



Thomas Klikauer

The Language of Managerialism

Organizational
Communication or an
Ideological Tool?

palgrave
macmillan

The Language of Managerialism

Thomas Klikauer

The Language of Managerialism

Organizational Communication
or an Ideological Tool?

palgrave
macmillan

Thomas Klikauer
Sydney Graduate School of Management
Western Sydney University
Sydney, NSW, Australia

ISBN 978-3-031-16378-4 ISBN 978-3-031-16379-1 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16379-1>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG. The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

*This book is dedicated to
Alan Kurdi*

Acknowledgement

I would like to acknowledge the proofreading and editorial assistance and support of, firstly, my adored and trusted proofreading friend, Meg Vista who hammered the book into shape in the first place. Based on weeks of her hard work, a fine-tuned book reached a presentable level.

Thanks also goes to my good friend Ralf Itzwerth without whom this book—written between 2019 and 2022—would not have been possible. Ralf sold an old Apple desktop computer to me on which this book was written. Ralf also provided an on-going IT support.

Another thank-you goes to the *German Foundation* (boeckler.de/en) that generously supported my transition from being a German countryside boy who trained as a tool-maker and as a union representative to eventually becoming an academic. I also thank the Union of Automobile Workers in Detroit (uaw.org) where I learned, during an internship, how to type with ten fingers.

A final thanks and, nonetheless, an equal thank-you also goes to the following people for valuable critique over the past years: Stephen Ackroyd, Herman Schwind, Henry Grioux, Richard Hyman, John Trumpbour and Noam Chomsky.

A thank-you also goes to the Western Sydney University's School of Business because my workload granted me time for writing this book. This book received no internal and external support. There was also no funding, no institutional and editorial assistance. Nonetheless, I am

grateful for the assistance of WSU's Library and in particular, WSU's Document Delivery Service. A substantial thank-you goes to those colleagues who shielded me from the worst excesses of university Managerialism. This allowed me to concentrate on the book rather than filling in forms and write reports for corporate apparatchiks.

Furnished with time to engage in critical scholarship, this book is not about empirical presentations. It is about an abstraction, the abstractions of *The Language of Managerialism*. It is written in the spirit of the philosopher Alfred Whitehead who once said, *you cannot think without abstractions*. Foremost, this book is written for people with the ability to think in abstractions.

Contents

1	Introducing the Language of Managerialism	1
2	Models of Managerialism	35
3	The Twelve Language Areas of Managerialism	65
4	The Language of Managerialism and Its Infiltration of the Lifeworld	101
5	Business Schools and the Language of Managerialism	131
6	Language & Rationality	161
7	Corporate Apparatchiks and Superlatives	191
8	Conclusion: The Curse of the Language of Managerialism	223
	Index	253

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	The Organisational Model of Managerialism (M_A). M Management, M_A Managerialism	40
Fig. 2.2	The global model of Managerialism (M_A). M Management, M_A Managerialism	48
Fig. 2.3	The trident model of Managerialism (M_A). M Management, M_A Managerialism	50
Fig. 3.1	Neoliberalism's and Managerialism's language	67
Fig. 4.1	The language of management and Managerialism	102
Fig. 7.1	From Satanic Mills to ideology	205
Fig. 8.1	The structure of an ideal speech	243

List of Tables

Table 1.1	The vocabulary of Managerialism	13
Table 3.1	Current fields with manifestations of Managerialism	68
Table 3.2	Comparing two approaches to Managerialism	69
Table 3.3	Different forms of Managerialism	69
Table 3.4	The twelve elements of the language of Managerialism	69
Table 5.1	The historical epochs of business organisations	138
Table 6.1	A classification of management journals	166
Table 7.1	Key actors and institutions of the interest symbiosis	192
Table 7.2	Some acronyms used by Managerialism	196
Table 7.3	QS world university rankings: global MBA rankings 2020	214
Table 8.1	A University's mission statement, goals and values	232
Table 8.2	Three conditions for ideal speech	239
Table 8.3	Three forms of arguments	240
Table 8.4	Sentence formulation for discourses	241
Table 8.5	Four theories of truth	242



1

Introducing the Language of Managerialism

In order to understand the language of Managerialism, a brief examination into Managerialism itself is needed. This introduction is designed to be a clarifying contribution to current discussions on Managerialism and will hopefully provide a single and satisfactory working definition of Managerialism. From its *immaculate conception*, Managerialism originated in for-profit enterprises where it dispersed from until today, where it is found in public and private organisations.

Like almost anything, Managerialism can be defined *positively* (by stating what it is) and *negatively* (by stating what it is not). Since this book is about 'Managerialism rather than management'¹ and historically, *Managerialism* came after management, or what this book calls 'simple management', let's start with the negatives, that is, what Managerialism is not. Managerialism is not simply a modern management method or an institutional model.² Neither is it a hands-on method because it has transformed the applied methods of management into an ideology. While management carries 'how to do' methods and certain engineering-like techniques, Managerialism is almost completely deprived of such elements.

Secondly, Managerialism cannot be understood within the framework of institutional theory which proposes that an organisational structure

defines organisational schemes, rules, norms and routines. Managerialism is the exact opposite of what institutional theory proposes. This book argues that it is the ideology, not the structure, that defines organisational schemes, rules, norms and routines.³ Both—methodological and institutional—approaches would cut too short in explaining Managerialism, yet like these approaches, Managerialism too originates to a large degree in business schools. In other words, modern business schools remain as the most fertile breeding grounds for Managerialism.⁴

These business or management schools furnish managers with technical skills, but more importantly, they also breed the ideology of Managerialism. Together with, perhaps, corporate public relations (PR) departments,⁵ business schools remain the institutional centres for Managerialism that provide the ideological means to establish their own ends: the ideological managerialisation of society.⁶ Managerialism, like any ideology, is defined by its ends and by the means used to achieve those ends. Today, Managerialism's primary means of managerial ideology has reached its end, namely society.

Yet, the rise of Managerialism during the last two and a half decades has not been paralleled by a satisfying theory development. There are rafts of management textbooks, collections, books, academic and non-academic journals, magazine articles and large numbers of academics employed by management schools today, but despite all this, there are very few theoretical elaborations on Managerialism. Nonetheless, there are some noteworthy exceptions.⁷ These have discussed Managerialism although none has delivered a comprehensive theory, let alone a satisfying definition.

A first and general attempt to answer the question 'What is Managerialism?' is defined as a belief that organisations have more similarities than differences and, thus, the performance of all organisations can be optimised by the application of generic management skills and theory. To the managerialist practitioners, there is little difference in the skills required to run an advertising agency, an oil rig or a university. Experience and skills pertinent to an organisation's core business are considered secondary. The term Managerialism has been used disparagingly to describe organisations perceived to have a preponderance or excess of managerial techniques, solutions, rules and personnel.

The MBA degree, for example, is intended to provide generic skills to a new class of managers not wedded to a particular industry or a professional sector. Managerialism extends this to society in general. Proponents of Managerialism like the *Harvard Business Review's* former editor Magretta⁸ once claimed, 'we all learn to think like managers, even if that's not what we're called'. Set against that, Grey⁹ highlights the oppressive character of Managerialism's project. But Managerialism's universalisation remains not only oppressive, it also seeks to eliminate managerial capitalism's class character. Following from that, the term Managerialism has been used pejoratively to define a managerialist class that converts society in its totality.

American management expert Locke,¹⁰ for example, sees Managerialism as an expression of a special group—management—that entrenches itself ruthlessly and systemically in an organisation. It deprives the owners of decision-making power and the workers of their ability to resist Managerialism. In fact, the rise of Managerialism may in itself be a response to people's resistance in society and more specifically, workers' opposition against managerial regimes.¹¹ In a Hegelian dialectic of Managerialism-vs.-resistance, two key aspects emerge. Firstly, in managerial regimes as well as externally, there is Managerialism's inability to completely annihilate workers' resistance against it. Secondly, there is also the historic tradition of resistance against Managerialism's global project that finds its more recent expression in the anti-globalisation movement.¹²

In managerial regimes meanwhile, Managerialism justifies its takeover on the grounds of the managing group's superior education and their exclusive status of 'people in positions of institutional power'.¹³ Managerialists, corporate apparatchiks¹⁴ and those who represent a 'translational managerial class'¹⁵ reach well beyond organisational knowledge and know-how deemed necessary to the efficient running of an organisation. Today, these definitions have to be enhanced as Managerialism has extended itself from the limitations of business organisations deep into public institutions and society. Hence, a more appropriate approximation of a definition might be as follows:

Managerialism combines management's generic tools and knowledge with ideology to establish itself systemically in organisations, public institutions,

and society while depriving business owners (property), workers (organisational-economical), and civil society (social-political) of all decision making powers. Managerialism justifies the application of its one-dimensional managerial techniques to all areas of work, society, and capitalism on the grounds of superior ideology, expert training, and the exclusiveness of managerial knowledge necessary to run public institutions and society, as corporations.

To achieve this, management had to mutate into Managerialism, thereby transforming neoliberal capitalism into ‘Managerial Capitalism’.¹⁶ The transition from management to Managerialism has historic origins. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, simple factory administrations were running what Blake called *Dark Satanic Mills*.¹⁷ These were small workshops administered by overseers. Their brutal regime was soon symbolised by the whip.¹⁸ Eventually, and as workplaces grew even larger, these early overseers mutated into managers.

Management installed itself as the sole institution with specialised managerial knowledge to administer the rising factory system.¹⁹ Perhaps, the most hyped-up turning point between simple factory administration and *Scientific Management* was Taylor’s rather un-*Scientific Management* for which not a single scientific experiment was conducted. Falsely claiming to be a product of science, *Scientific Management* was giving a quasi-scientific legitimacy to management. Simultaneously, these so-called *Scientific Management* humiliated labour by setting it equal to farm animals, just as Frederic Taylor talked about ‘ox, gorilla, [and that] workers are kept stupid’.²⁰

During the twentieth century, factory management expanded its operations. By inventing and legitimising ideologies such as competition, efficiency, free markets, greed is good, and so on, management mutated into an ideological operation that has infected virtually all sections of human society.²¹ Managerialism’s chronological trajectory could only ever be linear: management→Managerialism. Historically, management and Managerialism were not parallel movements nor was Managerialism an ideology that formed the practical expression of management. In short, management entered the scene before Managerialism.

In terms of historical-geographical chronology, Managerialism's managerial origins are genuinely American because the USA has been at the forefront of management techniques and their accompanying ideologies—Taylor, Ford, Drucker, Porter, etc.²²—with possible exceptions being the French writer Henri Fayol (1916), and perhaps Max Weber (1864–1920).²³ Consequently, it was in the USA where management first became Managerialism. 'During Herbert Hoover's years as Secretary of Commerce and then as President, Managerialism was further honed until it became the sword's point of reform in the Roosevelt era. Managerialism was credited with the prosperity of the Eisenhowers in the 1950s'.²⁴ In short, management is an early twentieth century term signified through four names: Taylor, Fayol, Ford and Chandler, while Managerialism is a late-twentieth and twenty-first centuries' term signified through four different names: Enteman, Locke, Spender and Klikauer.²⁵

Managerialism merges ideology with management. This combination assists the expansion of something rather simplistic and dull: administering a company. 'Management, to put it plainly, is boring'.²⁶ But, this has become something that transcends management, mutating a full-fledged ideology under the formula:

Managerialism = Management + Ideology + Expansion

This formula ($M_A = MIE$)²⁷ signifies Managerialism's origins to which it added ideology as the second ingredient. Its third ingredient is its drive to spread managerial techniques 'across space and time',²⁸ far beyond the realms of managerial organisations into the *lifeworld*.²⁹ Managerialism also claims that technology is value-neutral. Still, technology remains deeply ideological.³⁰

In other words, technology can be combined with, as Marx called it, 'various processes'. In Karl Marx's original concept, 'capitalist production ... develops technology' and combines these 'into a social whole'.³¹ For Marx, this is the original source of all wealth. Managerialism extends

this process by adding ideology. Today, the ideology of Managerialism affects almost all our social existence even more severely than Marx could have ever imagined in the nineteenth century. This manifests the ideological power of technology when appropriated by Managerialism.

When management mutated into an *-ism*, it joined a family of *-isms* that indicate an informal, often derogatory and unspecified doctrine, system or practice. Such *-isms* are belief-systems with a cognitive content that is held up as being true. The hidden companion of management—Managerialism—represents such an *-ism* that is implicitly accepted as authoritative by the managerial class, in management schools and by the general public. In short, any *-ism*-like Managerialism represents a doctrine consisting of a shared set of common ideological beliefs and practices.

To turn management into an *ism*, management needed to come up with a proper ideology. It has become common to see an ideology as a set of ideas that constitute goals, expectations and actions. An ideology can be thought of as a comprehensive vision or as a one-dimensional way of looking at things. What is important is that an ideology provides a worldview phrased as a set of ideas proposed by a dominant class or group.

Today, virtually all members of the managerial domain, and even society, receive the managerialist ideology that creates an alienated and ‘false consciousness’. The ideology as false consciousness equation originates in Marx’ ‘false consciousness, a pure ideology alienating people from themselves’ [*Insofern sei sie ein falsches Bewusstsein, also reine Ideologie von sich selbst entfremdeten Menschen*] and in the Frankfurt School’s critical theory—‘the distinction between true and false consciousness, real and immediate interest still is meaningful’.³²

Ideologies are used to engineer complacency and compliance so that the victims of ideological socialisation do not rebel but support the given ideology.³³ But, ideology always seeks to masquerade uniformity and the overall goal based on a set of easy to digest principles such as competition, deregulation, efficiency, free markets and privatisation, to name a few. These are presented as unquestioned truths, as neutral and natural. Nevertheless, managerialist ideologies have to support capitalism and competition.³⁴ But they remain systems of abstract thought applied to public matters, making ideology central to politics, economics and

society. Implicitly, a catch-all umbrella ideology, such as Managerialism's 'competitive advantage', seeks to redirect thinking away from truth and into a specific direction that is invented by a hegemonic power group.³⁵

As with most *-isms*, Managerialism is more often used pejoratively rather than favourably. Where Managerialism is dominant, its ideology is made to appear as common sense requiring no further explanation (e.g. competitive advantage). These assumptions are backed up through an ideological legitimacy delivered by universities that house management schools generating thousands of MBAs and other management graduates.

The university association seeks to elevate management to the realm of science in an attempt to equalise management with science on par with physics or at least with economics. With the rise of business schools inside universities, management 'science'—as a whole—serves as a PR-exercise to legitimise the crypto-academic subject of management studies.³⁶ It created a mutually supportive arrangement between university Managerialism and its university apparatchiks, on the one hand, and business school and management studies, on the other hand. When the language of Managerialism needs a name—free enterprise, business community, etc.—the preferred PR choice is usually one that conceals the profit interest—now framed as *shareholder value*.³⁷ What new public management is in the public sector, is shareholder value in the private sector.

Managerialism's language of *shareholder value* comes along with synonyms like organisational goals and outcomes, performance, organisational objectives, adding value, *Triple Bottom Line* (PPP, i.e. people, planet, profit), the Real Bottom Line and the like. All of which conceal the profit motive. As an ideological cloaking device, shareholder value is of particular interest. It presents managers simply as mere agents of the shareholders while simultaneously pretending that they are best suited to run society. Managerialism is dangerous because of its ability to spread its ideological doctrine.³⁸

Hence, Managerialism's perilous central doctrine is that the differences between a university and a car company are less important than their similarities, and that the performance of all organisations can be optimised by the application of generic management skills and knowledge. As a consequence, Managerialism relentlessly pushes institutional reform also known as 'organisational restructuring'. Indeed, restructuring has

become one of Managerialism's most favourite buzzwords.³⁹ Restructuring gained high currency because of its ability to further remove obstacles from management's self-invented *the right to manage*. In short, restructuring fosters authoritarian managerial regimes inside companies and corporations. Meanwhile, neoliberalism seeks to achieve the very thing in society.

Managerialism and Neoliberalism

Historically, the rise of Managerialism has gone hand in hand with that of reactionary programmers of market-oriented reforms, such as Thatcherism, Reaganism, economic rationalism and neoliberalism. Nonetheless, Managerialism and neoliberalism are not synonymous even though they share certain affinities. Neoliberalism has a definite political programme as outlined by *Herr von Hayek* in his *Road to Serfdom*⁴⁰ which consists of roughly seven policies:

1. Deregulation of markets,
2. Creation of new markets,
3. Deregulation of labour and industrial relations,
4. Reduction and destruction of social welfare,
5. The privatisation of everything,⁴¹
6. Reduction of state regulation, and
7. Anti-unionism.

By contrast, Managerialism is not primarily concerned with such political issues. Managerialism's prime concern is not politics but the management of capitalism and society in its image with the ultimate goal that both mirror the way corporations are managed. For Managerialism, managerial techniques are the guiding principle; for neoliberalism, it is the free market.⁴²

Neoliberalism is about economics and politics, while Managerialism is primarily about corporations, management and the function of both inside 'managerial capitalism'.⁴³ Neoliberalism at least pretends to serve the common good, whereas Managerialism has no common good. But

perhaps, the clearest point of difference between both remains democracy.⁴⁴ Managerialism has no democratic programme. It does not seek to influence politics to get democratically elected representatives to further any political ambitions. Managerialism is primarily about getting its managerial-reactionary ideology carried over from companies into society by colonising societal institutions and consequently, attacking what Habermas calls *the lifeworld*.⁴⁵

For Managerialism, politics and democracy are simply a hindrance on the way to efficiency and competitive advantages. In sum, neoliberalism is about democracy while for Managerialism, the extermination of democracy is no more than an—albeit welcomed—side-effect. Inside the neoliberalist project, democracy and politics remain important. Inside Managerialism, no democracy and no politics exist, and there are no democratic solutions to problems, only managerial ones. Equally, Managerialism is not about Rousseau's *volonté générale* of the people, but about a managerial-engineering approach to societal problems that have been converted into technicalities.

While neoliberalism's background is economics, Managerialism remains an outgrowth of management. At first glance, Managerialism may even appear inconsistent with traditional free-market thinking with ideals such as competitive markets supplied by firms. Neoliberalism's free-market ideology is merely an obstruction for Managerialism. This has been perfectly expressed by one of Managerialism's main ideological flagships—*Harvard Business Review*—when its former editor Magretta made the following stunning revelations⁴⁶:

Business executives are society's leading champions of free markets and competition, words that, for them, evoke a world view and value system that rewards good ideas and hard work, and that fosters innovation and meritocracy. Truth be told, the competition every manager longs for is a lot closer to Microsoft's end of the spectrum than it is to the dairy farmers'. All the talk about the virtues of competition notwithstanding, the aim of business strategy is to move an enterprise away from perfect competition and in the direction of monopoly.

Managerialism's ideology, rhetoric and factual interests are worlds apart when it comes to advocating 'free markets' while simultaneously seeking to establish monopolies. Managerialism may be consistent with neoliberalism's ideology of 'advocating' free markets. But neoliberalism neglects to mention that this inevitably leads to economic monopolisation with a handful of corporations occupying a domineering position. Managerialism actively seeks to establish this. Similarly, when Managerialism engineers takeovers of public entities, it takes corporations as *the* model.

But the relentless application of managerial techniques to public administration paralleled by an expansion of Managerialism into public policy areas also brought the previously relatively unknown idea of Managerialism into the public mind. 'The managerial revolution attracted very little public attention because Managerialism did not call attention to itself; it was a dull affair that appealed to the mentality of the accountant, not the charismatic'.⁴⁷ Lacking charisma, management was in dire need for ideology.

Managerialism's Ideology

The main features of Managerialism at the level of managerial regimes, for example, are unremitting organisational restructuring, sharpening of incentives, and expansion in number, power and remuneration of senior managers, with a corresponding downgrading of the role of skilled workers.⁴⁸ This is accompanied by the managerialist trilogy of 'downsizing-rightsizing-suicizing'. It extends to outsourcing, reducing employees to a material inventory framed as human resources and human capital, lowering their income and downgrading their working conditions.⁴⁹ All these management measures are supported by the managerialist ideology. Despite Managerialism's pretension that there is some kind of management philosophy, Managerialism remains an ideology, not a philosophy.⁵⁰

Ideology may be seen as knowledge in the service of power. This sharply distinguishes ideology from philosophy. For the former, knowledge serves power while for the latter, it is *philo-sophia φιλοσοφία*—the love of

wisdom. Unlike ideology that creates and even invents knowledge for a specific purpose, philosophy carries connotations to studying fundamental problems, such as those connected with reality, existence, knowledge, values, reason, mind and language. In Hegelian philosophy, for example, philosophy is seen as serving nobody apart from itself. It seeks to understand the world by examining its opposites through analysing two sides of an argument—thesis and anti-thesis. Examining these relationships creates philosophical knowledge.

Being a rather one-dimensional affair, ideology, on the other hand, is not geared towards examining positives and negatives. Nor does it exist ‘in-itself’ (Kant) or ‘for-itself’ (Hegel) but for a purpose: serving power. Its task is not understanding and wisdom but covering up, eclipsing, colonising and distorting. Its ‘telos’ is that of Hegel’s master-slave relationship in which ideological knowledge serves a master. Philosophy, by contrast, is to a large extent defined by epistemology—Greek *ἐπιστήμη* *epistēmē*—meaning knowledge, understanding and *λόγος* *logos* as ‘study of’. By contrast, an ideology can be seen as a set of ideas constituting goals for action. The main purpose behind an ideology is to make individuals adhere to certain ideals cementing ‘the given’ as a ‘factum brutum’ or status quo.

As a consequence, Managerialism remains an ideology that does not serve the truth but invents ideas in the service of power for one of the foremost powerful institutions in today’s society: management. When management metamorphosed into an ideology, it expanded not only ideologically but also institutionally, with setups like Managerialism’s main broadcasting system of corporate mass media. But many more deeply ideological institutions were to come in the shape of business-lobbying organisations, think tanks and institutions like the OECD, GATT, IMF, World Bank and the Davos World Managerial Forum.⁵¹ Not surprisingly, the institutional and relentless ideological expansion of the language of Managerialism extended from corporate public relations deep into the lifeworld. The advancement of the language of Managerialism can be described in the following way⁵²:

The language of Managerialism originating as a linguistic doctrine of business organisations has its own terminology and jargon. The language of

Managerialism came to the lifeworld as the German army came to Poland. In public schools, colleges, and universities, for example, they talk about *achieved learning outcomes*, *quality assurance mechanisms*, and *international benchmarking*. Throw *triple bottom line*, *customer satisfaction*, and *world class* around and the language of Managerialism determines your thinking.

There are many more examples of the language of Managerialism. Just like any other form of language—the language spoken by medical people, the language the military speaks, the language of mathematicians, to name but a few—the world of management speaks its own language. In all these cases, specific fields of endeavours have created specific languages as a structured system that communicates issues internally (doctors↔doctors) as well as to the external world (doctors↔patients). The language of factory administration and later management was, to a large extent, designed to communicate managerial issues internally—inside business organisations. By contrast, the new language of Managerialism is largely designed to communicate the ideology of Managerialism to the external world. As a consequence, Managerialism has created not just its own language but also plenty of jargons. Apart from classics like www.bullshitgenerator.com,⁵³ a number of generators can be used to increase the managerialist's vocabularies⁵⁴:

Even more disturbing than these (Table 1.1) are the many *managerialist buzzword generators* available on the internet. *The Corporate B.S. Generator*,⁵⁵ for example, allows the creation of the language of Managerialism by randomly linking adverbs, verbs, adjectives and nouns. The use of the language of Managerialism and its spread into the lifeworld provides Managerialism with a transmission system that also relies on the assistance of corporate mass media. Together, these have infiltrated substantial sections of the lifeworld and almost every eventuality of human existence. By stealth, the language of Managerialism has aided the creation of a managerialist society based on a managerialist ideology.

The language of Managerialism, management, managerial capitalism and Managerialism itself has *managed* to penetrate the lifeworld so effectively that it warrants the term managerialist society. The language of Managerialism has aided the creation of a one-dimensional managerialist society without any serious opposition. But each of the language of

Table 1.1 The vocabulary of Managerialism

<i>Bucketise</i>	This is the act of putting things into buckets or, as a normal person would say, groups. The extra few syllables of saying put things into groups are well worth the extra effort.
<i>Calendarise</i>	If you calendarise something, you schedule something. Let's put something in the calendar is also an acceptable alternative.
<i>From the cradle to the grave</i>	This means from start to finish, which is much better to say, unless you are feeling particularly morbid.
<i>Cross-pollinate</i>	Some scientists are now saying that human beings are not the same as bees. So, instead of cross-pollinating, try working with your colleagues and sharing ideas.
<i>Deep-dive</i>	In the management sense, this means to explore something extensively. It's a nice way of saying research something until you can take no more.
<i>High-level learnings</i>	These are lessons that have been learned at the top level of your organisation. Instead of sharing them with you, this phrase is often used as the speaker doesn't understand the lessons themselves and wants to skip onto their next point. We're on to you!
<i>Ideation</i>	Simply another word for thinking. This is a word typically used by an English student who gets over-excited by their thesaurus, wanting to impress their teacher.
<i>Lay the foundations</i>	A round-about way of saying prepare. It is also cringeworthy referred to as doing the groundwork.
<i>Reach out</i>	This is one that I have been guilty of using myself, but our reader Jeanette assures me that it should only be said if you're a member of the Four Tops. As I am not, I will now use the phrase go and speak to instead.
<i>Robust</i>	When you could easily use simple alternatives like strong and powerful, you must start to wonder what's going through someone's mind when they use the word robust.
<i>Don't reinvent the wheel</i>	Don't try to be innovative, just keep things simple. Advice does not get much more vague.
<i>Get down in the weeds</i>	This means to go into detail, to discuss the complexities of the issues. It's quite a tricky one to understand how it originated—garden weeds are not the most complex plant. Sorry, garden weed fans!
<i>I hear what you are saying</i>	Everyone cringes when they hear this because the literal translation is: I'm going to carry on with my point and ignore yours.
<i>Keeping this show on the road</i>	This means to keep something going successfully, which isn't too cringey until someone abbreviates it to KSOR in an email and you stare at it for five minutes to figure out what that actually means. The pessimists' alternative is keeping the boat afloat.

(continued)

Table 1.1 (continued)

Let's touch base offline—The more jazzy way of saying let's meet in person, which you may want to think carefully about if you hear someone use this phrase.

Push and pull strategy—A push strategy is when you push a product towards a customer and a pull strategy is when you pull a customer towards a product. It's a phrase that's too often directed at us non-marketing muggles.

Sharpen the point of this pencil—Well done for not gagging when you read this one. It means to go further into detail about what you are saying to leave a more refined mark on the listener—although it could be interpreted differently.

Sing from the same hymn-sheet—This is another way of saying let's all work in unison, unless your church is running out of lyric-sheets for its hymns.

This is mission-critical—If something is mission-critical it is very important to the success of the venture. I imagine sci-fi fans like to say this in a dramatic voice.

When was the last time you did something for the first time?!—The ultimate cliché, but at least a manager who says this cares about your personal development. I'm desperately looking for the positives now.

Seamless, holistic and leverage will likely be favourite terms of your technology suppliers.

Adoption process—This is the practice of introducing a new process, procedure or technology onto the contact centre floor. Don't worry, your manager isn't asking you to prepare to raise a child from the workplace.

Best of breed/New breed—If a technology is best of breed, it is another way of saying it's better than all of its competitors. New breed means that it's better than what came before. But all this talk of breeding over a Monday-morning coffee may be a little much.

Holistic—If you have a holistic view of something, you take a look at its entirety and not its component parts. The phrase a holistic view of the customer journey is a particular favourite of technology providers which leaves many of us scratching our heads.

Leverage—To leverage something means to make better use of it or bring it to the forefront of your operations. It's something easy for a manager to say but difficult to figure out how to do.

Low-hanging fruit—While it may conjure the image of a discreet part of the male anatomy, in the contact centre it means to focus on the most easily achievable task.

Operationalise—This means to put something into operation. Another example of how adding -ise onto the end of an ordinary word can prove needlessly irritating.

(continued)

Table 1.1 (continued)

Onboarding—The process of introducing new recruits to the contact centre. Seems harmless, yet many find that this phrase is only acceptable if your contact centre is situated on a boat.

Seamless—Can you feel your eyes rolling back into your skull when somebody says this? Phrases like seamless transition simply mean a pain-free transition or better still an easy transition.

Team diagnostic survey—A team survey looks to get to the bottom of a contact centre problem. It was a term devised by a manager who hadn't gotten over a career failure in the medical world—probably.

Vendor/Technology Agnostic—If someone is agnostic it means that they believe that humans cannot know if there is or isn't a God, right? So, how does this relate to technology? To be honest, your guess is as good as mine on this one.

Decompose to a lower level of granulation—This must mean to look into something in more detail. But what level of granulation does it need to be decomposed to? One of life's big questions.

Herding the cats—When you try to herd cats you attempt to control something that's uncontrollable. This phrase is usually paired with a smug grin.

Irrational exuberance—How rationally do you exuberate? Another of life's big questions.

Let's circle the wagons—If you circle the wagons, you team up to defend against an impending attack. Apparently, this is a common phrase in the USA, which is strange. But they are the country that brought us cheese in a spray can, so what can we expect?

OOO—This means that the person is currently Out of Office; they have not experienced a sudden realisation or an ooo moment.

Run it up the flagpole—If you run something up the flagpole, you open an idea up to the room and test it by peoples' reactions to it. Unfortunately, no flags are involved.

Secret sauce—When something is your key business differentiator, it's your secret sauce. This phrase is a worse use of sauce than mayonnaise on chips.

Thought-shower—A complicated term for brainstorming. It has nothing to do with reflecting upon your life while in the shower, which I personally think is a much better definition.

The sharing economy—This is the economy of either renting or borrowing. A phrase more pointless than cheese in a jar. Seriously, what's wrong with a simple block of cheese?!

Managerialism has also extended from managerial regimes deep into the crypto-academic subject of management studies as organised by business schools.⁵⁶ Management studies which can be seen as the purest form of the application of the language of Managerialism have relinquished

nearly all forms of critical scholarship in order to be a functional and ideological auxiliary.⁵⁷

The exclusion of an opposition under Managerialism's TINA—there is no alternative—operates not only in management studies but also in society, and eventually in the lifeworld as a whole. One of today's problems is the role of the language of Managerialism in, for example, global warming, corporate environmental vandalism, resource depletion, and the passing of *peak oil* and *peak soil*.⁵⁸ What the lifeworld might call global warming is belittled by the language of Managerialism as a little 'climate change'.⁵⁹

The language of Managerialism assists Managerialism's effort to eclipse the global catastrophe by overshadowing the search for potential causes. The case of global warming demonstrates the degree to which the language of Managerialism has anaesthetised society. The causes remain unidentified, unexposed and unattacked because they have receded before the all-too-obvious ideological makeovers framed by the language of Managerialism. Guided by this language, we continue to submit to the commercial production of the means of global destruction and yet fail to stop perfecting wasteful goods and services.

We can relate the causes of the danger of global warming to the way in which the language of Managerialism has organised and continues to organise the thoughts of individuals.⁶⁰ By linguistically integrating people into the orbit of Managerialism, individuals are immediately confronted with the fact that managerialist societies have become richer and perhaps even better as they perpetuate environmental devastation. Managerial capitalism makes life easier for a greater number of people by extending the mastery of nature. Under the language of Managerialism, corporate mass media have little difficulty in selling particular interests as the interests of all.

The language of Managerialism has been successful in giving particular managerial interests the aura of being universal, attaching corporate interests to the truly universal interests of humanity by presenting specific needs as universal needs and aspirations. Their satisfaction promotes business and a commonwealth deprived of *common*-wealth in favour of corporate wealth, as the wealth of the commons is vacuumed upwards,