

An aerial photograph of a city, likely Launceston, showing a large bridge spanning a river. In the foreground, there are several buildings, including a large industrial structure that appears to be tram sheds. The text is overlaid on the top half of the image.

# 10th CSEAR Australasian Conference

PROGRAM & ABSTRACTS

4 - 7 December 2011

Tram Sheds Launceston

## Tuesday – 6<sup>th</sup> December

Time		
9.00 – 9.10		Welcome
9.10 – 10.10	<b>PLENARY 2</b> <b>Rob Gray and Stefan Schaltegger</b> Debating accounting and sustainability: Incompatibility and rapprochement in the pursuit of corporate sustainability	
10.10 – 10.30	<b>Session 9 – Auditorium</b>	Morning break
10.30 – 12.00	<b>MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTING – Chair: Sue Conway</b> <b>Evangeline Eljido-Ten and Yulianda Tjan</b> Sustainability balanced scorecard disclosures: An Australian investigation <b>Kevin Huang, Matthew Pepper and Graham Bowrey</b> Implementing a sustainability balanced scorecard 'dashboard' approach to assess organisational legitimacy <b>Lyn Murphy and William Maguire</b> Uncovering stakeholder perceptions of sponsored clinical trials to inform a social audit	<b>INTERNATIONAL – Chair: Gordon Boyce</b> <b>Northayati Mat Husin, Keith Hooper and Karin Olesen</b> Intellectual capital reporting in Malaysian companies – A benchmark against Malaysian knowledge-based initiatives <b>Moazzem Hossain and Anna Rowe</b> Enablers for corporate social and environmental responsibility (CSER) practices: Evidence from Bangladesh <b>Nacanieli Rika</b> Social, environmental and economic catalysts for accounting policy changes
12.00 – 12.05		Transition
12.05 – 1.05	<b>Session 11 – Auditorium</b> <b>ENVIRONMENTAL/CSR – Chair: Anna Rowe</b> <b>Bakhtiar Alrazi, Charl De Villiers and Chris van Staden</b> The comprehensiveness of environmental reporting by global electric utilities: The type of information and the reporting media <b>Shayuti M. Adnan, Chris van Staden and David Hay</b> Does the interaction of culture with governance structure influence CSR disclosure?	<b>Session 12 – Tram Room 29</b> <b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT – Chair: Sumit Lodhia</b> <b>Nick Scullli</b> Towards the development of a climate change risk index for local government: Some evidence from coastal councils in Australia <b>Larry O'Connor</b> The institutionalization of sustainability: Observations from the Australian local government sector
1.05 – 1.45		Lunch

## Plenary session 2

### DEBATING ACCOUNTING AND SUSTAINABILITY: Incompatibility and Rapprochement in the Pursuit of Corporate Sustainability

**Rob Gray**

CSEAR, School of Management  
University of St Andrews  
St Andrews, Fife, KY16 9RJ  
Scotland  
rob.gray@st-andrews.ac.uk

**Stefan Schaltegger**

Centre for Sustainability Management  
(CSM) Leuphana University of Lüneburg  
Scharnhorststr. 1, 21335  
Lüneburg, Germany  
schaltegger@uni.leuphana.de

**DRAFT: 16<sup>th</sup> November 2011**

#### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the participants at the 2010 International Congress on Social and Environmental Accounting Research at St Andrews University who supported and helped develop this debate. In addition especial thanks are due to Sue Gray for her considerable help in recording and transcribing the debate itself. We are grateful for the suggestions and encouragement of the referees of the CSEAR Conference at Launceston, Tasmania in December 2011

#### ABSTRACT

This paper explores and compares two approaches to accounting and sustainability to understand why different implications for practice, research and education are drawn. We attempt to forge a bridge of communication and understanding between the critical social accounting and the pragmatic sustainability accounting approach, which represent apparently incompatible, views on the nature of sustainability, the interactions between sustainability and business and how accounting can, could or should be deployed in support of the development of our understandings of (un-)sustainable businesses. The paper is derived from – and retains the form of – a debate between the two authors. The debate struggles from the outset with differences in language and conception. This, in turn, leads to confusions over the nature of the theoretical allegiances of the two authors and what sustainability can (or cannot) mean at the organisational level. The debate is structured around four key points concerned with agency, process, language and time. The conclusion offers both agreement and disagreement. It offers points of rapprochement, points of strong agreement but also identifies some continuing disagreement and seeks to identify the reasons for that remaining disagreement. Conclusions are drawn for further research.