

Singapore Management University Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of
Business

Lee Kong Chian School of Business

6-2012

More than nothing? Auditing business studies

Stefano HARNEY

Singapore Management University, sharney@smu.edu.sg

Stephen DUNNE

University of Leicester

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2011.06.007>

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research

Part of the [Accounting Commons](#), and the [Strategic Management Policy Commons](#)

Citation

HARNEY, Stefano and DUNNE, Stephen. More than nothing? Auditing business studies. (2012). *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*. 24, (4-5), 338-349. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research/3437

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email libIR@smu.edu.sg.

More than nothing? Accounting, business, and management studies, and the research audit

Stefano Harney, Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University, 50 Stamford Road, Singapore 178899, Singapore

Stephen Dunne, Centre for Philosophy and Political Economy, University of Leicester School of Management, University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RH, UK

Published in *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, Volume 24, Issues 4–5, June 2013, Pages 338-349

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2011.06.007>

Abstract

This paper argues that business school scholarship can be seen as the example par excellence of what we are calling extreme neo-liberalism. By extreme neo-liberalism we mean the coexistence in the same sphere of extreme externalization of costs and extreme regulation of the sources of value. We argue that this condition is most obvious in the research audits conducted in Britain, and spreading globally, audits that record both the extreme externalization in business scholarship of all the sources of the wealth expropriated by business, and at the same time, regulate the very labour that produces this extreme self-regulation. Although this self-regulated labour regards itself as complete, and although it regards its acts of externalization as acts of self-making, we consider the relation between pedagogy and scholarship in order to show how this pervasive form of self-regarding simply does not hold. We conclude by noting that if business scholarship persists in defining itself against all that makes wealth possible, and thus making itself, logically at least, worthless, it also opens the possibility of starting an investigation of wealth, worth and value, from another point of view, one not dependant of completing business, but competing with it.

Keywords: Accountability, Critical, Public sector, Audit, Neo-liberalism

1. Neo-liberalism and interventionism

The current economic crisis has been characterized as a crisis of self-regulation. Neo-liberalism is said to have relied excessively on the market to regulate itself and society. The proposed solution to the crisis is therefore regulation by the state. But as others are already remarking, this is not an accurate diagnosis, nor a useful cure (see Martin, 2009). Neo-liberalism was marked both by extreme self-regulation and by extreme regulation. Its crisis is therefore a crisis of both of these modes. In the article that follows we are going to give an example of this contradictory characteristic of neo-liberalism. In the business and management studies community we find evidence of both extreme externalization under the sign of self-regulation, and the extreme regulation of knowledge production more detailed and ambitious than any

state planning efforts under actually existing socialism, suggesting the regulation of the state by the market necessarily manifests these extremes in the production of neo-liberalism (Harney, 2009).

Before we present our evidence, we are going to outline the way extreme externalization and extreme regulation became not just contradictions of neo-liberalism, but necessary contradictions, necessary until, that is, they collapsed under their own weight, doing incredible damage, most of which is still to be fully apprehended in the current crisis. This destruction extends throughout society and includes damage to the university and to the public sector in general. The public sector was of course the main target of what we are calling extreme regulation during the period of neo-liberalism. Far from being abandoned it was assaulted by waves of management, auditing, reporting, and political exhortation. New management systems, targets, assessments, and rankings marked extreme government intervention in the public sector (Catchpole et al., 2004, Cutler and Waine, 2000, Dunleavy and Hood, 1994, Humphrey et al., 1993, Lawrence and Sharma, 2002, van Thiel and Leeuw, 2002). Far from dismantling the public sector as earlier analysis often predicted, neo-liberalism has been extremely interested in the public sector and in the state in general. This story of extreme regulation of neo-liberalism seems to have been largely forgotten in the rush to call for new regulation of financial markets.

At the same time of course, financial markets benefited from another set of neo-liberal regulations designed to allow finance capital to externalize not just its own costs but also to provoke extreme externalization across the fractions of capital. Little told for instance is the story of the de-skilling in the financial markets themselves, of analysts who purchased computer programmes with their investments much as business professors receive power-point lecture slides with their textbooks. Many analysts knew how the programmes worked, but not the investments. This widespread de-skilling, combined with a non-union workforce, and what Martin (2002) calls the financialization of daily life, meant that the financial industries themselves were able to externalize more and more of their costs as they financialized themselves in an act of self-cannibalization. (This is most obvious in the financialization of the investment banks from partnerships with full liability for the bankers to nothing more than special purpose vehicles producing other special investment vehicles.) But more profoundly damaging for society is the more familiar story of how finance capital allowed other industries to externalize their costs, sometimes in extreme ways. The financialization of the corporation meant its capital was freed up and became mobile, able to externalize local labour costs and regulation costs at speed (see for instance Harvey, 2007). The financialization of national currencies and government debt meant that the costs of the welfare state could be externalized by states who now found ways to make taxpayers pay yet again for the welfare states funded by initial taxation by forcing them into ever more brutal competition for wages and jobs first on a regional and then a global scale. And as Marazzi (2008) outlines, the pension system externalized these costs unevenly especially after the bankruptcy in New York City. The trend in state pensions was subsequently to externalize their costs to the poor, to those who might draw other state benefits, splitting the working class, and in the U.S. in particular splitting it by race and gender.

This neo-liberal world of extreme externalization, of sweat shops, of migrant camps, homeless populations and now massive foreclosures, always depended on extreme neo-liberal regulation. Much is made of the transition from discipline to control but this movement had to be accomplished by neo-liberalism, not just assumed. It required that all organized collective endeavours, from education, to health, to transportation, somehow needed to produce, nonetheless, individual outcomes, differentiation, and hierarchy. The now familiar neo-liberal subject had to be prevented from finding solidarities in order to find its project of the self. This required a massive state intervention into hospitals, schools, and local government to make them into places where competition, individualism, and most importantly precariousness and uncertainty prevailed.

Many state theorists will say that one cannot talk about a state intervention into the public sector because the public sector was produced by the state. But as Poulantzas (2001) long ago reminded us, so too was

the private sector, produced as it was by property rights, enforcement of labour contracts, and by policing. More exactly for our purposes though, Poulantzas spoke of a relative autonomy of the state in which a condensed and continual struggle takes place between different class forces, and where the quality of the relation to capital, its political inflection, was the subject of a clash on the field of the state between labour and capital. In the public sector a kind of autonomy had been won in many areas and a form of solidarity achieved that had to be defeated for the neo-liberal project to take hold. But that in a sense is the end of the story, not the beginning, and it is at the beginning that we must start to tell the story of business and management studies as the apogee of neo-liberal contradiction, the poster child of extreme regulation and extreme externalization.

2. Neoliberalism and the audit

What provoked neo-liberalism? If we are not to see it as inevitable or natural, and therefore to feel helpless even in the face of its collapse, this is a question we must remind ourselves to ask. It was not just that people were trying to develop some autonomy from capitalist relations in some vague or unorganized or violent way, in the way that the 1960s and 1970s is now so often caricatured. This autonomy was also being sought institutionally in a move that was both against externalization and against regulation. We have room here only to explore one institution, the university, but it is the one most pertinent to our evidence on business studies at any rate.

What was going on in the institution called the university in the 1960s but especially in the 1970s? We would suggest two things in particular. First, people were studying. To study is to take responsibility for learning, not to externalize it, but it is also to engage in an activity that is against any kind of regulation, any kind of productivity, and any kind of measure. If this is what study is, then it is unclear if study goes on in the university today (Bousquet et al., 2009). This was most manifest in the study group, emerging in the 1960s and 1970s, which often sought to learn what was not on the curriculum, to explore pedagogical endeavours not common within the mass education of the day, collectively, without credit and without end. Today, however, all activity in the university is expected to have outcomes that can be not only measured but also distinguished and demanded. Study as such in today's university is said to be useless and therefore to be discouraged. But study also generated in cases such as study groups on gender and sexuality, in black studies, or Chicano studies in the US, a second development in the universities.

This other development in the university was the explosion of new programmes, centres, and approaches to study. Black studies, women's studies, development studies, and cultural studies, to name a few, began to populate universities particularly in the Anglo-American world. Once again such tendencies stood against externalization and indeed stood for a kind of bringing into the university, into the institution, and into study what had previously been externalized, including a concern for reproductive and hyper-exploited labour of many groups, the work of consumption, and subsistence economies and underdevelopment of the Third World. By definition this was hard to regulate because it appealed to politics beyond that which established the procedures of the university. The point is not to develop a nostalgia of a university still full of problems, but to see the ways in which such self-activity had to be stopped if it were not to rival the private sector's extreme externalization, seen by neo-liberalism as its great hope. Extreme regulation of the university had to be therefore a long-term goal of neo-liberalism, not least in the U.K.

Enter the research audit in its various historical forms. Combined with the development of professional schools, principally the business school but also numerous policy programmes designed to spread extreme regulation across sectors, research audits as pioneered in the U.K. were designed to promote the twin neo-liberal projects of extreme regulation and extreme externalization. At the level of extreme

regulation it was irrelevant whether the audit was possible, whether it made sense, or whether it was consistent and accurate, all accusations that have been levelled against it over the years.¹ The only objective was to stop what else was going on in the university, at least initially. This it gradually did. Externalization for the university took the form of sweating academic labour, and an academic speed-up. This meant less time for study, for politics, and for self-activity, and more power to management. It meant more publications, more grant money, and more students per academic staff. But even if this externalization did not yield real results, as its other face, extreme regulation at least it stopped any other activity. As Marc Bousquet explains in his important book *How the University Works*, a similar regulation, conducted through manipulation of the working conditions more appropriate to the mixed economy in higher education, was achieved in American universities. And of course this extreme regulation was so effective because of the veneer of self-regulation. Peer review disguised the central planning at the heart of the system, and the new ambition to regulate ideas themselves, something that [Do \(2008\)](#) suggests will now be taken up in labour processes beyond the university in other parts of the knowledge economy where the university's real knowledge transfer, that of its own knowledge management culture, is taking place (even if the backflow of management practices wash into the university at the same time) (Harney, 2010).

It is into this frame that we can now place the peculiar case of business and management studies. Its very prosperity over the last twenty years was itself a tactic in the extreme regulation of the university, and the starving of other less cooperative programmes and positions. But business and management studies was not just a child of neo-liberalism, but a father. Externalization was in some ways already its object, in both senses of the term as we will see. What the research audit permitted was the legitimacy to push forward this research programme and the means to profit from it. And just as extreme externalization proved the downfall of finance capital, until the state intervened, so too this combination of extreme regulation enabled by the audit, combined with the innate tendencies towards championing externalization in the scholarship, revealed the crisis of business and management studies as a legitimate academic discipline.

3. Auditing the audit

With this claim, it is time to introduce our case study and our evidence, in the form of our own audit of over 2300 journal articles in business and management from 2003 and 2004. We might note these were articles published after the Enron and Worldcom scandals when the contradictions of neo-liberalism were already apparent to readers of this journal thanks to numerous exposes in its pages (Cullinan, 2004, Unerman and O'Dwyer, 2004; see also Cooper, 2005, Neu et al., 2001, Power, 2003a, Power, 2003b). We asked ten questions of these articles published in the 20 most popular journals, RAE

¹ The question of the accuracy of the audit is beside the point for us since we want to read the RAE as a resistance to self-activity in the university, not a positive power itself, although this is more typically how it is read. With the results of the 2009 RAE now in, it becomes suddenly apparent again that this is not a self-regulatory exercise, so much as it is neo-liberalism's other face, extreme state intervention, the central planning of knowledge itself. It would be better to see this exercise as itself extreme and obsessive and therefore vulnerable to neo-liberalism's state intervention, not its autonomous opposite. Questions of accuracy are thus a distraction, but they will return with the new REF, where the contradiction between citation and journal lists will lead to much delusional self-regulation, before once again yielding to extreme regulation. For instance, citation has two aspects – impact, an intensive one, and range, an extensive one. If the second is to be preserved, journal lists will have to be abandoned in favour of taking into account all journals across all fields as the only way to measure extensive influence. This is how one comes to know Jacques Derrida's real influence for instance, by seeing how many disciplines he has influenced, not by counting his citations in philosophy journals. Of course, disciplinary boundaries and hierarchies will resist this extensive measurement and make a mockery of citation as only in-group self-reference in top journals.

submissions wise, as determined by Geary et al. (2004). The questions and full results are included in the appendices, and have been published previously elsewhere (Dunne et al., 2008).

Here is a summary. Within the two year period analysed, 98% of the papers published in the twenty most popular business and management journals did not acknowledge the relationship between business practice and war, global violence or the displacement and dispossession of populations. Over 90% of the same papers paid no substantial attention to unsafe or exploitative working conditions around the world. 2296 of these 2331 articles analysed did not consider questions of racism, international migration, or neo-colonialism within the context of business and management. And despite the increasing attention being afforded to ethical business practices, almost 85% of the articles surveyed failed to examine the issues of corporate social responsibility or business ethics.

The study also found that less than one percent of these highly regarded articles found any room for a discussion of sexuality or homophobia. Only 80 of the 2331 articles engaged gender perspectives. 2037 did not touch upon the relationship between business practices and the social distribution of wealth. And over three-quarters of what were considered by the top business schools in the U.K. to be the best articles to submit to the previous RAE ignored wage negotiation and worker representation. Only 223 of these exemplary 2331 articles regarded safe working conditions as worthy of consideration whilst critical race theory and postcolonial studies figured only 1.5% of the time. Less than 6% of the articles were published by authors based in the developing world. Less than 4% engaged a feminist perspective. Less than 1% published anything from the perspective of queer studies. For comparison we included some critical accounting and critical management studies journals. These fared better in most cases, but those who take these projects seriously, including authors and editors, will be disappointed with many of the results, no doubt.

4. Lessons learned?

But have things changed? After all, a worldwide financial crisis and near collapse of the global banking system tends to concentrate even the minds of business and management scholars, or at least so one would think. Let us recall that the pieces published during the period analysed had ample time to react to the last crisis in the placid narrative of capitalism, and the implosion of the accounting profession. Beyond those obvious signs of the times, it should not be forgotten that for many the crisis of capitalism never ends, whether in West Papua, among the gold mines, in West Africa, among the trade in small arms and blood diamonds, or in the factories of China and on the farms of Brazil. For anyone paying attention, business as usual was simply not an option when these articles were being written in 2001, 2002, and 2003.

Moreover, even a cursory survey of the current Association of Business Schools Journal Quality List, divided now for the convenience of deskilled academics and deskilling academic managers alike into tiers, quickly reveals that journals at the top, in tier 4, fare little better in this, the third quarter of 2010, two years after the financial crisis, than they did after, and during, all the other crises. Meanwhile, the critical journals given some pride of place in the Geary list are downgraded by the ABS, and this should be a hint to us. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, for example, is given a 4 by the Geary list and a 3 by the ABS list.

In all other respects, the ABS list overlaps with the Geary list in most cases, and the Geary list was indeed the basis for the more comprehensive, and some would say Borgesian, ABS list.² But just in case the new ABS list holds any surprises, we ran our questions again on the 2010 issues of some ABS tier 4 journals not listed as top journals on the Geary list, asking our ten questions two years after the banking crisis, and in the midst of many other ongoing crisis in capitalism. *Personnel Psychology*, a top-rated journal we did not run in our 2003–2005 content analysis, scored, in 2010, a perfect zero in its first three issues of the year on all but two of our questions, those relating to race and gender, where it recorded a roughly 10% hit rate over this period. *The Leadership Quarterly's* first four issues two years after the massive failure of leadership in finance returned one article on Australian Aboriginal leadership, one on corruption in Lebanon, and one on anti-nuclear leadership, in over fifty articles published so far in 2010. The news gets no better. *Organization Science*, which receives not only a 4 rating but a star from the ABS also receives our star for outstanding example of externalization. This journal manages to publish fifty-seven articles in its internationally excellent 'world leading' pages in 2010 with just one article registering from our ten questions, an article on diversity in firms. Another tier 4 journal with an ABS star for extreme excellence is *Management Science*, a journal which has already put out eight issues in 2010, with a quarter of the year to still to go. Having not found one hit in running our ten questions through these eight issues of *Management Science*, the 4* ABS journal, in 2010, we admit we became despondent and continued the analysis no further with 2010 publications. It seems clear enough to us that we have seen the future in the ABS list and it is much like the past, only slightly more self-deluding.³

5. Some analysis

As discouraging as these results are, they are dazzling in their clarity, and they in turn form the empirical basis for an analysis of extreme neo-liberalism in the business schools. We would like to begin by suggesting that business and management academics appear to define their disciplinary object overwhelmingly, at least in their actual work practice, as a way of studying capitalism that regards our ten questions as external to the operation of profit-making organizations. In some instances, but not many, the external relationship between this disciplinary object and these questions is taken into account. Sometimes this takes the form of a moral relation through a sub-discipline like corporate social responsibility or equality and diversity in the workplace. At other times it takes the form of a utilitarian relation through the employment of the neo-classical economic notion of externalities. In both cases, as indeed in our audit, what seems important is that the questions are seen to come from outside the object. In the majority of the articles analysed we found that these questions are just so external, so alien to the work practices of British-based academics within business schools, that they are simply not encountered at all. And so it appears that the study of business and management is a way of looking at profit-making

² The ABS list came out of the University of West of England where it was devised and edited by Charles Harvey and Huw Morris. It was based on opinions of academics. In contrast the Geary list was a census based list taken from the 2001 RAE return. It was devised at the University of North London. It is noteworthy that both lists were developed in post 1992 universities.

³ For disingenuous 'scholarship' it would be difficult to match the recent the Association of Business School's own study of the relationship between the audit and their own list, 'Modelling the Outcome of the UK Business and Management Studies RAE 2008 with reference to the ABS Journal Quality Guide.' The authors, Aidan Kelly, Huw Morris, and Charles Harvey proceed as if numerous academic managers had not already used the list to prepare their submission to the RAE panels, and in this act shaped the profession's, and the panel's, preferences and opinions of business and management journals. They then conclude without a hint of shame that the ABS list is an excellent predictor of RAE results, and recommend its use as a labour-saving device in the REF. But however stunning as a self-serving argument, and however ignorant of how audits produce their object, the study is also another piece of evidence of the profession is content to equal zero.

and its organization that separates this process from the questions we raised, only occasionally engaging them as by-products, short-comings or unfortunate deficiencies of the profit-making process.

This might appear as a mundane, patently predictable and therefore somewhat unremarkable observation at first. But the logical consequences of this definition of the disciplinary object are anything but routine, and this so precisely because this act of definition, which externalizes all these questions, leads to something of a logical problem, at least for readers of this journal and anyone trained in the critique of capital. The logical problem runs something like this. From the perspective of a critique of capital the questions we have asked on war, poverty, exploitation, racism, and sexism, and homophobia are not just proper to the study of capitalism. *They are capitalism*. If capitalism can be understood as the struggle produced by contradictions between socially organized production and privately organized gain, then these questions are ways of naming that struggle – they are therefore ways of naming capitalism. So as we understand them, these questions are not only produced by capitalism – this would lead either to a functionalist or a-historical understanding of these questions – but also the opposite – they produce capitalism. By this we mean that capitalism has no meaning other than the very displacement of this struggle over the contradictions between social production and private gain, and it is nothing other than the operation of that very displacement.

As Althusser famously said, in the last instance this struggle is economic, but the last instance never comes. By this Althusser did not mean one could not identify this last instance – after all he does – but rather that political struggle was always a displacement of this struggle. Nor should this be such a mystery to students of Marx's critique of capital, a critique that from beginning to end in the three volumes must practice a series of substitutions in a spiralling pursuit of its object. This displacement of the class relationship (even in class struggle if one thinks of the fate of the second international for instance) means that our questions of war, poverty, exploitation, racism, sexism, and homophobia are the sites of production of this relationship, and in turn it needs to be remembered that this relationship is at one and the same time the operation of capital. Therefore, for us, today, the production of these questions is the production of capital. This in turn brings us back to our problem, our logical problem.

The discipline of business and management studies sits in some reduced relation to the study of capitalism, and now this relationship starts to come into view. One can say, as we have been saying, that capitalism is both the production of war, poverty, exploitation, racism, sexism and homophobia and at the same time the product of these struggles. One can therefore say that these questions are capitalism, and if the disciplinary object of business and management is characterized by the externalization of these questions, then logically one could say that what remains of the study of capitalism as a set of operations and relations after these questions are externalized is the discipline called business and management. One could even say that business and management = capitalism – war, poverty, exploitation, racism, sexism and homophobia. But we have said that capitalism is war, poverty, exploitation, racism, sexism and homophobia, and thus logically subtracting these from capitalism does not yield a reduced object, but rather eliminates the object altogether. Or, to put it another way, business and management = capitalism-struggle but capitalism = struggle therefore business/management = zero. Business/management equals zero. Business scholarship logically has as its object, nothing. Or, to put it another way, we could say that business scholarship *is only* externalization, a formulation familiar to traditional Marxist critiques of orthodox economics. Extreme externalization therefore brings together the two meanings of the phrase 'object of study' – both the thing and the intention – and brings them together to the vanishing point where what is left is nothing.

We have a lot of examples of an audit determining the object and not just its value, but this particular audit undertaken here must be the only example of an object of no value being determined by an audit! Nevertheless, those of us who work in business schools know that business and management scholarship does have content, and that it does not appear as zero in our work practices as teachers, scholars and

administrators within higher education. But more than that, we can say that it is because of our work practices that business studies appears as more than zero. Indeed we might even say that our work practices are these very practices of externalization derived and unfolded above. And these practices of externalization are the very content of business and management studies. These practices of externalization can be found in our work as teachers, as researchers, and as administrators. We have already suggested that our administrative labour consists in part at least of auditing our labour in general, and that this audit, even critically approached, seems to reproduce a disciplinary object that can then be differentiated internally as more or less valuable, according to strictly quantitative methods. In this process, the overall value of business and management studies, despite its definition of itself as an object separate from these ten questions and thus as nothing, also gets established. But we would speculate that this process of assigning value of more than zero begins with teaching. And that this kind of teaching is reinforced by a misunderstanding of value in business and management scholarship that serves usefully to assign a positive number to an object otherwise equal to zero.

6. Teaching the object

It seems worthwhile at this point and in light of what has been said above to review the way in which business and management is taught, focusing principally upon the business and management studies undergraduate programme. It would be impossible to sustain the work practice of business and management *scholarship* without the constant ideological and practical reinforcement of the curriculum through our own *pedagogical labour*. Rather than making the conventional observation that such scholarship is detached from teaching, we rather would argue that the exact opposite is the case. We would like to suggest that the labour of scholarship and the labour of pedagogy are ideologically interdependent when it comes to business and management studies. The reductionism and atomism that externalize capitalism and subtract all substance from business and management as a disciplinary object begins exactly with the likes of *Fundamentals of Management*, or *Introduction to Marketing*, or of course, *Accounting for Managers*. In such courses, whatever their titles, we can see this academic operation of externalization at work. Typically students are introduced to the object of business and management through textbooks that stress the contemporary, the global, and the practical. These textbooks are full of examples, models, and tropes of relevance. Any engagement with the theoretical remains highly compartmentalized and limited. Typically we find a short chapter or series of information boxes on Smith, Marx, and Weber in management, or a short chapter or series of information boxes on the historical development of the accounting starting within Italy or China. Later on during the course of the curriculum, perhaps in the second or third year, students are introduced to critical approaches, to ethics and corporate social responsibility, or to issues of fairness in the workplace.

But this is to get everything the wrong way round! It would be as if a drama student learned to perform *Cats* in the first year and only learned of Shakespeare or Harold Pinter in the second or third year, but only as external influences on *Cats*. This pedagogical process enacts the very operation of externalization with which we are presently concerned – the process of externalization discussed above. Pedagogically speaking, the disciplinary object of business and management is established in the first year and then, in the second or third year, already externalized questions are brought to it from the by now constituted as self-evident outside. This is the case even in the rare instances where these questions are introduced in the first year, as in the few textbooks created by critical management scholars. The operation is the same, the pedagogical timeline alone differs.

Indeed this practice of teaching forms the basis of the critical stance in critical management scholarship and teaching as such. A disciplinary object regarded as incomplete needs to be completed, or balanced, or even called into question by a course on the *Realities of Work*, or *Critical Approaches to Organisation*,

or *Accounting and Accountability*, or *Business Ethics*. By entering the curriculum from the outside, after the fact, or in response, critical approaches almost inevitably establish the inside, the fact, the positive number above zero, the statement itself of the disciplinary object called business and management.

In short it would be necessary for critical approaches to begin with the premise that business and management scholarship was worthless *in order to* avoid this reinforcement of the object. But of course inserted in the curriculum as such approaches currently tend to be, the consistency of then insisting on the worthlessness of the rest of the curriculum becomes problematic, even if one charitably understood most critical approaches as intending to take issue with the disciplinary object itself. Thus the critical, it must be admitted, is an integral part of the pedagogical establishment of the object of business and management as more than zero.

7. Value in the object

This teaching practice of externalization forms the basis for a smooth transition among orthodox business and management scholars into scholarship. We may trace special aspects of the teaching operation that permit the disciplinary object to appear as more than nothing. In particular we may see that the common understanding of *value* serves to fill the nothingness of the object. We say common because one has to acknowledge that most critical approaches, though not all of course, share what we regard as this misunderstanding of value, one that is non-relational, non-dialectical one, and a-historical.

To explain our position let us return to the initial proposition that capitalism is war, poverty, exploitation, racism, sexism, and homophobia. It might be objected that this definition of capitalism is only one side of the famous dialectic that also sweeps away all trains of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions. Certainly, if one understands war, poverty, exploitation, racism, sexism, and homophobia as business and management does then of course they are negative externalities only. They are therefore nothing other than unproductive problems encountered by business and management from the outside (or the inside, but not the ontological inside). Thus for business and management studies, and many critical approaches to the study of business and management, value lies elsewhere, away from these negative externalities.

Nevertheless, as aspects of capitalism, these problematics are not external but productive, and not just productive but generative. By this we mean that some approaches to corporate social responsibility, for instance, might concede that racism could be productive in the narrow sense that one could gain higher profits under an apartheid regime, and thus by extension that racism could be understood as a source of value (see for instance Fleischman and Tyson, 2004). Or some approaches to critical accounting might investigate war profiteering as a source of value or the hidden cost of such wars (see for instance Chwastiak, 2007, Chwastiak, 2008). On a more basic level still, who could deny the fact that value is to be directly derived out of the maintenance of inhumane working conditions?

But we are still firmly within the framework of externalities that under neo-classical theory might be turned to positive rather than negative effects for one or both of the contracted. Here we find only a politics of morality. But from the point of view of a critique of capital, struggle and conflict are the source of wealth: these questions are not an additional aspect of value creation. As Mario Tronti suggests in his magisterial book *Operai E Capitale* (1971), workers bring three sources of wealth to production. They bring the class relation (the fact that class exists and persists). They bring their socialization (the fact that class proliferates and distinguishes). And they bring their labour (the fact that work produces value). For Tronti, all three of these are struggles over the privatization of social production. But they are also what makes wealth-making possible under capitalism. One must have the class relation. One must have human interdependency, and one must have human energies. The source of value is in struggle for Tronti. Little

wonder then since workers bring this struggle, Tronti reverses Marx here and says that workers bring the capital, and capitalists only the labour, or as we might say the labour process. But this conception of value as internal to struggles and struggles as internal to value is not one found in business and management studies, nor even in most critical management studies.

8. Critical approaches

In this sense, by accepting the opening position that these questions come from outside, in both the registers of teaching and scholarship, one could say that critiques of business and management, such as critical management scholarship, not to mention the milder forms of criticism in CSR scholarship or in equality and diversity, frequently serve to prove the object of business and management scholarship in the face of its own implicit definition of itself as about nothing. We want to stress here that we are speaking empirically when we say business scholarship externalizes capitalism. And we are speaking empirically when we say that critical approaches to this object serve to add a value to this zero. The evidence in our content analysis is overwhelming on this score.

The contradiction of the critical management studies position have not gone unnoticed of course and have been sympathetically considered. Jack's (2004) piece on speaking out in the business school, Hanlon's (2006) critique of corporate social responsibility, and Harney and Nyathi's (2007) critique of equality and diversity positions, are all examples of critique taking business and management at its self-declared value of zero (see also Annisette, 2000, Carter et al., 2008, Carter et al., 2010, McKernan and Kosmala, 2007, Neu and Quantanilla, 2008, Spence, 2007, Tinker and Koutsoumadi, 1997). Along with classic studies like Cooper and Sherer's political economy of accounting (1984), Lehman's her-storical analyses (1992) and Armstrong's 'Accounting for Insecurity' (2000), such work remains a small minority in the fields of critical accounting and critical management studies. As the extreme externalization of finance capital has come even more clearly into view, and the extreme regulation of the university in the U.K. has revealed its hand in the recent RAE, it seems time to ask what is to be done about these conditions of critical participation in the assigning of value to a discipline about nothing.

Clearly one strategy cannot hold in the face of these two extremes. The idea that critical scholars ought to compete for publication in mainstream journals or teach critical approaches to mainstream business and management studies, is nothing but an act of externalization, a making of something into nothing by a hollowing out of capitalism, and a making of nothing into something by allowing our teaching and research practices to stand in for the nothing of capitalism-struggle = business and management, or business and management studies. This pluralist approach simply reinforces this discipline about nothing, and turns critique into value for business and management studies. No, it is necessary to say that business and management studies is nothing and at the same time to insist on everything, which is to say the totality of capitalism. For us what is required, then, is a form of critique that does not itself externalize capitalism, a form of critique we would call, a little awkwardly, critique-of-capital critique.

9. We who are nothing

Here are some examples of what we mean by this form of critique. Although for many readers of this journal this may be a familiar rehearsal, we think that the work practices we face 'work against' the production of this kind of critique and this is why we think it is worth pointing here explicitly to what we mean. It also worth rehearsing because now we can see that often that critique which strives not to externalize, post-structuralist critique, is often misread as 'not Marxist.' But post-structuralism is, at its

best, a critique-of-capital critique very capable of keeping these questions close (see, for example Choat, 2010, Derrida, 2008, Jameson, 2011, McKinlay, 2006, McKinlay et al., 2010, McKinlay and Pezet, 2010, Sprinker and Derrida, 1993) and it is little wonder that those who have chosen to read post-structuralism as alien to Marxism have in the main been academic Marxist economists and political scientists whose own work externalizes our questions almost as brutally as business and management studies does (think only of the charge that the politics of race or gender subtracts from class politics).

When business and management studies can assert that its object is something of value by casting out all that makes up that value, then a kind of reversal is achieved. Something worth nothing takes on a value, and those who produce value are cast out of the wealth-making process, externalized, made worth nothing. It should not be a surprise that among those made worthless we find this critique-of-capital critique, a critique that demands everything, and sets itself against all separations and divisions. This critique necessarily therefore sets itself against the integrity of business and management studies. Rather than seeking to include itself within business and management studies, it seeks to include business and management studies as a moment in the operation of capital, a moment wherein capital makes something out of nothing.

For a queer theorist like Sedgwick (1990) this critique means recording the way in which desirous life has been closeted and darkened in order for something less than life to emerge as the enlightened platform of a system of hetero-normativity. In such a critique what is in the light is not something partial. To assert that position would be to move towards a kind of pluralism that only required more light to be shone. No, the point about what is in the light is that it points to the darkness and sees a monster. It is against light except as its own deformed enlightenment, because it lives off the darkness. The absence is not in the closet, but in the light. There is no redemption here for either space, and such a critique must seek something found in neither space. So, for instance, to externalize something like sensuousness is both to damage what is closeted and to exploit it, while at the same time deforming the life left in the light. This does not result in an equality of degradation but it does do damage all around, requiring something new, outside darkness and light.

So too for a scholar from the black radical tradition like Robinson (2000) this critique means a history of black rebellion, and a secret history of socialist thought of which Marxism is only a moment, that understands class societies as negative capacities against which are launched repeated projects of positive capacities, projects that falter only to recover and launch themselves again. This form of critique does not seek the recuperation of these societies or their reform, but instead demonstrates the necessarily revolutionary precepts of any challenge to their historicity. Here class societies have only a negative value, a value whose purpose can only be to call forth something more than zero, and thus entirely other than them. That these assaults are launched from the terrain understood as worthless, or priced accordingly, the slave world, means that the critique that traces them begins with the value of nothing against what is subtracted from this nothing and set up as more than zero.

So too from Harraway (1991) or Braidotti (1994) or Grosz (1994) we might understand a feminism that seeks not to ask what is missing in man but what is manly about missing, how lack is the principle of the heteronormative human, the male, the species, in other words how man defines himself through subtraction, through if you like, an externalization of life. Obviously any additions to such an operation will only go back to zero. Against this game of subtraction and addition, the game of business and management studies but also the game of capitalism in which business and management studies is a moment of play, this particular feminist critique calls for all or nothing. Here is what Rosi Braidotti calls the journey through 'another essentialism,' not based on this mathematics. It is not a question of the incomplete, but of imagining another being as a way to escape this incessant externalization and regulation, as most radical feminist reject a definition of woman that relies on what is left of man, or indeed the reverse. Being instead would start from sufficiency, not relation. Relation would be born of

this sufficiency. Here, to be more than nothing, is to be all, an ambition for business and management, as for capital, that it will by its own definition never achieve. None of these total critiques of man, of the heteronormative human, of class societies make it into journals in the Geary list or the new and improved ABS list like the *British Journal of Industrial Relations* or the *International Journal of Human Resource Management*.

We could also point to the same lack of compromise, the same total critique, the same critique of the totality confronting us, capitalism, in the work of Jameson on language (2003), or Ong (2006) or Chow (2006) on post-colonial theory and neoliberalism and epistemic violence. For Jameson the point of post-modernism is that it threw into suspicion our own powers of suspicion. Language, concepts, and meaning came to be understood as commodities, as priced, as laboured, and became subject to the same struggle rather than being about that struggle. Anything presenting itself as something, as valuable, including language, was hopelessly compromised and only an overthrow of language itself, of the relations of production of theory could hope to escape the externalization of meaning in language. So too for Ong or Chow, any critique of the commodity, or reification needs the highest level of vigilance about the erasure of the human commodities, slavery and colonialism, and the sharp end of Orientalism. It cannot be conducted as a problem of psychology in which it is a matter of not being fooled by magic of markets, but a problem of what Martin (2002) has called a different principle of association, a different societal fetish. Such a principle of society would have to be a break with this history under erasure, not a mere tracing of it. None of this of course makes it into highly regarded journals on marketing such as the *Journal of Marketing Management*, the *European Journal of Marketing*, the *British Journal of Management*, or even *Consumption, Markets and Culture*.

We could continue with Deleuze and Guattari on war and primitive accumulation (1986), and their conception of the war machine, with Foucault's notion of the race wars founding states (2004), with war founding law in Agamben (1998), the violent making of nothing that produces normalization for 'operations', 'planning', 'strategy' and 'globalization' and the like. This is not the approach in *Long Range Planning*, *The European Journal of Operations Research* and the *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, top journals in the research audit.

Nor could we be content with the sociological view of the worker that understands exploitation in the long tradition of Proudhon as a problem of inequality and distribution. But rather in the tradition of CLR James, and more recently Hardt and Negri (2000), we might seek to recover a Marx for whom self-activity required not equality, much less an end to difference, but interdependency shorn of the general equivalence of money and finance that still informs sociological critiques of exploitation. But it is the sociological worker alone who shows up, if he shows at all in *Work, Employment and Society*, in the *Industrial Relations Journal*, in *Organization Studies* and indeed in the critical journal *Organization*.

Finally it should be obvious that critical accountants are perhaps alone in business schools in rejecting the vicious externalization of all sources of value, the complete abdication of responsibility for the reproduction of this value, even as business seeks to horde, drain, and strip these sources by every means from the 'harvesting' of 'wikinomics' (Tapscott and Williams, 2008) to primitive accumulation of disaster capitalism (Klein, 2008). By raising the question of what else ought to be counted, critical accountants have done what their colleagues in finance, HRM, or strategy have not (Hopwood and Miller, 1994, Miller and Rose, 1990). But before we offer too much self-congratulation, it is worth emphasizing that each of the sets of theories we have surveyed above seek not to correct the accounts of business and management, but to found something beyond its schizophrenic domain. Critical accounting has shown some recent awareness of its own compulsion to complete business in the pioneering work of subaltern accounting studies, like those of Chandrasekara (2010), Neu and Heincke (2004), Neu (2001), which seek not to count everything, but to count differently. But there is much in the pursuit of a critique-of-capital critique if critical accounting is going survive the era of extreme neo-liberalism.

How far this form of critique, what we would consider the critique-of-capital form of critique, extends in business scholarship cannot ultimately be gauged by an exercise like ours, and that finally, may be the point. But what our study does indicate, we think, is that business and management studies, like neo-liberalism in general, cannot escape its contradictions even with extreme regulation. Because extreme externalization, the pushing away of all cost and the hoarding of all profit, in scholarship or in business, always ends up revealing that what is pushed away is the only thing that can save those who externalize from the oblivion of being about nothing.

Appendix A. The questions and their rationale

Q1. Does the journal publish articles by scholars from a diversity of academic institutions?

This question is designed to recognize that much valuable academic work goes on among scholars not placed at the top research universities. The question also pays attention to the conditions of production in the university, insisting that academic work should not be artificially separated from its possibilities.

Yes = Any university outside the Top 500 universities in the world list.

No = Any university inside the Top 500 universities in the world list.

Non-university affiliated authors score 'yes'.

Top 500 University List available at <http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/rank/2005/ARWU2005FullList2.pdf>.

Ranking Methodology available at <http://ed.sjtu.edu.cn/rank/2005/ARWU2005Methodology.htm>.

Q2. Does the journal publish articles from scholars based in the developing world?

This question is designed to provide an indication of the commitments to scholarly fair trade and to measure the diversity of international voices in the various conditions.

Countries in the 'Developing World' are of Low or Medium Human Development as measured by the United Nations Human Development Reports.

These lists are available at http://hdr.undp.org/statistics/data/rc_2005.cfm.

The methodology for the compilation of these lists is available at <http://hdr.undp.org/statistics/>.

Based = National affiliation offered in the publication.

Q3. Does the journal publish articles engaging feminist or gender studies perspectives?

This question is designed to foreground the centrality of feminist understandings of management and accounting knowledge to any claim to excellence in scholarship.

Engaging = Are feminist approaches mentioned in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper?

Yes/No

Q4. Does the journal publish articles engaging queer theory and/or theories of sexuality?

This question is designed to foreground the centrality of gay/bi-sexual understandings of management and accounting knowledge to any claim to excellence in scholarship.

Engaging = Are these approaches mentioned in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper?

Yes/No

Q5. Does the journal publish articles engaging postcolonial studies, critical race theory, and/or transnationalist migrant analysis?

This question refocuses management and accounting knowledge away from Eurocentrism and towards a global perspective.

Engaging = Are these approaches mentioned in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper?

Yes/No

Q6. Does the journal publish articles studying the relationship between business/corporate practice and war, violence and/or the displacement of populations?

This question is designed to value the contribution of indigenous, disadvantaged or underprivileged peoples to producing the relationship between economy and society.

Engaging = Are these approaches mentioned in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper?
Yes/No

Q7. Does the journal publish articles directly concerned with the relationship of business to environmentalist, consumer and anti-corporate movements?

This question is designed to value the contribution of a whole range of corporate critics to producing the relationship between economy and society.

Directly concerned = Are these issues discussed and prioritized in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper? Yes/No

Q8. Does the journal publish articles directly concerned with the persistence of exploitation in the workplace and/or unsafe and dehumanizing business practices towards employees?

This question balances the profit interest in business with legal and humane obligations of business in the workplace.

Directly concerned = Are these issues discussed and prioritized in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper? Yes/No

Q9. Does the journal publish articles directly concerned with wage negotiations, the effort bargain, and the consequences of collective representation and/or workplace democracy?

This question is designed to consider at the level of the firm the consequences to employee living standards of the profit imperative.

Directly concerned = Are these issues discussed and prioritized in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper? Yes/No

Q10. Does the journal publish articles directly concerned with business practice and its relationship with the (re)distribution of wealth?

The question is asked to draw attention to the connection domestically between social welfare and business environment, and globally between corporate control of resources, and national and local rights to the profits.

Directly concerned = Are these issues discussed and prioritized in the title, abstract or conclusion section of the paper? Yes/No

Appendix B. Geary audit, our audit, ABS audit

Geary rank	Journal title	Our questions										ABS rank
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1	Journal of Marketing Management	64%	4%	2%	0%	0%	0%	19%	3%	2%	3%	3
2	Journal of Management Studies	34%	1%	3%	2%	2%	0%	30%	9%	32%	10%	4
3	Journal of the Operational Research Society	67%	13%	0%	0%	0%	4%	7%	0%	1%	2%	3
4	British Journal of Management	61%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	13%	2%	3
5	European Journal of Marketing	70%	5%	0%	0%	1%	0%	9%	3%	3%	4%	3
6	International Journal of Ops. and Production Mgmt.	70%	7%	0%	0%	0%	1%	10%	3%	13%	5%	3
7	British Journal of Industrial Relations	42%	2%	11%	0%	0%	0%	24%	21%	94%	18%	4
8	Human Relations	55%	1%	11%	5%	6%	4%	26%	25%	32%	11%	4
9	International Journal of HRM	55%	6%	5%	1%	1%	0%	18%	12%	50%	18%	3
10	Organization Studies	39%	3%	2%	1%	4%	5%	39%	17%	36%	15%	4
11	Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	53%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	5%	16%	3
12	Human Resource Management Journal	46%	2%	2%	0%	0%	5%	24%	20%	39%	15%	3
13	Work, Employment and Society	56%	5%	31%	6%	8%	8%	14%	52%	81%	34%	4
14	European Journal of Operational Research	70%	10%	0%	0%	0%	1%	13%	1%	2%	9%	3
15	Industrial Relations Journal	47%	0%	14%	0%	2%	0%	2%	47%	81%	31%	2
16	Service Industries Journal	71%	9%	1%	1%	1%	0%	10%	2%	5%	6%	2
17	Long Range Planning	48%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	19%	1%	6%	1%	3
18	Applied Economics	66%	10%	0%	0%	1%	0%	11%	1%	11%	31%	2
19	Personnel Review	58%	3%	8%	0%	4%	0%	26%	15%	59%	15%	2
20	Organization	23%	0%	6%	2%	4%	7%	13%	35%	46%	12%	3
N/A	Culture and Organization	48%	3%	15%	13%	15%	13%	28%	28%	30%	13%	1
N/A	Critical Perspectives on Accounting	44%	1%	7%	0%	15%	10%	85%	8%	9%	57%	4
N/A	Gender, Work and Organization	34%	0%	100%	14%	9%	5%	30%	52%	64%	20%	3
N/A	Consumption, Markets and Culture	23%	0%	35%	6%	13%	16%	74%	13%	23%	52%	2
N/A	Accounting, Organization and Society	34%	2%	3%	0%	3%	0%	52%	26%	23%	61%	4
Averages		55.6%	5.4%	6.2%	1.3%	2.5%	2.2%	20.1%	11.1%	23.6%	15.8%	3.00

20 "Top" journals.

"Geary" rank	Journal title	Our audit										ABS score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1	Journal of Marketing Management	64%	4%	2%	0%	0	0%	19%	3%	2%	3%	3
2	Journal of Management Studies	34%	1%	3%	2%	2%	0%	30%	9%	32%	10%	4
3	Journal of the Operational Research Society	67%	13%	0%	0%	0%	4%	7%	0%	1%	2%	3
4	British Journal of Management	61%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	13%	2%	3
5	European Journal of Marketing	70%	5%	0%	0%	1%	0%	9%	3%	3%	4%	3
6	International Journal of Operations and Production Management	70%	7%	0%	0%	0%	1%	10%	3%	13%	5%	3
7	British Journal of Industrial Relations	42%	2%	11%	0%	0%	0%	24%	21%	94%	18%	4
8	Human Relations	55%	1%	11%	5%	6%	4%	26%	25%	32%	11%	4
9	International Journal of Human Resource Management	55%	6%	5%	1%	1%	0%	18%	12%	50%	18%	3
10	Organization Studies	39%	3%	2%	1%	4%	5%	39%	17%	36%	15%	4
11	Journal of Business Finance and Accounting	53%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	5%	16%	3
12	Human Resource Management Journal	46%	2%	2%	0%	0%	5%	24%	20%	39%	15%	3
13	Work, Employment and Society	56%	5%	31%	6%	8%	8%	14%	52%	81%	34%	4
14	European Journal of Operational Research	70%	10%	0%	0%	0%	1%	13%	1%	2%	9%	3
15	Industrial Relations Journal	47%	0%	14%	0%	2%	0%	2%	47%	81%	31%	2
16	Service Industries Journal	71%	9%	1%	1%	1%	0%	10%	2%	5%	6%	2
17	Long Range Planning	48%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	19%	1%	6%	1%	3
18	Applied Economics	66%	10%	0%	0%	1%	0%	11%	1%	11%	31%	2
19	Personnel Review	58%	3%	8%	0%	4%	0%	26%	15%	59%	15%	2
20	Organization	23%	0%	6%	2%	4%	7%	13%	35%	46%	12%	3
Averages		57.7%	5.9%	3.4%	0.8%	1.5%	1.6%	15.8%	9.6%	23.1%	12.6%	3.05

Critical journals.

"Geary" rank	Journal title	Our audit										ABS score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
N/A	Culture and Organization	48%	3%	15%	13%	15%	13%	28%	28%	30%	13%	1
N/A	Critical Perspectives on Accounting	44%	1%	7%	0%	15%	10%	85%	8%	9%	57%	4
N/A	Gender, Work and Organization	34%	0%	100%	14%	9%	5%	30%	52%	64%	20%	3
N/A	Consumption, Markets and Culture	23%	0%	35%	6%	13%	16%	74%	13%	23%	52%	2
N/A	Accounting, Organization and Society	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%	4
Averages		30.5%	0.7%	29.0%	5.5%	10.3%	7.7%	45.6%	18.8%	22.9%	30.1%	2.8

Compiled aggregates.

"Geary" rank	Our audit										ABS score
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Averages (critical)	30.5%	0.7%	29.0%	5.5%	10.3%	7.7%	45.6%	18.8%	22.9%	30.1%	2.80
Averages (top 20)	57.7%	5.9%	3.4%	0.8%	1.5%	1.6%	15.8%	9.6%	23.1%	12.6%	3.05
Averages (overall)	55.6%	5.4%	6.2%	1.3%	2.5%	2.2%	20.1%	11.1%	23.6%	15.8%	3.00

References

- Annisette M. Imperialism and professions: the education and certification of accountants in Trinidad and Tobago. *Accounting Organizations and Society* 2000; 25(7):631–59.
- Armstrong P. Accounting for insecurity. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2000; 11:383–406.
- Agamben G. *Home Sacer: sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford: Stanford University Press; 1998.
- Bousquet M, Stefano H, Fred M. On study: a polygraph roundtable. *Polygraph* 2009; 21:159–75.
- Braidotti R. *Nomadic subjects: embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. New York: Columbia University Press; 1994.
- Carter C, Clegg S, Kornberger M. Strategy as practice? *Strategic Organization* 2008;6(1):83–99.
- Carter C, Clegg S, Kornberger M. Re-framing strategy: power, politics and accounting. *Accounting Auditing and Accountability Journal* 2010; 23(5):573–94.
- Catchpole L, Cooper C, Wright A. Capitalism, states and accounting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2004; 15(8):1037–58.
- Chandrasekara I. Why finance is critical? A dialogue with a sinhalese women's community' *Ephemera theory and politics in organization* 2010; 9(4):300–17.
- Choat S. *Marx through post-structuralism: Lyotard, Derrida, Foucault, Deleuze*. London: Continuum; 2010.
- Chwastiak M. Rendering death and destruction visible: counting the costs of war. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2008; 19:573–90.
- Chwastiak M. War incorporated: private, unaccountable, and profitable. Available online at: http://merlin.mngt.waikato.ac.nz/ejrot/Vol_10_cms2007specialedition/chwastiak.pdf.
- Chow R. *The age of the world target: self-referentiality in war, theory and comparative work*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2006.
- Cooper C. Accounting for the public interest: public ineffectuals or public intellectuals? *Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal* 2005; 18(5):592–607.

- Cooper D, Sherer MJ. The value of corporate accounting reports: arguments for a political economy of accounting. *Accounting Organizations & Society* 1984; 9(3/4):207–32.
- Cullinan C. Enron as a symptom of audit process breakdown: can the Sarbanes-Oxley act cure the disease? *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2004; 15(6/7): 853–64.
- Cutler T, Waine B. Managerialism reformed? New labour and public sector management *Social Policy & Administration* 2000; 34(3):318–32.
- Deleuze G, Guattari F. *Nomadology: the war machine*. New York: Semiotexte; 1986.
- Derrida J. *Marx and Sons*. In: Sprinker M, editor. *Ghostly demarcations: a symposium on Jacques Derrida's spectres of Marx*. London: Verso; 2008.
- Do P. No future ephemera theory and politics in organization 2008; 8(3):303–11.
- Dunleavy P, Hood C. From old public administration to new public management. *Public Money and Management* 1994; 14(3):9–16.
- Dunne S, Harney S, Parker M. Responsibilities of management intellectuals: a survey. *Organization* 2008; 15(2):272–82.
- Fleischman R, Tyson T. Accounting in service to racism: monetizing slave property in the antebellum South. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2004; 15:376–99.
- Foucault M. *Society must be defended*. Foucault: Picador; 2003.
- Geary J, Marriott L, Rowlinson M. Journal rankings in business and management and the 2001 research assessment exercise in the UK. *British Journal of Management* 2004; 15:95–141.
- Grosz E. *Volatile bodies: toward a corporeal feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press; 1994.
- Hanlon G. On the denial of politics. In: Crane A, editor. et al. *The Oxford handbook of corporate social responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2006.
- Hardt M, Negri A. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 2000.
- Harney S, Nyathi NQ. Race, revolution, and organisation. In: C Jones, R. ten Bos, editors. *Philosophy and organisation*. London: Routledge; 2007.
- Harney S. Extreme neo-liberalism: an introduction. *Ephemera* 2009;9(4):318–29.
- Harney S. The real knowledge transfer. In: *Social text periscope*. 2010 In: <http://www.socialtextjournal.org/periscope/>.
- Harraway D. *Simians, cyborgs, and women: the reinvention of women*. New York: Free Association Books; 1991.
- Harvey D. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007.
- Hopwood AG, Miller P. *Accounting as social and institutional practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1994.
- Humphrey C, Miller P, Scapens RW. Accountability and accountable management in the UK public sector. *Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal* 1993;6(3):7–29.
- Jack G. On speech, critique, and protection. *Ephemera Theory and Politics in Organisation* 2004;4(2):121–34.
- Jameson F. Symptoms of theory or symptoms for theory. *Critical Inquiry* 2003; 30(2):403–8.
- Jameson F. *Representing capital: a reading of volume one*. London: Verso; 2011.

- Klein N. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Picador; 2008.
- Lawrence S, Sharma U. Commodification of education and academic labour – using the balanced scorecard in a university setting. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2002; 13:661–77.
- Lehman C. “Herstory” in accounting: the first eighty years. *Accounting Organization and Society* 1992; 17(3/4):261–85.
- Marazzi C. *Capital and Language: From the New Economy to the War Economy*. New York: Semiotext(e); 2008.
- Martin R. *The financialization of daily life*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press; 2002.
- Martin R. Whose crisis is that? Thinking finance otherwise *Ephemera Theory & Politics in Organization* 2009; 9(4):344–9.
- McKernan JF, Kosmala K. Doing the truth: religion – deconstruction – justice, and accounting. *Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal* 2007; 20(5):729–64.
- McKinlay A. Managing Foucault: genealogies of management. *Management & Organizational History* 2006; 1(1):87–100.
- McKinlay A, Carter C, Pezet E, Clegg S. Using Foucault to make strategy. *Accounting Auditing and Accountability Journal* 2010; 23(8):1012–31.
- McKinlay A, Pezet E. Accounting for Foucault. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2010;21(6):486–95.
- Miller P, Rose N. Governing economic life. *Economy and Society* 1990; 19(1):1–31.
- Neu D. Banal accounts: subaltern voices. *Accounting Forum* 2001; 25(4):319–33.
- Neu D, Heincke M. The subaltern speaks: financial relations and the limits of governmentality. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2004; 15(1):179–206.
- Neu D, Cooper D, Everett J. Critical accounting interventions. ***Critical Perspectives on Accounting*** 2001; 12(6):735–62.
- Neu D, Quantanilla C. Market discipline and management education: a view from a southern women’s cooperative. *Journal of Management Education* 2008; 32(6):697–715.
- Ong A. *Neoliberalism as exception: mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham: Duke University Press; 2006.
- Poulantzas N. *State, Power, Socialism*. London: Verso; 2001.
- Power M. Auditing and the production of legitimacy. *Accounting Organisation and Society* 2003a; 28(4):379–94.
- Power M. Evaluating the audit explosion. *Law & Policy* 2003b; 25(3):185–202.
- Robinson C. *Black Marxism*. London: Zed Books; 2000.
- Sedgwick E. *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley: University of California; 2007.
- Spence C. Social and environmental reporting and hegemonic discourse. *Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal* 2007; 20(6):855–82.
- Sprinker M, Derrida J. Politics and friendship: an interview with Jacques Derrida. In: Kaplan EA, Sprinker M, editors. *The Althusserian legacy*. London: Verso; 1993.
- Tapscott D, Williams AD. *Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything*. London: Portfolio Trade; 2008.

Tinker T, Koutsoumadi A. A mind is a wonderful thing to waste: “think like a commodity”, become a CPA. *Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal* 1997; 10(3):454–67.

Tronti M. *Operai e Capitale*. Turin: Einaudi; 1971.

Unerman J, O’Dwyer B. Enron, Worldcom, Andersen et al.: a challenge to modernity. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 2004; 15(6/7):971–93.

van Thiel S, Leeuw FL. The performance paradox in the public sector. *Public Performance and Management Review* 2002; 25(3):267–81.