



**From the Big Five to the Big Four?
Exploring Extinction Accounting for the Rhinoceros**

Journal:	<i>Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	AAAJ-12-2015-2320.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Accounting for biodiversity, Social construction of reality, Extinction accounting, Poaching, Rhinoceros, Emancipatory

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

**From the Big Five to the Big Four?
Exploring Extinction Accounting for the Rhinoceros**

1. Introduction

Accounting is more than a mere technical methodology for accumulating data and facilitating 'neutral' representations of financial position and performance. By altering what is made visible, it has the potential to encourage change at the social, organisational and individual level (for example, see Hoskin and Macve, 1986; Hopwood, 1987; Miller and O'Leary, 1987). This has been demonstrated in a management accounting context where accounting systems are designed to monitor, organise and correct business processes (Mennicken and Miller, 2012) and in the financial reporting space where technical reporting prescriptions are used to enhance the quality of financial statements (van Zijl and Maroun, 2016). Of particular importance for this paper, are developments in environmental reporting.

The last twenty years have witnessed an exponential increase in the extent of environmental, social and governance (ESG) disclosures being included in annual and, later, integrated reports (Solomon and Maroun, 2012; Hughen et al, 2014). According to the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), this signals a shift from conventional reporting models focused exclusively on financial performance to a more comprehensive review of how organisations create value while ensuring long-term sustainability (see also Atkins and Maroun, 2015; King, 2016). Critical theorists have, however, challenged the change-potential of the sustainability reporting movement (Milne et al, 2009; Tregidga, 2013). They argue that ESG reporting may offer a glimpse of an improved socio-economic state but, ultimately, relies on a financial discourse and accountancy's calculative infrastructure to legitimise unsustainable business practices, deflect corporate criticisms and resist the need for meaningful reform of the capitalist system (Solomon et al, 2013; Tregidga et al, 2014; Zadek et al, 2015). In this context, most of the research which deals with accounting as a social construction adopts a negative perspective which presents ESG reporting as a response to the hegemonic threat posed by the demand for *real* sustainable development. This paper challenges this position.

Undoubtedly, some corporations will use non-financial disclosures to manage impressions and reframe the sustainability debate to conceal unsustainable business models and maintain the

1
2
3 status quo. It is, however, premature to conclude that ESG reporting by *all* organisations should
4 be interpreted as the result of negative hegemonic forces (see Gallhofer and Haslam, 2003).
5
6 While there are limitations, the vocabulary of non-financial reporting has widened the scope of
7 the corporate reporting function, created new areas of organisational accountability and driven an
8 awareness of the need for sustainable business practice (Gray et al, 1995; Adams and Frost,
9 2008; Higgins and Walker, 2012). This is especially evident when considering efforts at
10 accounting for biodiversity (as a specific example of non-financial reporting) (Jones and
11 Solomon, 2013; Rimmel and Jonäll, 2013).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Both anthropocentric and deep ecological studies of biodiversity reporting confirm the ability
20 (even if theoretical) of this form of accounting to contribute to an ecological or a sustainability
21 discourse and encourage corporate change (Jones and Solomon, 2013; Rimmel and Jonäll, 2013;
22 Samkin et al, 2014). While financial paradigms continue to characterise most corporate reporting
23 initiatives (Tregidga et al, 2014), given sufficient time, emerging forms of ESG reporting
24 (including narrative and biodiversity reporting) can alter perceptions and lead to the creation of a
25 better world (Pearce, 2007; Atkins et al, 2015). We demonstrate this transformative or
26 emancipatory potential by examining disclosures dealing specifically with the plight of South
27 Africa's rhinoceroses provided by some of the largest companies listed on the Johannesburg
28 Stock Exchange (JSE). A social constructionist framing of 'accounting' is used to develop
29 interpretively the outlines of an extinction accounting framework. This moves beyond the
30 traditional views of the philanthropic accounting and impression management literature (see
31 Solomon et al, 2013; Zadek et al, 2015) and reveals a sincere effort to protect one of Africa's
32 iconic 'Big Five'¹ which is being threatened by habitat destruction, climate change and a severe
33 poaching problem.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 An interpretive text analysis of disclosures in companies' integrated reports and sustainability
49 reports and on their webpages suggests deeply-held beliefs in a need for ethical behaviour, a
50 genuine concern for rhino conservation and protection and a range of corporate strategies aimed
51 at reversing the rhinoceros' trend towards extinction. Often, these 'accounts' include details on
52
53
54

55
56 ¹ The 'Big Five' is a term coined by hunters to describe the five most difficult animals to hunt (on foot) in Africa.
57 These are: buffalo, elephant, leopard, lion and rhinoceros.
58
59
60

1
2
3 the efforts of environmental/conservation groups (such as RAGE²) and how these companies are
4 taking it upon themselves to commit funds to anti-poaching initiatives and encourage awareness
5 of rhinoceros conservation and protection. Corporate reporting on the plight of the rhinoceros
6 suggests that 'extinction' is no longer limited to the domain of ecologists. The harsh reality of
7 losing one of Africa's Big Five coincides with a never-before-seen response from leading South
8 African corporations. Accounts of rhinoceros conservation (which is not *directly* linked to these
9 organisations' primary *business* objectives) imply that corporate discourses are evolving and
10 organisations' boundaries are expanding in reaction to the possible loss of this species (see
11 Llewellyn, 1994; Gray et al, 1995). More specifically, 'extinction' is emerging as a corporate
12 (rather than solely biological/scientific) construct and an important sustainability consideration.
13 Additional disclosure also suggests a desire to demonstrate a broad level of accountability and
14 responsibility. In this way, extinction accounting goes a step beyond the now well-documented
15 'accounting for biodiversity'. The reporting is more than just descriptive, focused on compliance
16 with specific laws, regulations or codes of best practice (Milne et al, 2009; Jones and Solomon,
17 2013; Cho et al, 2015) or driven by the need to secure social acceptance (Milne et al, 2009;
18 Tregidga, 2013; Atkins et al, 2016). Companies are recognising their unique ability to affect
19 change by devoting funds and resources to reverse extinction trends.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Consequently, an evolving 'extinction accounting framework' would not draw on impression
36 management (Solomon et al, 2013), philanthropic accounting (Zadek et al 2015) or the relevance
37 of isomorphic pressures (de Villiers and Alexander, 2014) to explain the emergence of
38 rhinoceros-specific biodiversity disclosures. These non-financial accounts are seen as more than
39 a response to social pressures for ESG reporting or a method of managing threats to an
40 organisation's credibility (see Milne et al, 2009; Jones and Solomon, 2013; Cho et al, 2015). We
41 are inspired by a post-modernist framing of accounting (see, *inter alia*, Gallhofer and Haslam,
42 2003; Adams and Frost, 2008; Dillard and Reynolds, 2008; Atkins et al, 2015) to suggest an
43 evolving reporting schematic which is emancipatory, transformational, dialogical and motivated
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 ² RAGE (Rhino Action Group Effort) was established by LeadSA, a Premedia Broadcasting and Independent
55 Newspapers Initiative, to assist in the fight against illegal rhinoceros poaching. RAGE organises campaigns to build
56 public awareness of issues associated with rhinoceros poaching and lobbies appropriate authorities for support.
57 RAGE is fully supported by the South African Police and SANParks.
58
59
60

1
2
3 by concerns of heritage, culture, ethics and a fear of the consequences of extinction (see Dillard
4 and Reynolds, 2008; Atkins et al, 2015)..
5
6
7

8
9 The paper is structured as follows. Section two discusses the existing literature in the areas of
10 accounting for biodiversity focusing specifically on the requirements of the GRI. Section three
11 provides a theoretical framework. It discusses philanthropic accounting and social
12 constructionism as a means of interpreting corporate accounting on preventing species
13 extinction. Section four provides a short review of the current state of rhinoceros populations in
14 South Africa. Section five explains the research method and the findings of our interpretive
15 content analysis are provided in section six. Section seven concludes and identifies areas for
16 future research.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 25 **2. Reporting on biodiversity and species** 26 27

28
29 Multinational companies are disclosing ever more information dealing with threatened species
30 and efforts to protect them. This may be motivated by the GRI's call for biodiversity-related
31 disclosures. relating to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List
32 Species. Specifically, GRI reporting principle G4-EN14 calls for companies to disclose
33 information on the total number of endangered species which have habitats in areas affected by
34 the company's operations. The disclosures should be provided by level of extinction risk³
35 according to the IUCN Red List and relevant national conservation lists.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 According to *the G4 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines Implementation Manual*, this disclosure
44 practice assists the company in identifying, "...where its activities pose a threat to endangered
45 plant and animal species". By identifying threats, it is hoped that the company can take
46 appropriate action to avoid harm and prevent the extinction of affected species. In other words,
47 the GRI acknowledges a direct relationship between reporting and action. It is assumed that by
48 recording and accounting for impacts on threatened species, companies will - as a direct
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 ³ Categories included endangered, endangered, vulnerable, near threatened, of least concern, by the IUCN Red List
58
59

1
2
3 consequence of having to develop and write the disclosures - do something to avoid extinction. A
4 review of the GRI extinction reporting guidelines, however, reveals some important limitations:
5
6
7

8
9 “.... Some of the strongest critical comments provided on the GRI throughout its
10 development have concerned its apparent reluctance to provide a definition of
11 ‘sustainability’, ‘sustainable development’ or ‘sustainability principles’” ... This has
12 led to concerns that companies could “... sell their GRI compliant report as a sign of
13
14 ‘sustainable behaviour’” (Milne and Gray, 2013, p.19).
15
16
17

18
19 In other words, it is not clear if trends of increased ESG reporting documented over the last three
20 decades actually depict improved transparency, a greater awareness of the importance of
21 sustainability and enhanced accountability (Milne, 2013). Instead, there is the risk that, because
22 the
23
24
25
26

27
28 “... GRI are insufficient conditions for organizations contributing to the sustaining of
29 the Earth’s ecology...they may reinforce business-as-usual and greater levels of un-
30 sustainability” (Milne et al., 2013, p.13).
31
32
33
34

35
36 Consequently, measures of compliance with the GRI (or other existing biodiversity frameworks)
37 are not necessarily indicative of an organisation’s commitment to sustainability and, in
38 particular, the management or mitigation of biodiversity loss (Atkins et al, 2014; Tregidga et al,
39 2014; Atkins et al, 2016; Maroun, 2016). From a critical perspective (as touched on in Section 1)
40 an increase in the extent of biodiversity reporting can be interpreted as the mobilisation of ESG
41 disclosures in response to social, regulatory or political pressure for more non-financial detail in
42 corporate reports rather than a genuine commitment to sustainability (ibid). At best, sections of
43 the integrated, annual or sustainability report which deal with issues such as habitat lost, number
44 of species affected by an organisation’s activities and different conservation initiatives are only a
45 basic form of biodiversity reporting (GRI Principles, version 4). ‘Extinction accounting’ must be
46 transformational if it is contribute to extinction prevention. Generic disclosures required by
47 codes of best practice need to be complemented with corporate reporting which demonstrates
48 specific policies, plans and actions being implemented to avert extinction (see Cho et al, 2015;
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Atkins et al, 2016). In other words, extinction accounting is not just a GRI compliance exercise
4 but an emancipatory form of accounting.
5
6
7

8
9 To examine the 'elements' of an extinction accounting framework in more detail, the prior
10 research interpreting accounting as part of a social constructionist paradigm provides a
11 theoretical frame of reference. This body of work is useful for explaining how corporate
12 reporting (including corporate narrative reporting) creates new 'fields' of accountability, alters
13 perspectives and promotes positive change (see Adams and Frost, 2008; Dillard and Reynolds,
14 2008). Elements of philanthropic accounting and impression management may be present
15 (Solomon et al, 2013) but accounting is, ultimately, a socially constructed practice which can be
16 mobilised to give an account of past performance *and* encourage an enlightened business
17 approach which attempts to align corporate action with social imperatives (Gallhofer and
18 Haslam, 2003; Atkins et al, 2015). To this end, Section 3 presents the theoretical framework used
19 to outline an extinction accounting schematic. The critical research on philanthropic accounting
20 and impression management is touched on (Section 3.1) and a contrasting emancipatory role of
21 accounting is developed
22 (Section 3.2). This is used to analyse disclosures found in integrated and sustainability reports
23 and on the webpages of some of South Africa's most prominent companies (Section 6) and
24 reveal the elements of a transformative accounting discourse emerging in response to the threat
25 of extinction of the rhinoceros.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **3: Theoretical grounds for understanding and developing an extinction accounting** 41 **framework** 42 43 44

45
46 For the purpose of this research, we differentiate between accounting for philanthropic purposes
47 (Brown et al, 2006) and accounting as an agent of transformation in a sustainability setting (Gray
48 et al, 1995). There may be some overlaps, particularly in the sense that an organisation's
49 corporate social responsibility (including acts of philanthropy) can coincide with specific
50 sustainability projects. Nevertheless, and as discussed in more detail below, philanthropic
51 accounting seems often mobilised for the purpose of impression management. It is our position
52 that this is not the case for 'extinction accounting'. Extinction accounting is informed by a
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 genuine commitment to the environment and, in the social constructionist tradition, alters
4 corporate discourse and offers a potential for meaningful corporate action on important
5 biodiversity issues.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **3.1: Philanthropic accounting** 13

14
15 Corporations traditionally devote spare cash flow to ‘good’ or philanthropic causes and provide
16 information about such donations in their reports (referred to as philanthropic accounting).
17 Researchers have suggested that such activities are motivated more by a desire to enhance
18 corporate reputation rather than by genuine ethical and philanthropic concern. This type of
19 critical and cynical approach to corporate reporting is common in the social and environmental
20 accounting literature and is difficult to disagree with. For example, Zadek et al. (2015) argue that
21 it is easy for companies to report on charitable programmes and philanthropic activities but the
22 reporting does not provide information on the effect of the donation on either the recipients or
23 the company itself. They also question whether philanthropic programmes should be assessed
24 according to financial value:
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 “... is a million dollars of ‘giving’ to be valued the same way irrespective of its use or
36 its effectiveness for the intended beneficiaries and the company itself? Clearly not”
37
38 (Zadek et al, 2015, p.6).
39
40
41

42 Brown et al. (2006) are also sceptical. They found some evidence that donations to charities and
43 expenditure on other philanthropic concerns enhanced shareholder value. Consequently,
44 companies with larger boards of directors and those with lower debt-to-value ratios are more
45 likely to donate fund and establish corporate foundations. Similarly, companies which perform
46 less well in the areas of employee relations, environmental issues and product safety are more
47 likely to make charitable contributions. As explained by Chen et al (2008, p.131),
48
49
50
51
52

53
54
55 “... [r]ather than being a purely altruistic sharing of discretionary resources with
56 society, corporate philanthropy may instead be being used as a means for companies
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to mitigate exposures to their social legitimacy brought about by poor performance in
4 other social domains”.

5
6
7
8
9 As a result, we acknowledge, from the outset, that corporate accounting and accountability for
10 rhinoceros conservation and protection may represent another example of ‘philanthropic
11 accounting’ informed, primarily, by the need to manage impressions. This is consistent with a
12 large body of critical accounting research which draws on a social constructionist paradigm to
13 demonstrate how companies employ different methods of accounting and reporting to construct a
14 more favourable image of an organisation than may actually be the case (Higgins and Walker,
15 2012; Solomon et al, 2013; Tregidga et al, 2014). This is discussed in more detail in Section
16 3.2.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 3.2: Accounting as social construction and emancipation

25
26
27
28 Accounting researchers have devoted significant attention to interpreting corporate reporting
29 through the post-modernist frame of social construction and narrative discourse analysis. For
30 example, Spence (2007) explored social and environmental accounting using discourse theory
31 from Laclau and Mouffe (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Laclau, 1990) which derives from the
32 Gramscian hegemonic tradition. Gramsci, in his ‘Prison Notebooks’, outlined ways in which
33 groups (including the ‘intellectual elite’) maintained hegemonic control over society through
34 intellectual dominance (Gramsci, 1971). Laclau and Mouffe (1985) explain that, through
35 language and discourse, a particular version of ‘reality’ can be constructed. Berger and
36 Luckmann’s seminal treatise on the social construction of reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1966)
37 demonstrates how everyone’s perceptions of reality differs but how communication is crucial in
38 allowing us to share each other’s versions of reality, as,
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 “The reality of everyday life further presents itself to me as an intersubjective world,
50 a world that I share with others. This inter-subjectivity sharply differentiates everyday
51 life from other realities of which I am conscious. I am alone in the world of my
52 dreams, but I know that the world of everyday life is as real to others as it is to
53 myself. Indeed, I cannot exist in everyday life without continually interacting and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 communicating with others.....I also know, of course, that the others have a
4 perspective on this common world that is not identical with mine. My 'here' is their
5 'there'. My 'now' does not fully overlap with theirs. My projects differ from and may
6 even contradict with theirs” (Berger and Luckman, 1966, p. 37).
7
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 ***On the limitations of non-financial reporting*** 15

16
17 Applying this social constructionist perspective to accounting allows us to interpret accounting
18 as a means for companies to construct, disseminate and maintain a particular image which they
19 wish people to believe in (Higgins and Walker, 2012; Tregidga et al, 2014). A social
20 constructionist interpretation of financial accounting and its relation with social welfare is
21 explained as follows:
22
23
24
25

26
27
28 “... if financial accounting reduces all problems to economics, activities that have
29 malign social and environmental consequences begin to appear rational and desirable.
30 In ignoring these social and environmental consequences financial accounting
31 actively shapes social reality” (Spence, 2007, p.7).
32
33
34
35

36
37 Indeed, corporate attempts to produce sustainability reports have been criticised, from a social
38 constructionist perspective, as merely instruments employed to perpetuate their own hegemonic
39 world view (Laine, 2009b; Milne et al, 2009; Tregidga et al, 2014). As explained by several
40 critical writers, the social, environmental or sustainability reporting movement promised a move
41 towards a more holistic approach to business management and reporting but failed to live up to
42 expectations (Gray et al, 1995; Bebbington et al, 1999; Adams and McNicholas, 2007; Gray,
43 2010). In the context of a continuing dominance of organisational discourse by economic or
44 financial paradigms, sustainable development is interpreted as a business threat and, as a result,
45 the transformative potential of sustainability reporting is significantly reduced by efforts to
46 maintain hegemonic control (Tregidga et al, 2014). As stated by Spence (2007, p.8), “the notion
47 that SER [social and environmental reporting] could ever portray a complete social and
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 environmental reality is itself impossible". A review of the prior research on biodiversity
4 reporting confirms this view.
5
6
7

8
9 A special issue of the *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* (2013) was devoted to
10 locating accounting for biodiversity within a cultural, historic, philosophical and accountability
11 framework (Jones and Solomon, 2013). The special issue aimed to identify a series of challenges
12 in the hope that their identification would lead to the development of solutions (ibid). These
13 included the difficulty of defining 'biodiversity'; assessing the current extent of biodiversity
14 reporting; the technical challenge of accounting for changes in biodiversity mass; and identifying
15 whom to hold accountable for biodiversity loss (see also Jones, 2014; Mansoor and Maroun,
16 2016).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 Examinations of the nature and form of biodiversity accounts are, however, often couched in an
26 anthropocentric construct (Atkins et al, 2014). The focus is on recording of and reporting on
27 species which are 'of use' to humans rather than a genuine commitment to preserving all species
28 because of their ecological or intrinsic value (Rimmel and Jonäll, 2013; Samkin et al, 2014). For
29 example, Atkins et al (2014) argue that 'biodiversity reporting' is framed as an internal control
30 and risk management exercise. In this context, 'biodiversity risks' are understood in only
31 financial terms and protecting and enhancing biodiversity are, in fact, attempts to mitigate
32 business risks and financial losses. Likewise, Cuckston (2013) and Freeman et al (2013) discuss
33 biodiversity loss in terms of existing valuation and financial accounting methodologies. Their
34 research highlights limitations in the accounting system but stops short of providing a clear
35 framework for reporting on biodiversity loss which encourages organisations to change their
36 business processes. Tregidga et al (2014) reach a similar conclusion, demonstrating how
37 sustainability considerations (which would include biodiversity loss) are interpreted in terms of a
38 business or finance discourse which limits (and even negates) the transformative potential of
39 sustainability and biodiversity reporting (see also Tregidga, 2013; Mansoor and Maroun, 2016).
40 In this context, there is often a disconnect between corporate rhetoric on the need to protect the
41 environment and evidence on specific actions being taken to address material risks to
42 biodiversity.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cho et al (2015), for example, argue that organisations rely on special and temporal distance in their corporate reporting to balance conflicting stakeholder expectations. Demands for more detailed accounts on environmental impacts are addressed by policy-related disclosures which meet reporting requirements and espouse the need for sound environmental practices (see also Gray, 1992; Higgins and Walker, 2012; Tregidga et al, 2014). Specific details on environmental action plans, progress made to date and the timelines for implementation of important reforms are, however, seldom provided. As explained by Malsch (2013, p. 155), the aim is to:

‘consign the social and environmental effects of economic activity to a relatively distant future at the scale of the planet, beyond the temporal and spatial horizon of most citizens and enterprises. Any contribution that companies and even whole countries might make to the prevention of climate change or to maintain the well-being of people is accordingly insignificant’.

The significant threat posed by environmental unsustainability to contemporary society is well-documented by the scientific community. In contrast, organisations rarely articulate these risks in their integrated and sustainability reports (Atkins et al, 2016; Maroun, 2016). Where issues such as climate change, habitat destruction and loss of species are covered, the disclosures are generic. Biodiversity conservation is often framed as a general concern which is the responsibility of a broad group of stakeholders and beyond the jurisdiction of the respective organisation. As such, specific commitments to protecting biodiversity are infrequent and often couched as long-term considerations rather than pressing issues which require immediate attention (Rimmel and Jonäll, 2013; Tregidga, 2013; Cho et al, 2015; Mansoor and Maroun, 2016). The aim is to satisfy expectations for at least some environmental reporting, defer substantive reforms which may impact financial performance adversely and leave stakeholders assuming that long-term sustainability has been taken into account by business leaders. Research on private reporting (verbal engagements in one-on-one meetings between companies and their core institutional investors) confirms these views.

Interpretations of the private reporting context have referred to neo-Gramscian frameworks such as Freire’s dialogic approach to education within an oppressed society (Solomon and Darby,

2005). There is a clear case of organisations mobilising different forms of stakeholder expectations to manage or constrain the debate on ESG-related concerns, limiting the emancipatory potential of the sustainability reporting movement (Solomon et al, 2013). The researchers demonstrate various ways in which companies create a specific reality for their readers using the annual or sustainability report. The image of the organisation presented in these documents is designed specifically to allow readers to reach more favourable conclusions about the organisation than the company's own interpretation of its situation (see for example, Aerts, 2005; Beattie, McInnes, and Fearnley, 2004; Beattie and Jones, 1992, Beattie and Jones 2002; Beattie, Dhanani and Jones, 2008; Guillamon-Saorin, 2006; Jones, 2011; Mather, Mather, and Ramsay, 2005; Preston, Wright, and Young, 1996).

Towards an emancipatory accounting schematic

From a social constructionist perspective, little research has taken a view that a more positive and ecological perspective may be validly constructed by corporate reports. Does creating a social reality through accounting always have to be motivated by negative, hegemonic forces? The Gramscian tradition in social theory tends to assume that the creation of social realities by the most powerful groups in society is associated with coercion and oppression through ideological hegemony. Surely such powers can be wielded for good? The potential for accounting to be emancipatory and to drive positive change is always there, as:

“... an appreciation of accounting's emancipatory possibilities implies seeing accounting as at least potentially aiding (and being integral to) or giving further help to an emancipatory project. Critical researchers thus envisage accounting as functioning to help overcome repressive obstacles so that a better state is realised ...A vision of accounting as an emancipatory force is consistent with seeing accounting as a communicative social practice that functions as a system of informing that renders transparent and enlightens with the effect of social betterment” (Gallhofer and Haslam, 2003, p.7).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

In other words, despite substantial evidence that companies employ sustainability reports to manage impressions and forge realities they wish to have disclosed (Solomon et al, 2013; Tregidga et al, 2014), there may also be some potential for genuinely concerned managers and directors to employ reporting as an emancipatory tool. For example, Gray et al (1995) identify a number of shortcomings in the environmental accounting movement. Nevertheless, the researchers find examples of a growing awareness of the need for environmental accountability and some evidence of reforms to current business practices. Similarly, Adams and Frost (2008) find that some organisations are beginning to integrate environmental (and social) indicators into their strategic planning and key performance indicators suggesting that the environmental reporting considerations are, to some extent, being 'internalised' by corporations and promoting some level of change. More broadly, Atkins et al (2015) and Dillard and Reynolds (2008) suggest that accounting systems, by virtue of their ability to construct different fields of measurement, evaluation and review, can be successfully mobilised to drive genuine sustainability reforms. This would enable fears of impending environmental issues (including extinctions) to drive a new form of accounting and accountability. These would be less involved with managing impressions and building reputation and more concerned with demonstrating corporate activities which are seeking to reverse negative trends.

It is on this basis that this paper seeks to examine the corporate disclosures of South African companies in order to establish whether their 'extinction accounts' may actually be aimed at reducing the threat of rhinoceros extinction and improving corporate accountability and ecological protection. More specifically, the recent development in corporate disclosures relating to rhinoceros conservation could be interpreted as a change in corporate narrative or discourse. As suggested by Shotter and Gergen (1989), a narrative is not created by the individual/company but by the external culture and influences on that company. As mentioned in Section 1, the sudden realisation that one of the 'Big Five' may be on the brink of extinction is an example of an external cultural influence which is likely to impact the corporate narrative. Consequently, reporting on the plight of the rhinoceros is more than an exercise in GRI compliance or impression management. It suggests a change in corporate behaviour in terms of which the entity becomes aware of a sustainability issue which is not linked specifically to its business model and demonstrates that it is taking action to address negative effects for which it is not specifically

1
2
3 responsible. In doing so, the sustainability or integrated report becomes a link between the
4 organisation's discourse and the social narrative which champions the preservation of the
5 rhinoceros (see Gray, 1992; Gallhofer and Haslam, 2003).
6
7
8
9

10 In other words, 'extinction accounting' may be emerging as a new form of accounting where, to
11 paraphrase Gallhofer and Haslam (2003, p.7), the "connotations of accounting that see it as
12 negative are transformed through praxis into connotations that see it as positive". The accounting
13 system, rather than restricting the sustainability agenda (Tregidga et al, 2014) actually functions
14 as an instrument of "social well-being or welfare" which is aligned with an "emancipatory
15 project" (Gallhofer and Haslam, 2003, p.162). Communication through emancipatory narrative
16 reporting may assist organisations to enhance the reality they "create". As Pearson (2007)
17 argues, changing patterns of communication such as shifting an organisational culture of
18 "command and report" style communication to one which is listening, deliberative and dialogic,
19 provides a means of forming better social worlds. Indeed, this perspective on communication
20 demonstrates the power of the organisational discourse and how it may be altered to enhance
21 societal welfare. We now discuss the plight of the mighty rhinoceros and the current and
22 potential role of accounting in saving the species from extinction.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 **4: Rhinoceros in South Africa** 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 The rhinoceros was found across most of Africa with an estimated population of 500,000
4 animals at the start of the twentieth century. This stands in sharp contrast with the present
5 situation. In the mid-1830s there were great numbers of black rhinoceros reported on expeditions
6 in Southern Africa, although these expeditions seemed to involve shooting the animals as game
7 (Guggisberg, 1966). By the 1960s very few black rhinoceros were left south of the Rivers
8 Zambesi and Kunene. Indeed, concerns about the decline in rhinoceros is by no means a 21st
9 century phenomenon, as, for example, “In Kenya responsible people began to worry about the
10 dwindling numbers of rhinoceros as early as 1906, when large scale poaching was reported”
11 (Guggisberg, 1966, p.50). As early as 1932, extinction of the rhinoceros was seen a credible
12 threat,
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 “Many more people are out to slaughter the gigantic beasts than there are beasts to be
23 slain. Their armour does not protect them. Extinction is approaching rapidly. In
24 another hundred years their stuffed mummies will stand in the museums of the world,
25 next to the skeletons of the tyrannosaurus...” (Bengt Berg, quoted in Guggisberg,
26 1966, p.144).
27
28
29
30
31

32 In 2011 the IUCN declared the Western Black Rhinoceros extinct citing poaching as the main
33 reason for this species’ demise. The remaining five species are presently listed on the IUCN’s
34 Red List of threatened species with three of these being classified as critically endangered (Save
35 the Rhino, 2015). Despite efforts to protect the species from human exploitation, the effects of
36 habitat loss and poaching have been severe (Save the Rhino, 2015). The harsh and cruel reality
37 of poaching and the inhumane impact it has on the rhinoceros is captured by a conservationist,
38 who describes how rhinoceros’ “... natural world collided with man’s destructive, greed-fuelled
39 way of life. For the rhinos the result of this clash was a new world of pain, blood, blindness,
40 suffering and a mighty struggle to survive” (Peirce, 2013, p. 139).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48


49 South Africa has been particularly hard hit. The country has the one of the world’s largest
50 populations of the rhinoceros. The country’s Kruger National Park, for instance, boasts an
51 estimated 5,000 animals (SANParks). Poaching in South Africa has, however, reached a crisis
52 point. A total of 668 animals were lost to poaching during 2012 with the Kruger National Park
53 worst affected after reporting 425 animals lost to poachers. The number of deaths exceeded
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1,000 animals in 2013 increasing to 1,215 in 2014 thereby threatening the survival of the species
4 (South African Department of Environmental Affairs, 2013). Statistics released by the South
5 African Department of Environmental Affairs highlight the escalating extent of the crisis (see
6 Figure 1). The Kruger National Park has remained the biggest target for poachers so far in 2015,
7 with 290 rhino killed there between January and the end of April. The South African
8 Environmental Minister stated that 393 had already been lost to poachers by May 2015.
9 However, there has been a sharp increase in arrests.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 Poaching exists because of the high value placed on rhinoceros horn. Recent statistics suggest
19 that the market price of horn has increased from between 400 and 700 per cent and for Taiwan
20 the price has grown by 2,800 percent (Walker and Walker, 2012). In 1979 the average price for
21 African rhinoceros horn in the Asian market was US\$550 per kilogram. This had increased to as
22 much as US\$1,000 per kilogram by 1993 and is currently around US\$60,000 per kilogram
23 (Walker and Walker, 2012).
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Figure 1

31 Poaching statistics
32
33
34
35



54 (Save the Rhino, 2015⁴)
55
56
57

58 ⁴ https://www.savetherhino.org/rhino_info/poaching_statistics
59
60

1
2
3 Much of the increase in poaching is the result of a growing illegal trade in rhinoceros horn for
4 supply to Asian Markets (IUCN, 2013). As a result, the IUCN and the South African Department
5 of Environmental Affairs are attempting to address the problem by lobbying for revised regional
6 and international trade laws which will curb the supply of rhinoceros horn. This has been
7 complemented by a concerted effort at educating Asian consumers to combat the cultural belief
8 that the animal's horn can be used as an aphrodisiac (IUCN, 2013). In the 1950s it was reported
9 that rhino horn was believed to ease childbirth and that owners or horns would rent them out for
10 the equivalent of £30 to expectant mothers (Gee, 1959). Rhinoceros horn is valued as a medicine
11 and in many decorative ways by cultures the world over. The South African Police Service
12 (SAPS) has also joined the fight, declaring the illegal trade of rhinoceros horn to be a priority
13 issue. Arrests increased from 165 in 2010 to 267 in 2012. This has gone hand-in-hand with
14 revisions to legislation including stricter controls on hunting permits and the transportation of
15 horn leading to a reduction in the number of hunting applications from 222 in 2011 to 90 in 2012
16 (South African Department of Environmental Affairs, 2014). At the same time, the National
17 Environmental Management Laws First Amendment Bill and the National Environmental
18 Management Laws Second Amendment Bill have been tabled in an effort to curb the abuse of
19 the hunting permit system and make it easier to hold individuals engaged in these activities
20 criminally liable. The Bills will further restrict the transport of specimens making trafficking of
21 horns more difficult (South African Department of Environmental Affairs, 2014).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Nevertheless, the country's dwindling population of rhinoceros remains at risk. Poaching units
39 are normally well equipped and trained making it difficult for park rangers (with limited funding)
40 to combat these criminals. This has prompted a significant response from the private sector with
41 many of South Africa's largest companies introducing a number of initiatives to raise much
42 needed funds to deal with the unprecedented poaching of one of South Africa's "Big Five".
43 Conservationists have long concerned themselves with the rhinoceroses' extinction threat
44 commenting for example, "... the world has to unite to save its heritage, a biological legacy that
45 involves more than rhinos. Conservation is the responsibility of all nations, not just a few. If we
46 cannot protect rhinos, why should we expect a better fate for ourselves?" (Cunningham and
47 Berger, 1997, p.230). Passionate conservations and ecologists need the assistance of
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 multinational corporations and big business if they are to succeed in preventing extinction. We
4 see from the analysis that follows the many initiatives and projects underway to reduce poaching,
5 enhance rhinoceros populations and prevent extinction. It is, however, extremely difficult to
6 prevent extinction when a species such as the rhinoceros has attracted financial value,
7 constructed through the social perceptions associated with rhinoceros horn, with the cost of
8 trophy hunting, as well as the value of rhinoceros for business purposes such as ecotourism, "...
9 because of the way we have constructed the world to operate, wildlife must have an economic
10 value to make it viable and keep it worthwhile. It is not enough to say that the African bush and
11 wildlife must be preserved for its own safe, for aesthetic or moral reasons" (Booth, 1992, p.185).
12 This may have been the case in the past but we consider in this paper whether the urgency of
13 extinction threat has brought even big business to consider extinction prevention for moral
14 reasons as well as for financial. The way in which the value of the animal dead balances against
15 the value of the animal alive is a dangerous economic predicament and one which can only be
16 addressed through hard work, education and collaboration between all parties involved.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **5. Research method**

30
31
32
33 In keeping with our aim of outlining an extinction accounting framework, we subscribed to a
34 social constructionist worldview. The language used by companies is seen as playing an
35 important role in constructing a specific organisational identity and demonstrating how
36 companies' discourse is being aligned with a broader social narrative (Laine, 2009b; Higgins and
37 Walker, 2012; Tregidga et al, 2014). As a result we use an interpretive text analysis (informed by
38 discourse analysis) to study the disclosures of the 41 of the largest companies listed on the
39 Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE)⁵. The companies included in our study are listed in Table
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 1.

47
48
49 **Table 1**

50 **List of companies included in the analysis**

51
52
53
54
55
56 ⁵ This was by market capitalisation at the time of data collection in 2014. The top 40 companies was selected but an
57 additional company was included in the analysis due to a change in ranking of the largest listed companies at the
58 time of review.

1	
2	
3	
4	Anglo American Platinum Ltd
5	Anglo American PL
6	
7	AngloGold Ashanti Ltd
8	
9	Aspen Pharmacare Holdings Ltd
10	
11	Assore Ltd
12	
13	Barclays Africa Group Ltd
14	
15	BHP Billiton PLC
16	
17	Bidvest Group Ltd
18	
19	British American Tobacco PLC
20	
21	Capital & Counties Properties PLC
22	
23	Compagnie Financiere Richemont SAC
24	
25	Discovery Ltd
26	
27	Exxaro Resources Ltd
28	
29	FirstRand Ltd
30	
31	Growthpoint Properties Ltd
32	
33	Impala Platinum Holdings Ltd
34	
35	Imperial Holdings Ltd
36	
37	Intu Properties PLC
38	
39	Investec Ltd
40	
41	Investec PLC
42	
43	Kumba Iron Ore Ltd
44	
45	Life Healthcare Group Holdings Ltd
46	
47	Mediclinic International Ltd
48	
49	Mondi Ltd
50	
51	Mondi PLC
52	
53	MR Price Group Ltd
54	
55	MTN Group Ltd
56	
57	Naspers Ltd
58	
59	Nedbank Group Ltd
60	
	Old Mutual PLC

Reinet Investments SCA
Remgro Ltd
RMB Holdings Ltd
SABMiller PLC
Sanlam Ltd
Sasol Ltd
Shoprite Holdings Ltd
Standard Bank Group SBK
Steinhoff International Holdings Ltd
Tiger Brands Ltd
Woolworths Holdings Ltd

The researchers considered the content in integrated reports and sustainability reports and on the above companies' webpages from 2011-2013 which was the period covering the most significant increases in poaching year-on-year. In addition, the researchers were able to gain a sense of whether or not disclosures were being provided consistently over this time and were not limited to a particular year⁶.

We concentrate on these organisations for four reasons. Firstly as listed companies they are required by the JSE (from 2010) to either prepare an integrated report or provide reasons for not doing so (Atkins and Maroun, 2015). They should have a detailed understanding of reporting on different types of capital and explaining interconnections between various financial and non-financial performance measures (IIRC, 2013). As such, they offer established cases for investigating the emergence of new forms of accounting practice. Secondly, the nature and extent of information provided to users is likely to be less affected by resource constraints. In other words, the reports provide a reasonable account of the issues which these companies deemed relevant rather than reflecting the information which could be provided subject to material cost constraints. Thirdly, the resources available to these organisations mean that they have the ability to engage actively with their stakeholders and affect specific societal change.

⁶ The 2014 and 2015 periods were not included as the reports were not available at the time of data collection, which occurred from June to December 2014.

1
2
3 Finally, the sample is made up of a range of companies from different sectors including food
4 production, retail, financial services and mining. The aim was not to identify reporting trends by
5 industry but the researchers wanted to gain a sense of reporting by South African companies in
6 general rather than focusing on those sectors (such as extraction, construction and energy) which
7 have a high environmental impact and may be more likely to report on biodiversity losses.
8
9

14 *Data collection and analysis*

15
16
17 Data were collected from integrated reports, sustainability reports and corporate websites and
18 were analysed systematically by two of the researchers. They read each corporate report in detail
19 identifying references to biodiversity issues. Three specific types of content were concentrated
20 on: narrative on the rhinoceros, disclosures dealing conservation in general and references to
21 extinction of species.
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 In keeping with a social constructionist approach, the researchers made no effort to quantify the
29 disclosures in a positivist sense. Instead, each section was reviewed carefully to identify content
30 on accounting for extinction and how diction and tone was used to convey the corporates' views
31 on rhinoceros poaching and the need for action (adapted from Laine, 2009b; Merkl-Davies et al,
32 2011; Solomon and Maroun, 2012; Tregidga et al, 2014). To do this, each section of the reports
33 or webpages under review were examined in the context of the discussion on the role and
34 limitations of the GRI and biodiversity reporting (Section 2) and the possibility of the content
35 being used in an impression management or transformative/emancipatory role (Section 3).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 This was a time consuming process which required each company's disclosure to be analysed at
45 least twice. The interpretive approach used for analysing the data also relied significantly on the
46 researchers' judgement. As a result, to ensure reliability, the final analysis of the integrated
47 reports, sustainability reports and company webpages was reviewed by the lead researcher for
48 reasonableness. Draft results, were also presented at three different conferences to ensure that the
49 findings resonated with a broad audience.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results were grouped according to broad theme headings as presented in Section 6.1. This was used to gain a sense of the scope of reporting dealing with the rhinoceros and identify links between corporate narrative and the transformative potential of accounting systems, as discussed in Section 1 and Section 3. It must be stressed that this process was not intended to follow a scientific method. The relatively limited body of research dealing with accounting for extinction (Jones and Solomon, 2013) resulted in a subjective analytical approach which progressed in hermeneutical manner unrestricted by a rigid methodological framework (Llewelyn, 2003; Laine, 2009b). In this light, theme headings were developed interpretively by the researchers and the 'assignment' of specific content to different themes was informed by a lively debate among on the researchers on the 'essence' of each disclosure example under review. The aim was not to 'measure' the disclosures according to a defined scale but each to generate initial views on the emphasis being placed on the rhinoceros in corporate communication with stakeholders and gauge the sense of importance of the possible extinction of these animals (adapted from Laine, 2009b; Laine, 2009a). In this way, as explained by Laine (2009a, p. 1034), data analysis and reduction was not restrictively formal to allow for creative analysis and interpretation. Instead, the researchers relied on 'a process of subjective sense-making, which included numerous rounds of reading and various attempts to systematise the findings into a coherent interpretation'.

6. Findings from the interpretive content analysis

Our disclosure analysis revealed the following themes: (1) educational-focused initiatives; (2) direct wildlife protection initiatives; (3) partnership and collaborative corporate initiatives; (4) customer-focused initiatives; (5) stakeholder-focused initiatives; (6) genuine concern for native wildlife and cultural heritage in South Africa; (7) materiality of rhinoceros initiatives; ; (8) specific disclosures relating to extinction; and (9) business incentives for rhinoceros protection and conservation. Many of these themes indicate the emergence of a corporate discourse aligned with a social narrative which is championing the plight of the rhinoceros. There are indications of a growing awareness of the effects of poaching and a need for change, problematising the extinction threat for the rhinoceros. This is complemented by evidence of specific corporate action and 'call to arms' aimed at different stakeholders. The specific themes are discussed in Section 6.1.

1
2
3 Section 6.2 explains how these themes are indicative of an emerging form of ‘extinction
4 accounting’.
5
6
7

8 9 **6.1: Theme identification**

10 11 *Educational-focused Initiatives*

12
13
14
15
16 The disclosures show that Woolworths ran a campaign from 2013, ‘Swipe for Africa’, which
17 targeted over 400 South African schools. This initiative aimed to raise awareness among
18 schoolchildren about endangered species and raised funds for rhinoceros conservation. The
19 company reported that three schools each raised R100 000⁷ plus the chance to donate R100 000
20 to the charity of their choice (paid for by the company?) (Good Business Journey Report, 2013,
21 p.41). They also ran a ‘rhino bags’ initiative, where Woolworth explains, “these bags have
22 educated consumers on the facts”, (Good Business Journey Report, 2013, p.79) indicating an
23 educational motive behind the initiative and perhaps also the disclosure.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 32 *Direct Wildlife Protection Initiatives*

33
34
35 There are a wide range of initiatives in which companies are engaged in order to protect and
36 conserve rhinoceros. The Investec website, for example, provides detailed information regarding
37 the necessary initiatives and how they are contributing to them at all levels. Similarly, Vodacom
38 Group Ltd explain that, although the tracking and monitoring of endangered species is critical to
39 their conservation and protection, many African game reserves do not have the capacity to “run
40 effective monitoring programmes and require assistance to ensure this vital component of
41 conservation is carried out” (Company website., Wildlife ACT, Vodacom Corporate). To assist
42 in this respect, Vodacom developed machine-to-machine technology which tracks wildlife. They
43 explain that this technology took only 30 minutes to configure and two weeks to implement with
44 zero server downtime.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ⁷ South Africa’s currency is the Rand. At the time of review, 1USD = R13.
59

1
2
3 Standard Bank Group Ltd stated in their 2012 Sustainability Report that they had held sessions
4 on rhino poaching interventions during the year. Further, Standard Bank hosted an event in
5 March at which a multi-million rand donation was provided to SANParks. The aim of this
6 donation was to enhance rhinoceros protection in the Kruger National Park. The company
7 explained in an online blog that this funding would be used to create, "... an Intensive Protection
8 Zone using sophisticated detection and tracking equipment, as well as infrastructure in the air
9 and on land"⁸. The bank also provided preferential banking fees and interest on the funds
10 donated.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Mondi Plc highlights its global best practice case study in the company's sustainable
20 development review.⁹ The case study focuses on the company's SiyaQhubeka Forests, in
21 KwaZulu-Natal. The company has partnered with government, local communities and other
22 corporations to ensure that approximately 9,000 hectares of land is incorporated into the
23 iSimangaliso Wetland park to ensure habitat for rhinoceros as well as other endangered species.
24 (It is notable that there is significant repetition regarding this case study on the company's
25 sustainable development reports of 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014, indicating a tendency for boiler-
26 plate disclosure.)
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The extractive company, Exxaro Resources Ltd, explains on the corporate website that one of its
36 subsidiaries, Kumba Resources Limited, has announced that Ferroland, the wholly owned
37 subsidiary responsible for the management of Kumba's natural resources, has expanded their
38 Menketti Reserve from 6,000 to 14,000 hectares, thus creating one of the largest privately-held
39 wildlife reserves in South Africa.¹⁰
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Compagnie Financiere Richemont SAC stated in their annual report (2014) that, in response to
47 the illegal wildlife trade that is destroying Africa's elephant and rhino populations, they have
48 launched a programme to combat wildlife crime. However, the report does not provide further
49 details about this programme.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ⁸ Taken from the #Aid4Rhino Standard Bank blog.

57 ⁹ See the following website: <http://www.newgenerationplantations.com/pdf/case6.pdf>

58 ¹⁰ Follow the direct link: <http://www.exxaro.com/index.php/kumba-resources-expands-wildlife-reserve/>
59
60

1
2
3 Anglo American PLC discuss their vision for the future as they plan to develop a wildlife park
4 which will be used to promote educational and recreational activities. They plan to introduce
5 game drives and hiking trails in order to be able to extend the park and support game such as the
6 white rhinoceros.¹¹
7
8
9

10
11
12 These initiatives involve committing substantial resource to rhinoceros protection and
13 conservation. Importantly, this is not only in terms of direct monetary contributions. There are
14 examples of companies engaging actively with different stakeholder groups (such as RAGE) and
15 developing specific technological solutions using their in-house expertise.
16
17
18

19 20 21 *Partnership and Collaborative Corporate Initiatives* 22

23
24 Companies discussed numerous partnerships with a wide range of groups in their corporate
25 reports and on their websites. For example, Old Mutual has partnered with Earth Night in order
26 to raise funds for conservation projects including rhinoceros protection and conservation.¹²
27 Investec Ltd. stated in their 2013 integrated report that they have partnered with scientific
28 experts to launch Investec Rhino Lifeline. The aim of this initiative is to raise awareness of the
29 rhinoceros crisis and respond through education, rescue and prevention initiatives. Specifically,
30 Investec emphasise that this partnership is motivated by recognition of the "... intensity of the
31 rhino issue in Southern Africa" (Integrated Report, 2013, p.110). As an additional illustration,
32 First Rand Ltd states that it supports the Endangered Wildlife Trust and highlights their work in
33 conserving rhinoceros as well as other endangered species.¹³ Similarly, the website of the Game
34 Ranger Association stated that Barclays Africa Group have partnered with Prince Albert II of
35 Monaco to sponsor the Rhinoceros Conservation Awards.¹⁴
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Partnerships between organisations and various environmental experts/NGO's were
48 complemented by collaborations between organisations which would otherwise view each other
49 as competitors. For example, Bavaria Brewery, facilitated a campaign, 'Adopt So Our Rhino'
50
51
52

53
54 ¹¹ See the company's website

55 ¹² See the company website, <http://www.oldmutual.co.za/> under press releases

56 ¹³ See the company website: FirstRand Foundation

57 ¹⁴ See the website of the Game Ranger Association on <http://www.gameranger.org/news-views/89-nominations-for-the-rhino-conservation-awards-are-now-open-3.html>
58
59

1
2
3 Don't Die'. This collaboration included Woolworths, Spar, Massmart, Pick 'n Pay and divisions
4 of the Shoprite Checkers Group. All of the collaborators matched a margin sacrifice from every
5 purchaser of any six-pack of select drinks to raise funds for this initiative. Similarly, the Rhino
6 Action Group, RAGE, is conducting a massive public campaign to raise public awareness and
7 encourage participation in conversation programmes. The aim is also to bring attention to those
8 companies which are donating funds and resources to rhinoceros conservation and protection.
9 Companies collaborating in this initiative included the large retailers, banks and media houses.¹⁵
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 *Customer-focused Initiatives for Rhinoceros Conservation and Preservation*

19

20
21 Many of the corporate initiatives appeared to be focused primarily on customer stakeholder
22 groups. For example, Woolworths Holding Ltd produced a 'Good Business Journey Report' each
23 year from of the period studied in which they described the launch of their 'rhino bags' initiative,
24 explaining that this was in response to the "dramatic increase in rhino poaching". The bag is a
25 limited edition, reusable bag which asks customers to 'Imagine No Rhino'. They then donate
26 R10 from the sale of each bag to, "help protect remaining rhino populations from extinction"
27 (Good Journey Business Report, 2011, p.60). By 2011, Woolworths Holding Ltd. had sold
28 600,000 rhino bags, amounting to a donation of over R1 million. The company has been working
29 in partnership with the WWF, channelling these funds into financing anti-poaching equipment
30 and to supporting rangers across the region.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Further, Woolworths has introduced a MyPlanet card for customers. Customers can select which
41 of three charities they would like to support, one of which is the Endangered Wildlife Trust
42 (EWT) Rhino Fund. The company then donates a percentage of the purchase to the charity
43 selected. In April 2013, Woolworths also launched the 'Every Paw Print Counts' range of
44 bracelets, sweets and reusable bags. These are aimed to "... raise additional awareness and
45 funds" (Good Business Journey Report, 2013, p.41) for charities including the EWT MyPlanet
46 Rhino Fund. This initiative raised over R100,000 in its first year.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹⁵ See the RAGE website, "Rhino Action Group Means Business".
59
60

1
2
3 Nedbank Group Ltd have a high profile in green initiatives in South Africa. In 1990, together
4 with World Wildlife Fund-South Africa (WWF-SA), Nedbank founded WWF Nedbank Green
5 Trust, which aims to protect the unique biological diversity of Southern Africa and to counter the
6 adverse effects of unsustainable development. Their corporate website has a substantial section
7 entitled, 'Nedbank Green Affinity', which details their green financial products. For every Green
8 Affinity savings account opened by a customer, the bank makes a donation of R2.50 initially
9 followed by a quarterly contribution to the Green Trust, based on the client's daily credit
10 balance. For customers holding a Nedbank Green Affinity credit card, the bank donates monthly
11 to the Green Trust a percentage of total purchases. Further, when a customer opens a Nedbank
12 Green Affinity current account, the bank donates a fixed monthly fee to the Green Trust, with no
13 additional premium charged to clients.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 In relation specifically to rhinoceros protection, Nedbank stated on a recent blog that continued
26 strategic action is crucial across the entire illicit rhinoceros horn trafficking network in order to
27 address the South African rhinoceros poaching crisis. The blog quotes the latest statistics on
28 rhinoceros poaching demonstrating an educational and awareness-raising element to the
29 company's extinction accounting on their website disclosures.
30
31
32
33
34

35 Nedbank's initiatives have raised more than R115 million to date for more than 180 major
36 conservation projects. Despite this being a clearly 'green initiative', it does have a financial
37 benefit for the company by attracting customers and enhancing corporate reputation. As a result,
38 it can be argued that there is an element of impression management. The sums being contributed
39 to wildlife conservation and preservation are, however, substantial and the impact on rhinoceros
40 preservation and conservation is likely to be significant suggesting that the company's 'green
41 initiatives' are a genuine form of sustainability engagement.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 *Stakeholder-focused Initiatives*

51
52

53 Companies are tapping into societal concern over rhinoceros extinction by encouraging the
54 general public to participate in initiatives. Although companies are donating money to rhinoceros
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conservation, this is only in response to stakeholder action. In a way, this is placing the emphasis
4 on public participation rather than purely corporate philanthropy.
5
6
7

8
9 For example, in addition to providing preferential treatment for funds donated to SANParks,
10 Standard Bank launched a social media campaign in order to raise significant donations to
11 rhinoceros protection in the Kruger National Park. The bank pledged to donate R10 to the
12 SANParks account for every sharing of the post #Aid4Rhino.
13
14
15

16 17 18 *Genuine Concern for Native Wildlife and Cultural Heritage in South Africa* 19

20
21 Some of the disclosures suggested a genuine concern for native wildlife and the cultural heritage
22 of South Africa. For example, Woolworths stated, "... wherever we are in South Africa, our
23 behaviour affects our precious wildlife" (Good Business Journey Report, 2013, p.41). Similarly,
24 Investec stated that they are "... proud to be associated with a number of non-profit organisations
25 that are working hard toward creating a sustainable future and preserving the future security of
26 the world's rich cultural and national heritage" (Integrated Report, 2013, p.110). Further,
27 Investec state that:
28
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 "Given Investec's African roots, we are passionate about ensuring the continued
36 existence of a number of African species. We, therefore, fund three biodiversity
37 projects which are focused around rhinos, wild dogs and the impact of renewable
38 energy on local birdlife. These initiatives allow Investec to give back to the
39 environment and help ensure the sustainable existence of South African wildlife"
40 (Sustainability Report, 2013, p.25).
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Investec also stated that,
48
49

50
51 "South Africa loses rhinos on a daily basis. The rhino crisis has become the most
52 significant conservation issue faced by the country. Poaching attacks represent
53 lawlessness, a lack of political will, human greed, and a disregard for the wellbeing of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 animals in spite of the most dramatic public response in our conservation history”
4
5 (Sustainability Report, 2013, p.25).
6
7

8
9 This seems to go far further than impression management or reputation-building type
10 disclosures. The above extract displays a genuine desire to contribute to avoiding rhinoceros
11 extinction and to enhance South Africa’s wildlife due to a love for the country’s heritage. In the
12 authors’ views, the comments are too passionate to be motivated purely by impression
13 management. This disclosure also seems to portray a corporate form of accounting which adopts
14 a moral high ground and takes a purely ethical stance. The ‘reality’ being constructed and
15 communicated through this corporate reporting is one which appears to hold rhinoceros
16 protection and extinction prevention at a premium.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 ***Materiality of Rhinoceros Initiatives***

25
26
27
28 We did not find examples of companies dealing specifically with the rhinoceros as part of their
29 materiality considerations in their integrated or sustainability reports. For example, there were no
30 definitions of ‘materiality’ in these documents which explained how different conservation
31 efforts were being evaluated or the processes used to decide what information to include in the
32 different reports. The researchers did not, however, feel that this detracted from the emphasis
33 being placed on rhinoceros conservation.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Materiality, in general, was not explained in detail. Consistent with some of the prior research,
42 companies appear to be battling with the concept of ‘materiality’ (which is often financially-
43 focused) in the context of qualitative non-financial reporting (Atkins and Maroun, 2015; Edgley
44 et al, 2015; PWC, 2015). Consequently, the fact that different conservation efforts were not
45 linked directly to a clearly laid out materiality assessment does not automatically mean that the
46 disclosures are simply provided for the sake of impression management.
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 On the contrary, the sums contributed to rhinoceros conservation and protection by many of the
55 companies we studied are substantial and, in several cases, likely to be material for the
56 companies involved. For example, Woolworths’ Integrated Report (2012) states that their,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “Annual contribution to society around us ranges from R1 million for protecting rhinos through
4 the sale of our rhino bags” (Integrated report, 2012, p.14). Thus, the company considers this is a
5 material financial amount which should be reported in the integrated report. This suggests that a
6 form of ‘extinction accounting’ may be starting to enter the primary annual report.
7
8
9

10 11 12 *Specific Disclosures relating to Extinction* 13

14
15
16 Mediclinic International Ltd comment specifically on extinction threats. The company’s
17 integrated report deals with the size of land holdings adjacent to protected areas, including those
18 with high biodiversity value. The organisation comments on the significant impact of its products
19 and services on biodiversity and its strategies, current actions and future plans for managing the
20 impact on biodiversity. Of particular importance for the purpose of this paper is specific
21 disclosure dealing with the number of IUCN Red List species and national conservation list
22 species with habitats in areas affected by operations. This information appears to be aggregated
23 by level of extinction risk (Integrated Report, 2011, p.121; Sustainability Report, 2013, p.68;
24 Sustainability Report, 2012, p.64; Sustainability Report, 2011, p.121). The corporate website for
25 Investec states that,
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 “South Africa is losing rhinos daily, through poaching. It is the most significant
36 conservation issue faced by the country and time is running out. In 2012 Investec
37 established Investec Rhino Lifeline to respond to this crisis ... By working closely
38 with our trusted partners and supporters, and by taking a hands-on approach, we
39 believe that we can make a difference in saving the rhino and ensuring its long-term
40 survival.”¹⁶
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 This does not seem to coincide with public relations-driven disclosure aimed at building
49 corporate reputation and managing impressions. Rather it appears to be a form of accounting
50 driven by the realisation of imminent extinction of a species. Again, there is impassioned
51 language used in this ‘extinction accounting’. For example, “Rhinos are at the centre of a violent,
52
53
54

55
56
57 ¹⁶ This is from the company website; <https://www.investec.co.za/about-investec/sustainability/planet/investec-rhino-lifeline.html>.
58

1
2
3 well-organised series of poaching attacks in South Africa due to rampant trade in rhino horn”.
4 This depicts a form of corporate reporting which is characterised by sincere, emotional, rhetoric,
5 which is quite the opposite of traditional accounting rhetoric based on calculative rationalities.
6
7 Imperial Holdings Ltd stated that,
8
9

10
11
12 “The plight of South Africa’s rhinos continued to dominate headlines during the year,
13 with poaching reaching epidemic proportions. In response to the situation the
14 Distribution, Retail and Allied Services division launched a programme to provide
15 protection to 12 white rhinos in the Rietvlei Nature Reserve outside Pretoria”
16
17 (Sustainability Report, 2013, p.55).
18
19
20
21
22

23 The disclosure goes on to explain that the company provided the financial support for each
24 rhinoceros to be tagged and to assist in ongoing security within the reserve. In the 2013
25 Sustainability Report, Imperial explains that tight security, base stations and tracking allows
26 rangers to monitor the rhinoceros constantly. Imperial are also funding a new initiative to fit
27 transmitters into the horns of rhinoceros which send out a distress signal if the animal’s
28 movements are abnormal or irregular.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Dealing with extinction more broadly, BHP Billiton plc state unequivocally that, “We will not be
36 operating where there is a risk of direct impacts to ecosystems that could result in the extinction
37 of an IUCN Red List Threatened Species in the wild” (Sustainability Report, 2014, p.29). This is
38 a strong commitment whose disclosure creates a reality where the company would, theoretically
39 at least, forego profitable opportunities and projects to prevent extinction of any threatened
40 species.¹⁷
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Finally, it was interesting to note that some of the extinction-related disclosures suggest that
49 customers (as an important stakeholder group), as well as the companies, are required to take
50 action. For example, with the MyPlanet card, Woolworths is tapping into societal concern in
51 order to develop their reputation for conserving the rhinoceros, as they commented,
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹⁷ This statement does, however, raise questions about how this disclosure could be audited and assured?
59
60

1
2
3 “Woolworths customers proved in a big way that they are not prepared to settle for the
4 ‘Big 4’” (Good Business Journey Report, 2012, p.67).
5
6
7

8 ***Business Case Incentive for Rhinoceros Protection and Conservation***

9
10
11
12 In addition to evidence supporting an ethical and cultural incentive for South African companies
13 to engage in initiatives and campaigns to conserve and protect rhinoceros, there is a clear
14 business case, especially for the eco-tourism industry. Remgro, originally a tobacco company
15 (founded in the 1940s by Dr Anton Rupert) is now an investment house. In their business model,
16 discussed on the company’s website, they explain that,
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 “As a shareholder of the investee companies, Remgro also exercises its shareholder
24 rights to ensure as far as possible that the entities concerned adhere to its
25 requirements in respect of matters such as governance, internal controls, financial
26 management, risk management, legal compliance, safety, health and environmental
27 management, internal audit, ethics management, information management,
28 stakeholder relationships and sustainability”.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 It seems that Remgro focuses on a responsible investment strategy. The company has a specific
36 interest in SANParks and in conservation due to the founding of the Peace Parks Foundation
37 (PPF) by the company’s founder Dr. Anton Rupert (working with Dr Nelson Mandela and Prince
38 Bernhard of the Netherlands). The aim of the PPF was to manager the country’s natural
39 resources so as to increase socio-economic development opportunities through eco-tourism.
40 Remgro discuss the threat to South Africa’s competitive advantage in ecotourism due to a
41 marked increase in wildlife crime, especially rhinoceros poaching.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Similarly, there is strong evidence from Exxaro’s disclosure of a business case for rhinoceros
50 protection and conservation,
51
52
53

54
55 “We believe conservation is becoming increasingly important, given the enormous
56 value of biodiversity and tourism to the South African economy. Accordingly, we
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 intend to be a mining company that leads by example in protecting, enhancing and
4 conserving the country's biodiversity and demonstrating that mining activities can co-
5 exist with world-class biodiversity conservation initiatives. That way, we ensure the
6 right of future generations to a healthy, complete and rich environment. Various
7 conservation measures are being implemented that underscore Exxaro's commitment
8 to entrench duty-of-care principles" (Integrated Report, 2012, p.120).
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16 We can see from these illustrations that, despite emergence of possibly ethically driven and more
17 genuine 'extinction accounting', there remain elements of a more self-serving form of disclosure
18 based on corporate reputation and impression management as well as an eco-tourism business
19 case.
20
21
22
23

24 **6.2: Developing an extinction accounting framework**

25
26
27
28 The companies under review are providing information on different biodiversity metrics and, in
29 particular, details on IUCN Red List species affected by their operations. They also include some
30 detail on conservation initiatives with they support.
31
32
33
34

35 This points to only a basic-level of sustainability awareness and disclosure (see Grabsch et al,
36 2012; van Liempd and Busch, 2013). Biodiversity reporting and GRI disclosures can be seen as
37 part of a process of impression management. The organisations under review are including at
38 least some information on rhinoceros conservation in their annual, integrated or sustainability
39 reports to address societal expectations and appear to be concerned about the possible extinction
40 of the species. Extinction accounting goes beyond this biodiversity or general conservation
41 discourse. It reveals, albeit subtly, the possibility of an emancipatory type of accounting which
42 is characterised by a belief in the need to save the rhinoceros on deep ecological grounds and
43 ensure that substantive steps are taken to deal with the risk of extinction (as a specific
44 sustainability consideration)¹⁸ whilst acknowledging the reporter's potential to make a
45 difference.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹⁸ Special thanks to one of our reviewers for helping to articulate this point.
59
60

1
2
3 As discussed in Section 2 and Section 3.2, biodiversity reporting is often descriptive and
4 superficial. The information is seldom integrated with explanations of how the reporting entity
5 develops its strategy, manages risks and monitors different elements of performance (see, for
6 example, Tregidga, 2013; van Liempd and Busch, 2013; Samkin et al, 2014; Mansoor and
7 Maroun, 2016). Alternatively, 'biodiversity' is understood in purely anthropocentric terms. It is
8 presented as an element of financial risk management rather than a sincere commitment to
9 minimising the effects on the ecosystem (Atkins et al, 2014). In contrast, reporting on the plight
10 of the rhinoceros involves a different perspective.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The examples in Section 6.1 provide evidence of companies appreciating the beauty of the
20 animal and its cultural relevance. In the authors' views, this points to deep ecological framing.
21 There is a sense that species must be preserved, not because of the immediate business case, but
22 because of the moral and social costs of failing to take immediate action as well as because of the
23 rhinoceros' intrinsic value. The fact that none of the companies under review are engaged
24 directly in eco-tourism reaffirms this view. In each instance, the rhinoceros is not a direct
25 'component' or 'element' in the respective organisations' business models weakening the
26 anthropocentric case for championing conservation initiatives. For example, the rhinoceros does
27 not affect a food retailer's primary activities to the same extent as issues such as climate change
28 and sustainable agriculture. Nevertheless, one such organisation (Woolworths) goes to
29 considerable lengths to explain the different projects it supports to combat poaching.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 There is, of course, an element of image management. Companies like Woolworths and Nedbank
41 probably benefit from the reputation of being environmentally aware. This does not, however,
42 mean that rhinoceros-related reporting is merely an example of philanthropic accounting or
43 impression management (see Section 3.1). There are several factors which support this view.
44
45
46
47
48

49 Firstly, rhinoceros disclosures were not limited to specific organisations or those in particular
50 sectors. There are widespread accounts on different conservation efforts, the effects of poaching
51 and the possibility of the species being driven to extinction. Secondly, these disclosures are more
52 than just a basic narrative (cf Cho et al, 2015). Conservation efforts are being integrated with
53 CSR policies and strategies and there is evidence of specific actions being taken to combat
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 poaching. For example, and as discussed in Section 6.1, organisations are devoting financial
4 resources *and* their technical expertise to aid government, NGO's and park rangers. This is
5 complemented by active engagement with different stakeholders and the formation of
6 partnerships as part of a long-term plan to support rhinoceros conservation. This is the case even
7 when the collaborating companies would otherwise view each other as competitors. Equally
8 important is accounting's enabling role which, as explained by Hopwood (1987), is easy to
9 overlook.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 The impressive calculative and organisational infrastructure making up the accounting systems
18 of South Africa's large listed companies is being mobilised as part of the conservation effort.
19 These accounting systems contribute to the public awareness of the threats posed by poaching by
20 reporting information in integrated reports and on websites. They also provide the means for
21 individuals to contribute to tackling poaching, whether by investing in particular financial
22 instruments (Nedbank), purchasing special shopping bags (Woolworths) or following a particular
23 blog (Standardbank) in order to raise funds for conservation. In several cases material amounts
24 of money are being raised and significant time and effort is being invested in the environmental
25 project implying that there is more at work than just impression management and philanthropic
26 accounting (cf Solomon et al, 2013; Cho et al, 2015).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 Finally, the researchers reflected on the tone of the corporate reports. As discussed in
38 Section 6.1, there were several examples of shock and outrage at the prospect of one of the Big
39 Five being driven into extinction. This went hand-in-hand with suggestions that companies are
40 morally obligated to act, even though they are not directly responsible for poaching and the
41 rhinoceros is not a material financial consideration: they may not be directly responsible but they
42 are acknowledging an ability to influence the creature's survival. Equally important were
43 examples calling on stakeholders (most often customers) to support different corporate projects
44 aimed at protecting the rhinoceros.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 In the authors' opinion, the indicators discussed above provided clear evidence of an emerging
54 form of accounting. This new type of 'accounting' is shifting organisational boundaries. South
55 African companies are clearly reacting to possible extinction of a specific species. Organisational
56
57
58
59
60

discourse is changing. The companies under review are not only discussing financial considerations but advocating a deep ecological stance on rhinoceros conservation aligned with a social narrative demanding the protection of the species. In this way, ‘extinction accounting’ raises awareness of the risk of a specie’s extinction (see Gray et al, 1995), provides evidence of specific corporate actions in response to that risk (see Cho et al, 2015) and mobilises a broad group of stakeholders in an effort to prevent the species being wiped out (see Atkins et al, 2014). The essential features of ‘extinction accounting’ and how this accounting differs from biodiversity or philanthropic accounting is summarised in Figure 2.

Figure 2

Views of Researchers on Accounting for Biodiversity, Philanthropy and Extinction

	Accounting for Biodiversity	Philanthropic Accounting	Extinction Accounting
Motivation	Business case scenario Financial risk management Environmental governance Internal control	Reputation risk management Cosmetic accounting Impression management	Heritage Genuine desire to prevent species extinction Shock at extinction risk – especially of a key, visible species (rhino for example as a ‘special case’)
Content	Focus on show casing best practice Focused on financial risks and risk management	Focused on financial quantity of corporate giving	Emotional language and impassioned discussion of species extinction and efforts to prevent extinction Setting a moral high ground and an ethical stance Evidence of specific action A call to arms

Rather than develop an independent reporting framework, the authors use existing GRI principles as a starting point to ground extinction accounting in an existing discourse which is already well-understood and generally accepted. A potential schematic could include details on

1
2
3 different species impacted by an organisation's activities and the risk of extinction as currently
4 recommended by the GRI and IUCN. The framework must also take into consideration the
5 guidance provided by the integrated reporting initiative. In addition to factual reporting on
6 species, a company should strive to demonstrate an interconnection between the risk of
7 extinction, action plans and the evaluation of how its policies, plans and actions are appropriate
8 for addressing that risk.
9
10
11
12
13

14
15
16 In particular, an emergent extinction accounting framework should recognise the need for an
17 iterative reporting and reflection process. The entity proposes specific plans to address corporate
18 impact on endangered or threatened species. Consistent with the approach recommended by the
19 IIRC (2013), this takes into account the need for stakeholder engagement to form appropriate
20 partnerships to design and implement suitable responses. In the interest of balanced reporting,
21 these decisions (and their results) are disclosed but, given that the reporting process should be
22 emancipatory and engender change, the IIRC (and academic literature) stress the need for self-
23 reflection and revision. In a general integrated reporting context, this is to ensure that
24 organisations improve the articulation of their business models and the efficiency with which
25 they manage different capital transformations in order to create sustainable value (Eccles and
26 Krzus, 2010). Likewise, from the specific perspective of extinction accounting, the intention is to
27 understand better the impact the business is having on species by recording changes, developing
28 responses, implementing these and reflecting on and reacting to successes and failures.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 A possible framework would not only offer a structured approach for organisations to
41 conceptualise and report on the risk of extinction: it should also 'mesh' with the existing
42 integrated reporting model and should be useful for providing a basis for meaningful reporting
43 on environmental capital transformations as part of a broader integrated approach to corporate
44 reporting and business management. In this paper we do not provide an explicit framework as
45 this could limit and constrain the development and discourse surrounding a suitable extinction
46 framework. Instead, we explore the possible elements which in a large part issue from our
47 analysis of existing rhinoceros reporting.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **7. Concluding discussion**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The concept of ‘extinction accounting’ is introduced and discussed in this paper. It is seen as a
6 natural extension to biodiversity accounting. ‘Extinction accounting’ differs from biodiversity
7 accounting, however, in that it appears to be driven by different motivating factors. Whereas
8 prior research has concluded that biodiversity accounting is primarily motivated by a business
9 case scenario, impression management and enlightened shareholder value (Barone et al, 2013;
10 Solomon et al, 2013), our findings suggest that there may be an element of genuine philanthropy
11 at work. Further, ‘extinction accounting’, we feel, is one outcome of a societal shift in ecological
12 consciousness evidenced by a growing awareness of ongoing threats to biodiversity and the
13 harsh reality of extinction. This is especially relevant in the context of a high profile species such
14 as the rhinoceros which is promoting a change in organisational discourse and, related to this, the
15 focus of their stakeholder engagement.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 We find that the tone and focus of corporate reports (and webpage content) is not limited to
27 financial and economic considerations or ESG issues specific to the business model. The
28 companies under review deal with the rhinoceros – which is not directly linked to their primary
29 activities – in considerable detail. What is more, disclosures are not limited to descriptive
30 accounts of poaching and conservation. There are clear examples of corporates providing direct
31 financial and technical support and collaborating with different government agencies and NGO’s
32 to combat poaching. Partnerships of these forms are helping companies construct an ecological
33 corporate narrative through the accounting function allowing reports to become increasingly
34 representative of genuine rhinoceros protection and conservation as well as a desire to
35 communicate openly and effectively with stakeholders. Perhaps most telling is the use of the
36 entities’ accounting infrastructure to enhance awareness, engage a broad group of stakeholders
37 on the need to support conservation initiatives and provide the public with a practical means of
38 contributing to anti-poaching measures.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Collectively, we feel that these findings show that extinction of the rhinoceros is being identified
52 as a material issue. Companies are not simply reporting for the sake of managing impressions but
53 to prevent the demise of this culturally and biologically important species. In other words,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 organisational boundaries are shifting. Economic, technological and ideological changes are
4 being inspired by deep ecology.
5
6
7

8
9 Companies are contributing financial resources and providing operational support for
10 conservation initiatives which are not part of their business models. They are collaborating with
11 third parties which make no direct financial contribution and are even prepared to partner with
12 their competitors in an effort to reverse the effects of poaching. As such, there is a sense of
13 genuine concern for the plight of the species rather than an expectation that an investment in
14 anti-poaching initiatives should generate future financial returns. This view is reaffirmed by the
15 fact that the rhinoceros is not framed as part of a non-financial reporting compliance exercise.
16 The rhetoric found in corporate reports reveals a passionate drive to protect the species and real
17 anxiety about the extinction of this ecologically and culturally important animal. As a result, the
18 role of the accounting infrastructure is changing. Articulating financial performance is still a
19 primary consideration but companies' integrated and sustainability reports are also being
20 mobilised to provide an 'account' of the demise of the rhinoceros and reiterate the need for an
21 immediate response. In this way, corporate discourse and action are moving away from an
22 anthropocentric account of the environment to one informed by a deep ecological view and
23 aligning with the social narrative championing the need to protect the rhinoceros.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 To develop this form of 'extinction accounting' further, we suggest that a reporting framework
38 (which can be applied to social and environmental accounting) ought to be derived through a
39 normative and social constructionist tradition. This framework takes into account the existing
40 guidance provided by the GRI and the IIRC's integrated reporting framework. It stresses the
41 need to report on specific extinction indicators and to draw interconnections between the risk of
42 extinction, the reporting entity's action plans and the evaluation of how its policies are
43 appropriate for addressing that risk. Importantly, the relationship between risk and action is not
44 limited by the hegemony of financial capital. Instead it is grounded in a deep ecological view
45 that the preservation of a species is a moral, social imperative. Ultimately, the aim is not to
46 monetise extinction risk but to promote dialogue and engagement between multinational
47 corporations and their diverse stakeholders to promote positive change.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The exact form of extinction accounting is currently a work in progress. To develop the
4 accounting framework future research is required. We feel that to provide an explicit framework
5 at this stage could delimit emancipatory elements, could stifle further debate and may stunt the
6 evolution of a genuinely transformational reporting model. This study is limited to a single
7 species in a South African context. It would be useful to explore how companies in other
8 jurisdictions are responding to the threat of extinction. Theoretical eclecticism is also required.
9 This study relies on guidance provided by the GRI and IIRC, coupled with the prior research on
10 transformative accounting, to develop an extinction accounting framework. Alternate theoretical
11 perspectives can be used to refine extinction accounting. For example, exploratory methods can
12 be used to discover whether or not conversations between companies and their stakeholders are a
13 type of therapeutic dialogue between the therapist (e.g. RAGE) and the patient (company) in
14 order to recreate accounting as an emancipatory agent.¹⁹ It is possible that extinction accounting
15 may be fulfilling the desires and hopes of earlier researchers who promoted the notion of
16 emancipatory accounting which enhances societal welfare and leads us to a better place. Through
17 enhancing the tone of corporate communication and extending the scope of narrative reporting,
18 the hegemonic power of organisations can be harnessed via the accounting function to make
19 better social worlds.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 *“Rhinos have lived on Earth for more than 50 million years compared to humans’ span of less*
38 *than half a million. If rhinos can survive the current poaching onslaught and hang on until*
39 *Mother Nature strikes back, they may well still be around in another 50 million years, long after*
40 *man has caused his own destruction”.*
41
42
43

44 *Richard Peirce, 2013, p.139*
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 ¹⁹ See, for example, the following conference paper, Atkins et al., (2015).
58
59
60

References

- Adams, C. A. & Frost, G. R. 2008. Integrating sustainability reporting into management practices. *Accounting Forum*, 32 (4), 288-302.
- Adams, C. A. & McNicholas, P. 2007. Making a difference: Sustainability reporting, accountability and organisational change. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 20 (3), 382-402.
- Aerts, W. (2005). Picking up the pieces: Impression management in the retrospective attributional framing of accounting outcomes, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 30(5), 493–517.
- Atkins, J., Barone, E., Maroun, W. & Atkins, B. 2016. Bee accounting and accountability in the UK. In: Atkins, J. & Atkins, B. (eds.) *The Business of Bees: An Integrated Approach to Bee Decline and Corporate Responsibility*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishers.
- Atkins, J. & Maroun, W. 2015. Integrated reporting in South Africa in 2012: perspectives from South African institutional investors. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 23 (2), 197-221.
- Atkins, J., Atkins, B., Thomson, I. & Maroun, W. 2015. ‘Good’ news from nowhere: imagining utopian sustainable accounting. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 28 (5), 651-670.
- Atkins, J., Gräbsch, C. and Jones, M. J. (2014) “Biodiversity Reporting: Exploring its Anthropocentric Nature” chapter in Jones (eds.) *Accounting for Biodiversity*, Routledge, UK.
- Barone, E., Ranamagar, N. & Solomon, J. F. 2013. A Habermasian model of stakeholder (non)engagement and corporate (ir)responsibility reporting. *Accounting Forum*, 37 (3), 163-181
- Beattie, V., & Jones, M. J. (1992). The use and abuse of graphs in annual reports: A theoretical framework and an empirical study. *Accounting and Business Research*, 22(88), 291–303.
- Beattie, V., & Jones, M. J. (2002). Measurement distortion of graphs in corporate reports: An experimental study.
- Beattie, V., Dhanani, A., & Jones, M. J. (2008). Investigating Presentational change in UK Annual Reports: A longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Business Communication*, 45(2), 181–222.
- Beattie, V., McInnes, W., & Fearnley, S. (2004). Through the eyes of management: Narrative reporting across three sectors, research report. London, UK: Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales.
- Bebbington, J., Gray, R. & Owen, D. 1999. Seeing the wood for the trees: Taking the pulse of social and environmental accounting. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 12 (1), 47-52.
- Brown, W. O., Helland, E. and Smith, J. K (2006) Corporate philanthropic practices, *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 12(5), 855-877, December.
- Chen, J. C., Patten, D. M. And Roberts, R. W. (2008) “Corporate charitable contributions: A corporate social performance or legitimacy strategy?”, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 82, 131-144.

- 1
2
3 Cho, C. H., Laine, M., Roberts, R. W. & Rodrigue, M. 2015. Organized hypocrisy, organizational
4 façades, and sustainability reporting. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 40 (0), 78-94.
- 5
6 Cuckston, T. 2013. Bringing tropical forest biodiversity conservation into financial accounting
7 calculation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 26 (5), 688-714.
- 8
9
10 de Villiers, C. & Alexander, D. 2014. The institutionalisation of corporate social responsibility reporting.
11 *The British Accounting Review*, 46 (2), 198-212.
- 12
13 Dillard, J. & Reynolds, M. 2008. Green Owl and the Corn Maiden. *Accounting, Auditing &*
14 *Accountability Journal*, 21 (4), 556-579.
- 15
16 Eccles, R. G. & Krzus, M. P. 2010. Integrated Reporting for a Sustainable Strategy. Available:
17 [http://www.financialexecutives.org/KenticoCMS/Financial-Executive-](http://www.financialexecutives.org/KenticoCMS/Financial-Executive-Magazine/2010_03/Financial-Reporting-Feature--March-2010.aspx#axzz48iuAkAHV)
18 [Magazine/2010_03/Financial-Reporting-Feature--March-2010.aspx#axzz48iuAkAHV](http://www.financialexecutives.org/KenticoCMS/Financial-Executive-Magazine/2010_03/Financial-Reporting-Feature--March-2010.aspx#axzz48iuAkAHV) [Accessed
19 26 November 2012].
- 20
21
22
23 Edgley, C., Jones, M. J. & Atkins, J. 2015. The adoption of the materiality concept in social and
24 environmental reporting assurance: A field study approach. *The British Accounting Review*, 47
25 (1), 1-18.
- 26
27
28 Freeman, M.C. and Groom, B. (2013), "Biodiversity valuation and the discount rate problem",
29 *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 715-745.
- 30
31 Gallhofer, S. and Haslam, J. (2003) *Accounting and Emancipation: Some Critical Interventions*,
32 Routledge, London, UK.
- 33
34 Grabsch, C., Jones, M. J. & Solomon, J. F. 2012. Accounting for biodiversity in crisis: A European
35 Perspective. working paper, Kings College, London.
- 36
37 Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith
38
- 39 Gray, R. 2010. Is accounting for sustainability actually accounting for sustainability...and how would we
40 know? An exploration of narratives of organisations and the planet. *Accounting, Organizations*
41 *and Society*, 35 (1), 47-62.
- 42
43
44 Gray, R. 2013. Back to basics: What do we mean by environmental (and social) accounting and what is it
45 for?—A reaction to Thornton. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 24(6), 459-468.
- 46
47 Gray, R., Walters, D., Bebbington, J. & Thompson, I. 1995. The Greening of Enterprise: An Exploration
48 of the (NON) Role of Environmental Accounting and Environmental Accountants in
49 Organizational Change. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 6 (3), 211-239.
- 50
51
52 Guillamon-Saorin, E. (2006). Impression management in financial reporting: Evidence from Spanish and
53 UK companies. Unpublished PhD thesis. Dublin: University College Dublin, National University
54 of Ireland.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Higgins, C. & Walker, R. 2012. Ethos, logos, pathos: Strategies of persuasion in social/environmental
4 reports. *Accounting Forum*, 36 (3), 194-208.
5
6 Hopwood, A. G. 1987. The archaeology of accounting systems. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*,
7 12 (3), 207-234.
8
9 Hoskin, K. W. & Macve, R. H. 1986. Accounting and the examination: A genealogy of disciplinary
10 power. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 11 (2), 105-136.
11
12 Hughen, L., Lulseged, A. & Upton, D. 2014. Improving stakeholder value through sustainability and
13 integrated reporting. *CPA Journal*, March, 57-61.
14
15 IIRC. 2013. The International Framework: Integrated Reporting. Available: [http://www.theiirc.org/wp-](http://www.theiirc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/13-12-08-THE-INTERNATIONAL-IR-FRAMEWORK-2-1.pdf)
16 [content/uploads/2013/12/13-12-08-THE-INTERNATIONAL-IR-FRAMEWORK-2-1.pdf](http://www.theiirc.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/13-12-08-THE-INTERNATIONAL-IR-FRAMEWORK-2-1.pdf)
17 [Accessed 1 October 2013].
18
19 International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Guidelines for Applying Protected Area
20 Management Categories, 2008
21
22 International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Red List of Threatened Species,
23 <http://www.iucnredlist.org/>, accessed on 1 May 2013.
24
25 Jones, M. J. & Solomon, J. F. 2013. Problematizing accounting for biodiversity. *Accounting, Auditing &*
26 *Accountability Journal*, 26 (5), 668-687.
27
28 Jones, M. J. (2011). *Creative accounting, fraud and international accounting scandals*. Chichester, UK:
29 John Wiley & Sons Inc.
30
31 Jones, M. J. (eds.) (2014) *Accounting for Biodiversity*, Routledge, UK.
32
33 Jones, M. J. and Solomon, J. F. (2013) "Problematizing accounting for biodiversity", *Accounting,*
34 *Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol.26, Issue 5.
35
36 King, M. 2016. Comments on: *Integrated reporting*, Public lecture. GARI Conference, Henley on
37 Thames, United Kingdom. 23 October
38
39 Laclau, E. (1990). *New reflections on the revolution of our time*. London: Verso Books.
40
41 Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy*. London: Versi Books.
42
43 Laine, M. 2009a. Ensuring legitimacy through rhetorical changes? A longitudinal interpretation of the
44 environmental disclosures of a leading Finnish chemical company. *Accounting, Auditing &*
45 *Accountability Journal*, 22 (7), 1029-1054.
46
47 Laine, M. 2009b. Towards Sustaining the Status Quo: Business Talk of Sustainability in Finnish
48 Corporate Disclosures 1987–2005. *European Accounting Review*, 19 (2), 247-274.
49
50 Llewellyn, S. 1994. Managing the Boundary: How Accounting Is Implicated in Maintaining the
51 Organization. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 7 (4), 4-23.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Llewelyn, S. 2003. What counts as "theory" in qualitative management and accounting research?
4 *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 16 (4), 662-708
5
6
7 Malsch, B. 2013. Politicizing the expertise of the accounting industry in the realm of corporate social
8 responsibility. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 38 (2), 149-168.
9
10 Mansoor, H. & Maroun, W. 2016. An initial review of biodiversity reporting by South African
11 corporates - The case of the food and mining sectors. *South African Journal of Economic and*
12 *Management Sciences*, 19 (4), 592-614.
13
14 Maroun, W. 2016. No bees in their bonnet: On the Absence of bee reporting by South African listed
15 companies. In: Atkins J & Atkins B. (eds.) *The Business of Bees: An Integrated Approach to Bee*
16 *Decline and Corporate Responsibility*. Sheffield, UK: Greenleaf Publishers
17
18 Mather, D., Mather, P., & Ramsay, A. (2005). An investigation into the measurement of graph distortion
19 in financial reports. *Accounting and Business Research*, 35(2), 147-159.
20
21 Mathews, M. R. (2009) "Mega-Accounting and Reporting: A Proposal for Further Development",
22 *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(2), 329-339, March.
23
24 Merkl-Davies, D., Brennan, N. & Vourvachis, P. 2011. Text Analysis Methodologies in Corporate
25 Narrative Reporting Research. *23rd CSEAR International Colloquium*. St Andrews, United
26 Kingdom.
27
28 Mennicken, A. & Miller, P. 2012. Accounting, Territorialization and Power. *Foucault Studies*, 13, 4-24.
29
30 Miller, P. & O'Leary, T. 1987. Accounting and the construction of the governable person. *Accounting,*
31 *Organizations and Society*, 12 (3), 235-265.
32
33 Milne, M. J. (2013) "Phantasmagoria, sustain-ababbling in social and environmental reporting", chapter 9
34 in Jack, L., Davison, J. And Craig, R., *The Routledge Companion to Accounting Communication*.
35
36 Milne, M. J. And Gray, R. (2013) "W(h)ither ecology? The triple bottom line, the Global Reporting
37 Initiative, and corporate sustainability reporting", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 118(1), 13-29.
38
39 Milne, M., Tregidga, H. & Walton, S. 2009. Words not actions! The ideological role of sustainable
40 development reporting. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 22 (8), 1211-1257.
41
42 Preston, A. M., Wright, C., & Young, J. J. (1996). Imag[in]ing annual reports. *Accounting, Organizations*
43 *and Society*, 21(1), 113-137.
44
45 PWC. 2015. Integrated reporting Where to next? Available:
46 <http://www.pwc.co.za/en/assets/pdf/integrated-reporting-survey-2015.pdf> [Accessed 16 February
47 2016].
48
49 Rimmel, G. and Jonall, K. (2013), "Biodiversity reporting in Sweden: corporate disclosure and preparers'
50 views", *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 746-778.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Samkin, G., Schneider, A. & Tappin, D. 2014. Developing a reporting and evaluation framework for
4 biodiversity. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 27 (3), 527-562.
5
6 Save the Rhino. 2015. Poaching: The Statistics. Available:
7 http://www.savetherhino.org/rhino_info/poaching_statistics. [Accessed 1 March 2015].
8
9 Solomon, J. & Maroun, W. 2012. The impact of integrated reporting on social, ethical and environmental
10 reporting in South Africa. 2012. ACCA Report.
11
12 Solomon, J. F. and L. Darby (2005) "Is Private Social, Ethical and Environmental Disclosure Mythicizing
13 or Demythologizing Reality?", *Accounting Forum*, Vol.29, pp.27-47.
14
15 Solomon, J. F., Solomon, A., Joseph, N. L. & Norton, S. D. 2013. Impression management, myth creation
16 and fabrication in private social and environmental reporting: Insights from Erving Goffman.
17 *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 38 (3), 195-213.
18
19 Spence, C. (2007) Social and Environmental Reporting and Hegemonic Discourse, *Accounting, Auditing
20 and Accountability Journal*, 20(6), 855 - 882.
21
22 Tregidga, H. (2013), "Biodiversity offsetting: problematisation of an emerging governance regime",
23 *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 5, pp. 806-832.
24
25 Tregidga, H., Milne, M. & Kearins, K. 2014. (Re)presenting 'sustainable organizations'. *Accounting,
26 Organizations and Society*, 39 (6), 477-494.
27
28 United Nations (UN) Convention, 'Convention on Biological Diversity', 1992.
29
30 United Nations (UN) Convention, 'Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild
31 Flora and Fauna (CITES)', 1979.
32
33 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Biosphere Reserves,
34 [www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/
35 ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves/](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/biosphere-reserves/),
36 accessed on 1 May 2013.
37
38 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), World Heritage Sites List,
39 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>, accessed on 1 May 2013.
40
41 van Liempd, D. & Busch, J. 2013. Biodiversity reporting in Denmark. *Accounting, Auditing &
42 Accountability Journal*, 26 (5), 833-872.
43
44 van Zijl, W. & Maroun, W. 2016. Discipline and punish: Exploring the application of IFRS 10 and IFRS
45 12. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, In press.
46
47 Zadek, S., Evans, R. and Pruzan, P. (2015) Building Corporate Accountability: Emerging Practice in
48 Social and Ethical Accounting and Auditing, Routledge, UK.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60