

## Principals' Perceptions on School Management: A Case Study with Metaphorical Analysis<sup>1</sup>

İlhan GÜNBAŸI<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

Schools are social organizations in which the members are tied together in interpersonal relations in a complicated way. Only if those relationships are understood, the school organization can function and be managed effectively. Metaphors can serve as a powerful strategy to describe those complicated realities related to school management, illuminating aspects of school management phenomena not previously noticed, and adding depth of meaning to understanding it. This paper provides an overview of principals' perceptions on school management with metaphors in school setting. The purpose of this study is to investigate the mental images (metaphors) that principals formulated to describe the concept of school management and school management activities in which they are involved. This is an holistic multiple case study. The research sought to use qualitative methods to gather the relevant data via semi-structured interviews with principals in Antalya. The outcome of the research addresses important implications for the professional work life of principals in understanding school management and school management activities in school setting.

**Key Words:** Principals; school management; metaphors; artifacts

### Introduction

Metaphor can be defined as a figure of speech in which a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea is used in place of another to suggest a likeness or analogy between them (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary 2009). Metaphors are a mental construction which plays a constitutive role in structuring human beings' experience and in shaping their imagination and reasoning. In other words, rather than being a product of a comparison between two existing things or ideas, metaphor is what brings abstract concepts into being (Sfard, 1994). Applying known characteristics of familiar concepts to

---

<sup>1</sup> This study was supported by Akdeniz University Scientific Researches Project Coordination Unit

<sup>2</sup> Akdeniz University, Antalya Turkey, igunbayi@akdeniz.edu.tr

other less known phenomena helps to clarify and broaden understandings of the less known (Moss, Moss, Rubinstein, & Black, 2003). Metaphors can exemplify behaviors and processes by simplifying concepts, stressing some properties over others (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

In qualitative researches, metaphors can serve as: a powerful strategy to describe realities difficult to understand (Miles & Huberman, 1994), making aspects of phenomena not previously noticed clearer to understand (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), adding depth of meaning to understanding (Kangas, Warren, & Byrne, 1998). Thus, metaphors can be used by researchers for four reasons. Firstly, metaphors supply structure to data by reducing data, developing themes, explicit metaphor analysis.

Secondly, metaphors assist in understanding a well known process in a new light. For instance, Lemlech (1988) defined classroom management by using orchestra metaphor, which served as a framework for understanding of a familiar process of management of teaching and learning activities at classroom setting in new light. Teachers can be accepted as the composer and the conductor. Teachers can also be viewed as an expert demonstrating excellent teaching skills, guiding and coordinating students' actions. The orchestra metaphor provides a unique context from which to consider the complex and non linear nuances of teaching expertise in a classroom area.

Thirdly, metaphors can suggest suitable or acceptable interventions. Participants' uses of metaphors are likely to suggest insight into potential interventions that are situation specific. For instance, Kabadayi (2008) states in his study called "Analysing the metaphorical images of Turkish preschool teachers", recent reforms in teacher training systems of Turkish education are producing fruit since a need for a shift from a more teacher-centred to a more student-centred schooling system appears to be supported by teachers. Before the reforms, the teacher was perceived to be a person who spoon-nourished the students with knowledge while the students were passive recipients of it, which increased their workloads. They were seen as wagons, railway, steam-engine which focused on teachers' workloads. After the reforms, teachers thought the way they learnt, which lessened their workloads and they were seen as team captain and product manager

as the teacher was in the position of organizer, and the students are part of team and active participants.

Finally, metaphors can evoke emotions. As a rhetorical tool, metaphors can help the researcher depict experiences with language that goes beyond straightforward information oriented paraphrasing. Metaphors that evoke emotion can help the reader connect to experiences (Patton, 1990). Qualitative researchers attempt to create texts that appeal to “cognitive and non-cognitive sensibilities” by the use of metaphors communicating ideas that are emotionally and cognitively vivid (Wilson, 1992). For instance in the study by Martinez, Sauleda and Huber (2001) called “Metaphors as blueprints of thinking about teaching and learning”: Some teachers formulated metaphors: “Children should not be obliged to swallow information” ;“The child is not a container to be filled;” and “The teacher should not violently penetrate the mind of the child ...”Metaphors of this type underlining the passive role of students are particularly apt to provoke cognitive and emotional controversies in teams and to fuel fruitful discussions.

Metaphors can be also used in understanding organizational culture. Organizational culture can be defined as: a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Shein, 2001). Another definition for organizational culture is that it is an active, living phenomenon through which people jointly create and recreate the worlds in which they live (Morgan, 1997). Elements of organizational culture may include fundamental assumptions values, behavioral norms, patterns of behavior and artifacts.

- *Fundamental assumptions* are unconscious beliefs that members share about their organization and its relationships to them (Like the lens of your eye, you cannot see fundamental assumptions but they affect everything you see). They are also taken for granted aspects, not conscious, hard to change.

- *Values* are goals, priorities, preferred results, feelings and beliefs about what's good or right. What organizations prize as most important in terms of their accomplishments and performance is what they value. Fundamental assumptions are manifested in values e.g. "organization as a family" leads to values emphasizing "relationships". Values determine which norms are followed when.
- *Norms* are socially constructed preferences, group expectations about how things should be done, beliefs about appropriate and inappropriate ways to do work and relate to others or what it takes to fit in be accepted by members. Behavioral norms are often performance terms in a work group's normative contract e.g. Good employee: cooperation, attention to detail, working....
- *Patterns of behavior* are observable and repeated practices, shared ways of interacting, approaching a task , shared ways of responding to something new
- *Artifacts* are visible objects, actions, stories that represent the culture, physical and symbolic ways in which culture is communicated (Rousseau, 1995). The elements of artifacts may include: Visible objects, actions, stories that represent the culture, Rites, rituals, ceremonies, stories, myths, legends, symbols, metaphors and language/jargon/gestures.



**Figure 1.** Onion model of organizational culture (Rousseau, 1995).

Metaphors, artifacts of an organizational culture, are valuable tools for both the discovery and communication of organizational culture. Widely used metaphors offer a starting place for assessing the shared meaning of a corporate culture (Griffin, 2005). Metaphors reflect the underlying values of a culture (Gannon, 2003). The metaphors we use when speaking about our organizations provide a rich source of information about organizational attitudes and beliefs, Metaphors are also a potent way for those attitudes and beliefs to perpetuate themselves and build organizational culture (Morgan, 1997). The goal of metaphorical analysis is to create a better understanding of what it takes to function effectively within the culture (Griffin, 2005). Managers have only a limited amount of time for studying culture and the manner in which it interfaces with their work. Thus, metaphors provide a quick, efficient, and easily understandable way of responding to this challenge (Gannon, 2003).

Schools are social institutions in which people interact in a complicated way (Getzels & Guba, 1970). Within school organizations there are students, teachers, administrators, and many kinds of service personnel. Members of each of these groups occupy distinctive positions and are expected to behave in certain ways. The role expectations of these groups and norms ascribed to them are different from each other. Clearly, the relationships among the many kinds of people in schools are varied and complex. Only if those relationships are understood and generally accepted can the school organization function effectively. However, schools do not exist in isolation. They are very much a part of the larger environment and social system. Board of education, the parents of the students, local organizations, national association and groups are important parts of the environment (Campell, Corbally & Nystrand, 1983). Schools are also hierarchical organizations. The board of education is usually placed at the top of the hierarchy, followed by the superintendent, the principals and the teachers. In terms of the responsibility, students are responsible to teachers; principals are responsible to the superintendent, and the superintendent responsible to the board of education. Structurally, there is a series of superordinate-subordinate relationships within schools. Functionally, this hierarchy of relationships (principal to teacher, teacher to student, and

so on) is the basis for allocating and integrating roles, personnel, and facilities to achieve school goals. Operationally, educational organizations are people intensive, thus the process in schools takes place person-to-person interaction (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988).

In schools, there are two kinds of management and leadership styles: task-oriented and interpersonal relations-oriented. Task-oriented behavioral acts call attention to the accomplishment of whatever task the group is working toward. Interpersonal relations-oriented behavior recognizes the presence of the human element and defers to the basic human considerations of security, respect, dignity, autonomy and worth. For optimizing management and leadership effectiveness, leadership functions call attention to the need for group leadership in addition to individual leader behavior on the part of the school executive (Sergiovanni, & Carver, 1973). Principals control learning in classrooms indirectly; they have to create environments in which teachers can work effectively. Thus, principals should be facilitative in terms of management and leadership, because facilitative power is power through, not power over (Dunlap, & Goaldman, 1990).

In school setting, metaphors on school management and management activities by principals can provide a rich source of information about organizational attitudes and beliefs. A metaphorical analysis of principals on school management and management activities will help us to a better understanding of what it takes to function effectively within school culture. The purpose of the study is to investigate the mental images (metaphors) that principals formulated to describe the concept of school management in which they are involved. Thus, the study examined:

1. What are the metaphors that principals formulated to describe school management and management activities?
2. What are the principals' reasons for the metaphors they formulated for school management and management activities?

## Research Method

A qualitative approach was selected for this study because this research was more concerned with understanding individuals' perceptions of the world and seeking insights rather than statistical analysis (Silverman, 2005). This is an holistic multiple case study. Multiple cases strengthen the results by replicating the pattern-matching, thus increasing confidence in the robustness of the theory (Yin, 1993).

Because investigation of principals' perceptions on school management took place in school setting, school was viewed as an instrumental case study. Case studies can establish cause and effect, indeed one of their strengths is that they observe effects in real contexts, recognizing that context is a powerful determinant of both causes and effects. Further, contexts are unique and dynamic, hence case studies investigate and report the complex dynamic and unfolding interactions of events, human relations and other factors in a unique instance (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Thus, the focus of this study was perceptions on school management with metaphors.

## Sampling

**Table 1.** Principals participating in research

Code	Age	Gender	Seniority as a principal (year)	Institution Graduated
PA	46	Male	4	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PB	35	Male	7	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PC	36	Male	4	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PD	42	Female	4	Faculty of Education (Master's)
PE	40	Female	14	Faculty of Science (Bachelor's)
PF	42	Male	10	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PG	39	Male	12	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PH	39	Male	13	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PI	38	Male	5	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PJ	40	Male	8	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PK	47	Male	10	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PL	36	Male	7	Faculty of Science (Bachelor's)
PM	44	Male	8	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)
PN	29	Male	4	Faculty of Education (Bachelor's)

The population of the study was 116 state schools and their principals in the city of Antalya in 2009-2010 school terms. A non-probability sample was used because 'the sample derives from the researcher's targeting a particular group, in the full knowledge that it does not represent the wider population, it simply represent itself. This is frequently the case in small scale research, for example, as with one or two schools, two or three groups of students, or a particular group of teachers, where no attempt to generalize is desired; this is frequently the case for qualitative researches such as action ethnographic or case (Cohen *et all*, 2007). The informants in this study were school principals. As seen in Table 1, a sample of fourteen principals who were volunteers were interviewed by the researcher.

### **Data collection**

In order to investigate principals' perceptions on school management and school management activities with metaphors , semi-structured interviews were used because it would provide an in depth exploration of the topic, it would allow me the flexibility, for example, to change the order of questions, simplify the questions and to probe the interviews ( Cohen, *et all*, 2007). Data was collected from March, 2010 through June, 2010. With the face-to-face interviews, informants' experiences, thoughts and feelings were recorded

### **Data analysis**

Data analysis began with repeated readings of interview transcripts from conversations with principals. The purpose was to determine the essence of the phenomenon and structures of experiences of principals related to metaphors on school management and school management activities and principals' perceptions on school management.

.During data analysis, the data were organized categorically and chronically, reviewed repeatedly and continually coded. Interview transcripts were regularly reviewed. In addition, data analysis process was aided by the use of a qualitative data analysis computer program called NVIVO. These kinds of computer programs do not actually perform the analysis but facilitate and assist it. That is NVIVO does not perform the

analysis but only supports the researcher doing the analysis by organizing data and recodes and nodes etc (Kelle, 1995; Cohen *et all*, 2007).

### **Interview Process and Mapping**

The aim of this study was to understand principals' perceptions on school management and school management activities with metaphors. Thus the mapping of interview questions was carried out in three levels. Firstly, interviewers were asked an initial question as: What do you think school management is like? A thing, a living thing, etc.? Secondly, they were asked follow-up question as why? Finally, they were asked to give their reasons for the metaphors they formulated for school management.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Participants were briefed about the research aims, kept informed at all stages and be offered anonymity. A consent form (Apendix 1) was signed between researcher and the each participant about the use of the data in terms of how its analysis would be reported and disseminated. It was also tried to be careful not to impose researcher's belief on others and researcher's beliefs were secondary and the participants thinking be what was required.

### **Research Findings**

This section will cover what metaphors the principals formulated on school management and management activities and their reasons for the metaphors they formulated and metaphorical analysis.

Metaphors formulated by 14 principals can be categorized under six themes:

1. Animals: octopus, horses, bees,
2. Things: Books, teeter-totter,
3. Professions: Boxers, football team,
4. Machine: Steam engines, watches, rockets,
5. Cybernetic mechanisms: Robots, computers,
6. Nature: the sun, trees and gardens.

## **Animals**

Three of the principals formulated animal metaphors in defining school management and management activities. For instance, PA defined school management as an octopus: "A principal is an octopus who has more than two arms and who has to carry out lots of work at the same time in coordination." He also added "Just as the brain is in the head of the octopus, which directs its eight legs; the school principal is the brain of the school who directs employees who are the arms of the principal (teachers and other personnel) towards the goals of the school. The brain of the octopus should work in cooperation with its eight arms."

On the other hand, PB formulated bee metaphor for school management and stated that "School management is a hive of honey bees. The queen bee is the manager and teachers, other personnel and students are workers. Just as honey bee nests are active and busy, principals, teachers and students in school are active and busy all the time." He also compared the way bees worked and the way principal and teachers worked in a school: "...in order to be successful and reach the goals, every body in school must work hard like bees..... Everybody in school is connected to one another in networks through flows of information and patterns of cooperation just as bees in hives. Just as the quality of honey produced by bees in a hive is depend on how well worker bees are managed by the queen, the extend to which the goals of school are achieved is depend on how well the school is managed by the principal."

Additionally, PC defined school management as a horse: "School management is a horse carrying heavy loads on its back." Besides he stressed the principal workload: "School management is responsible for everything in school and performs nearly all tasks in school and carries out difficult tasks....."

## **Things**

Two of the principals formulated things as metaphors in defining school management and management activities. PD described school management with book metaphor: "School management is a course book. The whole book reflects the school. The content of a book is

the management, the sections are the teachers, and the pages in every section are the students. She also compared the context of a book and school management in terms of unity: "Even if a page of the book is omitted, its context is disordered and it will become useless. ...the subject of the book identifies the goals of the school..."

As for PE, She defined school management as a teeter-totter: "School management is a teeter-totter. Besides, she assessed school management and a teeter-totter in terms of balance: "Balance of a teeter-totter is of great importance.... In order to manage teeter-totter, it is required both to keep the balance against the weight and technically to be able to keep oneself down and up whenever necessary, which is same for school management..."

### **Professions**

Two of the principals preferred professions in formulating metaphors in defining school management and management activities. For example, PF stated school management as a boxer: "School management is a beaten boxer. He also stressed the pressure principals experienced in school management: "School management is under pressure by the demands of those groups inside school and outside school. They both want to affect and direct school towards their demands....and this kind of pressure sometimes are likely to keep school away from what its goals are..."

On the other hand, PG described school management as a football team: "School management is a football team playing for a championship." Additionally, he made a comparison of the way the team captain led footballers and the way the principal led teachers: "Just as the team captain leads players to be successful; school manager leads teachers, other personnel, parents and students towards the goals of the school. The school principal is the technical director, the captain is the teacher and students are football players.....just as a football teams plays well and win the match, the students are well educated if the school is managed effectively by the principals and the vice-principals and teachers. "

## **Machine**

Three of the principals used machine metaphors in defining school management and management activities. Firstly, PH stated school management as a locomotive and made a comparison between the way a locomotive worked and the way the school management functioned: "Just as a locomotive pulls the wagons as a carrying power, school management is a power which leads school personnel and students towards school goals...The locomotive is the school management and teachers. The passengers in the wagons are the students...according to the rules of ministry of education the railway is run...."

Secondly, PI defined school management as a rocket and explained the similarity in the function of rocket fuel and the function of a school management in a school: "School is a rocket and school management is the fuel of the rocket, which supplies pushing power so that the rocket can reach its target"

Finally, PJ described school management as a watch and tried to explain the importance of unity and co-work in school management: "School management is an original hand made watch. A watch consists of lots of components such as cog-wheels which rotate in harmony. On the condition that the components of the watch are fixed well, the watch will work well and in harmony, which is the same for school management."

## **Cybernetic Mechanisms**

Two of the principals chose cybernetic mechanisms as metaphors in defining school management and management activities. For instance, PK defined school management as a robot and focused on the lack of self-authority in school management in a similarity between a robot and a principal with little authority but too much responsibility: "School principals are robots as their authority is less than their responsibilities. They do not have enough authority to carry out their responsibilities. School principals are robots that have to perform what is asked for by central authority and superiors....They also have to perform their duties according to laws, regulations and printed notices."

Besides, PL formulated computer metaphor for school management by making a comparison between the way a computer worked and the way a manager functioned: "School management is a computer which serves above self according to commands. Just like a computer, a school principal should not forget anything but remember and answer what is demanded immediately.....should perform his or her duties effectively free of error with the use of little energy."

### **Nature**

Finally two of the principals preferred nature as metaphors in defining school management and management activities. PM stated school management as a garden with trees: "School management is a fruit tree. The trunk is the school management, branches are teachers and fruits are students. Just as trees in a clean garden with water, fertilizers and fresh air grow up with plenty of large and ripe fruits, students in a well managed, a well built, clean and well equipped school with lots of availabilities are educated in consistent with the goals of education."

On the other hand, PN described school management as the sun and stressed the equilibrium of using authority in school management in a comparison with the energy of the sun: "School management is a lonely sun which enlightens, warms up, enlivens and satisfies everybody. However just as too much and too little sun give harm to all living things, school management should not take their authority too much serious or be indifferent to their power but should be balanced in power using in order to activate employees and make them work in peace with high motivation.

### **Discussion and Implications of Findings**

This study was done to investigate the mental images (metaphors) that principals formulated to describe the concept of school management in which they are involved and to understand better of what it takes to function effectively within school management and culture. Principals' perceptions on school management and school management

activities with metaphors were researched with semi structured interviews carried out at three levels as what they thought the school management was like, a thing, a living thing, etc., follow-up question as why and their reasons for the metaphors they formulated for school management.

Findings showed that school management is a collective activity. For instance, PB stated as 'everybody in school is connected to one another in networks through flows of information and patterns of cooperation just as bees in hives' in his/her formulating school management as a hive of honey bees. Similarly, PG defined school management as a football team and the school principal as a team captain "Just as the team captain leads players to be successful, the school manager leads teachers, other personnel, parents and students towards the goals of the school. Besides, PJ stressed the importance of unity and co-work in school management with watch metaphor "On the condition that the components of the watch are fixed well, the watch will work well and in harmony, which is the same for school management". These findings are consistent with Sergiovanni's idea and stewardship metaphor that in schools, the roles of parents, teachers and administrators are brought together in a collective practice that resembles a shared stewardship (Sergiovanni, 2000).

It is also worth noting that some principals not only confirmed the bureaucracy in schools but also complained about that kind of structure in schools. For instance, PK defined school management as a robot and focused on the hierarchy in school management: "School principals are robots that have to perform what is asked for by central authority and superiors....They also have to perform their duties according to laws, regulations and printed notices." Similarly, PL formulated computer metaphor and made a similarity between the way a computer worked and a principal worked according to given commands. "Just like a computer, a school principal should not forget anything but remember and answer what is demanded immediately. They should perform his or her duties effectively free of error." Besides, PM confirmed that schools are also hierarchical organizations in the definition of school management as a tree "School management is a fruit tree. The trunk is the school management, branches are teachers and fruits are

students” Additionally, PH used the locomotive metaphor pointing hierarchy in schools “Just as a locomotive pulls the wagons as a carrying power, school management is a power which leads school personnel and students towards school goals.” As for PD, she explained structural hierarchy in schools with books metaphor, “School management is a course book. The whole book reflects the school. The content of a book is the management, the section is the teachers, and the pages in every section are the students...” Moreover, PI defined school management as a rocket trying to reach its target: “School is a rocket and school management is the fuel of the rocket, which supplies pushing power so that the rocket can reach its target”. Finally, PA accepted school principal as “the brain of the school who directs employees who are the arms of the principal towards the goals of the school” in his defining school management as an octopus”. These findings are parallel with Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (1998) the statement that “Schools are also hierarchical organizations. The board of education is usually placed at the top of the hierarchy, followed by the superintendent, the principals and the teachers. In terms of the responsibility, students are responsible to teachers; principals are responsible to the superintendent, and the superintendent responsible to the board of education. There is a series of superordinate-subordinate relationships within schools. Functionally, this hierarchy of relationships (principal to teacher, teacher to student, and so on) is the basis for allocating and integrating roles, personnel, and facilities to achieve school goals. Operationally, educational organizations are people intensive, thus the process in schools takes place person-to-person interaction”. This finding is also parallel with Eisen’s (2000) defining an orchestra by using starfish metaphor. A starfish’ central nerve ring can be accepted as conductor and its arms as players in the orchestra. The starfish metaphor dramatized the vital importance of communication: If a starfish’s central nerve ring (or the organization’s communication system) is severed, its arms will react independently and it won’t be able to function at all. Additionally, this finding is also parallel with Özar’s (1997) study called “A case study on identifying the perceptions of teachers on the present organizational structure and processes of an educational institution through the use of metaphors”. In her study, some of the metaphors used by the teachers to describe the present structure of the school were 'train, machines, factory, clock, gears'.

Findings also showed that principals had some problems with the use of their authorities and carrying out their responsibilities. For instance, PN warned principals to keep balance in the use of their authorities with the sun metaphor: "School management should not take their authority too much serious or be indifferent to their power but should be balanced in power using". On the other hand, PK complained about the lack of school-based management with robot metaphor "School principals are robots as their authorities are less than their responsibilities. They do not have enough authority to carry out their responsibilities. School principals are robots that have to perform what is asked for by central authority and superiors....." Besides, , PC criticized the pressure of workload in school management with horse metaphor: " School management is a horse carrying heavy loads on its back...School management is responsible for everything in school and performs nearly all tasks in school and carries out difficult tasks....." Similarly, PF criticized the pressure principals experienced inside and outside school in school management with a beaten boxer metaphor: "School management is under pressure by the demands of those groups inside school and outside school. They both want to affect and direct school towards their demands....and this kind of pressure sometimes are likely to keep school away from what its goals are...." Additionally, PE stressed the importance of how to keep balance in the use of principals' authorities with a teeter-totter metaphor "Balance of a teeter-totter is of great importance.... In order to manage teeter-totter, it is required both to keep the balance against the weight and technically to be able to keep oneself down and up whenever necessary, which is the same for school management" These findings related to problems with the use of principals' authorities and carrying out their responsibilities address the issue of centralized management in schools and are parallel with the idea that the traditional centralized management often ignores school-based needs; it is found to be ineffective too rigid to develop school-based initiative and meet school based needs." (Cheng, 1996). This finding is also consistent with Silman and Şimşek's (2006) findings showing that the metaphors the Turkish participants used presented more the centralized characteristics of the Turkish school system in their study called "A Metaphorical Perspective to Schools and Central Educational Organizations in Turkey and the United States".

These findings have important implications for the school management and management activities. This study analyses the perceptions of principal on school management with metaphors and those analysis are likely to enrich knowledge in understanding how principle perceive school management and what difficulties they have related to management activities.

In addition, this study suggests important implications about what can be done to help principals to overcome or reduce the effects of difficulties originating from management activities in school setting as principals themselves expressed the problems with the use of their authorities and carrying out their responsibilities due to traditional centralized school management. One another implication the study has is that metaphors can suggest suitable or acceptable interventions. Principals' uses of metaphors are likely to suggest insight into potential interventions that are situation specific. The issue of centralized management in schools and principals' complaints on the traditional centralized management can be diminished by decentralization or school- based management which allows quick response to local and school based conditions make schools more innovative and productive.

### **Conclusion**

In schools, school management activities occur in a collective way. As explained in football team, bee and watch metaphors by participants, the principal should work in cooperation with the personnel towards the goals of the school. School is also a hierarchical organization, which is the basis for allocating and integrating roles, personnel, and facilities to achieve school goals as explained in robot, tree, computer, locomotive, book and rocket metaphors by participants. Principals experience some problems with the use of their authorities and carrying out their responsibilities due to traditional centralized management as defined in sun, robot, a beaten boxer, horse and teeter-toter metaphors by participants.

To sum up, as an analysis of school management and management activities with metaphors by principals can provide a rich source of information in understanding organizational attitudes and beliefs within school culture. Thus, both top and sub managers had better be aware of the issues experienced by principals in school setting in order to create a school culture where all the personnel work in cooperation with the principals to achieve school goals. A metaphorical analysis of principals on school management and management activities will also help us to a better understanding of what it takes to function effectively within school culture.

### References

- Campbell, R. F., Corbally J. E., & Nystrand R. O. (1983). *Introduction to educational administration*. USA: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Cheng, C. Y. (1996). *School effectiveness and school-based management: a mechanism for development*. London: Falmer Press.
- Cohen, L., Mannion, L., & Morrison K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Dunlap, D., & Goaldman, P. (1990). Power as a system of authority vs. Power as a system of facilitation. *The Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association*, Boston Massachusetts, April 16-20, ED 325 943.
- Eisen, S. (2000). Cultural change in the Pittsburgh symphony organization: A roundtable discussion. *Harmony*, 11, 24-30.
- Gannon, M. J. (2003). Cultural metaphors: their use in management practice as a method for understanding cultures. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, Unit 7*. Retrieved July 30, 2010, from <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol7/iss1/4>.
- Getzels, J. W., & Guba E. G. (1970). *Social behaviour and the administrative process, selected readings on general supervision*. London: The Macmillan Company.

- Griffin, E. M. (2005). *A first look at communication theory*. (6th Ed.). USA: McGraw-Hill College.
- Kabadayi, A. (2008). Analysing the metaphorical images of Turkish preschool teachers. *Teaching Education*, 19, 1, 73–87.
- Kangas, S., Warren, N.A., & Byrne, M. M. (1998). Metaphor: The language of nursing researchers. *Nursing Research*, 47, 190–193.
- Kelle, U. (1995). *Computer aided qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lemlech, K. J. (1998). *Classroom management: Methods and techniques for elementary and secondary teachers*. New York: Longman.
- Martinez M. A., Sauleda, N., & Huber, G. L. (2001). Metaphors as blueprints of thinking about teaching and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 965–977.
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2009). Retrieved July 30, 2010, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/metaphor>.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded source book*. (2nd Ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Moss, M. S., Moss, S. Z., Rubinstein, R. L., & Black, H.K. (2003). The metaphor of “family” in staff communication about dying and death. *Journals of Gerontology*, 58B, 5, 290–296.
- Özar, B. (1999). *A case study on identifying the perceptions of teachers on the present organizational structure and processes of an educational institution through the use of metaphors*. Unpublished Thesis PhD. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schein, E. (2001). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. In *classics of Organization Theory*. (Jay Shafritz and J. Steven Ott, Eds). Fort Worth: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Sergiovanni J. S., & Carver F. D. (1973). *The new school executive: A theory of administration*. New York: Dood, Mead and Company Inc.
- Sergiovanni T. S., & Starratt, R. J. (1988). *Supervision: Human perspectives*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sfard, A. (1994). Reification as the birth of metaphor, *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 14, 44-55.
- Silman, F., & Şimşek H. (2006). A Metaphorical perspective to schools and central educational organizations in Turkey and the United States. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 23, 177-187.
- Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wilson, F. (1992). Language, technology, gender, and power. *Human Relations*, 45, 883-905.
- Yin, R. (1993). *Applications of case study research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

## Appendix 1

### Consent Form for Participation

....., 2010

My signature on this form indicates that I agree to participate in a study by İlhan Günbayı on “Principals’ perceptions on school management with metaphors”. This will include two interviews. In the event that I and the researcher decide that a second interview is not necessary there will be one interview. It also shows that I understand the following:

- I am volunteer and can withdraw at any time from the study.
- There is no risk of physical or psychological harm.
- The information I give will be strictly confidential and all the data will be collected and analyzed by the researcher and will be securely at Akdeniz University for seven years at which time it will be destroyed.
- I will receive a summary of the study upon request.
- I am giving permission to the researcher for the research and its results being published.

I, ....., agree to participate in the interviews.

Signature of the Participant

Date

..../..../2010