Andrea Mennicken and Peter Miller
Michel Foucault and the administering of lives

Book section

This version available at: http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/61662/

Available in LSE Research Online: April 2015

http://eprints.lse.ac.uk

Oxford Handbooks Online

Michel Foucault and the Administering of Lives 🔓

Andrea Mennicken and Peter Miller

The Oxford Handbook of Sociology, Social Theory, and Organization Studies: Contemporary Currents
Edited by Paul Adler, Paul du Gay, Glenn Morgan, and Mike Reed

⊟ Abstract and Keywords

This chapter suggests that Michel Foucault is a nuisance for scholars of organizations, albeit a productive one. Foucault disavowed the study of organizations, yet his work was fundamentally concerned with the administering of lives, a central concern of scholars of organizations. The chapter explores this tension by examining four displacements that Foucault sought to effect: first, a move from asking 'why' type questions to 'how' type questions; second, a concern with subjectivity that discards the ethical polarization of subject and object in favour of an analysis of the historically varying ways in which the capacities and attributes of subjects are constituted; third, a focus on practices rather than organizations, and a concern to analyse sets or assemblages of practices in terms of how they emerge and how they are stabilized over time; fourth, a focus on rationalities in the plural. It then examines the 'Foucault effect' in organization studies.

Keywords: Foucault, organization studies, practices, subjectivity, administering of lives

Introduction[*]

Michel Foucault is a nuisance for scholars of organizations. Not only did he say little about the topic, but he made it clear on numerous occasions that his interests lay elsewhere—particularly with practices, but also with a set of disciplines that at first sight have little to do with formal organizations. Conversely, and equally awkwardly, one of his most central concerns was with the administering and organizing of lives, both within and beyond carceral settings. So, we are faced with a considerable challenge: to make the link between Foucault's writings on the one hand, which are centrally concerned with the activity of administering, and the concerns of scholars of organizations and administration on the other. And we need to do this while not effacing the profoundly innovative and potentially discomforting way in which Foucault posed questions and framed his objects of interest. Further, we need to do so while respecting the shifting nature of Foucault's preoccupations, yet without traducing the continuity of concerns that can be lost if a proclivity for periodizing takes precedence over analysing.

There is a further challenge: how to select from or distil the vast corpus of Foucault's writings across a 30-year period. Our way of dealing with this is to select themes, many of which span the large part of Foucault's life as a scholar and activist, even if the nuances of their framing and the objects to which they were applied varied considerably. We make no claim that these themes contain all of Foucault's concerns. Nor do we claim that there are not other, equally plausible, ways of slicing through his oeuvre, which sits rather awkwardly somewhere between political theory, philosophy, history, and sociology. We do claim, however, that this way of viewing Foucault's work allows us to discern the key displacements that Foucault's writings suggest, and that this allows us in turn to identify some key features of his work that have relevance for scholars of organizations. (p. 12)

We identify four such themes or displacements: first, a move from asking 'why' type questions to asking 'how' type

questions; second, a concern with subjectivity that avoids the ethical polarization of subject and object in favour of an analysis of the historically varying ways in which the capacities and attributes of subjects are constituted; third, a focus on practices rather than organizations, and a concern to analyse sets or assemblages of practices both in terms of how they emerge and how they are stabilized over time; fourth, a focus on rationalities in the plural as distinct from rationality or rationalization in the singular, suggesting the importance of emphasizing that practices do not exist outside a particular regime of rationality, but also that such regimes of rationality need to be studied in terms of the diverse fields and levels at which they are formulated.

In the next section, we consider each of these four themes in turn. In the section that follows, we consider the 'Foucault effect' in organization studies. We suggest that this effect has been productive, in that it has extended the investigation of the multiple sites of emergence of technologies of rule, and the forms they assume, beyond those analysed by Foucault and his co-workers. Also, we suggest that it has contributed more generally to a transformation of organization studies which entailed a new way of thinking about power, and an increased focus on issues of language and identity. However, we also suggest that an overpreoccupation with the notion of discipline and the image of the Panopticon, a relative neglect by some of practices and the assemblages in which they operate, combined with a predilection for theoretical micro-differentiation rather than detailed empirical investigation, has somewhat limited our understanding of the ways in which organization studies can benefit from a critical engagement with Foucault's writings.[1] Further, we suggest that the tendency, in some quarters, to rehearse and recycle the very categories that Foucault and others have sought to reframe, in particular the comforting calculus of domination and emancipation, has limited the potential for careful investigation of the recent and still ongoing profound changes in the administering of lives in the West and the Rest (Hall, 1992). In the final section, we offer some comments on the utilization of Foucault's work by accounting scholars. This has been one of the most sustained areas of enquiry adjacent to organizational analysis in which Foucault's style of analysis has been deployed, although, and with important exceptions, it has been relatively neglected by organization scholars.[2]

Questions of Method

Even today, Foucault's writings can appear disconcerting or daunting. This is not only because of their remarkable volume and scope,[3] but because a series of conceptual displacements were central to his work. It is no doubt this, rather than any inherent obtuseness of style, that gives rise to the often heard comment that Foucault's writings are difficult or dense. Here, we will enumerate just some of the key shifts that he effected. (p. 13)

A first key move was *from 'why' to 'how'*. Organization scholars and many others, including political theorists, had typically asked 'why' type questions. Why, for instance, did a particular organization or type of organization appear or change at a particular moment in time? Why did a particular problem present itself at a particular moment in time? Here, the notion of interests (whether professional, or occupational, or personal) was often appealed to, together with gestures to processes such as globalization or modernization. Foucault asked a different question, not 'why' but 'how'. How, for instance, did madness, or disease, or delinquency, or sexuality, come to be established as something that really exists and that can be known and acted on? In a range of studies spanning several decades, Foucault explored what he called at one point rather enigmatically the 'surfaces of emergence' of such phenomena (Foucault, 1972: 41), and how they were linked to a conjoint process of normalizing and of subjecting such objects of concern to the division between true and false. Such surfaces of emergence vary, he argued, across periods and places. They may be the family, the immediate social group, the workplace, or whatever. Later, the term 'problematization' came to play a similar role, suggesting that we should focus on the ways in which certain phenomena come to be framed and constituted as problems to be addressed (see also Castel, 1994). This meant discarding the objectivity often attributed to problems, the notion that problems are sitting out there waiting to be discovered, and that once discovered solutions will be devised for them, or that the connecting of problems and solutions is more or less random (see e.g. the garbage can model of organizational choice by Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972). Instead, Foucault and others suggested that problematizing is a delicate process of assembling and aligning actors and arguments such that a measure of agreement is achieved, meaning that depopulation, pauperism, the decline of the race, industrial militancy, lack of competitiveness, or whatever are both significant problems and that they can be addressed. To adapt a phrase of Ian Hacking's, if solutions appear to fit problems so tidly, this is because they have been made to fit, rather than because that is how the world is (Hacking, 1983).

This suggests a focus on the production or emergence of phenomena, the study of the conceptual and practical operations through which something such as madness can be brought into existence as the object of a body of knowledge and a set of normalizing practices (Foucault, 1967, 1977). In one of his most important studies, albeit one that appears rather distant from the concerns of organization scholars, Foucault examined what he enigmatically called the historical a priori of the 'clinical gaze', the conditions of possibility for the forming of a contingent interlocking or stabilizing of a heterogeneous set of relations (Foucault, 1973; cf. also Gordon, 1980a: 243). Similarly, in his more recent writings on governmentality (see e.g. Foucault, 2007, 2008), Foucault was concerned with how type questions applied to the formation of phenomena, in this instance how the art of governing has sought not only to govern individuals and populations, but in doing so to construct very particular types of persons and sets of persons along with a range of reflections on the aims and objectives of governing. This is why Foucault and others have placed such emphasis on programmes, on the activity of programming, and on rationalities. We consider this in more detail in the following sections, as the **(p. 14)** significance of attending to the realm of the programmatic, in all its multiple forms, has at times been misunderstood and misrepresented in the organization studies literature. What is at issue here is a concern with the changing shape of the thinkable and the doable (Gordon, 1991: 7), a focus on the ways in which a variety of actors and texts have set out who can govern, to what ends, through what devices, to what extent, and so on.

This leads us on to a second key displacement, concerning *subjectivity*. Many have written about the effects of particular practices on the subjectivity of workers, managers, children, mothers, and so on (see e.g. Braverman, 1974; Burawoy, 1979; Lipietz, 1992; Noble, 1977, 1984). Indeed, some organization scholars have called for greater attention to subjectivity or agency (see e.g. Beckert, 2009; Crozier & Friedberg, 1980; DiMaggio, 1988; Lawrence, 1999; Oliver, 1991; Powell, 1991). Foucault's concern was different. Rather than positing a universal form for the human subject, he examined the historically variable ways in which the capacities and attributes of subjects were constituted (see e.g. Foucault, 1988, 2001 [1982]; but see also du Gay, 1993, 1996a, 1996b; Heller, Sosna, & Wellbery, 1986; Knights & Willmott, 1989; Martin, Gutman, & Hutton, 1988). Put differently, Foucault resolutely discarded the ethical polarization of subject and object, which elevates subjectivity to the position of moral autonomy, and similarly rejected the assumption that domination falsifies the essence of human subjectivity (Gordon, 1980a: 239). In its place, he put forward a conception of power that takes the form of both subjectification and objectification, a form of power that is intrinsically dependent on making individuals subjects (Foucault, 2001 [1982]: 331).

This scepticism about ontological claims concerning subjectivity entailed an equivalent commitment, throughout his work from *Madness and Civilization* to *The Will to Know*, to explore the multiple conditions of possibility for the making of the modern subject (see also Foucault, 1988). As Foucault himself put it, his concern was to produce a history of the different ways in which 'human beings are made subjects' (Foucault, 2001 [1982]: 326). This takes us to the heart of our present, an era that cherishes a commitment to individuals as knowing and knowable subjects, coupled with incessant endeavours to administer and normalize their conduct (see also Meyer & Jepperson, 2000). Initially, for Foucault, this took the form of examining the specific 'truth games', administrative techniques, and institutional settings through which human beings sought to develop knowledge about themselves and others, whether through the disciplines of psychiatry, medicine, biology, or economics. Subsequently, Foucault gave more explicit attention to what he called 'technologies of the self', the ways in which individuals act on their selves, and how this action on the self can be linked up to actions on the social body as a whole. Foucault spoke here of actions on the actions of others, the conduct of conduct. For, what defines a relationship of power, according to Foucault, is that it is a mode of action that does not act directly on others. Instead, it acts upon their actions, whether an existing action or one that may arise in the future. And, the 'other' over whom power is exercised remains resolutely a person who acts, who is faced with a whole field of possible actions and reactions (Foucault, 2001 [1982]: 341–2).

Regardless of the nuances of emphasis throughout his writings, and the varying empirical focus of his investigations, this is what allowed Foucault to frame the issue **(p. 15)** of power in such a distinctive and relational manner (Miller, 2010; Veyne, 1978). And it is also what makes Foucault's writings so relevant for scholars of organizations. The manager making a decision about how to spend or allocate a budget, how to achieve a specified return on investment or a required internal rate of return, is almost the perfect embodiment of power understood in this manner. For the manager remains 'free' to decide, yet is enmeshed within a web of financial norms that rule out telling her how to act in a specific instance. Governing, understood in this sense, is not only

about overtly political structures or states, rather it covers all socially legitimated modes of action that are more or less considered and calculated, and that seek to act in a deliberate manner upon the possibilities of action of others. As Foucault put it so succinctly, to govern in this sense is to 'structure the possible field of action of others' (Foucault, 2001 [1982]: 341).

Foucault once said, somewhat enigmatically, that it was not power but the subject that was the general theme of his research (Foucault, 2001 [1982]: 326). By this, he meant that to analyse power relations entailed analysing the myriad of ways in which individuals are made subjects, the multiple ways in which socially legitimated authorities seek to act indirectly on the actions of others. While this might be carried out in the more obviously political domains of existence, it had, if anything, even more resonance for those less obviously political domains, such as within families, schools, communities, and hospitals. Perhaps most importantly for our purposes here, it meant analysing the almost incessant attempts to administer or act on the actions of others within organizations and firms.

Insofar as much of these attempts to act on the actions of others entail attempts to economize social relations (see Çalışkan & Callon, 2009, 2010; see also Miller & Power, 2013), both within the already marketized realm and beyond, this linking of a concern with the subject and a preoccupation with relations of power enabled Foucault to provide a highly perceptive analysis of the phenomenon of liberalism and neo-liberalism. For such governmental rationalities depend on seeking to govern well by governing less. Foucault's notion of government, or governmentality, was based on the distinctive premise that power, understood as a form of action on the actions of others, is dependent on freedom. Understood as the conduct of others' conduct, government here was not limited to overtly political structures and the management of states, it meant a much broader concern with the ways in which the conduct of individuals or groups might be directed (cf. the analogy with Weber's concerns, Gordon, 2001: xxix). It meant also giving particular attention to the techniques and practices that seek to link up the administration of individuals and the administration of populations, something that has been given heightened significance since the late 1970s as a number of Western governments began confronting their citizens with a dual injunction: to respect the realities of the market, while accepting their duties to become enterprising selves (see also du Gay, 1993, 1994; Gordon, 2001: xxiii).

No doubt this marks a shift in Foucault's concerns, from the specialized knowledges of the individual (psychiatry, medicine, penology) and their institutional counterparts (the asylum, the hospital, the prison) to the exercise of government over an entire (p. 16) population. But the concern with subjectivity remains a constant, and is if anything made even more central to the administering of lives. Put differently, the 'macro' and the 'micro' analysis of power come together in a particular historical moment, one that both emphasizes the responsibilities of individuals to become entrepreneurs of themselves, while elevating the notion of economic enterprise to a generalized principle for the social body as a whole. Subjectivity, refashioned here according to the notion of the individual as an ensemble of enterprises, provides a way of redescribing governmental action through a progressive economization of social relations centred on the injunction that individuals make enterprises of their lives (see Foucault, 2008; but also du Gay, 1993; Gordon, 2001; Rose, 1989, 1998).

Foucault's concerns with the links between a particular notion of subjectivity and the governing of populations were clearly set out in his lecture on 'governmentality' delivered at the Collège de France in 1978 (Foucault, 2007). A little over a decade later this lecture, together with a range of commentaries and analyses, was made widely available in English (Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991). The reception of these materials was far from immediate (cf. Miller & Rose, 1995a, showing how 'governmentality studies' were developing by then), although the recent translation of a series of lectures delivered the following year have encouraged renewed attention to the phenomenon of neo-liberalism and the particular governmental rationality it articulates and the devices on which it depends (Foucault, 2008).

A complementary line of enquiry, and an unlikely yet highly relevant one for scholars of organizations, was that opened up by Foucault's writings on the history of sexuality (Foucault, 1981 [1976]). Here, Foucault framed the issue of sex and sexuality as part of a much broader phenomenon: the entry of life, and attempts to optimize and administer it, into systems of political power. This meant emphasizing the ways in which the governing of individual behaviours is linked to the governing of populations. Put differently, towards the end of the eighteenth century 'population' emerged as an economic and political problem. Sexuality was but one part, albeit a very important one, of the more general phenomenon of the administering of individual lives and entire populations. Foucault's admittedly rather cryptic comments on method here gave rise to some misunderstandings. For instance, the

statement that 'power is everywhere' (Foucault, 1981 [1976]: 93) may have given support to those that saw in Foucault's work a dystopian image of a form of power that is omnipotent, however inaccurate such a reading would be. Such misreadings are unfortunate, as Foucault's emphasis on the productive role of power relations, their immanence in the spheres in which they operate (economic processes, knowledge relationships, sexual relations), and the multiple points from which they operate, were immensely suggestive for those that wished to extend the empirical reach of his analyses, as subsequent studies have shown (see also Miller & Rose, 1995a).

Of particular importance for our purposes was his emphasis on a notion of power based on attempts to administer life so as to optimize it, albeit through a panoply of controls, regulations, and interventions (Foucault, 1981 [1976]: 135–45). Foucault pointed to two linked series of interventions. One focused on the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capability, and the attempt to enhance its usefulness **(p. 17)** and integrate it into ever more efficient systems of economic controls. The other focused on the population as a whole: its propagation, birth and death rates, level of health, life expectancy, longevity, and so forth. Foucault used the term 'sovereign power' to designate a form of power that was limited to the taking of life, the power of death, and contrasted this with the rather awkwardly named 'bio-power', a form of power based on the administration of bodies and the calculated management of life. Echoing Marx's analysis of the development of capitalism and the accumulation of capital, Foucault remarked that this would not have been possible without the parallel 'accumulation of men', the 'controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and the adjustment of the phenomenon of population to economic processes' (Foucault, 1981 [1976]: 141). This was a theme that he elaborated on in 1976 in a collaborative volume titled *Les machines à guérir* (Foucault et al., 1976). There Foucault spoke of the emergence of the health and physical well-being of the population as one of the key objectives of political power in the late eighteenth century (see also Foucault, 1980 [1976]: 170). The preservation, upkeep, and conservation of the 'labour force' are part of a wider phenomenon, one that centres on attempts to intervene so as to modify lives not only to ensure their subjection but to enhance their utility. Such interventions operated in a multiplicity of diverse sites, including the family, the army, schools, and so on. In such sites, individual lives, as well as life viewed collectively, were made subject to explicit calculations designed to allow it to be governed and administered.

A third key displacement was to focus on *practices*, together with an emphasis on analysing sets or assemblages of interdependent practices and how they emerge and are stabilized at particular moments in time. This is perhaps one of the more troubling or discomforting aspects of Foucault's writings for scholars of organizations, insofar as it displaces the category of organization from centre stage, and puts there instead the study of sets of heterogeneous practices. Put differently, the focus of attention shifts from the organization (whether singly, or as a set of related organizations, as in more recent network analysis) to the historically contingent and interrelated sets of ideas and instruments that are deployed within, across, and between entities that seek to administer the lives of others.

Echoing his earlier arguments in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Foucault, 1972), Foucault spoke of analysing a 'regime of practices', the regularities, logic, and self-evidence that connects what is said and what is done, the codes imposed, and the reasons given. To analyse regimes of practices means to analyse programmes of conduct that have prescriptive effects concerning what is to be done, and codifying effects regarding what is to be known (Foucault, 1991 [1981]: 75). It means analysing the interrelations and interdependency between the discursive and the non-discursive, not only what is said and done but the ways in which what is said programmes or codes what can and should be done (cf. also Gordon, 1980a; Miller & Rose, 2008). So, it was not a matter of writing a history of the prison as an organization or institution, but the *practice of imprisonment*, with the aim of showing how this came to be accepted at a certain moment as a key component of the penal system, something apparently indispensable and self-evident. Likewise with madness, it was a matter of showing how a whole set of **(p. 18)** practices helped give reality to the phenomenon of madness as something that could be known and acted upon as something natural and taken for granted.

It is important to emphasize here that the notion of practices is not reducible to that of 'material devices', such as a pricing equation, a shopping cart or a nuclear reactor (Muniesa, Millo, & Callon, 2007: 2–3). The recent rediscovery of performativity has been helpful in giving renewed attention to the domain of economic sociology, and it has also emphasized the importance of a particular subset of instruments that serve to format the economy (Callon, 1998; MacKenzie, 2006; MacKenzie & Millo, 2003; MacKenzie, Muniesa, & Siu, 2007). But it has led to a relative neglect of the interrelations between such instruments and the historically varying ideas or rationalities that

require and inspire them. As the historian Paul Veyne remarked over 30 years ago, for Foucault it was not a matter of starting from the study of objects, but analysing the sets of practices that fashion and form the objects which become the correlate of historically specific sets of practices (Veyne, 1978: 218). As Veyne also remarked, this places *relations* at the heart of the analysis, and it highlights a key methodological injunction of Foucault's: to accord primacy to the relations that link actors, instruments, and ideas (Veyne, 1978: 236). This means attending not only to the devices that instrumentalize the real, but analysing their interdependence with the multiple rationalities and codes that seek to prescribe how the real is to be programmed. As Rose and Miller argued prior to the recent rediscovery of performativity (see also Austin, 1962; Hänninen & Palonen, 1990; Shapiro, 1984), such rationalities are not merely contemplative or justificatory, they are performative (Rose & Miller, 1992: 177), and this applies as much to the governing of economic life as it does to the exercise of political rule (Miller & Rose, 1990).

Foucault was not interested in studying this or that device as something that appeared to 'perform' more or less by itself, but worked according to a principle of 'causal multiplication' (Foucault, 1991 [1981]: 76). As he put it, this meant 'lightening the weight of causality', multiplying the processes and practices that bring something such as punishment or madness into existence. This meant an increasing polymorphism of the elements brought into relation with each other, an increasing polymorphism of the relations described, and an increasing polymorphism of the domains of reference (Foucault, 1991 [1981]: 77). Commenting on *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault, 1977), which is perhaps Foucault's most sociological book, and the one that caught the attention of many organization scholars and indeed others, Deleuze spoke of the 'spatio-temporal multiplicity' that is intrinsic to the diagram or the abstract machine, which itself is made up of a tissue of non-localizable relations that are immanent to the domain in which they operate, and coextensive with the social field (Deleuze, 1999 [1988]: 21–38).

For scholars of organizations, this means attending to such assemblages, rather than focusing only on the devices that help to instrumentalize them (Miller & Rose, 1990: 7) (see also Deleuze, 1999 [1988]; Miller, 1991; Miller & O'Leary, 1994b).[4] The minimum unit of analysis according to this view is the assemblage, whether it is the health-assemblage, the madness-assemblage, or the punishment-assemblage, all of which Foucault studied, or the producing-assemblage or the market-assemblage which others have recently started to analyse (see e.g. du Gay, Millo, & Tuck, 2012). Such (p. 19) assemblages are themselves multiplicities, made up of many heterogeneous liaisons and relations. Their only unity is that of their co-functioning, and their operation is always and necessarily both social and technical.

A fourth displacement concerns rationality, or rather *rationalities*. On this point, Foucault was occasionally and rather unusually immoderate in his comments concerning parallel lines of enquiry, in this instance the writings of Max Weber and the Frankfurt School. Perhaps his strongest remark in this regard was to say that 'the word *rationalization* is dangerous' (Foucault, 2001 [1982]: 329, italics in original) (see also Foucault, 2001 [1979]: 299). He went on to say that we should analyse specific rationalities, rather than invoke the notion of rationalization in general. Instead of taking the rationalization of society or culture, this meant analysing such a process in the diverse fields in which it took place: madness, illness, death, crime, sexuality, and so on. Understandably, Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) saw Foucault's writings as inheriting Weber's concerns with the increasing objectification of social life through bureaucratization and calculative thinking, while shifting the focus to a genealogical analysis (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982: 165). Foucault himself argued against postulating an absolute or invariant value inherent in reason, and in favour of examining how particular forms of rationality inscribe themselves in practices or sets of practices, on the grounds that 'practices' do not exist outside a particular regime of rationality (Foucault, 1991 [1981]: 79).

The point, however, is not to traduce Weber in order to do justice to Foucault, as Colin Gordon has aptly remarked (Gordon, 1987: 294). Indeed, as the writings of Wilhelm Hennis have demonstrated (see e.g. Hennis, 1983), Weber's concerns with *Lebensführung*, the conduct of life, are much closer to Foucault's concern with 'technologies of the self' than previous commentators have suggested (Schluchter, 1979, 1981). The point is to register firmly the importance in Foucault's writings of attending to the reflected or programmatic aspects of social life. This is not to conflate the discursive or the programmatic with daily life in prisons, asylums, factories, or whatever. The aim in fact is the reverse, to insist on the gap that separates programmes and their effects. Nor is it to conjure up some dystopian vision of social subjection in which the programmatic achieves omnipotence and obliterates difference and differentiation. As Miller and Rose (1990: 10) have argued, programmes are 'congenitally failing', and are defined by their inherent limits, their often rivalrous nature, the multitude of difficulties and obstacles that arise as they are put to work, whether this takes the form of underfunding, professional and intra-

professional rivalries, communication systems that fail, or whatever. 'Reality' always escapes, for it is too unruly to be captured by the dreams and schemes of the programmers.

That said, programmes are much more than wishes or intentions. Programmes presuppose that the domain they help bring into existence and seek to intervene in can be known and be made programmable. Programmes, and the language and ideas through which they are articulated, are inherently *performative* (Rose & Miller, 1992: 177). The specific domains they address and problematize—the layout of a factory floor, national competitiveness, product quality, or whatever—are themselves co-created with the solutions they devise. And these relatively localized programmes are themselves linked, often in rather tenuous and mediated ways, with more abstract political rationalities or **(p. 20)** ideas that seek to specify the principles that should guide the administering of lives and the responsibilities of rulers and the ruled: freedom, justice, equality, mutual responsibility, enterprise, efficiency, fairness, and so on.

This is why Rose and Miller (1992) proposed a tripartite distinction between political rationalities, programmes, and technologies, and insisted on their mutual interrelations, even if this has at times been reduced to a binary distinction between programmes and technologies (cf. also Gordon, 1980a, and his tripartite distinction between strategies, programmes, and technologies). And this is why Foucault's writings have so much to offer to scholars of organizations. For they offer a way of linking up the 'macro' and the 'micro'. So, rather than view Foucault's focus on governmental rationalities in his later writings as a redirecting of his concerns, and rather than complain that governmentality scholars collapse historiography into abstract programmes (McKinlay & Pezet, 2010: 491), the tripartite distinction between rationalities, programmes, and technologies should be seen as a way of bringing together the local and the non-local, the macro and the micro. It is no doubt the case that much of Foucault's later writings on the notion of governmentality focus on the more abstract and macro end of the spectrum. But, as has been pointed out more recently, a concern with political rationalities, and with more localized political programmes such as the 'Modernizing Government' initiative in the UK, can fruitfully be linked with analysis of the 'everyday doings of practitioners' (Kurunmäki & Miller, 2011). This is not a matter, however, of abandoning the analysis of political rationalities and the realm of the programmatic. Instead, it is a matter of seeking to trace the mediated ways in which larger political transformations are operationalized and instrumentalized through the local concerns and preoccupations of practitioners, the assembling and linking together of disparate and possibly competing sets of actors, activities, and aspirations (Kurunmäki & Miller, 2011: 222; see also Mennicken, 2008). A central tenet of much of Foucault's writings is to attend to the *multiplicity* of objects, domains, layers, and strata (Gordon, 2001: xx). Foucault spoke of 'causal multiplication' as a way of analysing the singularity of an event, a way of attending to the multiple processes which constitute it (Foucault, 1991 [1981]: 76). This means discovering the connections, the encounters, the blockages, the plays of force, the strategies, and so on that allow something such as incarceration to become a central component of the penal order. And this causal multiplication, according to Foucault, always retains at least a grain of thought (Foucault, 2001 [1981]: 456) (see also Gordon, 2001; Hacking, 1992).

The Foucault Effect in Organization Studies

Much of the preceding is, of course, now widely accepted by many scholars of organizations. Foucauldian categories and concepts have become a central part of the toolbox **(p. 21)** of organization studies, particularly among European scholars, although others still appear to be more intent on rehearsing or reinstating the very categories that Foucault's work has helped displace. It is not our aim here to trace or celebrate the gradual dissemination of Foucault's writings, and the writings of his co-travellers, within organization studies. But we do think it is helpful to offer some highly selective remarks on some of the key themes and studies that together add up to what we term here the Foucault effect in organization studies (see also Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006: chapter 8), while also offering some cautionary remarks. For an effect of this kind is a curious phenomenon (Carter, 2008), it is something that spreads itself over a surface, and that has an immanent cause that is difficult to separate from its effects (Deleuze, 2001: 70).[5] The 'Foucault effect' in organization studies is the making visible of a particular way of doing the history of the present, of analysing the various ways in which the administering or governing of lives in a wide range of settings has been made thinkable and practicable. The 'Foucault effect' in organization studies, as we show below, has made a significant contribution to the establishment of a post-Marxist platform for 'the renewal of the powers of critique' (Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991: x) in the study of organizations. It has helped to deprive organizational practices and technologies of their self-evidence,

acknowledging 'that there is a parcel of thought in even the crassest and most obtuse parts of social reality' (Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991: x).

Despite these welcoming effects, and the more general transformation of organization studies that it has both facilitated and benefitted from, we suggest that the utilization of Foucault's work in organization studies has been somewhat partial, and that there is still much more that can be done to benefit from his insights. We argue that there has been an overemphasis on the notion of discipline, which for some has conjured up a dystopian image of a totally disciplined society and a neglect of resistance (see e.g. Thompson & Ackroyd, 1995), as well as a neglect of the ways in which subjects relate to and 'manoeuvre' around discourse (Newton, 1996: 139). This, together with a reluctance on the part of some to set aside the comforting categories of domination and emancipation that Foucault's work did so much to transcend, means that there has been less attention to detailed empirical analysis of practices and the assemblages in which they operate, together with an overpreoccupation with theoretical micro-differentiation.[6] As a result, we know rather less than we should about the remarkable transformations that have taken place across the past two decades and more in administrative apparatuses and the administering of lives in the West and the Rest (Hall, 1992), many of which have taken place within the orbit of neo-liberalism and associated endeavours to economize the entire social sphere (Çalışkan & Callon, 2009, 2010; Mennicken, 2008; Mennicken & Miller, 2012; Miller & Power, 2013).[7]

As Carter et al. (2002) have pointed out, although Foucault has become 'an icon and a fashion' in organization studies (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006: 229; but see also Carter, 2008), this has only been the case relatively recently. Indeed, it was only in the late 1990s that Foucault's ideas began to achieve momentum in organizational sociology. One of the first articles that sought to examine how Foucault's writings might be used for organizational analysis appeared in the journal *Organization Studies* in 1988 (Burrell, (p. 22) 1988). In his article, 'Modernism, Post Modernism and Organizational Analysis 2: The Contribution of Michel Foucault', Gibson Burrell discussed and compared the notions of archaeology and genealogy, and sought to explicate the possible implications of Foucault's notion of disciplinary power for scholars of organizations. He pointed in particular to what other literatures have called isomorphism, although in this instance it was a matter of asking, following Foucault, how it is that prisons, factories, and hospitals come to 'resemble' each other. He also considered how organization scholars might extend Foucault's insights concerning disciplinary power to such topics as information technology, spatial design, and other forms of surveillance.[8]

One year earlier, organization theorist Stewart Clegg wrote a discussion note in which he reflected on the adequacy of approaches to the study of language and power in organization analysis (Clegg, 1987). In that piece, Clegg suggested developing Foucault's (1977) concerns with power and discourse analysis (see also Clegg & Hardy, 1996; Hardy, 1996; Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004). A couple of years later, in 1989, Clegg published his highly influential book *Frameworks of Power* (1989), in which he utilized Foucault's work on power in his conceptualization of 'circuits of power' which seeks to represent the ways in which power may flow through different modalities (distinguishing between episodic, dispositional, and facilitative power) (see also Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006: 240–7). By 1994, Clegg was writing about the links between Foucault and Weber, describing Foucault as 'the contemporary theorist who has come nearest to carrying out a Weberian project with respect to the analysis of organizations' (Clegg, 1994: 149). In 2006, Clegg reformulated some of these ideas in *Power and Organizations*, co-authored with Courpasson and Phillips (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006: chapter 8). Drawing on Foucault, Clegg et al. highlighted the importance of looking at small questions: 'It is in the little things of socially constructed normalcy that we see power in organizations being slowly constructed' (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006: 228). Taking up Foucault's conception of power, together with later work on governmentality (Foucault, 1991 [1979], 2007; Gordon, 1980b; Miller & Rose, 1990; Rose & Miller, 1992), they emphasized the 'play of techniques, the mundane practices that shape everyday life', and how these shape and structure forms of conduct and selfhood (Clegg, Courpasson, & Phillips, 2006: 230).

In the early years of the reception of Foucault in organization studies, much emphasis was placed on Foucault's relevance for the study of mechanisms of surveillance and discipline in the post-Fordist organization: the rise of computer-based monitoring, the use of closed-circuit television cameras, and the just-in-time labour process (see in particular Sewell & Wilkinson, 1992; but see also Burrell, 1988; and Townley 1993, 1994), as well as the effects of management knowledge on the constitution of the employee (Jacques, 1996). Barbara Townley, a colleague of Gibson Burrell at Warwick, before moving to the University of Alberta in the early 1990s (see Carter, 2008: 19), applied Foucault's work very fruitfully to the study of human resource management (HRM) (Townley, 1993, 1994).

Townley argued that HRM should be understood as a discourse and set of practices that attempt to reduce the indeterminacy involved in the employment contract (p. 23) (Townley, 1993). Rereading HRM practices from a Foucauldian power-knowledge perspective, she argued that power in organizations is employed 'at all levels, and through many dimensions' (Townley, 1993: 520; but see also Townley, 1994). Following Foucault, she highlighted the relational aspect of power, and focused on the 'how' of power in organizations: the practices, techniques, and procedures that give it effect. Studying the HRM instruments of management by objectives (MBO) and selection testing, and echoing Foucauldian ideas of governmentality, she argued that 'HRM serves to render organizations and their participants calculable arenas, offering, through a variety of technologies, the means by which activities and individuals become knowable and governable' (Townley, 1993: 526).

Parallel to Townley, Grey conducted an ethnographic study of one of the big international public accounting firms, examining the disciplinary and socialization techniques applied to lower-level entrants which, he argued, helped to constitute 'the career as a project of the self' and 'labour process discipline' (Grey, 1994; see also Grey, 1998). Four years later, in 1998, Covaleski et al. published the results from a field study of the (then) 'big six' public accounting firms, in which they examined the use of MBO and mentoring in administering the lives of accounting professionals (Covaleski et al., 1998). Utilizing Foucault, and following Grey (1994) and Townley (1993, 1994), they sought to describe how 'power seeps into the very grain of individuals, reaches right into their bodies, permeates their gestures, their posture, what they say, how they learn to live and work with other people' (Foucault, 1977, cited in Covaleski et al. 1998: 294).

These and other Foucault-oriented organization studies of disciplinary power, mechanisms of surveillance, and technologies of the self (see e.g. the edited volume by McKinlay & Starkey, 1998), made an important contribution to understanding 'power and subjectivity at work' (Knights & Willmott, 1989). David Knights and Hugh Willmott, for example, drew upon the work of Foucault 'to suggest a more adequate appreciation of processes of subjugation in which subjectivity is fetishised in identity' (Knights & Willmott, 1989: 535), highlighting the connectedness of power and subjectivity (see also Knights & McCabe, 1998; McKinlay & Starkey, 1998). Following Foucault, they rejected polarizations of subject and object, and drew out the significance of the 'production of subjects' for the reproduction of the capital–labour relation (Knights & Willmott, 1989: 543). In so doing, Knights and Willmott sought to shift attention away from structuralist and Marxist debates in organizational sociology (see also Clegg, 1989). In a similar move, Sewell and Wilkinson used Foucault to show that just-in-time and total quality control (TQM) regimes both create and demand systems of surveillance to instil discipline (Sewell & Wilkinson, 1992: 271; see also the works by Knights & McCabe on TQM, e.g. Knights & McCabe, 1998).

In the late 1980s, and throughout the 1990s, Foucault-oriented scholarship in organization studies drew mainly on *Discipline and Punish*, with its emphasis on mechanisms of surveillance as a modality of power/knowledge. In recent years the emphasis has shifted, and increasing attention has been paid to Foucault's *History of Sexuality* (McKinlay, 2006; Starkey & Hatchuel, 2002; Townley, 2002), the management, conduct, and care of the self (McKinlay, 2002; Pezet, 2007), ethics (Ibarra-Colado et al. 2006; (p. 24) Parker, 1998; Wray-Bliss, 2002), Foucault's work on biopolitics and governmentality (Munro, 2012), the diverse arts of government, resistance, and freedom (see e.g. Barratt, 2008; Caldwell, 2007; Fleming & Spicer, 2003; Jones & Spicer, 2005; but see also Rose, 1999), as well as Foucault's compatibility with critical realism (Al-Moudi, 2007). Calls have also been made to make more use in organizational sociology of Foucault's work on parrhesia (Foucault, 2001), the enactment of provocative dialogue, to counteract the often meretricious allegations of the apolitical nature of Foucauldian scholarship (see in particular Barratt, 2008; but see also Skinner, 2011). Referring in particular to Foucault's later works, Barratt usefully highlights the disruptive potential of a historical sensibility, and suggests reasserting the ethical objectives of genealogy as a way of disrupting organizational common sense (Barratt, 2008). Barratt also argues that the study of programmatic statements of authorities ought to be complemented with studies of the messy and compromised ways in which forms of (managerial) knowledge are enacted (see also O'Malley, 1996; O'Malley, Weir, & Shearing, 1997). Ethnographic research, he rightly suggests, has a role to play here, in documenting the practical dynamics of power and resistance, and allowing for the possibility that the voices of a more heterogeneous range of organizational actors are heard. Barratt's article is valuable in drawing attention to the later work of Foucault, and for highlighting its ethico-political dimensions. Indeed, much of what he says is consistent with the arguments in the preceding section of this chapter. That said, insofar as it does not provide detailed empirical or historical engagement with specific events or issues, his paper runs the risk of reinforcing the somewhat inward-looking nature of many debates within organizational analysis, where micro-differentiations in

theoretical credentials appear to count more than analysis of things that have happened or are happening today. Newton (1998) addresses the issue of subjectivity in the writings of Foucault and organizational Foucauldians, and rightly notes that the latter often end up invoking notions of subjectivity and selfhood that are at odds with Foucault's discarding of the ethical polarization of subject and object. Yet, while noting Foucault's contribution to a decentring and historicizing of the notion of the subject, he still seems to yearn for an ethics of the 'real' self, one that would tell us how to change our selves and the world we inhabit, something that Foucault repeatedly disavowed.

Organization studies has benefitted considerably from an engagement with the writings of Foucault and his co-workers. But we suggest that this engagement has been somewhat partial, and that it could have benefitted more. This is due in part, we suggest, to an overpreoccupation with the notion of discipline and the image of a totally disciplined society or organization. But it is also due to repeated and often meretricious appeals to notions of resistance and the importance of being 'critical' (see e.g. Thompson & Ackroyd, 1995), as if critique was some sort of historically invariant a priori. This is at times coupled with misguided attempts to reframe Foucault's categories into the very ones that his work has sought to transcend. The notion of subjectivity is a case in point here, and in the preceding section we have sought to explain how we understand Foucault's notions of subjectivity and subjectivation, which takes us beyond repeated and largely empty appeals to notions of agency. In place of such internecine squabbles (p. 25) over concepts that have no part in a Foucauldian analysis of the stuff of organizational life, we have suggested an agenda that focuses not on organizations, not on discipline, and not on subjectivity, as if these were foundational categories that should tell us how and what to analyse. We have suggested that the analysis of *practices* should be primary, together with analysis of the *assemblages* of ideas and instruments, actors, and aspirations that form among these multiple and ontologically distinct components. Just as ideas do not work by themselves, so too with practices, which only exist within historically specific rationalities and assemblages. To understand such assemblages means analysing the local and the non-local, the macro and the micro, and how they come to be connected (see e.g. Kurunmäki & Miller, 2011; Mennicken, 2008; Samiolo, 2012). It means paying attention to the emergence and stabilization of novel assemblages, such as the recent and still ongoing attempts to economize the entire social sphere (see also Çalışkan & Callon, 2009, 2010). And it means acknowledging the importance of causal multiplication, rather than thinking we might find the locus of change in one place. It is, we suggest, attempting such empirical studies that will allow organization scholars to benefit further from a critical engagement with the writings of Foucault, and in turn a critical engagement with the phenomena they study.

Governing and Calculating

Foucault's analyses of power, of disciplinary mechanisms, and of governmental rationalities encourage us to draw out the inherently political character of technologies of organizing, administering, and calculating (Foucault, 1981 [1976]: 138).[9] Such Foucauldian themes featured as early as the late 1980s in one of organization studies' most proximate neighbouring disciplines, the field of accounting studies (see also Carter, 2008: 16; Power, 2011). With Foucault, such studies helped us to see the conjoint disciplining effects of accounting numbers, their involvement in the production of neo-liberal subjectivities, and their contribution in a particularly personal way to the economizing of the entire social field. A focus on the technologies of accounting, we argue, helped us get to grips with what we might call the inner workings of governmentality (Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991; Foucault, 2007, 2008), in particular neo-liberal modalities of governing and how these operate within and through organizations. For accounting technologies are key organizational practices that have helped bring about a significant shift in how power is exerted in advanced industrial societies. Accounting numbers, such as those produced through standard costing and budgeting, have a distinctive capacity for acting on the actions of others, one that goes far beyond the abstract injunctions of economic theory. Through their ability to produce certain forms of visibility and transparency, accounting numbers both create and constrain subjectivity. By linking decisions to the supposedly impersonal logic of quantification rather than to subjective judgement, accounting numbers configure persons, domains, and actions as objective and comparable. This, in turn, renders them governable. For the objects and (p. 26) subjects of economic calculation, once standardized through accounting, are accorded a very particular form of visibility. This creates distinctive possibilities for intervention while potentially displacing others.

Accounting technologies make it possible to articulate and operationalize abstract neo-liberal concepts, such as notions of competitiveness, markets, efficiency, and entrepreneurship. Accounting numbers constitute firms,

organizations, and sub-units as competing, market-oriented entities, which can be analysed, compared, and acted upon. Accounting makes the incomparable comparable, by distilling substantively different kinds or classes of things into a single financial figure (the return on investment of a division, the net present value of an investment opportunity, the financial ratios of a company) (Miller, 1992, 2010). Accounting figures can also turn qualities (e.g. the quality of health care or the decency of imprisonment) into quantities, through devices such as patient satisfaction questionnaires, rankings (of schools, universities, care homes, prisons, and so on), balanced score-cards, and much else besides. These, in turn, can then be subjected to a variety of further calculations and comparisons through audits and other forms of more or less public assessment (Espeland & Sauder, 2007; Kurunmäki & Miller, 2006; Mennicken, 2010, 2013; Power, 1997; Samiolo, 2012).

This way of understanding and analysing the roles of accounting and its imbrication in a more general economizing of the entire social field is relatively recent (see also Miller & Power, 2013). From the 1950s to the 1970s, the social scientific understanding of calculative technologies in organizations remained dominated by behavioural studies of budgeting and management control systems (see e.g. Argyris, 1954). In the 1980s this changed. Inspired to a significant extent by Foucault's writings (see also Power, 2011: 43–4), Anthony Hopwood, who in 1976 had founded the now internationally reputed journal *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, outlined a research programme that placed the study of the wider social and political aspects of accounting practices at its heart. In 1985, Hopwood and his co-authors outlined 'a three branched genealogy' of the specific social space within which ideas and techniques of value added accounting appeared and developed (Burchell, Clubb, & Hopwood, 1985). Drawing on Foucault's early writings (in particular *Discipline and Punish*), and at a time when others were starting to speak in terms of different types of complexes or assemblages (Donzelot, 1980; Rose, 1985), Hopwood et al. described this social space as an 'accounting constellation', 'a particular field of relations which existed between certain institutions, economic and administrative processes, bodies of knowledge, systems of norms and measurement, and classification techniques' (Burchell, Clubb, & Hopwood, 1985: 400). In 1987, Hopwood developed his neo-Foucauldian approach to the study of accounting further, by explicitly utilizing Foucault's notion of archaeology (Hopwood, 1987). In the same year, this time building on Foucault's histories of medicine, psychiatry, and the prison, together with his analyses of disciplinary power, Miller and O'Leary examined the involvement of accounting in constructing the 'governable person' (Miller & O'Leary, 1987). In a similar vein, in their study of 'The Genesis of Accountability' Hoskin and Macve traced how the US Military Academy at West (p. 27) Point contributed to the production of a meticulous 'grammatocentric' and 'panoptic' system for human accountability giving rise to US managerialism in the nineteenth century (Hoskin & Macve, 1988).

Around the same time, Miller and Rose set out some of the contours of what they described as the study of modes of governing economic life (Miller & Rose, 1990, 2008), while the study of governmentality more generally began to flourish through a number of forums, including the loosely formed History of the Present group. With these developments, accounting, and instruments of performance management more broadly, began to be analysed in the context of organizations as a technology for the 'conduct of conducts' (see also du Gay, 1996a). Power, for example, investigated the audit explosion in the 1980s in the UK, and argued that the rise and expansion of auditing from the corporate sector to the public sector was inextricably linked to 'a commitment to push control further into organizational structures, inscribing it within systems which can then be audited' (Power, 1997: 42). Drawing on Power's highly influential analysis of the audit society, Radcliffe examined how a reconfiguration of political rationalities in terms of performance-oriented 'management' stimulated the development of efficiency auditing in the local government of Alberta (Radcliffe, 1998).

The authors cited above have drawn explicitly on Foucault's writings, particularly his remarks on governmentality. They have also drawn on concepts borrowed from elsewhere, including social studies of science, the philosophy of science, actor-network theory, and new institutionalism, to name just the most obvious. They always studied 'events', characterized by their singularity and a principle of 'causal multiplication', as Foucault put it when arguing for the importance of 'lightening the weight of causality' (Foucault, 1991 [1981]: 76–7). The above studies have used Foucault's writings to generate a heuristic for empirically rich and historically sensitive descriptions of the multifaceted roles that organization and calculation play in the governing of economic and social life. As Miller and Rose (2008: 5) have put it, more important than a quest to faithfully replicate a particular concept or method is something rather more elusive, a mode of analysis, an ethos of investigation that was opened up by Foucault's writings. That, we suggest, is the distinctive contribution of the encounter between scholars of accounting and the Foucauldian concern with analysing the diverse modalities through which the administering of lives is achieved.

Conclusions

The writings of Michel Foucault have been an inspiration to many who have sought to understand and analyse the ways in which our lives are administered and organized. They have also perplexed or irritated others, who have seen them as arcane or anaesthetizing (Foucault, 1991 [1981]: 82–6; but see also Curtis, 1995; Froud et al., 1998; (p. 28) McKinlay & Pezet, 2010). In this chapter, we have attempted to distil what many have seen of value in Foucault's writings, while seeking also to dispel some of the misconceptions surrounding his work, which may have put off those who would otherwise have found it to be of value. We identified four themes that have animated Foucault's writings across three decades or so. First, we have emphasized his preference for 'how' type questions rather than 'why' type questions. Second, we have highlighted his concern with subjectivity or personhood, which entailed setting aside the ethical polarization of subject and object, in favour of an analysis of the historically varying ways in which the capacities and attributes of subjects are constituted. Third, we have drawn attention to Foucault's preference for studying practices—practices of organizing, governing, and calculating—rather than organizations, and for examining such practices in terms of the affiliations that emerge among practices, so as to form assemblages of interdependent practices. Fourth, we have remarked on Foucault's insistence that practices do not exist outside a particular regime of rationality, but that such regimes of rationality need to be analysed in the multiple and diverse fields in which they are formulated, rather than in terms of a singular process of rationalization.

We have emphasized that these four themes are not meant to be exhaustive, and that other ways of delineating the multiple strands of Foucault's writings are of course possible. We suggest, however, that these four themes have animated his writings across the large part of his oeuvre, and that they form a more or less coherent and complementary set of concerns that are relevant to scholars of organizations. A word of caution is in order here. We have emphasized the elements of continuity in Foucault's concerns, rather than seeking to periodize or partition. This of course is not to suggest that there are no shifts of emphasis in Foucault's writings, whether subtle or at times significant, nor that he has not reframed the objects of his concern, and more than once. And it certainly does not mean that there has been a continuity of empirical objects. Far from it, indeed one of the remarkable achievements of Foucault's writings has been their ability to cover such a broad range of phenomena, including madness, the body, sexuality, punishment, and selfhood more generally. Such objects of concern may appear, to those unfamiliar with Foucault's writings, to be distant from the study of organizations. But we hope to have shown, in our schematic coverage of Foucault's writings, in our discussion of the 'Foucault effect in organization studies', and in our brief discussion of Foucault-inspired studies in accounting, how the themes that have featured in such studies have implications for scholars of organizations.

In view of some of the misunderstandings that Foucault's writings have at times evoked, it may be worth noting some caveats. For instance, a concern with 'how' type questions does not mean neglecting analysis of the conditions which have made possible certain changes, whether within relatively localized settings in firms or other organizations (such as the layout of a factory floor), or larger-scale social transformations (such as the ways in which public services are organized and delivered), or more generally the ways in which work and the administering of the workplace is enacted and valorized at the societal level (du Gay, 1996b; Kurunmäki & Miller, 2011; Mennicken, 2013; (p. 29) Miller & O'Leary, 1993, 1994a; Miller & Rose, 1995b). We have pointed in this chapter to the notion of 'surfaces of emergence' that Foucault coined as early as 1972, as well as to his appeal nearly a decade later to 'causal multiplication' and 'lightening the weight of causality'. In differing ways, such concepts point towards a gentler form of causality than some continue to quest for. But they certainly do not suggest the abnegation of a concern to analyse the conditions that have made possible the emergence of phenomena that are new, and that deserve our attention.

Similarly, a concern with the ways in which the capacities and attributes of subjects are historically formed, whether in the workplace, the home, the school, or wherever, does not mean that the making up of persons is an epistemological blank cheque. The formation of modern notions of actorhood has been a lengthy and complex process, and it is still ongoing (Hacking, 2002; Meyer & Jepperson, 2000; Rose, 1989). To borrow the delightfully prosaic terminology of Ian Hacking, 'ideas' and 'things' play important roles here (Hacking, 1992). Relatedly, and to invoke Foucauldian terminology, to analyse the interdependence between what is said and what is done, between rationalities, programmes, and technologies, suggests a nuanced notion of practices which requires us to be attentive to the grain of thought that is present in even the most mundane parts of social reality (Burchell, Gordon, & Miller, 1991: x). Practices can assume a variety of forms, and the study of their interrelations leads us from highly localized or 'micro' settings to much larger or 'macro' issues, and back again.

Our discussion of the 'Foucault effect' in the domain of organization studies has embraced those writings that have explicitly sought to utilize and extend Foucault's concerns. But we do not view such an 'effect' as limited to those that explicitly affiliate themselves with or cite Foucault. It is a much broader phenomenon, and goes significantly beyond so-called governmentality studies. The Foucault effect in organization studies is as much to do with the writings of Ian Hacking, Anthony Hopwood, Ted Porter, John Meyer and his colleagues, and Michael Power, as well as those who have studied processes of standardization more generally (Brunsson & Jacobsson, 2000; Higgins & Larner, 2010). The intellectual partitioning that suffuses the social and political sciences, in an era when interdisciplinary work is trumpeted ever louder, is as much a potential impediment to organization scholars as it is to other areas of enquiry. One small hope that we have in writing this chapter is that it may help attenuate such partitioning.

Finally, some brief words of a prospective rather than retrospective nature may be appropriate in conclusion. It would be fair to say that Foucault's own writings have typically addressed large-scale transformations that have taken place over several decades, and in some cases over much longer timeframes. Organization scholars are often interested, at least in part, in more localized changes, within and between organizations, whether conducted ethnographically or otherwise. We have argued here that there is much of value in the writings of Foucault for such studies, and indeed there are already examples of such studies. But much more can no doubt be done in this respect, if the principle of multiplication—of levels, domains, and practices—is respected, and also if the links between such different levels, domains, and practices is fully explored so as to analyse the assemblages that form. It is not easy to study the conjoint emergence of (p. 30) practices and their associated rationales in both local and non-local settings, but our understanding of the administering of lives within and beyond organizations will be advanced to the extent that we attempt such studies. Much can also be gained if we attend more explicitly to the roles played by what have been called 'mediating instruments' or 'mediating models' (Miller & O'Leary, 2007; Morgan, 2012; Morrison & Morgan, 1999; Wise, 1988). While organization scholars have paid great attention to inter-organizational relations, less attention has been paid to the instruments that help link actors and aspirations, the devices that facilitate the transfer of information across domains and among formally separate legal entities. Likewise, we suggest that scholars of organizations could pay more attention to the multiple forms of territorializing (Brown, Lawrence, & Robinson, 2005; Elden, 2007; Mennicken & Miller, 2012; Miller & Power, 2013). As Elden (2007) has remarked, territory is more than merely land, and territorializing is not confined to states and statehood. For Foucault, what occurred was not a substitution of a 'territorial state' with a 'population state', but, as he put it in the course summary of *Security, Territory, Population*, 'a shift of accent and the appearance of new objectives, and hence of new problems and new techniques' (Foucault, 2007: 325). Put differently, attending to processes of territorializing is a matter of exploring how the administering of lives, the governing of children, of souls, of households, of hospitals, of teachers, of managers, of social workers, of retired persons, and much more besides, depends on a series of micro-territorializations (Mennicken & Miller, 2012). Instruments and practices of organizing, including calculative practices and the abstract ideas that animate them, play a vital role here. Instruments of accountancy, used widely in and on organizations, for example, presuppose and recursively construct the calculable spaces that actors inhabit within organizations and society. This may be a matter of delineating particular physical spaces, such as a factory floor or a subarea of it, an office, a hospital ward, or any other accounting unit. Or it may be a matter of defining a more abstractly conceived space, such as a department, a division, a particular cost centre, and a group of users or customers (Miller & Power, 2013: 559; but see also Miller, 1992; Mennicken & Miller, 2012).

These are just some suggestions for how Foucault's work may be relevant to organizational scholars in the future. There remains much to be gained, we suggest, from a critical engagement with Foucault's writings through detailed empirical investigations of the varied laboratories for the administering of lives, particularly if such investigations respect the principles of multiplication and the conjoint emergence of practices and their associated rationales. By removing the restriction of analysing only organizations, or even sets or networks of organizations, a substantial new empirical domain is opened up, one that is populated by assemblages for the administering of lives that form in both local and non-local settings, that effect multiple forms of territorializing, and that are facilitated in large part by a plethora of mediating instruments. From such a perspective, the stuff of organizational life is much more varied than it has at times appeared, and we can study it as it is, rather than trying to force it into unnecessarily constraining categories.

References

Al-Moudi, I. (2007). Redrawing Foucault's Social Ontology. *Organization*, 14(4), 543–63.

Argyris, C. (1954). *The Impact of Budgets on People*. New York: Controllership Foundation.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barratt, E. (2008). The Later Foucault in Organization and Management Studies. *Human Relations*, 61(4), 515–37.

Beckert, J. (2009). Agency, Entrepreneurs, and Institutional Change: The Role of Strategic Choice and Institutionalized Practices in Organizations. *Organization Studies*, 20(5), 777–99.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press. (p. 32)

Brown, G., Lawrence, T. B., & Robinson, S. L. (2005). Territoriality in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(3), 577–94.

Brunsson, N., & Jacobsson, B. (Eds). (2000). *A World of Standards*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process Under Monopoly Capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (Eds). (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Burchell, S., Clubb, C., & Hopwood, A. G. (1985). Accounting in its Social Context: Towards a History of Value Added in the United Kingdom. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 10(4), 381–413.

Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, Post Modernism and Organizational Analysis 2: The Contribution of Michel Foucault. *Organization Studies*, 9(2), 221–35.

Burrell, G. (1997). *Pandemonium: Towards a Retro-Organization Theory*. London: Sage.

Caldwell, R. (2007). Agency and Change: Re-evaluating Foucault's Legacy. *Organization*, 14(6), 769–91.

Çalışkan, K., & Callon, M. (2009). Economization, Part 1: Shifting Attention from the Economy towards Processes of Economization. *Economy and Society*, 38(3), 369–98.

Çalışkan, K., & Callon, M. (2010). Economization, Part 2: A Research Programme for the Study of Markets. *Economy and Society*, 39(1), 1–32.

Callon, M. (1998). Introduction: The Embeddedness of Economic Markets in Economics. In M. Callon (Ed.), *The Laws of the Markets* (pp. 1–57). Oxford: Blackwell.

Carter, C. (2008). A Curiously British Story: Foucault Goes to Business School. *International Studies of Management and Organisation*, 38(1), 14–30.

Carter, C., McKinlay, A., & Rowlinson, M. (2002). Foucault, Management and History. *Organization*, 9(4), 515–26.

Castel, R. (1994). 'Problematization' as a Mode of Reading History. In J. Goldstein (Ed.), *Foucault and the Writing of History* (pp. 237–52). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Clegg, S. (1987). Discussion Note: The Language of Power and the Power of Language. *Organization Studies*, 8(1), 61–70.

Clegg, S. (1989). *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage.

Clegg, S. (1994). Weber and Foucault: Social Theory for the Study of Organizations. *Organization*, 1(1), 149–78.

Clegg, S., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and Organizations*. London: Sage.

Clegg, S. R., & Hardy, C. (1996). Organizations, Organization and Organizing. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 1–28). London: Sage.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1–25.

Covaleski, M. A., Dirsmith, M. W., Heian, J. B., & Samuel, S. (1998). The Calculated and the Avowed: Techniques of Discipline and Struggles over Identity in Big Six Public Accounting Firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43(2), 293–327.

Crozier, M., & Friedberg, E. (1980). *Actors and Systems: The Politics of Collective Action*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Curtis, B. (1995). Taking the State Back Out: Rose and Miller on Political Power. *British Journal of Sociology*, 46(4), 575–89.

Deleuze, G. (1999) *[1988]*. *Foucault*. London and New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, G. (2001). *The Logic of Sense*. London: Athlone. (p. 33)

DiMaggio, P. J. (1988). Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional Patterns and Organizations: Culture and Environment* (pp. 3–22). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Donzelot, J. (1980). *The Policing of Families*. London: Hutchinson.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (Eds). (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

du Gay, P. (1993). Enterprise Culture and the Ideology of Excellence. *New Formations*, 13, 45–61.

du Gay, P. (1994). Making Up Managers: Bureaucracy, Enterprise and the Liberal Art of Separation. *British Journal of Sociology*, 45(4), 655–74.

du Gay, P. (1996a). The Conduct of Management and the Management of Conduct: Contemporary Managerial Discourse and the Constitution of the 'Competent' Manager. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(3), 263–82.

du Gay, P. (1996b). *Consumption and Identity at Work*. London: Sage.

du Gay, P., Millo, Y., & Tuck, P. (2012). Making Government Liquid: Shifts in Governance using Financialisation as a Political Device. *Environment and Planning: C*, 30(6), 1083–99.

Elden, S. (2007). Governmentality, Calculation, Territory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25(3), 562–80.

Espeland, W. N., & Sauder, M. (2007). Rankings and Reactivity: How Public Measures Recreate Social Worlds. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 1–40.

Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2003). Working at a Cynical Distance: Implications for Power, Subjectivity and Resistance. *Organization*, 10(1), 157–79.

Foucault, M. (1967). *Madness and Civilization*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1970) *[2002]*. *The Order of Things*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1973). *The Birth of the Clinic*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980) [1976]. The Politics of Health in the Eighteenth Century. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* (pp. 166–82). Brighton: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1981) *[1976]. The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. First published as La Volonté de savoir (Éditions Gallimard, 1976).

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the Self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds), *Technologies of the Self* (pp. 16–49). London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1991) [1979]. Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87–104). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (1991) [1981]. Questions of Method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 73–86). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless Speech*. New York: Semiotext.

Foucault, M. (2001) [1979]. 'Omnes et Singulatim': Toward a Critique of Political Reason. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984. Power. Vol. 3* (pp. 298–325). London: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2001) [1981]. So Is it Important to Think? In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984. Power. Vol. 3* (pp. 454–8). London: The New Press.

Foucault, M. (2001) [1982]. The Subject and Power. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984. Power. Vol. 3* (pp. 326–48). London: The New Press. (p. 34)

Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the College de France, 1977–1978*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the College de France, 1978–1979*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M., Barrett Kriegel, B., Thalamy, A., Beguin, F., & Fortier, B. (1976). *Les Machines à guérir: aux origines de l'hôpital moderne*. Paris: Institut d'Environment.

Froud, J., Williams, K., Haslam, C., Johal, S., & Williams, J. B. (1998). Caterpillar: Two Stories and an Argument. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 23(7), 685–708.

Gordon, C. (1980a). Afterword. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* (pp. 229–259). Brighton: Harvester Press.

Gordon, C. (Ed.). (1980b). *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. Brighton: Harvester Press.

Gordon, C. (1987). The Soul of the Citizen: Max Weber and Michel Foucault on Rationality and Government. In S. Whimster, & S. Lash (Eds), *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity* (pp. 293–316). Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental Rationality: An Introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 1–51). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Gordon, C. (2001). Introduction. In J. D. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984. Power. Vol. 3* (pp. xi–xli). London: The New Press.

Grey, C. (1994). Career as a Project of the Self and Labour Process Discipline. *Sociology*, 28, 479–97.

Grey, C. (1998). On Being a Professional in a 'Big Six' Firm. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 23(5/6), 569–87.

Hacking, I. (1983). *Representing and Intervening: Introductory Topics in the Philosophy of Natural Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hacking, I. (1992). The Self-Vindication of the Laboratory Sciences. In A. Pickering (Ed.), *Science as Practice and Culture* (pp. 29–64). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hacking, I. (2002). Making Up People. In I. Hacking (Ed.), *Historical Ontology* (pp. 99–114). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall, & B. Gieben (Eds), *Formations of Modernity* (pp. 275–320). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hänninen, S., & Palonen, K. (Eds). (1990). *Texts, Contexts, Concepts: Studies on Politics and Power in Language*. Helsinki: Finnish Political Science Association.

Hardy, C. (1996). Understanding Power: Bringing about Strategic Change. *British Journal of Management*, 7(1S), S3–S16.

Heller, T. C., Sosna, M., & Wellbery, D. E. (Eds). (1986). *Reconstructing Individualism: Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hennis, W. (1983). Max Weber's 'Central Question'. *Economy and Society*, 12(2), 135–80.

Higgins, V., & Larner, W. (Eds). (2010). *Calculating the Social: Standards and the Reconfiguration of Governing*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hopwood, A. G. (1987). The Archaeology of Accounting Systems. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 12(2), 287–305.

Hopwood, A. G. (2009). On Striving to Give a Critical Edge to Critical Management Studies. In M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, & H. Willmott (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies* (pp. 515–524). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (p. 35)

Hoskin, K., & Macve, R. (1988). The Genesis of Accountability: The West Point Connection. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 13(1), 37–73.

Ibarra-Colado, E., Clegg, S. R., Rhodes, C., & Kornberger, M. (2006). The Ethics of Managerial Subjectivity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 64, 45–55.

Jacques, R. (1996). *Manufacturing the Employee: Management Knowledge from the 19th to 21st Centuries*. London: Sage.

Jones, C., & Spicer, A. (2005). The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship. *Organization*, 12(2), 223–46.

Knights, D., & McCabe, D. (1998). Dreams and Designs on Strategy: A Critical Analysis of TQM and Management Control. *Work, Employment and Society*, 12(3), 433–56.

Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (1989). Power and Subjectivity at Work: From Degradation to Subjugation in Social Relations. *Sociology*, 23(4), 535–58.

Kurunmäki, L., & Miller, P. (2006). Modernising Government: The Calculating Self, Hybridisation and Performance Measurement. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 22(1), 65–84.

Kurunmäki, L., & Miller, P. (2011). Regulatory Hybrids: Partnerships and Modernising Government. *Management Accounting Research*, 22(4), 220–41.

Lawrence, T. B. (1999). Institutional Strategy. *Journal of Management*, 25, 161–87.

Lipietz, A. (1992). *Towards a New Economic Order: Postfordism, Ecology and Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.

MacKenzie, D. (2006). *An Engine, Not a Camera: How Financial Models Shape Markets*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

MacKenzie, D., & Millo, Y. (2003). Constructing a Market, Performing Theory: The Historical Sociology of a Financial Derivatives Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(1), 107–45.

MacKenzie, D., Muniesa, F., & Siu, L. (Eds). (2007). *Do Economists Make Markets? On the Performativity of Economics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Martin, L. H., Gutman, H., & Hutton, P. H. (Eds). (1988). *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. London: Tavistock.

McKinlay, A. (2002). 'Dead Selves': The Birth of the Modern Career. *Organization*, *9*, 595–614.

McKinlay, A. (2006). Managing Foucault: Genealogies of Management. *Management and Organizational History*, 1(1), 87–100.

McKinlay, A., & Pezet, E. (2010). Accounting for Foucault. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *21*(6), 486–95.

McKinlay, A., & Starkey, K. (Eds). (1998). *Foucault, Management, and Organization Theory: From Panopticon to Technologies of Self*. London: Sage.

Mennicken, A. (2008). Connecting Worlds: The Translation of International Auditing Standards into Post-Soviet Audit Practice. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 33(4/5), 384–414.

Mennicken, A. (2010). From Inspection to Auditing: Audit and Markets as Linked Ecologies. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 35(3), 334–59.

Mennicken, A. (2013). 'Too Big to Fail and Too Big to Succeed': Accounting and Privatisation in the Prison Service of England and Wales. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 29(2), 206–26.

Mennicken, A., & Miller, P. (2012). Accounting, Territorialization and Power. *Foucault Studies*, 13, 4–24.

Meyer, J. W., & Jepperson, R. L. (2000). The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency. *Sociological Theory*, 18(1), 100–20. (p. 36)

Miller, P. (1991). Accounting Innovation Beyond the Enterprise: Problematizing Investment Decisions and Programming Economic Growth in the U.K. in the 1960s. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 16(8), 733–62.

Miller, P. (1992). Accounting and Objectivity: The Invention of Calculating Selves and Calculable Spaces. *Annals of Scholarship*, 9(1/2), 61–86.

Miller, P. (2010). Accounting for Others. In M. Akrich, Y. Barthe, F. Muniesa, & P. Mustar (Eds), *Débordements: Mélanges offerts à Michel Callon* (pp. 315–24). Paris: Presses des Mines.

Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. (1987). Accounting and the Construction of the Governable Person. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 12(3), 235–65.

Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. (1993). Accounting Expertise and the Politics of the Product: Economic Citizenship and Modes of Corporate Governance. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 18(2–3), 187–206.

Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. (1994a). Accounting, 'Economic Citizenship' and the Spatial Reordering of Manufacture. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 19(1), 15–43.

Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. (1994b). The Factory as Laboratory. *Science in Context*, 7(3), 469–96.

Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. (2007). Mediating Instruments and Making Markets: Capital Budgeting, Science and the Economy. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 32(7–8), 701–34.

Miller, P., & Power, M. (2013). Accounting, Organizing, and Economizing: Connecting Accounting Research and Organization Theory. *Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 557–605.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing Economic Life. *Economy and Society*, 19(1), 1–31.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1995a). Political Thought and the Limits of Orthodoxy: A Response to Curtis. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(4), 590–97.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1995b). Production, Identity, and Democracy. *Theory and Society*, 24(3), 427–67.

Miller, P., & Rose, N. (2008). *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social and Personal Life*.

Cambridge: Polity Press.

Morgan, M. S. (2012). *The World in the Model: How Economists Work and Think*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morrison, M., & Morgan, M. S. (1999). Models as Mediating Instruments. In M. S. Morgan, & M. Morrison (Eds), *Models as Mediators: Perspectives on Natural and Social Science* (pp. 10–37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muniesa, F., Millo, Y., & Callon, M. (2007). An Introduction to Market Devices. In M. Callon, Y. Millo, & F. Muniesa (Eds), *Market Devices* (pp. 1–12). Oxford: Blackwell.

Munro, I. (2012). The Management of Circulations: Biopolitical Variations after Foucault. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(3), 345–62.

Newton, T. (1996). Resocialising the Subject? A Re-Reading of Grey's 'Career as a Project of the Self…'. *Sociology*, 30(1), 137–44.

Newton, T. (1998). Theorizing Subjectivity in Organizations: The Failure of Foucauldian Studies? *Organization Studies*, 19(3), 415–47.

Noble, D. F. (1977). *America by Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Noble, D. F. (1984). *Forces of Production: A Social History of Industrial Automation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Malley, P. (1996). Indigenous Governance. *Economy and Society*, 25(3), 310–36.

O'Malley, P., Weir, L., & Shearing, C. (1997). Governmentality, Criticism, Politics. *Economy and Society*, 26(4), 501–17. (p. 37)

Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1), 145–79.

Parker, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Ethics and Organizations*. London: Sage.

Pezet, E. (2007). *Management et Conduite de Soi. Enquête sure les Ascèses de la Performance*. Paris: Vuibert.

Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and Institutions. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 635–52.

Powell, W. W. (1991). Expanding the Scope of Institutional Analysis. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds), *New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 164–82). Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Power, M. (1997). *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Power, M. (2011). Foucault and Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 37, 35–56.

Rabinow, P. (Ed.). (1984) *[1991]. The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin.

Radcliffe, V. S. (1998). Efficiency Audit: An Assembly of Rationalities and Programmes. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 23(4), 377–410.

Rose, N. (1985). *The Psychological Complex: Psychology, Politics and Society in England, 1869–1939*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Free Association Books.

Rose, N. (1998). Governing Enterprising Individuals. In N. Rose (Ed.), *Inventing Our Selves: Psychology, Power and Personhood* (pp. 150–68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. (1999). *The Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), 172–205.

Samiolo, R. (2012). Commensuration and Styles of Reasoning: Venice, Cost-Benefit and the Defense of Place. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 37(6), 382–402.

Schluchter, W. (1979). The Paradox of Rationalization: On the Relation of Ethics to the World. In G. Roth, & W. Schluchter (Eds), *Max Weber's Vision of History* (pp. 11–64). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schluchter, W. (1981). *The Rise of Western Rationalism: Max Weber's Developmental History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sewell, G., & Wilkinson, B. (1992). Someone to Watch Over Me: Surveillance, Discipline, and Just-in-Time Labour Process. *Sociology*, 26(2), 271–91.

Shapiro, M. (Ed.). (1984). *Language and Politics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Skinner, D. (2011). Fearless Speech: Practising Parrhesia in a Self-Managing Community. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization*, 11(2), 157–75.

Starkey, K., & Hatchuel, A. (2002). The Long Detour: Foucault's History of Desire and Pleasure. *Organization*, 9(4), 641–56.

Thompson, P., & Ackroyd, S. (1995). All Quiet on the Workplace Front? A Critique of Recent Trends in British Industrial Sociology. *Sociology*, 29(4), 615–33.

Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, Power/Knowledge, and its Relevance for Human Resource Management. *The Academy of Management Review*, 18(3), 518–45.

Townley, B. (1994). *Reframing Human Resource Management: Power, Ethics and the Subject at Work*. London: Sage. (p. 38)

Townley, B. (2002). Managing with Modernity. *Organization*, 9(4), 549–73.

Veyne, P. (1978). Foucault révolutionne l'histoire. In P. Veyne (Ed.), *Comment on écrit l'histoire* (pp. 203–42). Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Wise, M. N. (1988). Mediating Machines. *Science in Context*, 2(1), 77–113.

Wray-Bliss, E. (2002). Abstract Ethics, Embodied Ethics: The Strange Marriage of Foucault and Positivism in Labour Process Theory. *Organization*, 9(1), 5–39.

Notes:

(*) We would like to acknowledge the comments and encouragement provided by the editors of this volume on earlier versions of this chapter, and Paul du Gay in particular. Also, we would like to note the very helpful comments and reflections provided by Chris Carter, especially regarding the utilization of Foucault by organization scholars.

(1) . There are of course exceptions, and without invidiously itemizing them we examine some of them in what follows.

(2) . We have reflected on this curious non-encounter, albeit without any plausible explanations. It is particularly puzzling, given the significant personal and institutional connections that existed at various points.

(3) . Over his relatively short lifespan, Foucault has produced numerous works, well known and widely cited classics, such as *Discipline and Punish* (1977), *The History of Sexuality* (1981 [1976]), *Madness and Civilization* (1967), *The Order of Things* (1970/2002), and *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972), but also less widely cited books, such as *The Birth of the Clinic* (1973). Further, he has written a great number of essays (see e.g. Rabinow,

1984/1991). He has given a range of short interviews (see e.g. Gordon, 1980b), and he has left behind a vast archive of lectures, notes, and correspondences, which continue to keep Foucault scholars busy.

(4) . Miller and O'Leary (1994b), for example, utilize the notion of assemblage to draw attention to the ensemble of actors, instruments, ideas and interventions, and the multiplicity of locales, within which the factory (in this case Caterpillar) was problematized and proposals for redesigning it emerged (492).

(5) . See also Burchell et al. (1991).

(6) . There are of course important exceptions, and we address some of those below. Anthony Hopwood (2009: 517), in a discussion of critical management studies, referred to the preoccupation with theory in characteristically pithy language as 'endless minor theorizing'.

(7) . Again, there are exceptions to this, and we consider some of them below.

(8) . See also the book by Burrell (1997), which featured Foucault and became an important landmark in organization theory.

(9) . This section has been adapted from Mennicken and Miller (2012).

Andrea Mennicken

Andrea Mennicken is Associate Professor in accounting at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and Deputy Director of the Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation (LSE). She received her doctorate from LSE in 2005 on a thesis entitled *Moving West: The Emergence, Reform and Standardisation of Audit Practices in Post-Soviet Russia*. She holds a Master (LSE) and German Diploma Degree (University of Bielefeld) in sociology. Her work has been published in the journals *Accounting*, *Organizations and Society*, *Financial Accountability and Management*, *Foucault Studies*, and different edited volumes. She has co-edited (with Hendrik Vollmer) *Zahlenwerk: Kalkulation, Organisation und Gesellschaft* [*Number Work: Calculation, Organisation and Society*] (2007). Her research interests include social studies of valuation and accounting, transnational governance regimes, processes of economization and marketization, standardization, and public sector reforms with a special focus on prisons.

Peter Miller

Peter Miller is Professor of Management Accounting at the London School of Economics and Political Science, and an Associate of the Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation. He is an Editor of Accounting, Organizations and Society, and has published in a wide range of accounting, management, and sociology journals, including The Academy of Management Annals, Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, Accounting, Organizations and Society, British Journal of Sociology, Economy and Society, European Accounting Review, Financial Accountability & Management, Journal of Cultural Economy, Foucault Studies, Management Accounting Research, and Social Research. He was an editor of I&C (previously Ideology & Consciousness), and co-editor of The Foucault Effect (1991). In 1987 he published Domination and Power, and in 1986 co-edited (with Nikolas Rose) The Power of Psychiatry. More recently, he has co-edited (with the late Anthony Hopwood) Accounting as Social and Institutional Practice (1994) and Accounting, Organizations and Institutions (2009). In 2008 he published (jointly with Nikolas Rose) Governing the Present.

Access is brought to you by London School of Economics and Political Science