

ANALOGICAL REASONING is the WAY to GO BEYOND
ORTHODOXY in FORMULATING
ORGANISATIONAL PROBLEMS:
THE USE of an IMPROVED VERSION of
MORGAN's METAPHORS REVISITED

N. Gökhan TORLAK*

ÖZET

Bu çalışma, yöneticilerin organizasyonları daha büyük ölçüde kavramalarını sağlayan vasıflarını geliştirmeyi ve çeşitli organizasyonel teoriler üzerine inşa edilen metaforları kullanarak yöneticilerin problemlerinin çerçevesini çizmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışma Morgan'ın metaforlarını ve bu metaforların sosyal teoride yaygın olarak kabul edilen ilgili sosyolojik paradgmalarını kısaca gözden geçirmekte ve böylece her bir metaforun kendi gerçekliği ve son teorik gelişmeler temelinde anketleri geliştirmekte ve yeniden yapılandırmaktadır.

ABSTRACT

The paper aims to promote skills of managers to gain greater insight into organisations and to frame their problems through the use of several organisational metaphors, which build on the concepts underpinning organisation theory. The paper briefly reviews Morgan's metaphors and their associated sociological paradigms that are commonly recognised in social theory, and then improves and rephrases questionnaires on the basis of intrinsic and recent theoretical developments of each metaphor.

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with encouraging managers to become creative in viewing problem situations through different metaphors and paradigms. If managers want to act creatively and in an all-embracing manner to address management problems and to improve their organisations, services, and operations, they have to think innovatively

and comprehensively. Predictable, conventional and restricted ways to view organisational concerns should be abandoned. Managers should generate an elitist propensity to learn to challenge their customary way of thinking that lead them to view organisations. Metaphors will guide them both to unleash their unquestioned mental models and to rigorously formulate various problems that are hidden in their organisations. They insightfully reveal both mainstream worldviews and ancillary alternative perspectives that help explore organisational issues. Creativity can also be encouraged when we embrace different paradigms or ways of seeing things. Paradigms that were originally pioneered by Kuhn (1970) are set of assumptions and beliefs that form scientific as well as organisational activity. It would be too simple for managers to pick up a set of metaphors that address organisational problems. A rigorous formulation of problems needs a theoretical backing that emphasises social theory in which there are social systems (organisations) that offer their unique accounts of 'reality' (organisational values, beliefs, services, and operations). The work of sociological paradigms was initiated by Burrell and Morgan (1979) and complemented by Alvesson and Deetz (1996) with the addition of postmodern paradigm. Because of metaphors that have theoretical attributes serving different paradigms, they can be associated with certain assumptions of these paradigms. Although metaphors provide different perspectives on problem situations they do not concern about the simultaneous entertainment of radically different alternatives. However, paradigms much concern about incompatible assumptions they rest on. They have been fighting with each other for a long time because the adherents of each paradigm favour 'isolationist thinking' (Jackson, 1987) that assumes that they could provide the best explanation of 'reality'.

The paper reviews the analogical reasoning in organisation theory, improves and rephrases the list of questions for Morgan's eight metaphors developed by Torlak (1999) in light of recent theoretical developments in the field, and adds a new list of questions for the carnival metaphor. The paper is divided into two parts. The first part, titled metaphors and sociological paradigms, points up both conventional and recent theories of metaphors and their associated sociological paradigms. The second part, titled questionnaires for

* Yrd. Doç. Dr. Fatih Üniversitesi IIBF İşletme Bölümü.

metaphors, improves and updates the list of questions for eight metaphors in light of recent theoretical developments and adds carnival metaphor to the repertoire of Morgan's set through drawing up a list of questions for it.

2. Metaphors and Sociological Paradigms

In this part, we basically highlight what are metaphors and their associated sociological paradigms? Metaphors as being mirror of management thought and organisation theory bring benefit and effectiveness to the practitioner/problem-solver/decision-maker in the formulation of organisational problems. They are diagnostic tools to gain insight into organisational practice or conceptual clarification and understanding of the complex networks' problem situations (Pepper, 1982). Morgan (1986, 1997) describes metaphors as 'developing the knack of reading situations with various scenarios in mind, and of forging actions that seem appropriate to the readings thus obtained.' They are systemic because each one equals to some kind of complex interactive network. The most powerful attribute of metaphoric approach to problem situations that they will provide managers with generating 'creative' insight about the organisational concerns. However, each insight has limited implications, and thus should be supplemented with others. In this way we create competing but complementary insights. Morgan who gained popularity among system thinkers reviewed the literature describing organisations as "machines", "organisms", "brains", "cultures", "political systems", "psychic prisons", "flux and transformation", and "instruments of domination." Jackson (2003) added ninth metaphor 'organisations as carnivals' from Alvesson and Deetz (1996). Different metaphors look at organisations from different perspectives and contain theories of organisation each yields distinctive appreciation of companies' character and functioning. This obviously affects what managers see as significant and how they seek to change it. We will briefly review nine images of organisations with reference to their respective key theories, which capture almost all assumptions of management and organisation theory. They are:

- Mechanical metaphor or 'closed system' view; places emphasis on the efficiency and effectiveness through control and authority in order to achieve predetermined goals.
- Organismic metaphor or 'open system' view; stresses the preservation of the organisational survival by adapting to the environment and recognition of the needs of the organisation, including its human participants.
- Neurocybernetic metaphor or 'viable system' view; emphasizes the learning, decision-making, and information processing capability of the organisation.
- Cultural metaphor; focuses on individual and organisational values, norms and beliefs.
- Political metaphor; focuses on the political climate of organisations, such as issues of interests, resolution of conflicts, and the exercise of power.
- Psychic prison metaphor; is concerned with the profound impact of the conscious and unconscious processes of the human psyche (such as preferred ways of thinking and unconscious processes) on the structure and functioning of organisations.
- Flux and Transformation metaphor; puts emphasis on deciphering the logics of change that profoundly influence the construction of organisation.
- Domination metaphor; handles how organisations hegemony their employees, as well as international politics and world economy.
- Carnival metaphor; puts emphasis on transient liberation from constructed order, 'a suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions.' During carnival the life is dependent on the laws of its own freedom.

The most influential strands in treating organisations as if they were machines are Max Weber's 'bureaucracy theory' (Weber, in Gerth and Mills 1970) that is the most technically advanced organisational form based upon an advanced division of labour, a strict hierarchy,

government by rules and staffing by trained officials; Fayol's (1949) 'administrative management theory' that advises managers to forecast and plan, to organise, to command, to coordinate and to control, and sets out fourteen principles designed to guide managerial action; Taylor's (1947) 'scientific management' that is the best way of doing each task in an organisation could be based upon a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. It brings about an extreme division of labour and the shifting of control away from the point at which the task is carried out; and Drucker's (1955) 'management by objectives.' The closed system view generated hegemony on the management theory during the first half of the 20th century. Its ideology is based on the overall goal-seeking feature of organisations. It places emphasis on designing goals, breaking down tasks to achieve them, and establishing rules that guide behaviour of system components. Authority, coordination, and control are important qualities in the achievement of preset goals. However, it fails to recognise the purposes of system components and cannot generate organisational forms that are in tune with their environments.

The primary aim in the organismic metaphor becomes survival. In this model theories include discovery of individual needs that covers the studies on employee needs by Mayo (1933) and Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs, Herzberg's (1968) 'two-factor theory', and McGregor's (1960) 'Theories X and Y'; discovery of organizational needs that covers Selznick's (1948) 'structural-functional' perspective and Parsons' (1956, 1957) 'functional imperatives'; organisations as 'open systems' that analyses Bertalanffy's (1968) General System Theory, socio-technical theory of Tavistock studies (Cherns, 1987), Burns and Stalker's (1961) 'management system theory', and Lawrance and Lorsch's (1969) 'differentiation-and-integration' model; the species of organisations that determines the mutual characteristics of 'excellent' successful U.S companies in the light of Peters and Waterman's (1982) refinement of adhocracies; the population-ecology view of organisations (Hannan and Freeman, 1989); and the ecology view of organisations that is based upon the work of Hannan and Freeman (1989). The assumptions of organismic metaphor are organisations as wholes contain interrelated parts, which are open to their sub-environments. They must adapt to their environments if they have to survive. Therefore, the requirements of the environment and the

congruence between the whole system goals and parts' sub-goals are so significant. However, it neglects the fact that there might be difference between individual/group goals and the organisation's overall goals. It conceals conflict, struggle, and internal change.

The neurocybernetic metaphor puts emphasis on active learning deriving from cybernetics rather than passive adaptability. It considers organisations as information-processing systems. Some of the significant theories in this context include Wiener's (1946) negative feedback principle, Simon's (1947) objective rationality, Galbraith's (1973), and Beer's (1979, 1981, 1985) Viable System Diagnosis. It also regards organisations as learning systems, which are based on the works of Argyris and Schön (1978) and organisations as holographic entities (Morgan, 1987). The overall goals of these theories are to ensure effective information-processing, decision-making and control in organisations. The organisation should have the flexibility to respond environmental disturbances and be capable of displaying single-loop learning and double-loop learning simultaneously. Innovative industrial companies and R & D work groups are good examples of this approach. However, this strand does not give attention to individuals, conflict, power struggles, and the process of setting goals. The new development in the brain metaphor is concerned with the creation of 'Team Syntegrity' by Beer (1994). This approach proposes a model based on a geometric structure ideal for perfect democracy. The model arranges teams that have identical structures, connections, and relative positions. Views flowing from one discussion group will echo in the structure and generate supporters and rivals, thus ensuring maximum creativity and synergy.

The culture metaphor stresses the significance of philosophy, spirit, and the drive of an organisation in which component parts are human beings. They have different perceptions of reality or attribute different meaning to the same events. The success and survival of an organisation is hugely conditioned upon the achievement of shared values and beliefs. In this way they could avoid conflict and secure freedom and innovation. The most influential strands in treating organisations as cultures are culture and organisation emphasising culture as an autonomous external force shaping individuals and

organisations (Child, 1981; Pascale and Athos, 1981; Smircich, 1983); corporate culture and subcultures considering internal variable characteristic of culture in organisations (Pfeffer, 1981; Smircich, 1983; Van Maanen and Barely, 1985); and how organisations as 'socially constructed realities' are developed and sustained (Weick, 1977 and Garfinkel and Sacks, 1986).

The political strand treats organisations where people who belong to various class and status think and act differently (Fox, 1966; and Bacharach and Lawler, 1980); where the diversity of individuals' interests and groups conflicting (Coser, 1956; Crozier, 1964; Pondy, 1967; Thomas, 1976); and where there is enormous reliance on mobilization of bias that serves the interests of power-holders in the process of resolving conflicts among individuals and groups (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; and Lukes, 1974). The political metaphor places power, control, and coercion at the centre of organisational life. It uncovers tensions and strains, recognises organisational members as political actors, and stresses goals that are rational for some and are irrational for others. However, it may bring about an unreliable organisational ambience due to overemphasis on political issues.

Psychic prison metaphor points up the repressive image of organisational life in terms of traps of favoured thinking and unconscious processes. In the trap of favoured thinking, there is great emphasis on the resistant cognitive images of past success, zero-defects, and 'assumed consensus' (Morgan, 1986). In the trap of unconscious processes, the emphasis is directed to the essences of unconscious processes such as repressed sexuality (Freud, 1953, 1959), patriarchal family (Coward, 1983), death and eternity (Becker, 1973), tension (Klein, 1957; and Bion 1961), transitional objects (Winnicott, 1958), and shadow (unrecognised and rejected desires) and archetype (definite forms in the human mind shaping thinking and helping understand the external world) (Jung, 1959) that trap people.

Flux and transformation metaphor emphasises surface happenings in organisational life that are shaped by concealed processes. It guides managers in a way that they have to observe hidden patterns behind the reality, which is constructed in the aspects of transformation. The most influential theories in this metaphor are organisations are as

'autopoiesis' or self-producing systems (Maturana and Varela, 1980); mutual causality emphasizing the understanding of tensions deriving from circular relations (Maruyama, 1963); Hegel's dialectical change considering change as a result of opposites, retaining something from rejected previous forms, and revolutionary changes in quantity leading changes in quality (Engels, 1940); and chaos and complexity theory treats organisations as systems that need greater complexity, crisis, new perspectives, continuous questioning, disorder, and chaos that are the most desirable states for the viability of an organisation (Gleick, 1987; Stacey, 1992; and Wheatley, 1992). However, there is great scepticism about the existence of deep and unchanged rules in organisations.

The domination metaphor mirrors the exploitation of certain groups by others in organisations. The interests of groups are always unbridgeable. The only reason that holds organisational members together is the exercise of power of some groups to control the activities of others. Thus, the consensus is false. The others who are silenced or not involved but are affected include women, handicapped, minorities and those of a different sexual orientation. The domination metaphor includes the following three theories. First, the dominant character of organisations is based on the Marxist theory focusing on organisations that allow one group of people to accumulate capital and to generate economic surplus through exploiting employees. Bureaucracy is the vehicle to exercise coercion and to protect the privileges of masters. Large firms accumulating surplus without spending on the welfare of people enforce economic depressions (Baran and Sweezy, 1966; and Mouzelis, 1967). Second, the exploitation of employees is based on the 'class-based' structures of organisations emerging from mechanization of production and homogenization of work (Braverman, 1974, Salaman, 1981) that gave rise to labour market segmentation (Reich et. al., 1973) as well as deterioration of working conditions promoted work-related hazards such as industrial accidents and mental diseases. Third, large organisations dominate international politics and the world economy (Morgan, 1997).

The carnival metaphor will be better understood, if we compare it with Deboard's (1967) 'society of spectacle.' Spectacle is a dominant model of social life; a narrative that legitimates and rationalises

consumption and production. Its language includes the signs of ruling production and consumption. The spectacle is the existing order's uninterrupted discourse that makes separation perfect within the interior of man through the exile of human powers. It fails to recognise people who are silenced and marginalized. It imposes a life scripted by others in which theatrical performers organise production and consumption. Spectacle equates material accumulation with happiness through a legitimating mechanism of social control. In organisational life, workers, managers, owners, customers, all stakeholders are designers and accumulators of spectacles. From a dialectic perspective, the idea of spectacle should be accompanied by the resistance of those who are isolated and alienated. Carnival metaphor that is suggested by Bakhtin (1984) makes room for criticising the rigid social authority or the prevailing norms of society. It gives opportunity to people to generate new practices and new order. People should not be limited to applying the rules in a social context and continuing with the same behaviour (Wittgenstein, 1974). They should be 'reflective' or be aware of possible alternative rules (Winch, 1958). It rejects a life whether social or organisational that is scripted and authorised by others who are so-called better storytellers. People who are oppressed can engage in social experiments, which are put forward by Boje, et.al. (2002, 2003), such as 'invisibility theatre' where spectators' critical consciousness is liberated and they become active spectators who develop alternative scripts and characterisations, and 'forum theatre' in which the rules of the game of power becomes explicit and there will be no boundary between audience and actors. Audience becomes co-directors and coach who suggest rule changes and new scripts experiment with new solutions to different forms of hegemony. The game continues until satisfactory solutions to oppressive situations are found. Carnival metaphor stimulates resistance and empowers latent audience with critical consciousness who become actors and script writers and can change the dramatic action. According to Henri Savall et al. (2000), the organisation is a theatre where there are written and mostly unwritten scripts—metascripts that define seven elements; fixed character roles, strategic plots or plans, codification and graphical preparation of themes of oppression, dialogs of talks, stories, and discourses, temporal rhythms (change, improvisation, experiment, chaos and disorder), frames

(ideological viewpoints or mind sets translated into actions and events), and spectacles (theatrical contexts—discursive, ceremonial, and legitimated inquiry or intersubjective process of interpreting actions and events that seek sensible practices and remedies to crises and disasters). DeBoard (1967) described three types of spectacle that include concentrated, diffuse, and integrated. The concentrated spectacle stresses seven elements of metatheatrics of enterprise that are constitutive described above. The diffuse spectacle focuses on the theatrical performances of the firm in the market such as advertising, franchising, and activities for public image. And the integrated spectacle equals concentrated plus diffuse spectacle in synergistic combination. Best and Kellner (2001) developed DeBoard's spectacle types and proposed the mega spectacle type that emphasises the enactment of a theatrical performance that collapses into scandal.

Modernist form of organisation typified by bureaucracy is an ill organisational form, which is incapable of responding to the creative dynamic environment of the twenty-first century. Tomorrow's surviving organisation should create and maintain carnival—constant "dynamic imagery" with its energy, surprise, buzz and fun away from static thinking that helps organisation have the right culture and strategy for the unsteady times (Peters, 1992; Hecksher, 1994). This is the postentrepreneurial organisation (Kanter, 1989), the postmodern organisation (Clegg, 1990), the post bureaucratic organisation (Hecksher and Donnellon, 1994), and the organisation as carnival (Peters, 1992). According to Heydebrand (1989) and Clegg (1990), these post modern organisations have the following dynamic features: they are small, flexible, participative (having self-managed team work), vertically coordinated by the government, functionally decentralised, using computerised technology, having strong homogenous corporate culture and well-focused mission, self-controlling, having high level of employee commitment and empowerment, focusing on niches in the market, using multiple technologies, having multi-skilled personnel (skill formation is oriented toward the organisation), using subcontractors and networks, rewarding organisational rather than individual performance, and having leaders who manage organisational culture.

Another way to look at problem situations is to view them from the viewpoints offered by four different sociological paradigms—'functionalist,' 'interpretive,' 'emancipatory,' and 'postmodern' that are commonly recognised in social theory. The word paradigm, originally provided by Kuhn (1970), supported an isolationist approach although this is not stated by its adherents. Kuhn said that 'the proponents of competing paradigms practice their trades in different worlds... the two groups of scientists see different things when they look from the same point in the same direction.' Technically there are values, beliefs, and assumptions that shape and direct both scientific and organisational activity. Although metaphors reveal different things in observation, which are not in conflict with each other in contrast they are actually complementary, sociological paradigms provide with most appropriate accounts of the observed nature of reality. They put forward contradictory implications, and therefore they are in irresolvable conflict with each other. Each one's postulations are incompatible with those of other paradigms. This is valid if the problem-solver uses an 'isolationist thinking' assuming that each approach should be developed on the basis of its own theoretical assumptions individually (Jackson, 1991) or sticks to 'paradigm bracketing'—acknowledging difference and does not attempt to combine the different approaches rather than believing 'discordant pluralism'—accepting synergies and tensions of different approaches but avoids reconciliation, 'paradigm bridging'—may combine theoretically and methodologically irreconcilable paradigms if an appropriate bridging theory can be found, 'complementarism'—requiring theoretical but not methodological commensurability, or 'methodological imperialism by subsumption'—subsuming methods from one paradigm and employing them within the assumptions of another (Lewis and Grimes, 1999; Gregory, 2003).

The assumptions of functionalist paradigm stress that there is an objective truth to be discovered by scientific analysis. It emphasises optimisation through efficient allocation and use of resources, effective achievement of goals, productivity, adaptation to the environment, and self-organisation. Thus, it creates predictable system behaviour, consensus, and regulation. In terms of time identification, these methodologies belong to the modernist era in which company managers can empirically study and understand organisations through rational

thinking such as using scientific methods and techniques to probe and lead the system effectively. The assumption of this era is that there is a concrete organisational reality and objective world that can be empirically studied and understood through rational thinking (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Basic goals of functionalist approaches are to generate law-like relations among system parts through efficiency, effectiveness, adaptation, and self-organisation. They try to eliminate inefficiency, ineffectiveness, unproductivity, and disorder. Metaphors they privilege are mechanical, organismic, neurocybernetic, and flux and transformation, which are described above.

The assumptions of interpretivist paradigm stress that organisations as socially created realities would be better regulated and maintained if they achieve greater reciprocal comprehension among different interest groups through norms, values, rites, and rituals. Organisational interests people have are sharply different due to different interpretations of the same situations but there is a possibility of conviviality of working together better or a resolvable dissension among parties through a participative involvement that leads to the unified shared culture and integrative values. The interpretive paradigm obviously embraces 'subjectivity' rather than 'objectivism' that underpins functionalist systems approaches. In terms of time identification, these methodologies belong to pre modern era in which company managers recover the integrative values of the organisation through mission and vision statements. The assumption is that there is a need to understand intentions and viewpoints of human beings (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Hermeneutics (understanding the 'life assertions' or objectifications such as institutions, historical situations or language of human mind), phenomenology (*transcendental*; attention is directed to the pure intentions of consciousness rather than neither ideal reality nor psychological reality and *existential*; 'life world') and phenomenological sociology (*ethnomethodology*; identification of 'taken for granted assumptions' which characterise any social situation and the ways in which members involved and *phenomenological symbolic interactionism*; the way individuals create social world) are significant components of this paradigm (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Basic goals of interpretivist systems approaches are to display the existence of differing values, norms, beliefs, interests, and appraisal standards (mounting pluralism) and the necessity of a unified shared culture through the clarification of

purposes in debates and encouragement of conflict, learning, mutual understanding and change. They try to eliminate illegitimacy and meaninglessness. Metaphors they privilege are culture and political metaphors, which are described above.

The assumptions of emancipatory paradigm stress that there is a need to remove sources of power and domination that tyrannize particular individuals and groups in organisations and society. The illegitimate use of power and various forms of discrimination necessitates a radical change in the social order in organisations and society. In terms of time identification, these systems methodologies belong to late modern era where pluralism is all right for the greater good of organisations. However, organisations must recognise difference in the spirit of fairness and justice, and thereby establishing openness and consensus. This requires criticism of status quo and identification of social and organisational practice that masquerades subtle forms of domination. Basic goal of emancipatory approaches is to unmask domination in order to provide with reformation of social order (Alvesson and Deetz, 1996). They try to ascertain whose interests are served, identify the processes by which power holders achieve and exercise authority, analyse organisational predispositions and social biases, and clarify organisational culture and sources of control. Metaphors they privilege are psychic prison and instruments of domination, which are described above.

The assumptions of postmodernist paradigm are to obtain objective truth and rationality, and stress that progresses are false. Language is not a regulative instrument for consensus, but a world-constituting action—'language as social action' (Gergen and Joseph, 1996). Difference, diversity in opinions, tolerance, conflict, disorder, insecurity, and instability will ensure creativity and respect voices of those who are silenced. In terms of organisations, it is a 'prologic' perspective that sees organisations as heteroglotic in nature and made up of different voices. Domination is mobile, situational, and not done by anyone. Therefore, organisations should reclaim suppressed conflict in everyday actions, meaning systems, and self-conceptions through legitimising marginalised and suppressed people (Alvesson and Deetz, 2000). Creativity, fun, and 'carnavalesque' actions should be supported that encourage 'communal negotiation' through social practical function

of language and pluralistic cultural investments in the conception of true and good. Organisational life should make room for conversational spaces in which distinctiveness and independency of different players are recognised (Gergen and Joseph, 1996). These ideas derived from the writings of Nietzsche and Heidegger who both aimed to promote 'self-emancipation' as an alternative to the universal emancipation of Enlightenment. 'Self' is contingent upon social, cultural, and physical forces and 'being in the world' should be restyled by individuals (Jackson, 2003). Alvesson and Deetz (1996) showed the relevance of postmodernist perspective to the organisational research by pointing out seven subject matters. They are the loss of power of the grand narratives (no misleading 'totalisations' but dissension and discrepancies), the centrality of discourse (discursive formations shape social structure and individual identities), the power/knowledge connections (discourses give opportunity to some to create domination while others' interests are silenced), research aimed at revealing indeterminacy and encouraging resistance rather than at maintaining rationality, predictability, and order ('genealogy' is the way to unveil discursive formations that serve the interests of power holders on a local basis), the discursive production of natural objects rather than language as a mirror of reality (language is misleading that illegitimately privileges any particular discourse as reality), the discursive production of the individual (the accumulation of the knowledge is on the shaky ground), and hyper reality—simulations replace the real world in the current world order (relationships among signs give them meaning, signs do not reflect some reality) (Jackson, 2003). Postmodern approaches create conversational spaces for all voices to be heard. Basic goals are to reclaim conflict and to generate a setting for lost voices. Problems they perceive are marginalization, oppression, totalisation, normalisation, and lost conflict and negotiation. Systems metaphor they privilege is carnival, as described above.

3. Questionnaires for Metaphors

In this part, we shall improve the list of questions for eight metaphors—mechanical, organismic, neurocybernetic, culture, political, psychic prison, and flux and transformation, domination, and then draw up list of questions for the carnival metaphor with reference to their key

and basic theories. Like Torlak's (2001a, b) efforts, this work intends to improve the usability of metaphors in practice by reviewing their theoretical improvements and to increase the number of metaphors used by including the carnival metaphor in light of recent developments.

3. 1. The list of questions for mechanical metaphor

The mechanical image of organisations include four key theories—Weber's bureaucracy theory, Fayol's 'administrative management theory,' Taylor's 'scientific management,' and Drucker's management by objectives.' The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation is a well-functioning mechanical system or not. The questionnaire is divided into three parts.

The questions that deal with bureaucracy theory:

1. What is the basis of authority used in the organisation?
2. What are the factors (technical competence, social status, heredity, or kinship) that determine organizational roles/positions?
3. Are roles/positions' task responsibility and decision-making authority and their relationships with other roles in the organisation clear?
4. Is there a full control and supervision of role holders who are in higher rank over people who are in lower rank in the organisation?
5. How effective the written rules, standard operating procedures, unwritten norms to control the behaviour and relationships among roles in the organisation?

The questions that deal with administrative management theory:

1. How specialized the organization is?
2. How are authority and discipline practiced in the organisation?
3. Do workers receive orders from different managers at a time?
4. How different the unit/departmental objectives are from the common overall objectives of the organisation?

5. What motivational techniques does the organisation use?
6. How are decisions taken in the organisation?
7. How flexible the organization's internal communication (the flow of information/knowledge) is among its units?
8. How does the organization coordinate its units/employees?
9. How equitable the organisation is in the treatment of its units/employees?
10. How stable the organisation is in the tenure of its personnel?
11. How effective the organisation is in the encouragement of worker initiative in undertaking a new work activity?
12. How effective the organisation is in group working?

The questions that deal with scientific management:

1. How predictable the work process is within management/organization, production, marketing, and financial units?
2. How premium and distinctive the products of the firm are?
3. Is required level of effort for any particular task is precise and clear?
4. Does the organisation use most effective and accurate way of executing any work activity?
5. What are the criteria in the selection and training of employees?
6. How does the organisation evaluate the worker performance?

The questions that deal with management by objectives:

1. How are overall and unit/departmental objectives set in the organisation?
2. How is performance monitored?
3. Are rewards given to units/individuals on the basis of how close they come to reaching their goals?

3.2. The list of questions for organismic metaphor?

The organismic image of organisations include six key theories—first discovery of individual needs that are analysed by Mayo (1933) and Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs, Herzberg's (1968) 'two-factor theory', and McGregor's (1960) 'Theories X and Y,' second discovery of organisational needs that are analysed by Selznick's (1948) 'structural-functionalist' perspective and Parsons's (1956, 1957) 'functional imperatives,' third organisations as 'open systems' that are analysed by Bertalanffy's (1968) General System Theory, socio-technical theory of Tavistock studies (Cherns, 1987), Burns and Stalker's (1961) 'management system theory', and Lawrance and Lorsch's (1969) 'differentiation-and-integration' model, fourth the species of organisations that determines the mutual characteristics of 'excellent' successful U.S companies in the light of Peters and Waterman's (1982) refinement of adhocracies, fifth the population-ecology view of organisations (Hannan and Freeman, 1989), and finally the ecology view of organisations that is based upon the work of Hannan and Freeman (1989). The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation is well-designed organism or not. The questionnaire is divided into three parts.

The questions that deal with individual needs:

1. Are employees taking part in important work assignments or projects?
2. How much do employees value teamwork?
3. What needs (physiological, safety/security, affiliation, recognition/approval, and self-fulfilment) motivate employees/units in the organisation?
4. Does the organisation expand the scope of job of employees by adding similar and routine tasks or dissimilar, new and challenging tasks?
5. How often do employees rotate among units within the organisation?

6. Are managers results-facts oriented, intolerant, one way listener, distant, poor at delegating, coercive or tolerant, good listener, closer, permitting creativity, and participative?

The questions that deal with organisational needs:

1. How cohesive primary formal goals and departmental goals of the organisation?
2. How adaptive the organization is in terms of paying continuous attention to the innovative actions of rivals in light of technological developments?
3. Are lines of authority and communication in the organisation stable and effective?
4. Are actions taken within the organisation with reference to specified policies?
5. What is the degree of unity within the organisation?
6. Are primary goals of the organisation clearly defined and enlisted to which units are directed to attain them?
7. How motivated units/individuals within the organisation to perform their roles?

The questions that deal with organisations as open systems:

1. How compatible the design of the organisation with its objectives is? (Compatibility)
2. How flexible or open to the realistic options the organisation is in terms of determining the methods for achieving objectives? (Minimal critical specification)
3. How good the organisation is at minimizing the sources of variances (unprogrammed events) rather than their consequences? (Variance control)
4. How flexible the boundaries within the organisation that do not interfere the sharing of information, knowledge and learning? Or how good the organisation is at adjusting the boundaries between departments, between departments and the whole organisation, and between the organisation and the environment,

- and thus making the manager/supervisor of a department a coordinator rather than a controller? (Boundary location)
5. Is the organisational information used for control, records, and action? (Information flow)
 6. Do departments/individuals that require certain resources (materials/equipment) have free access to, authority over, and responsibility for them? (Power and authority)
 7. What methods does the organisation use to adapt some departments/individuals to other departments/individuals? Is it adding new roles that may alter hierarchies, communication, and allocation of resources or is it modifying current roles? (Multifunctional principle)
 8. How similar the reward systems and management philosophy are? (Support congruence)
 9. How should the departments/individuals and the organisation as a whole behave in a state of change? Does the organisation allow self-selection of individuals in a change situation? (Transitional organisation)
 10. Does the organisation have ongoing evaluative and redesign system? (Incompletion)
 11. How predictable/unpredictable the organisation's structure is in terms of specialization, integration, communication, controlling tasks, coordinating work process, and status/skill?
 12. Does the organisation strike an appropriate balance between predictable and unpredictable organisational structures?
 13. Is the organisation aware of the strength, number, and interconnectedness of forces both in the specific and general environment?
 14. How quick the forces in the specific and general environment change over time?
 15. How harmonious the organisation's departmental differentiation and cross-functional integration relative to its particular environment?

The questions that deal with species of organisations:

1. Do departments/individuals have knowledge, interest, and commitments for getting things done?
2. Is customer satisfaction emphasised in all roles that the business plays?
3. Does the organisation encourage risk-taking and innovation in departments?
4. How respectful and enthusiastic people towards each other are in the organisation?
5. Does the organisation generate a company philosophy and shared values?
6. How concentrated the company is in terms of focusing on doing what it does best?
7. How much authority is delegated within the organisation?
8. Do planning and controlling allow for worker autonomy and conformity with rules and procedures simultaneously?

The questions that deal with population-ecology view of organisations:

1. How available the sources within the particular environment of the organisation?
2. Does the organisation make use of the benefits of first movers in the particular environment?
3. Does the organisation enter the particular environment late?
4. Does the organisation concentrate their skills to pursue a narrow range of resources in a single niche or spread their skills thinly to compete for a broad range of resources in many niches?
5. How capable the organisation is in terms of its skills and abilities that best fit with the environment?

The questions that deal with ecology view of organisations:

1. What are strategies of the organisation to increase its ability to grow in a competitive environment?
2. How coercive the values and norms in an environment that governs the behaviour of other organisations in the environment?
3. What is the tendency of the organisation in the environment in terms of imitating another to increase their legitimacy?
4. How proactive the organisation is with the industry, trade, and professional associations?
5. How does the organisation solve the crises of leadership, autonomy, control, and red tape within the process of growth?
6. How resistant the organisational departments/individuals to change?
7. Do managers have unwillingness to bear the uncertainty associated with entrepreneurial activities?
8. How assertive managers are in terms of fulfilling their desire for prestige, job security, power, and property rights (salaries and stock options)?
9. Do top managers resist attempts by subordinate managers to act entrepreneurially?
10. Do managers multiply subordinates?
11. Do managers encourage departments/individuals conform to organisational procedures?
12. How does the organisation remove the problems of inertia such as excessive numbers of personnel, a slow decision making process, a rise in conflict between divisions, and a fall in profits?
13. How does the organisation tackle the problem of taking little action to correct problems?
14. Are managers overly committed to their present strategy and structure though they are clearly not working?
15. How does the organisation avoid crisis?

3.3. The list of questions for neurocybernetic metaphor

There are three key theories: The first one is organisations as information processing systems that include theories of Wiener's (1946) negative feedback principle, Simon's (1947) objective rationality, Galbraith's (1973), and Beer's (1979, 1981, and 1985) Viable System Diagnosis and Team Syntegrity (Beer, 1994). The second key theory regards organisations as learning systems, which are based on the works of Argyris and Schön (1978) and Senge (1990), and the third one treats organisations as holographic entities (Morgan, 1987). The overall goals of these theories are to ensure effective information-processing, decision-making and control in organisations. The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation is well-designed brain or not. The questionnaire is divided into three parts.

The questions that focus on the information-processing capability of organisations:

1. What are the communication channels and information systems designed in the organisation?
2. How are decisions taken?
3. What techniques does the organisation use either to reduce the need for information processing or to increase the capacity to process information?
4. What mechanisms does the organisation use to facilitate communication and coordination among subunits?
5. What methods do managers use to cope with the high variety of their operations? And what techniques does the organisation use to observe, monitor and cope with the high variety of its environment?
6. Does the organisation have co-ordination, control, intelligence and policy-making functions?
7. Does the organisation have a set of procedures or a protocol that promote non-hierarchical, participative and effective decision-making? If yes, what steps does it have?

The questions that focus on organisational learning:

1. How does the organisation appraise its performance?
2. What is the value of current monthly production under existing resources and restrictions? What could be the value of possible production using existing resources within existing restrictions? And what could be the value of production if resources are developed and constraints are removed?
3. Does the organisation carry out any investigation into operating norms and standards (e.g. organisational objectives and policies) in order to measure their appropriateness?
4. How does the organisation dispose of undesirable deviations in its performance?
5. Who challenges and evaluates problem situations?
6. What is the organisation's managerial philosophy in the analysis and solution of complex issues?
7. How does the organisation set its objectives? Does the organisation define its limitations when it sets its goals?
8. Does the organisation create an organisational climate where employees freely and continuously question their methods in their work tasks and operating norms and are not afraid of living with creative tensions?
9. How much does the organisation use teamwork where individuals share and pool their skills?
10. How much do the organisational members make reference to the shared values and norms of the organisation when they tackle problems and capitalise opportunities?
11. How much does the organisation engage with alliances or mergers?
12. Does the organisation pay attention to the level of learning?

The questions that focus on the holographic character of the organisation:

1. What are the functions of the operating units? Are any of the operating units capable of performing extra functions rather than accomplishing only one specific activity?
2. Are operational units responsible for controlling and supporting each other?
3. What are the skills of unit members?
4. What techniques do the organisation and its sub-units use to cope with and monitor what is going on in their environments?
5. What is the nature of roles and job responsibilities in the organisation?
6. Are working groups or teams capable of challenging, questioning and changing their operations and/or design of products?

3.4. The list of questions for culture metaphor:

There are three theories: the first one is the culture as an external variable shapes individuals and organisations (Child, 1981; Pascale and Athos, 1981; Smircich, 1983). The second one includes two aspects; corporate culture and subcultures reflect internal variable characteristic of culture in organisations (Pfeffer, 1981; Smircich, 1983; Van Maanen and Barely, 1985); and the final one considers how organisations as 'socially constructed realities' (Weick, 1977 and Garfinkel and Sacks, 1986). The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation is well-designed culture or not. The questionnaire is divided into three parts.

Questions that deal with culture as an environmental variable:

1. What are the values, ideals, norms and beliefs of individual units or teams in the organisation?
2. What techniques does the organisation use to investigate individual values, ideals, norms and beliefs in the recruitment of employees?
3. What are the attitudes, behaviours and actions in the organisation in terms of both individual employees and units?

Questions that deal with corporate culture and subcultures:

1. What are the organisational instrumental and terminal values, operating norms, beliefs, preferences and ideals?
2. What processes by which organizational members learn and internalise the values and norms of an organization do the organisation use?
3. Do newcomers react passively and obediently to commands and orders?
4. Are they creative and innovative for solutions to problems?
5. Are they isolated during the learning process?
6. Does the organisation provide newcomers with explicit information about sequence in which they will perform new activities or occupy new roles as they advance?
7. Does the organisation give newcomers precise knowledge of the timetable associated with completing each stage in the learning process?
8. Do existing organisational members act as role models or mentors for newcomers?
9. Do newcomers receive negative or positive social support?
10. What are the organisation's rites (e.g. rite of passage, rite of integration, rite of enhancement and rite of degradation)?
11. What are the founder(s)' personal values and beliefs?
12. What are the departmental values, norms, beliefs and ideals? For instance, what are the languages, favoured concepts, perspectives on mission and the understanding of the business of departments and groups in the organisation?
13. How ethical is the organisation in terms of its values, beliefs and rules?
14. What are the property rights of managers and workers (e.g. stock options, salaries, control over resources, decision making, notification of layoffs, severance pay, pension and benefits, long-term employment, etc)?
15. How do you describe the organisation's structure and socially responsible behaviour?

16. What are the conflicts among organisational members?
17. How frequently do the organisational members interact with outsiders?
18. How does the organisation appraise top-level managers' attitudes?
19. How do the executives seek to discover subordinates' interests, values, norms and objectives?

Questions that deal with organisational reality:

1. What is the organisational ethos?
2. What are the organisational slogans?
3. What is the nature of the organisational vocabulary? For instance, how does the organisation explain, legitimise and rationalise its activities?
4. What are patterns of organisational rituals?
5. How is the environment perceived in the organisation?

3.5. The list of questions for political metaphor:

The political strand treats organisations where people who belong to various class and status think and act differently (Fox, 1966; and Bacharach and Lawler, 1980); where the diversity of individuals' interests and groups conflicting (Coser, 1956; Crozier, 1964; Pondy, 1967; Thomas, 1976); and where there is enormous reliance on mobilisation of bias that serves the interests of power-holders in the process of resolving conflicts among individuals and groups (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; and Lukes, 1974). The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation is well-designed political system or not. The questionnaire is divided into three parts.

Questions that deal with organisational interests:

1. What are the interests and problems managers, workers, departments, and teams?
2. What is the nature of relationships between managers and workers?

3. What is the level of cooperation among individuals and among departments?
4. What issues are considered by interest groups in the formation of coalitions in the organisation?

Questions that deal with organisational conflict:

1. How is conflict perceived in the organisation?
2. What is the level of conflict?
3. What methods and processes does the organisation use to resolve conflict amongst competing interest groups?
4. What methods and processes does the organisation use to resolve conflict between superiors and subordinates?
5. What techniques does the organisation use to eliminate the dissonance that occurs between the individual's and the organisation's goals?
6. What methods and processes does the organisation use to resolve conflicts amongst individuals at the same hierarchical level?
7. Where does the organisation see conflict as originating from? Is it inevitable interdependence between units? Is it coming from discrepancies in goals and priorities? Is it related to the bureaucratic factors, incompatible performance criteria or competition for scarce resources?
8. What are the organisation's strategies and tactics to maintain the right level of conflict in the organization?
9. Do organisational subunits write scenarios for the causes of conflict?
10. Do organisational subunits respond emotionally to each other and develop polarized attitudes?
11. Do organisational subunits openly fight with each other?
12. Does the resolution of conflict leave combative or cooperative feeling in parties in the organisation?
13. How does the organisation prevent conflict if it has to make quick decisions, apply temporary solutions to complex and urgent issues, or implement unwelcome decisions?

Questions that deal with organisational power:

1. How is power perceived in the organisation?
2. How do top managers achieve their positions in the organization?
3. Who exercise(s) control over money, materials, personnel, suppliers, and distributors?
4. Who control(s) the premises of the decision-making? Who decide(s) how a decision should be made, who should be involved and when it will be made? And who decide(s) who will contribute to decision discussion and who will select and evaluate alternatives and the constraints?
5. Who control(s) knowledge and information flow in the organisation?
6. Who control(s) boundary transactions in the organisation?
7. Who is/are responsible for stocks of critical resources, principle sources of uncertainty, and for the training of people in the organisation?
8. Who decide(s) the kind of technology to be used in the organisation?
9. Who decide(s) who can join a trade union, a consumer association or a cooperative group? Who affect(s) governmental agencies and the media?
10. Who promote(s) organisational images, language, symbols, stories, and rituals?
11. Does the organisation have any gender-related values and regulations? How are females perceived? And how are males perceived?
12. Who want(s) to become nonsubstitutable and central to the organisation?
13. Who often associate(s) with powerful managers?
14. Who play(s) key roles in building and managing coalitions in the organisation?
15. Who often tries to influence the decisions in his or her favour?

16. Who control(s) the agenda or issues, concerns, problems and alternative courses of action to be considered by the organisation?
17. Who often bring(s) in so-called legitimate and neutral outside expert?
18. Do power holders who support certain people require similar support from them?
19. Do people who experienced success have a desire to undergo a further victory?

3.6. The list of questions for psychic prison metaphor:

The psychic prison metaphor emphasises two key theories: the trap of favoured thinking and the trap of unconscious processes. In the trap of favoured thinking, there is great emphasis on the resistant cognitive images of past success, zero-defects, and 'assumed consensus' (Morgan, 1986, 1997). In the trap of unconscious processes, the emphasis is directed to the essences of unconscious processes such as repressed sexuality (Freud, 1953, 1959), patriarchal family (Coward, 1983), death and eternity (Becker, 1973), tension (Klein, 1957; and Bion 1961), transitional objects (Winnicott, 1958), and shadow (unrecognized and rejected desires) and archetype (definite forms in the human mind shaping thinking and helping understand the external world) (Jung, 1959) that trap people. The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation can make use of psychic prison metaphor or not. The questionnaire is divided into three parts.

Questions that deal with favoured thinking:

1. Do managers select alternative courses of action that brought them success in the past for the current organisational problems?
2. Is there a tendency to resist change in the organisation? If yes, who is/are reluctant to change and why?
3. Do the organisation's norms encourage employees to slow down the work, hide their errors or institutionalise a certain percentage of damaged products?

4. Are decision-making processes participative? What is the process of this involvement?

Questions that deal with the trap of unconscious processes

1. What are the patterns of authority, job roles, responsibilities, and relationships in the organisation?
2. What is the level of cooperation among subunits?
3. What is/are the direction(s) of communication flow in the organisation?
4. What is the nature of decision-making (problem-solving) in the organisation?
5. How do superiors monitor their subordinates' operations?
6. How are operations and activities controlled and coordinated in the organisation?
7. How do rules and regulations function in the organisation?
8. How is discipline perceived in the organisation?
9. Does the organisation make a precise distinction between the qualities and roles of man and woman?
10. Do group members individually fight against problems or escape from difficulties in the group decision-making?
11. Do group members contradict the group leader?
12. Do group members focus their attention on the leader and expect him/her to solve problems?
13. What is the nature of relationship between leader and subordinate like? Are they close to each other? Does the leader show tolerance towards his/her subordinates' policy suggestions or often show an adversarial attitude?
14. How do you characterise the nature of the organizational culture? Is it based on personal charisma, low respect for rules, risk-taking, sharply defined rules and job positions, expert teams which are established for particular tasks, or freedom of individuals who shape their jobs?
15. How active subordinates are in establishing their own objectives?

16. Is the organisation's culture open and adaptive to new techniques, methods and innovations?

3.7. The list of questions for flux and transformation metaphor:

The most influential theories in this metaphor are organisations as 'autopoiesis' or self-producing systems (Maturana and Varela, 1980); mutual causality emphasising the understanding of tensions deriving from circular relations (Maruyama, 1963); Hegel's dialectical change considering change as a result of opposites, retaining something from rejected previous forms, and revolutionary changes in quantity leading changes in quality (Engels, 1940); and chaos and complexity theory treats organizations as systems that need greater complexity, crisis, new perspectives, continuous questioning, disorder, and chaos that are the most desirable states for the viability of an organization (Gleick, 1987; Stacey, 1992; and Wheatley, 1992). The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation can make use of flux and transformation metaphor or not. The questionnaire is divided into four parts.

Questions that deal with organisations as self-producing systems:

1. What is the nature of the organisation's identity (structure, culture, and strategies)?
2. Does the organisation's ethos reflect the norms and beliefs of its subunits?
3. Are the organisation's corporate strategies such integrative (backward, forward, and horizontal), intensive (market penetration, product development, and market development), diversification (concentric, conglomerate, and horizontal), defensive (retrenchment, divestiture, and liquidation) and combination (joint venture)?
4. What is the nature of the relationship between the organization and its rivals?
5. How is environment perceived in the organisation?
6. How does the organisation generate, transmit, and maintain its values, norms, and beliefs?

7. What conditions, structure, culture, and strategies make the organisation capable of functioning efficiently and effectively in the market?
8. What is the nature of the relationship among subunits?
9. What is the level of cooperation between the organisation and its specific environment (employees, customers, competitors, suppliers, distributors, creditors, shareholders, communities, trade unions, trade associations, and government) and general environment (economic, technological, political, demographic and cultural, environmental, and international)?

Questions that deal with mutual causality:

1. How does the organisation detect and monitor changes in its environment?
2. What are the appropriate coping techniques of the organisation in stable and dynamic environments?
3. What are the organisation's appropriate problem-solving strategies in making confident and provisional managerial decisions regarding the environment?

Questions that deal with dialectical change:

1. What conflicts exist in the organisation?
2. What methods does the organisation use to recognize these conflicts?
3. How does the organization maintain the right level of conflict in the organisation?

Questions that deal with organisations from the chaos and complexity perspective:

1. Does the organisation review, question, and change its structure, culture, and strategies?
2. How free are subordinates in the organisation to challenge and transform organisation's structure, culture, and strategies?

3. Who binds the organisation into its existing structure, culture, and strategies?
4. Do strategy experts and organisation's analysts remain apart or disjointed in terms of determining issues of analysis, the problem of change, and the nature of strategy?
5. What are the ways the organisation changes from one attractor pattern (structure, culture, and strategy) to another?
6. How does the organisation preserve the balance between its existing structure, culture, and strategy—the legitimate system and the change, challenge, and tension—the shadow system?
7. How does the organisation ensure that tension and chaos have sufficient diversity leading to organisational learning but never giving rise to anarchy?
8. Do managers consider the history and the nature of their organisation in the choice of new structures and strategies?

3.8. The list of questions for domination metaphor:

The domination metaphor includes the following three theories. First, the dominant character of organisations is based on the Marxist theory focusing on organisations that allow one group of people to accumulate capital and to generate economic surplus through exploiting employees. Bureaucracy is the vehicle to exercise coercion and to protect the privileges of masters. Large firms accumulating surplus without spending on the welfare of people enforce economic depressions (Baran and Sweezy, 1966; and Mouzelis, 1967). Second, the exploitation of employees is based on the 'class-based' structures of organisations emerging from mechanisation of production and homogenisation of work (Braverman, 1974, Salaman, 1981) that gave rise to labour market segmentation (Reich et. al., 1973) and deterioration of working conditions promoted work-related hazards such as industrial accidents and mental diseases. Third, the way the large organisations dominate international politics and the world economy (Morgan, 1997). The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation can be considered a system of domination or not. The questionnaire is divided into three parts.

Questions that deal with dominating character of organisations:

1. Do the top managers believe that they have a right to exercise power? Do the employees consider it their duty to obey managers?
2. What are the bases (rational-legal, charisma, or tradition) of formal authority and control in the organisation?
3. How much sabotage and how many unofficial strikes have occurred in the organisation recently?
4. How often are subordinates' ideas sought and used constructively?
5. How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?
6. At what level are decisions and policies made? Are subordinates involved in decisions and policies related to their work?
7. How free do employees feel to talk to their superiors about the job?
8. Are organisational roles held on the basis of technical competence?
9. Is a role's task responsibility, decision making authority, and its relationship to other roles in the organisation clearly specified?
10. Are lower office roles under the control and supervision of a higher office?
11. How are behaviours and the relationship between roles in the organisation controlled?
12. Does the organisation have a written document concerning rules, decisions, and administrative acts?

Questions that deal with how organisations exploit their employees:

1. What are the organisation's corporate policies in the design of jobs and in the employment of workers?
2. How many work hazards, industrial accidents and occupational diseases has the organisation been concerned with recently?
3. What are the insurance and social security policies in the organisation?

4. Do the employees have the right to unionise?
5. How can the working atmosphere be characterised in the organisation?
6. What are the working conditions? How many employees have been wounded, injured or killed in the organisation recently?
7. What are the organization's policies or rules, regulations and compensation schemes relating to the possible occurrence of work hazards, industrial accidents and occupational diseases in the organisation?
8. Does the organisation make a separation between shop-floor workers and white-collar staff in the physical setting of the organization (e.g. separate dining rooms, cutlery and toilets)?
9. What are the organizational norms for wages and salaries and for working hours?

Questions that deal with how large organisations dominate international politics and the world economy:

1. What is the nature of the large organisation's investment policy? Does it make investment in underdeveloped and developing countries?
2. How does the organisation evaluate the desirability of investment proposals?
3. What is the nature of the large organisation's market research policy?
4. What is the nature of the large organisation's innovation, adoption of new technologies and technology transfer policies?
5. What are the large organisation's income, wage and working hours policies in developing countries?

3.9. The list of questions for carnival metaphor:

It is based on Deboard's (1967) *Society of the Spectacle*, a theatrics that is often violent and oppressive social control that masquerades as a celebration of progress by recycling pseudo-reforms, false-desires, and selective sightings of progressive evolution, Bakhtin's (1984) theory of the theatrics of rant and madness seeking repair to separation and

alienation, and the meta theatre theory of Boje (2002, 2003). The following questionnaire will give practicality to these theories and reveal that whether the organisation can be considered a well-functioning theatre or not.

Questions that deal with the metatheatre theory of organisations:

1. Who are enrolling and directing a cast of character roles in the organisation?
2. How are character roles constructed in dialogs—discourses?
3. Does the organisation limit the cast of characters to corporate players, or does it include all the stakeholders?
4. What are the contextualized events, patterns, structure, and networks (repeated strategies) of the organisation? What events are included and excluded in the plots of dialogs—discourses?
5. What are themes of oppression in the organisation? How are events realized and de-realized in dialogs?
6. Whose voices are included, excluded, and marginalised in dialogs—discourses?
7. How open or closed is the organisation to improvisation, experiment, chaos, disorder, and change—temporal rhythms (seasonal, cyclical, linear or non-linear, mechanical, organic, authoritarian, and democratic)?
8. What organizing frames—ideologies are embedded in the assumptions circulating in dialogs and in the organisation?
9. What is the dialectic relation between the dialogs styles of spectacles—situated theatrical contexts—concentrated; theatrical performances of the organisation, diffuse; franchising and advertising performances of the organisation in the market, integrated; concentrated plus diffuse, and mega; from time to time integrating into scandal)?
10. How is each dialog situated within a chain of types of dialogs (talk/conversation/chat, meeting/presentation/speech, script, text/report/release, and scenario)?

4. Conclusion

The paper has concentrated on creativity and holism in problem formulation. It emphasised the employment of metaphors and their associated paradigms. After an overview of the theoretical edifice of metaphors and paradigms, the paper improved and rephrased the use of metaphors in the form of questionnaires developed by Torlak (1999) in light of current theoretical improvements in the management thought and organisation theory.

In the mechanical, organismic, neurocybernetic, and flux and transformation views of organisations associated with the assumptions of functionalist paradigm, all questions emanating from their respective theories have been improved and rephrased. 'Team Syntegrity' approach developed by Beer (1994) has been added to the neurocybernetic metaphor. In the culture and political views of organisations associated with the assumptions of interpretive paradigm, all questions emanating from their respective theories are improved and rephrased. In the psychic prison and domination views of organisations associated with the assumptions of emancipatory paradigm, all questions emanating from their respective theories are improved and rephrased. In addition, the carnival view of organisations associated with the assumptions of postmodern paradigm has been discussed. All questions emanating from its respective metatheatre theory has been developed in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. (1996). Critical Theory and Postmodernism Approaches to Organisational studies. (Ed.: Clegg, R.; Hardy, C. & Nord, W.R.). *Handbook of Organisation Studies*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M. & Deetz, S. (2000). *Doing Critical Management Research*. Boulder: Sage.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D.A. (1978). *Organisational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading: Addison Wesley.
- Ashby, W.R. (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. London: Methuen.
- Bacharach, S.B. & Lawler, E.T. (1980). *Power and Politics in Organisations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bachrach, P. & Baratz, M.S. (1962). "Two faces of power," *The American Political Science Review*, 56: 4, 947-952.
- Bakhtin, M. (1984). *Rabelais and His World* (Translated by H. Iswolsky). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Baran, P. & Sweezy, P.M. (1966). *Monopoly Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Becker, E. (1973). *The Denial of Death*. New York: Free Press.
- Beer, S. (1979). *The Heart of Enterprise*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Beer, S. (1981). *Brain of the Firm*. 2nd Ed. Chichester: Wiley.
- Beer, S. (1985). *Diagnosing the System for Organisations*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Beer, S. (1994). *Beyond Dispute: The Invention of Team Syntegrity*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Best, S and Kellner, D. (2001). *Postmodern Adventure*. London: The Guilford Press.
- Bion, W. R. (1961). *Experiences in Groups*. London: Tavistock.
- Boje, D. M. (2002). *Theatres of Capitalism*. San Francisco: Hampton Press.
- Boje, D. M., Luhman, J.T. & Cunliffe, A.L. (2003). "A Dialectic Perspective on the Organisation Theatre Metaphor," *American Communication Journal*, 6(2): 1-16.
- Braverman, H. (1974). *Labour and Monopoly Capital*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*. London: Heinemann.
- Checkland, P.B. (1981). *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Cherns, A. (1987). "Principles of Sociotechnical Design Revisited," *Human Relations*, 40 (3): 153-162.
- Child, J. (1981). "Culture, Contingency and Capitalism in the Cross-National Study of Organizations," in L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw, (ed.), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*: 3: 303-356. Greenwich: CT: JAI Press.
- Clegg, S. (1990). *Modern Organisations: Organisation Studies in a Post-modern World*, London: Sage.
- Coser, L. A. (1956). *The Functions of Social Conflict*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Crozier, M. (1964). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. London: Tavistock.
- Coward, R. (1983). *Patriarchal Precedents, Sexuality and Social Relations*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Deboard, G. (1967). *The Society of Spectacle*. Paris: Buchet-Chastel.
- Drucker, P. (1955). *The Practice of Management*. London: Heinemann.

- Engels, F. (1940). *Dialectics of Nature*. (Ed.: Dutt, C.). New York: International Publishers.
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and Industrial Management*. London: Pitman.
- Flood, R. L. & Carson, E.R. (1992). *Dealing With Complexity: An Introduction to the Theory and the Application of Systems Science*. 2nd Ed. New York: Plenum.
- Fox, A. (1966). Industrial sociology and industrial relations. *Research Paper 3*. Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations, HMSO, London.
- Freud, S. (1953). Three essays on the theory of sexuality. *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 7, 125-243.
- Freud, S. (1959). Character and anal eroticism. *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 9, 167-175.
- Galbraith, J. R. (1973). *Designing Complex Organisations*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley.
- Garfinkel, H. & Sacks, H. (1986). "On Formal Structures of Practical Actions," in H. Garfinkel, (ed.), *Ethnomethodological Studies of Work*: 160-193. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gerth, H. H. & Mills, C. W. (1970). *From Max Weber*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Giddens, A. (1979). *Central Problems in Social Theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: the Making of a New Science*. London: Abacus.
- Gregory, W. (2003). Discordant Pluralism, in G. Midgley (ed.), *Systems Thinking*: 4: 123-142.
- Hannan, M. T. & Freeman, J.H. (1989). *Organizational Ecology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hecksher, C. (1994). "Defining the post-bureaucratic type," in C. Hecksher and A. Donellon (eds.), *The Post bureaucratic Organisation: New Perspectives on Organisational Change*, London: Sage.
- Hecksher, C. and Donellon, A. (1994). *The Post bureaucratic Organisation: Perspectives on Organisational Change*, London: Sage.
- Herzberg, F. (1968). "One more time: How do you motivate employees?" *Harvard Business Review*, 46: January, 53-62.
- Heydebrand, W. V. (1989). "New Organisational Forms," *Work and Occupations*, 16 (3): 323-357.
- Jackson, M. C. (1987). "Present positions and future prospects in management science., *Omega*, 15: 455.
- Jackson, M. C. (1991). *Systems Methodology for the Management Sciences*. London: Plenum Press.

- Jackson, M. C. (2000). *Systems Approaches to Management*. London: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Jackson, M. C. (2003). *Systems Thinking: Creative Holism for Managers*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Jung, C. G. (1959). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Kanter, R. M. (1989). *When Giants Learn to Dance: Mastering the Challenges of Strategy, Management, and Careers in the 1990s*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Klein, M. (1957). *Envy and Gratitude*. London: Tavistock.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawrance, P. R. & Lorsch, J.W. (1969). *Developing Organisations: Diagnosis and Action*. Reading MA: Addison Wesley.
- Lewis, M. W. and Grimes, A. J. (1999). "Metatriangulation: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms," *The Academy of Management Review*, 24, (4): 672-690.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. London: Macmillan.
- Maanen van, J. & Barely, S. R. (1985). "Cultural Organisation," (Eds.: Frost, P.J., et al.). *Organisational Culture*. London: Sage.
- Maruyama, M. (1963). "The Second Cybernetics: Deviation Amplifying Mutual Causal Processes," *American Scientist*, 51 (2): 164-179.
- Maturana, H. R. & Varela, F. J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Mayo, E. (1933). *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. New York: Macmillan.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organisation*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of Organisation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Mouzelis, N. P. (1967). *Organisation and Bureaucracy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Parsons, T. (1956). "Suggestions for A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organisations-1," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1: 63-70.
- Parsons, T. (1957). "Suggestions for A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organisations-1," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2: 225-230.
- Pascale, R. T. & Athos, A.G. (1981). *The Art of Japanese Management*. New York: Warner.

- Pepper, S. C. (1982). "Metaphor in Philosophy," *Journal of Mind and Behaviour*, 3(3): 197-205.
- Peters, T. (1992). *Liberation Management*, New York: Pan.
- Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R.H. Jr. (1982). *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). "Management As Symbolic Action: The Creation and Maintenance of Organisational Paradigms," in L.L. Cummings, and B.M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 3: 1-52.
- Pondy, L. R. (1967). "Organisational Conflict: Concepts and Models," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12 (2): 296-320.
- Reich, M., Gordon, D. & Edwards, R. (1973). "Dual Labour Markets: A Theory of Labour Market Segmentation," *American Economic Review*, 63 (2): 359-365.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. & Dickson, W. J. (1939). *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Salaman, G. (1981). *Class and The Corporation*. London: Fontana.
- Savall, H., Zardet, V. and Bonnet, M. (2000). *Libérer Les Performances Cachées Des Entreprises Par Un Management Socio-économique*. Ecully : ILO-BIT.
- Selznick, P. (1948). "Foundations of the Theory of Organisation," *American Sociological Review*, 13(1): 25-35.
- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative Behaviour*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smircich, L. (1983). "Concepts of Culture and Organisational Analysis," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28 (3): 339-358.
- Stacey, R. D. (1992). *Managing Chaos*. London: Sage.
- Taylor, F. W. (1947). *Scientific Management*. London: Harper and Row.
- Thomas, K. W. (1976). "Conflict and Conflict Management," in M. D. Dunnette, (ed.). *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*: 889-935. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Torlak, G. N. (1999). *Improving Total Systems Intervention through Theory and Practice*, PhD Thesis, Lincoln, UK.
- Torlak, G. N. (2001). "Rationalisation of Metaphorical Exploration: Improving the Creativity Phase of Total Systems Intervention (TSI) on the Basis of Theory and Practice", *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 14 (4): 451-482.
- Torlak, G. N. (2001) "Reflections on Multimethodology: Maximising Flexibility, Responsiveness, and Sustainability in Multimethodology Interventions through a Theoretically and Practically Improved Version of TSI", *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 14 (3): 297-337.
- Trist, E. L. (1983). "Referent Organizations and the Development of Inter-Organisational Domains," *Human Relations*, 36 (3): 269-284.

- Weick, K. L. (1977). "Enactment Processes in Organisations," in B. M. Staw and G. R. Salancik, (eds.), *New Directions in Organizational Behaviour*: 267-300. Chicago: St. Clair.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1992). *Leadership and the New Science: Learning About Organization from an Orderly Universe*. San Francisco: Berret-Kohler.
- Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics*. New York: Wiley.
- Winch, P. (1958). *The Idea of a Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy*. New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1958). *Transitional objects and transitional phenomena, in Collected Papers*. London: Tavistock.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1974). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.