	Assoc. Dean (Resources)	8	Head of Prog. (Comm. Comput.)	13	A/Assoc. Dean (Academic)	18	Head of Prog. (Grad. Dip. in Teach.)
4	Head of Prog. (Communics)	9	Head of Prog. (Analyt. Comput.)	14	Assoc. Dean (Academic)		
5	Dean	10	Head of Prog. (Grad. Stud.)	15	Assoc. Dean (Resources)		

Table 1 includes a varied range of ten metaphors. There are ten that occur in a positive context. At one extreme the metaphor of the university as agent of social change implies that the university is directly involved with social

reform. At the other extreme are metaphors highlighting the university as a more self-contained world: the metaphors of the university as monastery, as ivory tower, and as institution preserving, transmitting, and creating knowledge. Within these extremes are the metaphors of the university as producer, as business corporation, and as nurturer. Whereas the first two of these (that is, producer and business corporation) highlight the importance of meeting society's needs, the last (that is, the nurturer metaphor) emphasises the importance of the individual's needs. The range also includes three metaphors which apply principally to university education: the path, quest and journey metaphors.

The table includes no new metaphors for the university. Most are well known in the literature of organisational science or in the literature of the philosophy of higher education.

The above statement that all the metaphors are established in the literature probably needs some qualification with regard to the business corporation metaphor. It is more accurate to say that this metaphor has been, over the past few years, an emerging one in literature on organisation and administration. These data undoubtedly indicate that the business corporation metaphor should be considered a metaphor in its own right.

The metaphors mentioned to this point are those occurring in a positive context. Table 1 also includes metaphors that are used in a negative or unfavourable sense. These include the following: the producer and business corporation metaphors; the monastery and ivory tower metaphors; and the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge.

Distribution of Metaphors (Positive Context)

Table 1 also shows that the most prevalent metaphors for the university are the producer and business corporation metaphors. These are distributed across all three sub-cultures and each is used by a total of twelve subjects.

The metaphor of the university as institution preserving, transmitting and

creating knowledge is also distributed across the three sub-cultures and is used by a total of six subjects.

The metaphor of the university as nurturer occurs in only two sub-cultures (Information Technology and Education) and is used by a total of four subjects. The path metaphor is used by one subject from the Education sub-culture. The quest and journey metaphors occur in two sub-cultures (Arts and Education) and are used by a total of two subjects. The monastery metaphor is used in a favourable sense by one subject (Arts).

Within the Arts sub-culture, the producer and business corporation metaphors are used by two of the four subjects. The metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge is used by the remaining two subjects. The nurturer metaphor is used by only one of these four subjects, as is the metaphor of the university as agent of social change.

Within the Information Technology sub-culture, the producer and business corporation metaphors are used by five of the seven subjects. The remaining two subjects use the metaphor of the university as institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge. The nurturer metaphor is used by one subject.

Within the Education sub-culture, the producer and business corporation metaphors are used by five of the seven subjects, with the remaining two subjects using the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge. The nurturer metaphor is used by three of the subjects. The path and quest metaphors are each used by one subject.

All three Deans are users of the producer and business corporation metaphors. The Deans of Arts and Information Technology, in particular, are prolific users of these metaphors. The Dean of Arts is also the sole user of the metaphor of the university as agent of social change. In addition to the producer and business corporation metaphors, the Dean of Education makes extensive use of the nurturer metaphor and the path metaphor.

As with the Deans, the metaphors that are most prevalent amongst the Associate Deans are the producer and business corporation metaphors The metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge is used by only one Associate Dean - the Associate Dean (Resources), Arts. Only the Associate Dean (Resources), Arts, and the Acting Associate Dean (Academic), Education, use the nurturer metaphor.

Within the Arts sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Academic) uses the producer and business corporation metaphors. However, the Associate Dean (Resources) uses the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge and also makes extensive use of the nurturer metaphor.

Within the Information Technology sub-culture, both the Associate Dean (Academic) and the Associate Dean (Resources) are users of the producer and business corporation metaphors.

Within the Education sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Academic), the Associate Dean (Resources) and the Acting Associate Dean (Academic) are all users of the producer and business corporation metaphors. The Acting Associate Dean (Academic) also uses the nurturer metaphor.

It has already been noted that the metaphors that characterise the language of the Deans, and most Associate Deans, are the producer and business corporation metaphors. In contrast, the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge is mainly used by Programme Heads.

Within the Arts sub-culture, the Head of the Communications programme uses the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge.

Within the Information Technology sub-culture, the Head of the Applied Mathematics and Statistics Programme and the Head of Programme (Graduate Studies) are the users of the metaphor of the university as an

institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge. However, the Head of the Commercial Computing Programme and the Head of the Information Science Programme are the users of the producer and business corporation metaphors.

Within the Education sub-culture, the Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme and the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching) both use the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge and also the nurturer metaphor. The only Head of Programme in Education to use the producer and business corporation metaphors is the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Exceptional Children).

Distribution of Metaphors (Negative Context)

Table 1 (p.246) also shows the metaphors that occur in a negative context. The metaphors that occur most often in a negative context are the business corporation metaphor and the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge. There are six subjects who use the business corporation metaphor negatively. These include two subjects from each sub-culture. Its use in a negative context is most marked in the Information Technology and Education sub-cultures.

The metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge is used negatively by six subjects. These include four subjects from the Information Technology sub-culture and two subjects from the Education sub-culture.

The producer metaphor is used in an unfavourable sense by three subjects. Two subjects from the Information Technology sub-culture and one subject from the Education sub-culture use the producer metaphor unfavourably.

The monastery metaphor is used unfavourably by one subject from the Arts sub-culture. The ivory tower metaphor is used unfavourably by two subjects (one from the Arts and one from the Information Technology sub-culture).

Two Deans (the Dean of Information Technology and the Dean of Education) use the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge in an unfavourable sense. The Dean of Arts is strongly critical of the idea of the university as monastery and as ivory tower.

As with the Deans, there are some Associate Deans who use, unfavourably, the metaphor of the university as an institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge. These include two Associate Deans from the Information Technology sub-culture - the Associate Dean (Academic) and the Associate Dean (Resources). They include also the Acting Associate Dean (Academic) from the Education sub-culture.

There is only one Associate Dean who uses the business corporation metaphor unfavourably: the Associate Dean (Resources), Arts.

Of the Programme Heads, there are five who use the business corporation metaphor unfavourably. These include one from Arts, the Head of the Communications Programme; two from Information Technology - the Head of Programme (Graduate Studies) and the Head of Programme (Applied Mathematics and Statistics); and two from Education - the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching) and the Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme. It is noteworthy that the Head of the Graduate Studies Programme, Information Technology, uses the business corporation metaphor in an almost pejorative sense.

Again, of the Programme Heads, there are three who use the producer metaphor unfavourably. These include two subjects from Information Technology: the Head of Programme (Graduate Studies) and the Head of Programme (Applied Mathematics and Statistics). In addition, they include, from Education, the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching).

The Pattern of Metaphor Use

The above information concerning distribution reveals a distinct pattern of metaphor usage. None of the twelve subjects who favour the producer and

business corporation metaphors also favours the metaphor of the university as an institution which preserves, transmits and creates knowledge.

Similarly, none of the six subjects who favour the metaphor of the university as an institution which preserves, transmits and creates knowledge also favours the producer and business corporation metaphors. Indeed these six are critical of, or else reject, the producer and business corporation metaphors. They are especially critical of the business corporation metaphor.

Thus the subjects appear to fall into two main groups which have seemingly mutually exclusive conceptions of the role of the university. One group of subjects (twelve in all) favour the producer and business corporation metaphors. The remaining group (six in all) favour the metaphor of the university as an institution that preserves, transmits and creates knowledge. None of the subjects from either group favours the metaphors used by the remaining group.

What differentiates the two groups is probably obvious from the metaphors themselves. Nonetheless it is worth noting that the two groups adopt very different positions on the issue of how closely the university should be integrated with the wider society. Those subjects who favour the producer and business corporation metaphors strongly emphasise the need for the university to adopt an external orientation. They emphasise the importance of the university's role in serving directly the needs of society. Those subjects who favour the metaphor of the university as an institution that preserves, transmits and creates knowledge attach a greatly diminished importance to the need for the university to assume a closer relationship with the wider society. Indeed the adoption of a such a relationship is viewed with alarm, criticised, or rejected outright. These same six subjects favour what might be called an ideal perspective on the role of the university.

*Metaphors for the Role of the Academic
Administrator   (Conceptual)*

This section contains information on the range and distribution of the conceptual metaphors used for the role of the academic administrator. Of the three major groups of metaphors identified, only those used for the role of the academic administrator have been divided into the conceptual and the experiential. The former metaphors are those which indicate the way in which a subject thinks about or construes the role of the academic administrator. The latter are those which indicate a subject's felt or lived experience of the role. The conceptual metaphors for the role of the academic administrator form by far the largest individual group of metaphors identified and this section is confined to a consideration of their range and distribution.

Range
Table 2, on the following page, shows the conceptual metaphors used for the role of the academic administrator.

TABLE 2

Conceptual Metaphors for the Role of the Academic Administrator
Used by Academic Administrators from
Three Sub-Cultures

Group	Metaphors (Conceptual)	Arts				Information Technology							Education						
	POSITIVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Group 1: Classical Management Theory	Coordinator	TSE	F	SLM	N	F	F	TSE	F	N	N	F	N	N	SLM	SLM	N	N	N
	Controller	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Planner	SLM	N	N	N	SLM	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N
	Performance Reviewer	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Problem Solver	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Group 2: Human Resources Management Theory	Facilitator	F	TSE	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	SLM	TSE	F	N	N	N
	Builder of Environments	SLM	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	SLM
	Team Manager	F	SLM	TSE	N	F	TSE	SLM	N	SLM	SLM	TSE	TSE	TSE	TSE	F	N	N	TSE
	Player-Manager	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE
	Ball Carrier and Distributor	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE
Group 3: Political System Theory	Manager (Democratic)	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	F
	Negotiator	SLM	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM
	Statesman	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	N	SLM
	Spokesman/Representative	TSE	SLM	N	N	N	N	F	SLM	N	N	N	F	TSE	TSE	TSE	N	N	N
Group 4: Corporate Management Theory	Public Relations/Marketing Expert	TSE	SLM	N	N	TSE	F	F	F	N	N	TSE	F	TSE	TSE	TSE	N	N	N
	Salesman	F	TSE	N	N	TSE	TSE	F	SLM	N	N	TSE	F	TSE	TSE	SLM	TSE	N	N
	Entrepreneur	TSE	SLM	N	N	SLM	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	TSE	TSE	TSE	SLM	N	N
	Manager (Corporate)	F	SLM	N	N	F	SLM	SLM	SLM	N	N	TSE	TSE	TSE	F	F	F	N	N
Group 5: Miscellaneous	Manager	F	TSE	SLM	SLM	F	F	F	F	SLM	SLM	TSE	TSE	TSE	F	F	F	N	N
	Leader of Troops	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	SLM	N	N	N	N	N	SLM
	Servant-Manager	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Professional	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	N	N	N
	Manager of Change	TSE	SLM	N	N	N	SLM	N	N	SLM	TSE	N	SLM	N	SLM	N	N	N	N
	Builder	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Curriculum Developer	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	F	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	F	TSE	F
	Academic Leader	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F
	NEGATIVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Group 1: as above	Controller	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Group 2: as above	Manager (Democratic)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N
Group 4: Corporate Management Theory	Public Relations/Marketing Expert	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Salesman	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Entrepreneur	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	TSE
	Manager (Corporate)	N	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F
Group 5: as above	Manager	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	SLM	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	TSE
	Academic Leader	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

Key: F = Frequently   SLM = Seldom   TSE = To Some Extent   N = Never

Key to Numbers:

1	Dean	6	Assoc. Dean (Academic)	1 1	Head of Prog. (Infor. Sci.)	1 6	Head of Prog. (Grad.Dip.Except. Child.)
2	Assoc. Dean (Academic)	7	Assoc. Dean (Resources)	1 2	Dean	1 7	A/Head of Prog. (Bach. of Educ.)
3	Assoc. Dean (Resources)	8	Head of Prog. (Comm. Comput.)	1 3	A/Assoc. Dean (Academic)	1 8	Head of Prog. (Grad. Dip. in Teach.)
4	Head of Prog. (Communics)	9	Head of Prog. (Analyt. Comput.)	1 4	Assoc. Dean (Academic)		
5	Dean	1 0	Head of Prog. (Grad. Stud.)	1 5	Assoc. Dean (Resources)		

It should be emphasised that the metaphors are shown in Table 2 as they are used by the subjects. Thus there are some metaphors that are not necessarily conceptually exclusive of others. The inclusion in the table of the manager metaphor along with more specific manager-related metaphors (such as the coordinator metaphor, the facilitator metaphor, etc) is an example of this.

Table 2 also includes a tentative classification of metaphors. This classification was attempted because of the range of metaphors included in the table. Groups 1-4 include metaphors that are consistent with those underlying certain well known schools of theory. For example, Group 1 includes metaphors that might be seen as underlying classical management theory. Group 2 includes those metaphors often associated with human resource management theory, whilst Group 3 includes those that underlie political views on administration and management. Group 4 includes metaphors that have business or commercial connotations. These have been grouped separately here, because there is no doubt that, in these data, the business metaphor emerges as a distinct metaphor in its own right.

The remaining metaphors are grouped under the heading of 'Miscellaneous'. These include the leader of troops metaphor, the manager of change metaphor and the metaphors of the academic administrator as professional, as servant-manager, as curriculum developer and as academic leader. With the possible exception of the leader of troops and manager of change metaphors, the writer does not see these as readily fitting within established schools of theory.

The term 'miscellaneous', however, should not be allowed to obscure the

importance in the data of two of these metaphors: the curriculum developer and academic leader metaphors. These are by far the most important of the miscellaneous group.

The writer would also stress that the classification used in Table 2 is only tentative and is incomplete. Its purpose here is simply to facilitate comprehension of the information contained in the table. Undoubtedly the classification could be the subject of further investigation. As part of a future study, for example, a researcher might review the classification used here and refine or adjust the categories.

As Table 2 indicates, metaphors for the role of the academic administrator are distributed across a wide band. They range from those indicating a managerial orientation to those indicating an academic leadership orientation and they include one metaphor indicating a curriculum development orientation.

If the manager-related metaphors (for example, the coordinator, facilitator, salesman metaphors, etc) are considered as instances of the one generic metaphor, namely, the manager metaphor, then there are, overall, at least three generic or leading metaphors - the manager metaphor, the curriculum developer metaphor and the academic leader metaphor.

Table 2 also shows the metaphors that occur in a negative context. The range of metaphors used thus, however, is much narrower than for those that are used positively. The metaphors used negatively or unfavourably include the manager and academic leader metaphors, but not the curriculum developer metaphor.

From the Group 1 metaphors there is only one - the academic administrator as controller - that is used negatively. From the Group 2 metaphors there is similarly only one - the democratic manager metaphor.

Neither of the metaphors from Group 3 - the negotiator and statesman metaphors - is used negatively.

All of the metaphors from Group 4 - that is, the business-related metaphors - occur in negative contexts. Indeed, of all the metaphors, it is this group that is most frequently used in an unfavourable sense.

Distribution of Metaphors (Positive Context)

Metaphors indicating a managerial orientation are more prevalent than either the academic leader or the curriculum developer metaphor. Of the eighteen subjects, a total of twelve subjects use either the manager metaphor itself or specific manager-related metaphors. Manager-related metaphors occur in all three sub-cultures. One or more of them are used by two subjects from Arts, five from Information Technology and five from Education.

The academic leader metaphor is used by six subjects, two from each of the sub-cultures. The curriculum developer metaphor is used by seven subjects from two sub-cultures. As might be expected, the curriculum developer metaphor is most prevalent in the Education sub-culture. Five subjects from Education and two from Information Technology use the curriculum developer metaphor.

Within the Arts sub-culture, two of the four subjects use the manager metaphor or variants of it; two use the academic leader metaphor; one subject uses the professional and servant-manager metaphors; and two subjects use the manager of change metaphor. No subject from Arts uses the curriculum developer metaphor.

Within the Information Technology sub-culture, five subjects use the manager metaphor or variants of it; two subjects use the academic leader metaphor; two subjects use the curriculum developer metaphor; and three subjects use the manager of change metaphor.

Within the Education sub-culture, five subjects use the manager metaphor or variants of it; two subjects use the academic leader metaphor; five subjects use the curriculum developer metaphor; and two subjects use the manager of change metaphor.

There is a broad similarity across the three sub-cultures in that the manager metaphor and the academic leader metaphor appear as leading metaphors in each sub-culture. This point, however, should not be allowed to disguise the differences that exist. Across the three sub-cultures, there is a variation in the type of manager metaphor most used.

If the metaphors from Groups 1-4 are considered, the most prevalent manager-related metaphors overall are the coordinator, facilitator and team manager metaphors. Within Information Technology, the metaphor which predominates is that of the coordinator, whilst in Education, it is the team manager metaphor. Within Arts, both the coordinator and facilitator metaphors are prominent. The prevalence in Arts and Information Technology of the coordinator metaphor is noteworthy. There is no evidence of a contrasting metaphor, namely that of loose-coupling.

There is a clear difference between the metaphors that predominate in Education and those that predominate in Information Technology. The subjects from Education favour metaphors associated with the human resource management school of theory, or metaphors that are often associated with a democratic approach to management. In Information Technology, although there is some use of the team and facilitator metaphors, the coordinator metaphor is clearly predominant.

Metaphors identified in the table as Group 3 metaphors, those associated with a political perspective are not in wide use. The negotiator metaphor is used by two subjects, one from Arts and one from Education. The statesman metaphor is used by two subjects, both of these being from the Education sub-culture. Even when these metaphors do occur, none appears frequently in a subject's language.

Metaphors from Group 4 (business-related metaphors) are, however, very prominent across all three sub-cultures. One or more of the Group 4 metaphors are used by two subjects from Arts, five subjects from Information Technology and five subjects from Education.

The military metaphor - leader of troops - is used by only one subject from Information Technology and two from Education.

The metaphor of the administrator as manager of change occurs in all three sub-cultures, being used by two subjects from Arts, three from Information Technology and two from Education.

The metaphors of the administrator as servant-manager and as professional are used by only one subject, this subject being from the Arts sub-culture.

All three Deans use metaphors indicating a managerial orientation. None of the Deans uses the academic leader metaphor and there is only one who favours the curriculum developer metaphor, this being the Dean of Education.

The metaphors favoured by the Dean of Arts include the following: the facilitator, team-manager, salesman, corporate manager and manager of change metaphors.

Those metaphors favoured by the Dean of Information Technology include: the coordinator, team manager and corporate manager metaphors. The Dean of Education favours the following metaphors: salesman, public relations expert, spokesman, team manager, corporate manager and curriculum developer.

The corporate manager metaphor is thus common to all three Deans, as are specific business-related metaphors such as the salesman and public-relations expert metaphors.

As with the Deans, all of the Associate Deans, with only two exceptions, favour metaphors indicating a managerial orientation. The one exception is the Associate Dean (Resources), Arts who favours the academic leader metaphor. It is noteworthy that the Associate Dean who favours the academic leader metaphor also holds simultaneously the position of Head of Programme (Asian Studies).

Within the Arts sub-culture, there is a contrast between the metaphors of the two Associate Deans. The Associate Dean (Academic) favours the coordinator metaphor and the Associate Dean (Resources), the academic leader metaphor. Within the Information Technology sub-culture, the coordinator metaphor is favoured by both the Associate Dean (Academic) and the Associate Dean (Resources). The Associate Dean (Resources), Information Technology, is one of only a few subjects who use the military metaphor, the academic administrator as leader of troops.

Within the Education sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Academic) favours, amongst others, the planner, builder of environments and corporate manager metaphors. The Associate Dean (Resources) favours the facilitator, team manager and corporate manager metaphors. The Acting Associate Dean (Academic) favours the team manager, democratic manager and corporate manager metaphors. The Associate Dean (Academic), Education, is the only subject to favour the planner metaphor.

Thus, with the exception of the Associate Dean (Resources), Arts, the Associate Deans, taken as a group, favour metaphors from Group 1 (classical management theory) and/or from Group 2 (human resource management theory). With only one exception, the Associate Deans also favour one or more of the business-related metaphors. In this way they are similar to the Deans. The one Associate Dean who does not use a business-related metaphor is the Associate Dean (Resources), Arts.

It is especially noteworthy that, of the eight Programme Heads, five favour the academic leader metaphor. Thus the academic leader metaphor is used much more by Programme Heads than it is by Deans and Associate Deans.

Those who use the academic leader metaphor include the following: from Arts, the Head of the Communications Programme; from Information Technology, the Head of Programme (Graduate Studies) and Head of Programme (Applied Mathematics and Statistics); and from Education, the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching), and the Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme.

The metaphors most favoured by the three remaining Programme Heads - the Heads of the Commercial Computing and Information Science Programmes, and the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Exceptional Children) - are the corporate manager and manager metaphors.

Distribution of Metaphors (Negative Context)

Six subjects (two from each sub-culture) use the manager metaphor, or specific manager-related metaphors, negatively. These are the six subjects who favour the academic leader metaphor. Metaphors from Group 4 (the business-related metaphors), in particular, are used negatively by these six subjects. Four of these six subjects (two from the Information Technology and two from Education) frequently use the corporate manager metaphor in a negative sense.

As the previous points suggest, those subjects who use the academic leader metaphor are also those who use the manager metaphor and, in particular, the corporate manager metaphor negatively. On the other hand, of the twelve subjects who use the manager metaphor or manager-related metaphors, there are only two who use the academic leader metaphor in an unfavourable way. These include the Dean of Arts and the Head of the Commercial Computing Programme.

Of the Deans, it is the Dean of Arts who uses the academic leader metaphor in an unfavourable way.

Of the Associate Deans, the Associate Dean (Resources), Arts, uses the manager and the corporate manager metaphors negatively.

Of the Programme Heads, there are five who use the manager metaphor unfavourably. These include, from Arts, the Head of the Communications Programme. They include also, from Information Technology, the Head of the Graduate Studies Programme and the Head of the Applied Mathematics and Statistics Programme. And, from Education, they include the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching) and the Acting Head of Programme (Bachelor of Education).

These same five Programme Heads also reject, or are strongly critical of, the business-related metaphors. The Head of the Graduate Studies Programme, Information Technology, uses the corporate manager and entrepreneur metaphors in a way that approaches the pejorative.

There is one Programme Head who is somewhat distinctive in that he uses the academic leader metaphor negatively. This is the Head of Commercial Computing Programme. This same subject, along with the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Exceptional Children), also uses the democratic manager metaphor negatively.

The Head of the Communications Programme, Arts, and the Head of the Graduate Studies Programme, Information Technology, are the two subjects who use the metaphor of the academic administrator as controller negatively.

The Pattern of Metaphor Use

It was noted on p.252 that the subjects appear to fall into two main groups having seemingly mutually exclusive conceptions of the role of the university. A similar point applies to the use of the metaphors for the role of the academic administrator. If the manager-related metaphors are seen as instances of the manager metaphor, then there are two metaphors which appear to indicate mutually exclusive role orientations. These are the manager and academic leader metaphors. In effect these metaphors represent a kind of dichotomy. The language of a subject is characterised by either one or the other, but not by both. The only qualification to this statement relates to the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching). Whilst otherwise criticising the manager metaphor, and especially the corporate manager metaphor, this subject does sometimes use the metaphor of the administrator as democratic manager favourably.

The use of the curriculum developer metaphor differs from the academic leader metaphor, in that it can occur in combination with the manager metaphor. If the academic administrators are seen as falling into two main

groups (those who use the manager metaphor and those who use the academic leader metaphor), then there are some subjects from both groups who also use the curriculum developer metaphor.

The seeming dichotomy noted above - the manager-academic leader dichotomy - is an area that might warrant further investigation. A future study, for example, might explore further the extent to which academic administrators favour either one or the other of these metaphors. Such a study would, of course, require the researcher to refine and sharpen the questions asked of subjects.

Metaphors for the Role of the Academic Administrator (Experiential)

This section completes the information on the range and distribution of the metaphors used for the role of the academic administrator. It contains information about the range and distribution of the images that are used when the subjects are describing their felt or lived experience of the role. The images and analogies included in this category usually have a strong affective dimension and are more vivid and graphic than the conceptual metaphors. This particular category was only identified in relation to the language used for the role of the academic administrator.

Range

Experiential images and analogies for the role of the academic administrator are shown in Table 3, on the following page.

264

TABLE 3

Experiential Metaphors for the Role of the Academic Administrator
Used by Academic Administrators from
Three Sub-Cultures

Metaphors (Experiential)	Arts				Information Technology							Education						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Clerk				•									•					
Clerk (Postage)										•								
Senior Public Servant		•																
Functionary																	•	
Paper Shuffler			•										•					
Driver of Motor-Vehicle with Missing Gear-Box								•										
Cigar Store Indian				•														
Captain of Leaky Ship												•						
Julius Caesar												•						
Stooge				•														
Convenience				•														
Rubbish				•														
Saint				•														
God				•														
Phoenix												•						

Key to Numbers:

1 Dean
2 Assoc. Dean (Academic)
3 Assoc. Dean (Resources)
4 Head of Prog. (Communics)
5 Dean

6 Assoc. Dean (Academic)
7 Assoc. Dean (Resources)
8 Head of Prog. (Comm. Comput.)
9 Head of Prog. (Analyt. Comput.)
10 Head of Prog. (Grad. Stud.)

11 Head of Prog. (Infor. Sci.)
12 Dean
13 A/Assoc. Dean (Academic)
14 Assoc. Dean (Academic)
15 Assoc. Dean (Resources)

16 Head of Prog. (Grad.Dip.Except. Child.)
17 A/Head of Prog. (Bach. of Educ.)
18 Head of Prog. (Grad. Dip. in Teach.)

In the above table, the writer has deviated from her practice of indicating the kind of context in which the metaphors are used. This decision was made because the metaphors included in this particular group appeared, at first glance, to constitute a special case. They appeared to be distinctive enough to stand on their own. In retrospect, however, the writer now considers that it may have been better to include an indication of context. What can be said, however, is that most were used negatively. Some, such as those of clerk and senior public servant, were used negatively in the sense that the subjects appeared, to a greater or lesser degree, to be critical of them. Others, such as the captain of the leaky ship, Julius Caesar and cigar store indian images,

were used negatively in the sense that they carried connotations of difficulty, disappointment and frustration. The three that were clearly used positively are those of saint, god and phoenix.

What is clear from the table is that the images and analogies included here are extremely varied in range. They include one image with mechanistic connotations (the driver of a motor-vehicle with a slipping gear-box). This particular image also carries strong overtones of the journey metaphor, as does the captain of the leaky ship image. In contrast, the Julius Caesar image has classical, imperial connotations, whilst the cigar store indian image has commercial connotations. Five of the images (clerk; clerk (postage); senior public servant; functionary; and paper shuffler) have bureaucratic connotations. Of the three that are used positively (saint, god and phoenix) - the first two have religious overtones and the last, mythological connotations.

Distribution

Only two subjects in all describe their experience of the academic administrator's role in a positive way. They include one subject from the Arts sub-culture and one from the Education sub-culture.

The Head of the Communications Programme, Arts, speaks of how he feels occasionally like a saint or a god. The Dean of Education, after giving a rather negative account of his experiences, caps this account with a positive analogy. It is he who uses the image of the mythical phoenix arising from the ashes.

Seven subjects in all use images and analogies having negative connotations. These include two subjects from Arts, two subjects from Information Technology and three subjects from Education.

From the Arts sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Resources) uses the clerk and senior public servant analogies. The Head of the Communications Programme uses the clerk analogy and, in addition, the cigar store indian and stooge analogies.

From Information Technology, the Head of the Commercial Computing Programme compares himself to the driver of a motor vehicle with a missing gear-box. The Head of the Graduate Studies Programme uses the postage clerk analogy.

From Education, the Dean compares himself to the captain of a leaky ship and also to Julius Caesar, whilst the Acting Associate Dean (Academic) compares himself to a clerk and paper-shuffler. The Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme uses the functionary analogy.

Metaphors for the Academic Organisation

This section contains information on the range and distribution of the third major group of metaphors identified - the metaphors used for the academic organisation. It also contains information on the metaphors which the subjects themselves selected as their favoured organisational metaphors.

Range

The metaphors used for the academic organisation are shown in Table 4 on the following page.

TABLE 4

Metaphors for the Academic Organisation
Used by Academic Administrators
from Three Sub-Cultures

Metaphors	Arts				Information Technology							Education						
POSITIVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Machine	TSE	TSE	N	N	TSE	TSE	TSE	F	N	N	TSE	SLM	N	SLM	N	F	N	N
Organism	F	TSE	F	TSE	F	F	TSE	N	F	F	TSE	F	F	F	F	N	F	F
Political System	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	TSE
Culture (Democratic)	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	TSE
Corporation	F	TSE	N	N	F	F	F	TSE	N	N	TSE	F	F	F	F	F	N	N
Collegium	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	F	N	TSE	TSE
Neural Network	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Democracy	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	TSE	F	TSE	N	N	TSE	F
Democracy of Ideas and Learning	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
NEGATIVE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Machine	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	F
Political System	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	TSE	N	F	TSE	F	F	N	N	TSE	N	N
Corporation	N	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	F
Collegium	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	TSE	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N
Democracy	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N
Culture (Administrative)	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	N	TSE	TSE	N	N	N	N	F	N	F	TSE
Culture (Frontier)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	N

Key: F = Frequently   SLM = Seldom   TSE = To Some Extent   N = Never

Key to Numbers:

1	Dean	6	Assoc. Dean (Academic)	11	Head of Prog. (Infor. Sci.)	16	Head of Prog. (Grad.Dip.Except. Child.)
2	Assoc. Dean (Academic)	7	Assoc. Dean (Resources)	12	Dean	17	A/Head of Prog. (Bach. of Educ.)
3	Assoc. Dean (Resources)	8	Head of Prog. (Comm. Comput.)	13	A/Assoc. Dean (Academic)	18	Head of Prog. (Grad. Dip. in Teach.)
4	Head of Prog. (Communics)	9	Head of Prog. (Analyt. Comput.)	14	Assoc. Dean (Academic)		
5	Dean	10	Head of Prog. (Grad. Stud.)	15	Assoc. Dean (Resources)		

As Table 4 indicates, the range of organisational metaphors includes the machine, organism, culture and political system metaphors. The range also includes the metaphor of the organisation as neural network, as corporation, as collegium, and as democracy of ideas and learning.

No completely new metaphors for the academic organisation were identified. Four of the metaphors - those of the machine, organism, culture and political system - occur frequently in the literature of organisational science. These four are well-known as root metaphors for organisations and they underlie established schools of theory or theoretical approaches. The organisation as corporation, a business-related metaphor, is one which has been emerging in the literature over recent years.

The metaphor of the organisation as collegium is also well known in the literature of organisational science and is often associated with academic organisations in particular.

The remaining metaphor, the organisation as neural network, is probably the most novel of all the metaphors identified. Although it is a metaphor which now occurs in the field of computer science, it is clearly a variant of the organisation as brain, this last being a metaphor outlined by Morgan (1986) in his *Images of Organization.*

Table 4 also indicates that there are five metaphors that are used negatively. These are the metaphors of the organisation as machine, political system, corporation, collegium and democracy. Of these, those most used in a negative sense are the corporation and the political system metaphors, whilst those that occur least in a negative context are the collegium and democracy metaphors. It is noteworthy that the organism metaphor is never used negatively.

Distribution (Positive Context)

Table 4 also shows the distribution of the metaphors used for the academic organisation. The most prevalent are the machine, organism and corporation metaphors. Of all the metaphors, it is the organism that is used the most. It is prevalent in all three sub-cultures and is used by sixteen of the eighteen subjects.

There are only two subjects in whose language the machine is clearly the predominant metaphor. These two subjects are from the Information

Technology and Education sub-cultures. However, it is also true that the machine metaphor is used by some subjects from all three sub-cultures. It is, nevertheless, more prevalent in Arts and Information Technology than in Education.

The use of the corporation as an organisational metaphor is consistent with the use of business-related metaphors for the role of the academic administrator. A total of twelve subjects use the corporation metaphor, these subjects being from the three sub-cultures.

The culture metaphor is not nearly as prevalent as the organism, machine and corporation metaphors. There is one sub-culture in which it does not appear at all, this being Information Technology. Only one subject from Arts and two from Education use the culture metaphor.

The political system metaphor occurs infrequently in a positive context, being confined to two subjects from Education. Even here it is more accurate to say that it is used in a neutral rather than in a positive way. The two subjects accept that a university is in part a political entity, because they see all organisations as displaying to some extent the characteristics of a political system.

The collegium and democracy metaphors appear in all three sub-cultures, but are especially prevalent in the Education sub-culture. This is consistent with the use, in Education, of the team manager and democratic manager metaphors. From Education, one or other of the collegium and democracy metaphors appears in the language of all subjects, with only one exception. From Arts, there is only one user of both the collegium and democracy metaphors, whilst from Information Technology there are two.

The most novel of the organisational metaphors, the idea of the organisation as a neural network, is used by one subject from Information Technology.

All three Deans use the machine, organism and corporation metaphors. Their outlooks are very strongly characterised by the organism metaphor.

The machine metaphor, however, is used much less by the Dean of Education than it is by the other two Deans.

Only one Dean uses the culture metaphor - the Dean of Education. None of the Deans uses the collegium and democracy metaphors.

As with the Deans, the organism metaphor is common to all Associate Deans. Within the Arts sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Academic) uses the machine, organism and corporation metaphors, whilst the Associate Dean (Resources) uses only the organism metaphor.

Within the Information Technology sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Academic) and the Associate Dean (Resources) use the machine, organism and corporation metaphors.

Within the Education sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Academic), the Associate Dean (Resources) and the Acting Associate Dean (Academic), all use the organism and corporation metaphors. Only one of these, the Associate Dean (Academic), makes use of the machine metaphor, and this only to a small extent.

Within the Arts sub-culture, the Head of the Communications programme uses the organism, culture, collegium and democracy metaphors. This subject is the only subject from Arts to use the collegium and democracy metaphors.

Within the Information Technology sub-culture, the Head of the Commercial Computing Programme uses the machine and corporation metaphors. Of the eighteen subjects, this particular subject is one of only two subjects (the other being from Education), whose predominant metaphor is the machine metaphor. The Head of the Information Science Programme uses the machine, organism and corporation metaphors. The Heads of the Graduate Studies and Applied Mathematics and Statistics Programmes are identical in outlook, both using the organism, collegium and democracy metaphors. Their use of this particular combination (organism, collegium and democracy) indicates a perspective that contrasts

with that of the other academic administrators from the Information Technology sub-culture. The Head of the Applied Mathematics and Statistics Programme is also the user of the neural network metaphor.

Within the Education sub-culture, there is a distinct contrast between the metaphors of the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Exceptional Children) and the two other Programme Heads - the Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme and the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching). The language of the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Exceptional Children) is very strongly characterised by the machine and corporation metaphors. Indeed he is one of only two whose leading or predominant metaphor could be said to be the machine metaphor. The metaphors of the machine and corporation are used by the Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme and the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching), but only in a negative context. These last two subjects - that is, the Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme and the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching) - favour the organism, collegium and democracy metaphors. They are also the only two subjects to use the political system metaphor in a positive context.

Distribution (Negative Context)

The machine, corporation and political system metaphors are used in a negative sense by subjects from all three sub-cultures. One subject from each of the Arts and Education sub-cultures uses the machine metaphor negatively, whilst two subjects from Information Technology use this metaphor negatively. The corporation metaphor is used negatively by two subjects from each sub-culture.

The political system metaphor is used negatively by one subject from Arts, three subjects from Information Technology and three from Education.

The negative use of the collegium and democracy metaphors is confined to two sub-cultures. One subject from Information Technology and one from Education use both these metaphors in a negative sense. These are the two

subjects for whom the machine metaphor is a predominant or leading metaphor.

There is only one Dean who uses an organisational metaphor in a negative context - the political system metaphor is used negatively by the Dean of Education.

Of the Associate Deans, there are only two who use organisational metaphors negatively. Within the Arts sub-culture, the Associate Dean (Resources) uses the machine and corporation metaphors negatively. Within the Education sub-culture, the Acting Associate Dean (Academic) uses the political system metaphor negatively.

Of the Programme Heads, there are six who use organisational metaphors in a negative sense. These include one Programme Head from Arts, two from Information Technology and three from Education.

Within the Arts sub-culture, the Head of the Communications Programme uses the machine, corporation and political system metaphors negatively.

Within the Information Technology sub-culture, the Head of the Commercial Computing Programme uses the collegium, democracy and political system metaphors negatively. The Head of Programme (Graduate Studies) and the Head of the Applied Mathematics and Statistics Programme both use the machine and corporation metaphors negatively. The Head of Programme (Graduate Studies) also uses the political system metaphor negatively.

Within the Education sub-culture, the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Exceptional Children) uses the collegium and democracy metaphors in a negative sense. The Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education Programme uses the corporation metaphor negatively and the Head of Programme (Graduate Diploma in Teaching) uses the machine and corporation metaphors negatively.

Metaphors Selected by Subjects

All of the metaphors discussed to this point were identified from the subjects' own language. There is another group of metaphors, however, which are worthy of comment. The subjects were asked to select their own favoured metaphors from a list which included the metaphors explained in *Images of Organization* (Morgan, 1986). The subjects were shown this list on the completion of each interview and were asked to choose the metaphor that they thought best fitted their own perspective on the organisation. Table 5 below shows the metaphors that were selected by the subjects.

TABLE 5

Organisational Metaphors Selected
by Academic Administrators
from Three Sub-Cultures

Metaphors (1)	Arts				Information Technology							Education						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Machine								•								•		
Organism	•	•	•	•(2)	•(3)	•(3)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•
Brain																		
Culture		•										•					•	
Political System																	•	•
Psychic Prison																		
Flux and Transformation	•								•	•	•							
Instrument of Domination																		

1 The eight metaphors included in this table are taken from Gareth Morgan, *Images of Organization*, (Beverly Hills, Calif., Sage,1986)
2 Subject 4 considered the appropriateness of this metaphor and then proffered three others: Ant Colony, Beehive and Medieval Village.
3 Subject 5 and 6 suggested a variant of the organism metaphor - the body.

Key to Numbers:

1 Dean

2 Assoc. Dean (Academic)

3 Assoc. Dean (Resources)

4 Head of Prog. (Communics)

5 Dean

6 Assoc. Dean (Academic)

7 Assoc. Dean (Resources)

8 Head of Prog. (Comm. Comput.)

9 Head of Prog. (Analyt. Comput.)

10 Head of Prog. (Grad. Stud.)

11 Head of Prog. (Infor. Sci.)

12 Dean

13 A/Assoc. Dean (Academic)

14 Assoc. Dean (Academic)

15 Assoc. Dean (Resources)

16 Head of Prog. (Grad.Dip.Except. Child.)

17 A/Head of Prog. (Bach. of Educ.)

18 Head of Prog. (Grad. Dip. in Teach.)

As Table 5 indicates, the metaphors selected from the list include the following: machine, organism, culture, political system, and flux and transformation. None of the subjects selected the remaining metaphors included on the list - the brain, psychic prison or instrument of domination metaphors.

There is a very high degree of consistency between the metaphors selected by individual subjects and those that have been identified from the language of each subject. Thus the two subjects (the Head of the Commercial Computing Programme and the Head of the Exceptional Children Programme) who have been identified as clearly having a machine perspective, themselves selected the machine metaphor, and this metaphor only. The writer had already concluded that these subjects are close to having a one-dimensional perspective on the organisation and this is borne out by their responses to the list.

Again, as the writer would have predicted, most subjects selected the organism metaphor. A total of twelve subjects selected the organism, whilst two more named a variant of it, the body metaphor.

It is noteworthy also that eight subjects chose more than one metaphor from the list. This supports the writer's view that the perspectives of administrators are, more often than not, characterised by more than one metaphor.

Leaving aside the two subjects who identified a variant of the organism metaphor, namely the metaphor of the body, there was only one subject who volunteered metaphors of his own - metaphors, that is, that were not on the list. The Head of the Communications Programme, Arts, after giving some consideration to the appropriateness of the organism metaphor, noted that all of the metaphors, in his view, "break down." That is, he did not see them as completely fitting the notion of an organisation. The alternatives which he suggested included the following: the organisation as ant colony, as bee-hive and as medieval village. Nevertheless, he also saw these as being somehow inadequate.

Only a few anomalies were noted between the metaphors chosen from the list and those identified from the subjects' language. There are a number of subjects who did not select the machine metaphor from the list, but in whose language it has been identified, at least to some extent. Perhaps this means that the machine metaphor is one that individual subjects are reluctant to 'own' as a favoured metaphor.

Again, there are a few (a very few) instances in which subjects selected a metaphor that was not identified in their language. Whilst the Associate Dean (Academic), Arts, and the Acting Head of the Bachelor of Education programme both selected the culture metaphor, this metaphor was not identified in the language of these subjects. On the whole, however, there is a remarkable degree of consistency between the metaphors identified from the language of the subjects and those chosen by the subjects themselves.

The Pattern of Metaphor Use

Whilst a very clear pattern can be discerned in the use of metaphors for the university and for the role of the academic administrator, the pattern is not quite as clear with respect to the use of organisational metaphors. This is mainly because the organism metaphor is a very prominent metaphor in the language of all subjects, except two. That is to say, the organism metaphor is common to sixteen subjects who otherwise have contrasting metaphorical perspectives on the role of the university and the role of the academic administrator.

One point worth noting is the following. There would seem to be some relationship between two of the metaphors used for the university and the role of the academic administrator and two of the organisational metaphors. The metaphors being alluded to here include the university as institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge and the academic administrator as academic leader. The organisational metaphors alluded to are the collegium and democracy metaphors. In all three sub-cultures, those subjects who favour the metaphor of the university as institution preserving, transmitting and creating knolwedge and the metaphor of the administrator as academic leader - as distinct, say, from the producer and

manager metaphors - are also those who favour the collegium and democracy metaphors. There are only a few exceptions to this. In the Education sub-culture, the collegium metaphor is favoured by one subject who otherwise favours the manager and corporate manager metaphors. Again, in the Education sub-culture, the democracy metaphor is favoured by two subjects who otherwise favour the manager and corporate manager metaphors. It would seem then that, for the most part, the collegium and democracy metaphors appear to complement the metaphor of the university as institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge and the metaphor of the academic administrator as academic leader.

Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated the range of metaphors used for the role of the university, the role of the academic administrator and the nature of an academic organisation. Within each of these three major groups, there is considerable variation in the metaphors used. The metaphors for the role of the university vary between those that imply the need for a close relationship between the university and society and those that imply the idea of the university as a more self-contained world. At one extreme, for example, there is the metaphor of the university as agent of social change and, at the other, the metaphors of the university as monastery and as ivory tower.

Of the three groups of metaphors, those used for the role of the academic administrator are the most extensive and the most varied in range. These vary across a band which includes metaphors indicating a management orientation, a curriculum development orientation and an academic leadership orientation. Those implying a management orientation in themselves comprise a large and varied group.

Of the metaphors used for an academic organisation, there is likewise considerable variation. These vary from such well-known metaphors as those of the machine and organism to those that are more novel, such as the metaphor of the organisation as neural network.

The metaphors used for the role of the academic administrator differ from the other two groups in that they include images and analogies having a strong affective dimension. These are used by the subjects when they are discussing their felt or lived experience of the role.

Most of the conceptual metaphors identified are represented either in the literature of organisational science or the literature of higher education. Some are also common in everyday discourse. However, whilst no completely new metaphors were identified, it is nonetheless true that the language used by the administrators contains some novel and interesting variations of well-known metaphors. Undoubtedly the most graphic and colourful of the images used are those that have been designated as 'experiential.'

In this chapter the distribution of the metaphors has also been considered. Overall, the most prevalent metaphors for the role of the university are the producer and business corporation metaphors. For the role of the academic administrator, metaphors implying a managerial orientation are more prevalent than the metaphors of the academic administrator as curriculum developer and as academic leader. Of the manager-related metaphors, the following are the most prevalent: coordinator, facilitator, team-manager, salesman and corporate manager. For the nature of the academic organisation, the most favoured metaphor is clearly the organisation as organism.

A clear pattern of metaphorical use was identified across the three sub-cultures and within each sub-culture. The eighteen academic administrators fall into two main groups having contrasting, and what appear to be mutually exclusive conceptions of the role of the university and the role of the academic administrator. One group, comprising twelve subjects, favour the producer and business corporation metaphors for the university. Of these twelve subjects, two are from the Arts sub-culture, five from the Information Technology sub-culture and five from the Education sub-culture. This same group of twelve subjects also favour manager-related metaphors for the role of the academic administrator. The twelve subjects

referred to here include the three Deans. They include also all the Associate Deans with only one exception.

The second group of six subjects favour metaphors indicating what might be called a more ideal view of the university and of academic administration. These metaphors are the metaphor of the university as institution preserving, transmitting and creating knowledge and the metaphor of the academic administrator as academic leader. Two subjects from each of the sub-cultures favour these metaphors. Five of these six subjects are Programme Heads. Thus the metaphors indicating a more ideal view are distributed mainly amongst the Programme Heads.

Most of the subjects have outlooks characterised by more than one metaphor, although the number of metaphors used by each subject varies. There are only two subjects who are close to having a one-dimensional view of academic administration and organisation. These two subjects - one from the Information Technology sub-culture and the other from Education - have a very pronounced machine view of the organisation, a view which is reflected in the use of mechanistic analogies and images. Overall, however, the use of more than one metaphor for, say, the role of the academic administrator, is common. The Dean of Arts, for example, uses to some considerable extent, more than one metaphor for the role of the academic administrator. The implications of this point for statements made in the literature and for research in the area will be considered in the final chapter of this study.

With this chapter the writer concludes that aspect of the study that deals with the identification of the metaphors used by the eighteen subjects. It is submitted that two of the research questions posed at the outset of this study have now been answered. These are the questions: what are the metaphors used by the academic administrators and what are the similarities and differences between the identified metaphors? In the following chapter, the writer turns to a consideration of the second major aspect of the study, the administrative arrangements for decision-making used by the academic administrators to introduce masters' degree courses.