

**“Deregulation is so nineteen eighties, we’re into ‘better regulation’ now”:
Consequences of self-regulation through enterprise in the Passive Fire Protection industry**

Stephanie Russell
School of Economic and Management Studies
Darwin Building
Keele University
Staffordshire
ST5 5BG
United Kingdom
Email: s.d.russell@ippm.keele.ac.uk

Matthew J. Brannan
School of Economic and Management Studies
Darwin Building
Keele University
Staffordshire
ST5 5BG
United Kingdom
Email: m.brannan@mngt.keele.ac.uk

Stephanie Russell is a PhD student at Keele University, Staffordshire. Her PhD thesis explores the impact of deregulation in the passive fire protection industry. In particular, it focuses on the ways in which institutional theory can be advanced by considering how isomorphic pressures can exercise disciplinary power through the dispersal of the enterprise discourse.

Matthew J. Brannan is Director of International Partnerships and a lecturer in Management at Keele Management School. His research focuses upon the contemporary experience of work, especially service work, and employs predominately ethnographic techniques of investigation.

**“Deregulation is so nineteen eighties, we’re into ‘better regulation’ now”:
Consequences of self-regulation through enterprise in the Passive Fire Protection industry**

Abstract

This paper seeks to explore how a discourse of ‘morality’ can work to reconstitute employees as ‘enterprising’ subjects who are autonomous and self-regulating, compared to those who adopt a discourse of ‘denial’. A global manufacturer, FireStop (a pseudonym), is used to consider the ways in which employees internalise norms and values in becoming ‘moral’ subjects who aim to enhance, preserve and save lives through building safety. In comparison, those that do not, or cannot, adopt these norms and values are classified by moralists as being in ‘denial’. Paradoxically however, both states lead to the creation of enterprising subjects. . Although distinct, the two discourses (morality and denial) therefore share a common rationale with enterprise, which dovetails with a free market ideology. In common with a Foucauldian perspective on power, the discourses represented here are not seen as totalising forces which actively reconstitute passive employees’ subjectivity, but rather the notion of morality is used to explore how enterprising individuals achieve ends which lead to both conformance and non-conformance. The contribution which this paper seeks to make is to argue that a moral discourse which is concerned with a duty of care, and the principles of ‘right and wrong’, is used to create a self-regulatory, enterprising discourse that encourages individualistic behaviour. Although a discourse of morality aims to create enterprising and responsible behaviour, the self-regulatory context in which this takes place, illegitimately plays down morality. Individuals are subsequently provided with the space and opportunity to engage in practices which are deviant and lead to non-conformance. The paper therefore reveals the ambiguous and contradictory ways in which power is exercised, whilst indicating that it is both conditioned and made possible by

enterprise. The paper also raises concerns about the efficacy of regimes of regulation based on enterprise, particularly in an industry sector which is concerned with saving lives.

Key Words: denial, discourse, enterprise, Foucault, morality, power

Introduction

Contemporary accounts of organizational control have spawned interest in analysing how employees respond to both the disciplinary effects of bureaucratic control and to the more subtle controls associated with governing through enterprise (du Gay and Salaman, 1992; du Gay, 1996, du Gay 2004, Salaman and Storey 2008). At the heart of the enterprise discourse however a tension resides; on the one hand, employees are perceived as being docile and passive subjects, whilst on the other, they are viewed as self-regulating, responsible and risk-taking in exercising their autonomy to be ‘enterprising’ and in the process are (re)constituted by the discourses associated with customer sovereignty (du Gay and Salaman, 1992). Enterprise is often perceived as the exercising of control to produce subjects who conform, due to their internalisation of norms and values, yet this view fails to take account of how enterprise can also be used by employees as a ‘resource’ (Rosenthal, 2004) in pursuit of their own ends. The analysis in this paper is distinctive because our emphasis on a moral discourse makes explicit the uneasy balance that has been struck between making individuals unwitting agents of a regulatory regime which relies on enterprising qualities to achieve compliance, whilst refusing to make them culpable for non-conformance. One consequence of this ‘hands-off’ approach to regulation has been to emphasise autonomy over and above the means used to ensure life safety.

Morality originates from the Latin word ‘moralitas’ meaning ‘manner, character or proper behaviour. What is considered ‘moral’ differs from group to group and culture to culture, but a critical account of what it means to be moral involves examining the role of moral reasoning; one theorist who focused on this was Kohlberg (1927-1987). Kohlberg explored the conditions under which individuals’ ability to engage in moral reasoning may grow and develop. He argued that there are different stages of morality that people progress through; from the *preconventional* stage which is based solely on self-interest, to *conventional* morality where conformity to social norms becomes an end in itself, and *postconventional* morality is based on a concern for social justice and collective well-being (Snell, 2004). Whilst Kohlberg focused on the individual, the term ‘moral ethos’ (ibid) can be applied to organizational morality. Organizations perceived by their employees to emphasise the higher moral stages of development are likely to also be seen as possessing a greater level of honesty, environmental awareness and fairness for customers (ibid).

Organizational morality is often seen as resulting from the implementation of corporate codes of ethics which are perceived as ‘...‘dead’ missiles shot into the organization and they may, or may not ‘hit’ the human beings in the organization’ (Jensen et al, 2009: 530). An organization’s morality should not, however, only be framed as solely the outcome of human conduct, because ‘...the moral law is in our hearts, but also in our apparatuses’ (Latour, 2002: 253 cited in Jensen et al, 2009: 539). Codes of ethics, therefore, have the potential to alter individuals’ approach to, and perception of morality. For instance, codes of ethics can be translated into something which is ‘just common sense’; ‘necessary for somebody else’ and ‘about trivial things’ (Jensen et al, 2009: 540). When a moral duty is triggered amongst individuals, it can be difficult to fulfil because as Willmott (1998) acknowledges, ethical codes

are always embedded in a capitalist work ethic which is associated with profit; an objective which can override morality. Bauman (2003) also rightly points out that making moral decisions between right and wrong, and good and evil, creates a situation of uncertainty which ‘...is the home ground of the moral person’ (ibid: 93). This means that morality can often be spontaneous and the attempt to ensure its achievement through rationalised formal structures can result in the abdication of personal responsibility as individuals only become concerned for applying pre-determined ethical statutes (Jensen et al, 2009: 539).

This paper provides a distinctive contribution as it is comparable to previous literature which has tended to use enterprise as the main discursive framework to discuss how alternative discourses emerge (Fournier, 1998; Doolin, 2002). Rather than arguing that the discourse of morality originates from enterprise, we are arguing that enterprise is an example of morality; by being moral, individuals are encouraged to engage in autonomous reasoning and become enterprising subjects as they strive to regulate their conduct in responsible ways to ensure ethically and socially desirable ends are achieved. Reynolds and Yuthas (2008) discuss corporate social responsibility as a ‘moral discourse’, and draw on Habermas’ conditions for ‘ideal speech’ which suggests that moral norms do not gain validity through adherence to external, universal criteria, but norms are valid if they are developed in an open and fair discourse which enables the all parties affected by them to actively participate. In a practical sense, this requires a mutual understanding to be developed in an attempt to ensure mutually-acceptable solutions. In this paper, a moral discourse is not universally sought as some employees act strategically and are only concerned with their own self-preservation. Operating in a self-regulating environment can have quite paradoxical consequences as the drive to become self-regulating and enterprising can lead employees to evaluate and rearticulate attempts to control them.

Notions of enterprise are often embedded in state driven programmes that seek to govern organizations and individuals through the exercise of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977). It has been noted that enterprise discourses are present in all areas of life, including healthcare (Doolin, 2002) and government (Armstrong, 2001), and analysis of discursive formations has considered enterprise as a means through which responsible, autonomous, subjects are created and are willing to exercise self-control and to use their initiative. ‘Enterprising subjects’ (du Gay and Salaman, 1992) are expected to be empowered, to make their own decisions and to seek fulfilment in their work in pursuit of corporate objectives. Discourses of enterprise are particularly linked to the social and economic reforms of the early 1980s when the Thatcher Conservative government in the UK and Regan administration in the US, sought to deregulate and ‘let managers manage’ (Hood et al, 2000) by relinquishing interventionist strategies in favour of a ‘lighter touch’ (UKAS, 2004: p.1), and a ‘hands off’ approach to state regulation. A free market ideology is at the core of moves towards enterprise because, through deregulatory initiatives, individuals are expected to self-regulate rather than relying on the state for support and advice. Deregulation encourages individuals to be self-regulating and responsible and in essence, to be enterprising.

Research into enterprise has been wide ranging and theorists have explored its influence in areas as diverse as retail (du Gay, 1996), healthcare (Doolin, 2002, McDonald et al., 2008), banking (Nayak and Beckett, 2008), management consultancy (Sturdy and Wright, 2008) its impact on female entrepreneurs (Fenwick, 2002), as well as its exclusion of older workers (Ainsworth and Hardy 2008). In terms of an empirical investigation, the creation of enterprising subjects has not however been explored in the context of the Passive Fire industry which is a sector of the construction industry which itself is under-researched. Passive Fire Protection (PFP)

refers to products that are designed to both contain and slow the spread of fires through buildings. There are a range of PFP products available but most work as an addition to more usual building materials. For example Intumescent fire protection is applied as a paint as an intermediate application between undercoat and top coat. Whereas vermiculite fire protection, a much thicker product is applied for structural support. Both of these products remain inert and unnoticed until the event of a fire. The use of PRP to contain fires at their point of origin and, or, slow their spread, work in the event of fire to limit structural damage to buildings, to provide more time for the occupants of the building to be safely evacuated, and provide time for authorities to tackle the fire. This sector is worthy of research as the products that this sector produce are responsible for saving lives. If the products are installed incorrectly, due to insufficient knowledge, or as a result of non-compliance, then the potential for the loss of life is increased significantly. For example, in the report on the fire at Lakanal House, Camberwell, which claimed the lives of 20 people, concerns were raised as a result of the rapid spread of the fire and the effectiveness of PFP arrangements in place. The Chief Fire Advisor, Sir Ken Knight found: *“There is a long and established principle that the design and construction of high rise buildings enable the occupants adjacent to the immediate fire area to make their way to a place of safety, while other occupants can remain safely within their homes. However, these principles do require that a satisfactory level of passive and active fire safety systems are installed and maintained and the occupants are fully conversant with the fire safety arrangements of the building”* pg. 9 and *“The passive fire protection industry produces a comprehensive range of guidance and technical information on passive fire protection products, installation and standards. Consideration should be given to reminding specifiers, main contractors and installers and those responsible for building safety management of the need to use the available*

information when undertaking works where measures that form passive fire protection are removed, altered or replaced” . Pg 12.

In the UK, statutory building regulations (The Building Regulations, 2000) mandate that every building must be designed to inhibit the spread of fire, however the legislative requirement is enforced through voluntary compliance and the nature of passive fire protection products means that once installed it is difficult if not impossible to detect if they are compliant with industry standards in terms of performance. In terms of regulation this therefore raises the crucial issue for this paper of the monitoring of voluntary compliance where non-compliance is often only externally visible to those with close association with the industry, or through high profile whistle blowing¹, or after tragic events.

There have also been calls for more research into how individuals respond, negotiate and participate with enterprise (Edwards, 1998; Scott, 1996). One such study which seeks to fill this gap is McCabe's (2009: p. 1552) work which explores how staff in a UK bank ‘...confront and grapple with the ambiguities of enterprise often in ambiguous ways’. Building on McCabe's work, this paper originates out of an initial objective to explore the broader consequences of deregulation and specifically how it may work to produce paradoxical outcomes such as non-conforming subjects through the diffusion of self-regulatory standards which are disseminated across the industry. The distinctive contribution here therefore explores the empirical experience of how enterprising subjects are created out of a ‘moral’ discourse. Individuals are encouraged

¹ In the Thermo-Lag scandal for example, Gerald Brown, a Passive Fire contractor voiced his concerns to the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission that the testing of products to insulate circuitry to maintain structural integrity in the event of fire at US and Canadian Nuclear reactor plants was inadequate. Members of the US advisory committee on reactor safeguards were to write to the Director of Operations for U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the president to call for the implementation of more rigorous testing and performance-based rules arguing “*The use of performance-based rules for fire protection is frustrated by conventional attitudes. The desire of: regulators to have simple rules and tests for administrative convenience contrasts with the need of plant operators to have flexibility to arrive at optimal solutions. Unfortunately, the prescriptive characteristics embodied in regulations are accepted without proof, while any engineering solution supporting a performance requirement is subjected to a disproportionately higher standard of proof*”. US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (1996) A Compilation of Reports of The Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

to be personally responsible for their actions to ensure lives are saved, and this discourse of morality leads to the creation of enterprising subjects who are expected to comply voluntarily. However, the reliance on individuals being ‘moral’ leaves room for considerable discretion on what is taken to be ‘moral’, and what is not. Thus, it is for individuals to decide and judge what kinds of behaviour are deemed appropriate. The risk is that others might not see it in this way and the magnitude of what is perceived as a threat to life safety largely depends on individual perception. Paradoxically, being moral implies a sense of collectivism and a humanistic desire to achieve objectives which are for the greater good. But this becomes a challenge when morality is promoted in a neo-liberal environment of enterprise which focuses on individualistic and self-interested behaviour that is devoid of empathy and respect for others. In this context, some individuals redefine morality in market terms and begin to use the qualities of enterprise for their own ends; that is, they turn the discourse back onto the government whose initial aim was to encourage them to self-regulate by becoming an ‘enterprising self’. As we shall see, being morally inclined sustains, rather than undermines neo-liberal notions of enterprise and results in individuals using enterprising qualities to ‘choose’ not to comply, leading to unintended consequences.

Empirically the paper presents the UK-based case study of FireStop a a market leader in the production, distribution and installation of PFP, and its relationship with contractors, customers and consultants to explore individuals’ responses to compliance as mediated though a culture of morality embedded within organizational contexts. Successive Conservative and Labour governments in the UK have revived and extended the neo-liberal norms and values associated with the market in terms of responsibility and risk-taking and this commitment to enterprise led FireStop as an organization to create a distinction between those who embrace the moral

discourse and adopt it as an attempt to increase fire safety, and their counterparts who they define as engaging in non-compliance and ultimately ‘denial’. On the one hand, the former group (moralists) wanted to promote and enact ethical principles that serve the best interests for the majority and exercise responsibility and autonomy in order to improve overall standards within the industry. Desiring to be moral subjects, they also complained that government’s lack of mandatory intervention and regulatory enforcement was creating loopholes that meant that certain sectors of the industry were allowed to pursue non-compliant strategies. The paradoxical combination of these discourses resonates with Vaara et al’s (2006) work, which explored the discursive strategies used in the media coverage of a pulp and paper sector merger. Here the discourses identified were: normalization; authorization, rationalization, moralization and narrativization. Moralization resonates with the ‘moral’ discourse identified in the passive fire industry as companies who complied with the enterprising qualities were deemed legitimate, and there is an underlying principled concern for other people, rather than only what is laid down by existing formal rules or norms. Individuals may argue that their compliance stems from a ‘humanistic moralization’ which includes a ‘moral duty’ (Vaara et al, 2006: p. 801) to ensure passive fire protection is installed correctly as it saves lives and improves building safety. This reflects Kohlberg’s *postconventional* stage of morality as it entails ‘striving to be reasonable, consistent and purposeful in pursuit of principles that are good for the community’ (Snell, 1997: 189 cited in Snell, 2004: 260). A ‘rationalization’ discourse might usefully fit in with those embracing a discourse of ‘denial’. Individuals would be more inclined to calculate the personal risks and payoffs of an action they undertake, with limited concern for others.

This paper builds on previous research by exploring how enterprise is an outcome of a discourse of morality. Enterprise is not simply implemented by management, nor for that matter

by government, as a simple process to ensure compliance in a self-regulating environment. But rather the discourse of enterprise is a consequence of being a moral autonomous subject and is open to interpretation, adaption and re-articulation, individuals adopting the discourse of ‘denial’ were rather ironically being ‘too enterprising’; they used the discretion that morality encouraged, and adopted the qualities of enterprise, such as ‘choice’ and ‘autonomy’ to avoid compliance and self-regulation in the way that government had intended. This provides an empirical contribution and meets Rosenthal’s (2004) call for more research into how discourses can be used by workers as a resource to redefine and evade management’s (or government’s) intended objectives. This paper is organised as follows; the next section discusses the methodology adopted for this research and then introduces the empirical case study. The major insights and argument from the paper are then explored in the discussion and conclusion. Throughout the paper, the focus is predominantly on the role of one organization (FireStop) as the main focal point for analysis, but we draw upon other aspects such as government policy to contextualise the argument when necessary.

Methodology

FireStop (pseudonym) is a global manufacturer in the passive fire protection industry whose headquarters are located in the North of England. The field research was conducted over a four-month period between January and May 2009 with the intention that this would provide sufficient time to revisit the organization in order to engage in ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1993). The fieldwork involved attending the company offices, interviews with staff, both formal and informal, and access to company information. Research was also conducted with customers of FireStop, independent contractors, trade associations and building and safety consultants. This

allowed the use of qualitative research methods, including interviews, observations and documentary analysis².

Data analysis began in earnest almost immediately after the first interview. Listening back to the day's recordings and drafting an outline of the discussion and the responses that had been acquired; it often felt strangely as if one was listening to someone else's conversation as much of the information appeared as if it was being heard for the very first time. As Ezzamel and Willmott's (2008: p. 200) argue, research data emerges from a struggle to 'interrogate (but not 'test')...theoretical themes in relation to the empirical data' (Ezzamel and Willmott, 2008: p. 200). The account analysed is not embedded and emergent from the data, as this implies that it is only the interpretation, and not the generation of data, which is theory-laden (Ezzamel and Willmott, 2008: p. 200). Instead, data is generated through a '...ongoing interpretation of meaning' (Suddaby, 2006: p. 633 cited in Ezzamel and Willmott, 2008: p. 200) as subjects (and the researcher) participate in social practices and in the process, make sense of the social situation of participants.

FireStop in Context

FireStop is actively involved in international sales operating in more than 120 countries worldwide. The company is a world leader in developing, manufacturing and marketing, what it

²Over the period of four months, fifteen semi-structured interviews were conducted with a range of individuals, including culture team leaders, sales consultants and call centre employees. The interviews varied in length from one to three hours; they were all tape-recorded and later transcribed verbatim. This occurred after assurances to respondents that the information they provided would remain strictly confidential and anonymous, participant's names and those of their companies are therefore replaced with pseudonyms. The interviews were conducted in a variety of locations, but mostly in offices at the respondents' place of work or in nearby coffee shops or restaurants. When the location was outside of the workplace, it was often because respondents expressed a preference to discuss freely their ideas and thoughts without the fear of being overheard by work colleagues. Broad questions were asked such as: 'What is it like to work here?' and 'how do regulations affect you?'. These open-ended questions evolved during the course of the fieldwork, but the aim of the interviews was to acquire information from respondents on a broad range of topics, including what their perception was of the deregulatory policy proposals in the industry, particular problems encountered and what consequences deregulation had for their working practices and the industry more generally. During field visits to FireStop a range of non-participant observational activities were undertaken, the researcher was invited to participate in building tours and attend meetings. Copious notes were made during these situations, which triggered thinking and analysis in terms of themes, directions to pursue and areas to explore further. Culture booklets, magazines, websites and job advertisements were also analysed and drawn upon in the writing and analysis stage.

perceives as, the highest quality products for professional customers in the construction industry. It specialises in products used in drilling and demolition, diamond coring and cutting, measuring, fire-stopping and screw fastening. The organization was founded in 1941 by two brothers who established the first factory in Liechtenstein, after World War Two, the organization became directly involved in international sales and during the 1970s the organization consisted of 420 employees and had sales worth €27.3million. This growth continued until 1980 when, despite four plants having been built around the world which constituted the hub of FireStop, sales stagnated at €817.6 million. Changes were implemented, not only in cost structures and sales, but the organization also initiated it's first 'culture development' process and emphasis was more directly placed on improving the organization's brand and advertising techniques. The organizational structure consists of four main 'team roles' which emerged from the attempts to re-engineer the culture. These consisted of the 'Strategic Sherpa Team'; 'Culture Journey Sherpa Teams'; The 'Leadership Sherpa Team' and 'Team Member Sherpa Team'. The latter two groups are both situated at FireStop headquarters. The 'leadership' group is allocated to each team in order to facilitate the culture/branding process and rectify misaligned issues, whilst the 'Team Member Sherpa Team' consists of employees who are subject to the cultural process and are expected to share the experience with customers when applicable.

At a national level FireStop operates in a deregulated environment which is guided, in the UK, by voluntary regulation alone; the main regulatory document is referred to as 'Approved Document B', or ADB. Under this remit organizations are under no obligation to fulfil the guidelines and the document states that:

...there is no obligation to adopt any particular solution contained in an Approved Document if you prefer to meet the relevant requirements in some other way...(ADB, 2007: p.7).

This reflects the ‘hands-off’ approach adopted by successive governments who advocate for individuals and organizations in the passive fire industry to be responsible and autonomous and thereby decide for themselves how best they should comply. The assumption being that there is no need for government intervention because compliance is possible by encouraging individuals to self-regulate by being enterprising subjects (du Gay and Salaman, 1992). The absence of direct regulation has profound impacts on the organization, when discussing the government’s commitment to deregulation and voluntary compliance with the regulatory policy writer, Simon, his response was:

...deregulation is so nineteen eighties, we’re into ‘better regulation’ now and...well I mean the regulatory environment is very much evidence based now, it’s very much the driver for the sort of better regulation approach. There are a million and one things that we could make more thoroughly inspected but that all comes with a price. We could have an army of inspectors, I’ve no idea where they’d come from...it would be an awfully big hammer to crack a very small nut

Simon seems to imply that the regulation of organizations such as FireStop is ineffective if left to a regime of inspection and that the self-discipline of evidence-based regulation effectively constitutes ‘better regulation’. The comment *‘it would be an awfully big hammer to crack a very small nut’* suggests that fire is not perceived as being sufficiently important and that resources could be more usefully spent elsewhere. This was reinforced when Simon continued by stating:

Whatever industry we’re talking about, they’re all the same. You’ve obviously been speaking to the passive fire industry and they think passive fire is fundamentally important to the life of the universe and more important than all the other stuff. Well, *that is what they sell*. They then go on and moan about how building inspectors aren’t competent to inspect and it just comes back to the level of quality. You’ll never get one hundred percent compliance with anything, and let’s face it most buildings don’t catch fire...

The implication is that the threat from fire is perceived by the government as being insufficient to regulate using a mandatory approach because there are not enough of them, as indicated in Simon's comment about *'most buildings don't catch fire'*. Simon also implies that the reason as to why the passive fire industry is so concerned about regulating fire protection is because *'that is what they sell'*. This suggests calls for more direct regulation are ultimately driven by commercial intent; the more they can promote the benefits of using fire protection, the more they will gain in revenue. Against this background of 'hands off' regulation the paper now explores how discourses of enterprise create moral subjects whilst casting those who engage in non-compliance as 'in denial'.

Producing the 'moral' individual

FireStop's UK head offices are entered through automatic sliding glass doors at the front of the building where visitors are immediately greeted by a reception desk. Behind the desk, on the wall, are the mission statement and core values in the organization's colour scheme along with the brand name and logo, which is displayed with white, bold lettering against a red background. The reception area contains soft leather chairs separated by a small glass table that holds the latest product catalogues and in-house company magazine 'Filter'. The documents are laid out in the shape of a fan with each one slightly overlapping the other. Directly adjacent on the left hand side wall are 'excellence' awards presented to the organization relating to customer service, delivery speed and consistency. The presentation of these artefacts transforms the reception area into an exhibition suite where old timers and new comers alike are exposed to the brand and the image of the organization on arrival. The display of the brand continues throughout the building as the mission statement and core values are strategically exhibited on every floor and outside

every lift. Further evidence of the artifactualisation of FireStop's culture are to be found in photos of the winners of various awards and articles/newspaper clippings, which convey stories and comments regarding FireStop's success (Russell, 2011).

As part of an initial introduction to the organization, visitors receive a copy of the 'team camp guide'; a small booklet consisting of no more than one hundred and fifty pages which includes diagrams and pictures and seeks to outline to employees about what they were expected to do to fulfil the cultural requirements of working for FireStop. It also provides a number of thought-provoking questions regarding employee conduct, such as *'What is a personal goal of mine that will fulfil the organizational value of integrity?'* (Team camp guide, 2004: p. 56). Employees are encouraged to embrace a particularly moral discourse, this is illustrated in statements such as *'Be honest and ethical'* and *'be accountable for your actions and their consequences'* (Team camp guide, 2004: 28). FireStop self-consciously positions itself as an 'industry leader', the design of its espoused culture reflects this. The culture subsumes a series of norms and values, which are expected to be internalised by employees, in an attempt to ensure that employees embody the importance of fire safety in the knowledge that this also acts as a benchmark for others within the industry whom may replicate their practices. FireStop's culture actively seeks to encourage enterprising qualities as reflected in their core values which all have an underlying commitment to morality. Among the enterprise attributes that management sought to foster were 'integrity'; 'courage'; 'teamwork' and 'commitment'.

Integrity, was based on notions of 'walking the talk' and making sure individuals were 'authentic, consistent and predictable' (Team camp guide, 2004). Employees were expected to align their behaviour with the core values and purpose of FireStop, invoking levels of self-discipline as employees are called to regulate and be responsible for their actions. Although this

operates at the level of discourse, it has real practical consequences. For instance, if an employee realised that a product was incorrectly installed, even if not by themselves, then they would be invoked to perceive it as *their* responsibility to ensure it was corrected. As Bob (team leader) explained: *'...the integrity value, well, it means that if we knew someone was doing something that didn't meet the requirements and we came across, an installation that wasn't correct, then we would have to say something, we'd have to say 'that's not safe', it's part of our culture to get it right...'*. This was supported by Joe (fire engineer) who further explained: *'it can be embarrassing for us sometimes, we go in trying to help people and advise them, but then we look up at the building on site and cringe; we can point at things and say 'that's not been done right'. People may say we're being too fussy, or just driven by our morals but then that's the only thing that we are driven by, if you know what I mean...'*. These examples suggest that FireStop's culture may lead employees to internalise norms and values which instil into individuals a notion of morality as a central organizing idea, respondents seemed keen to tell how this results in them feeling responsible for ensuring that practices are being conducted safely, even if they were not responsible for the initial transgression.

The value of 'courage' encourages individuals to 'take purposeful risks by thinking outside the box and leaving the circle of habits' (Team camp guide, 2004). Individuals are prompted to take risks in order to improve their personal development; this was achieved on team camps when employees were asked to look into a 3 x 2m mirror and question their behaviour in terms of how it affected their performance at work and what improvements could be instigated to change it in line with expected organizational requirements. The attribute of 'courage' meant that managers could use it as a 'corrective' (Foucault, 1977: 179) device to measure the gaps between those who conformed, compared to those who did not. Courage also resonates with the idea of

denial as explored later in this paper, those in denial lack the personal courage to confront their behaviour and to change.

The deployment of the idea 'Teamwork' attempted to create 'an environment of open communication and feedback, sharing of ideas and best practice' (Team camp guide, 2004). Employees are encouraged to recognise the contribution of others through a reward and recognition scheme known as 'World Aqua' (pseudonym). Individuals are expected to contribute to their team by 'making others smile', 'being helpful' or 'contributing significantly to the achievement of goals'. The teamwork core value also exercised disciplinary power because the gifts awarded to employees became a means of normalising the everyday critical appraisal of performance (Foucault, 1977). Teamwork in this sense acts as a form of surveillance because individuals measured their own, and each other's, behaviour; constantly and indexically relating their work to those of peers both within FireStop and outside. Whilst, for some, this may be motivating, it also increases work intensification; as individuals are pressured to work harder to show their capability to colleagues and this is particularly evident when the gifts can be used to demonstrate how many people have recognised and nominated specific individuals. Recognition is therefore both a productive and repressive element of enterprise, but nonetheless, works to produce individuals who are committed and identify with the mission of FireStop.

The value of 'commitment' refers to being 'responsible and accountable' (Team Camp Guide, 2004) and seeks to enhance individuals' passion for being 'customer focused' and producing 'FireStop fans'. During the recruitment interview, prospective employees were asked to demonstrate examples of where they had provided a service that reflected the core values of FireStop. Sarah (corporate social responsibility officer), for instance, reflected on her interview and explained '*...in my interview I was asked to describe situations which showed the core*

values, so where I showed courage, customer service skills and commitment...I used some examples from my previous job...'. Individuals thus are encouraged to demonstrate prior to becoming a FireStop employee that they had qualities which replicated those of the organization and that they would be able to demonstrate evidence of their morality prior to entry. The employment of individuals who 'believe' in the values illustrates how interviews and recruitment practice are used as normalising criteria from which employees would be observed and measured (Foucault, 1977). The important assumption made here is that these desired qualities may not be trained; they have to already be part of the individual's make-up. This supports Callaghan and Thompson (2002) who found that companies aim deliberately to recruit and mould individuals who already have the 'correct' attitude on entry, and Brannan and Hawkins (2007) who argue that selection is used as a pre-emptive strike for cultural control. The values and discourse presented to individuals served to imagine them as entrepreneurial and self-actualizing, thus resonating with a free market ideology that seeks to emphasise autonomy and independence. In a press release (January 2009) it was expressed that the aim was to '...have many entrepreneurs within the company, mature employees who exercise entrepreneurial thought and action and who are independent and responsible' (Press Release, 'Enterprise for Health').

Doing It Right: FireStop's 'moral model'

FireStop's discourse of 'morality' was not just directed towards its employees, but it was also used to promote conformance amongst customers as a 'model', which could be replicated due to its high quality products, but also its attempt to improve regulatory compliance in a national environment of deregulation. FireStop's moral culture became almost a 'regulatory filler' which

works to compensate for the lack of enforcement and direct government regulation in an enterprising environment. As Hannah (sales co-ordinator) explained:

FireStop has kind of trained so many companies within the industry...these companies are then able to have compliance just by potentially using our products. We've been heavily involved in educating the industry and we want to make a difference. I think it comes from this self-responsibility we have for things, and you know, we have quite a big influence in the construction industry, especially educating customers

Hannah suggests that the input FireStop has in educating its customers provides a mechanism through which FireStop's moral zeal can seep into other areas of the construction industry. The slow infiltration of compliance via consumption of its products provides an apposite comparison to notions of industrial 'best practice'; but crucially is predicated upon the growth of sales and market share. Compliance through consumption discharges FireStop's moral responsibilities and obligations and transfers these responsibilities to other organizations to improve their compliance and understanding of regulatory policy. Dependent on a mindset that originates from the enterprise discourse, individuals are required to use their skills of initiative, responsibility and commitment to educate others through sales, but not only of FireStop's products, as Gary (fire engineer) states:

...it's not just educating about FireStop products...it's about educating to do it right. So you know it's not just saying 'buy FireStop', 'buy FireStop' (chuckles), we'll always be saying 'use third party approved products, use third party approved installers' because by us saying that, we're helping to raise the standard bar in the industry

The emphasis that Gary makes on '*doing it right*' indicates that FireStop are seen as being at the forefront of attempting to improve procedures for the good of the industry. This involves providing customers with advice on how to improve health and safety, as well as what tools to use. The 'morality' discourse became an overriding means by which to reconstitute and direct

conduct towards ensuring that fire safety standards could be improved. This was reinforced in a discussion with Daniel (consultant) who identified the role of FireStop's moral culture:

...it's all coming from a point of correctness and the thing is it's the right thing to do because its life and limb and duty of care and all the rest of it. You can sway people that way...if you say what you know to be right, from a point of principle, then you cannot defeat a principle...people might attack it for a while and try and cheat but they know they're wrong, they know in here [*touching his heart*] they're wrong and therefore you can always defeat them ultimately if you're willing to do what needs to be done.

The reference to a '*point of principle*' relates to the notion of 'morality' because being 'moral' was the driving principle which FireStop's employees were encouraged to internalise. Their everyday practices were based on demonstrating qualities and behaviour that were ethically motivated towards desirable ends. The individual's identity was shaped in terms of their role as promoters of safety and of displaying a 'social conscience' (Doolin, 2002: p. 383). Employees used the values of FireStop to self-regulate, whilst at the same time, morality became a way of exercising disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977). FireStop became a benchmark and normalising function, which other organizations could copy and were measured against (Townley, 1998). This reflects '...disciplinary power, with its particular focus on training and correcting the human body in accordance with norms' (Randall and Munro, 2010: p. 1490). Individuals saw themselves as 'moralists' and as Nigel (contractor) commented in relation to how he perceived his work: '*...what I do is all based on a 'moral thing' because we know what we have to do to make sure things are correct. If we had to cheat then I'd prefer not to be in this market. If we had to deliberately price a job to do it badly, then I'd just say 'let's do something else'...*'. He compared his perspective with his non-conforming counterparts who he classified as being in denial: '*...I know other guys in my position who work for other companies, who, how shall I put it, let's say that they make money as they can, until they get caught...and then once they get*

caught they think 'what is the worse that's going to happen.' I'm sure they would deny that it's wrong, but we know otherwise'.

A moral discourse has the ability to create an enterprising self as individuals make informed choices to better themselves and become responsible and autonomous subjects with the intention of ensuring that their conduct is driven towards ends that are ethical. In this way, morality is the means used to achieve humanistic, desirable ends and resonates with the government's original intention of achieving compliance through creating enterprising subjects who are committed and self-regulating. As John (contractor at FireStop) indicated to me: *'...being conscientious is a big thing for us because I ask myself 'could you sleep at night knowing that you're putting people's lives at risk?'. It sounds very high brow, moral and holier than thou, but to a certain extent it is, its right'.* It can be argued that the stance taken by FireStop employees and others who adopt a similar perspective resonates with Reynolds' (2003: p. 254) notion of 'self-ethicity'. This is a term to describe those individuals who are ethically and morally driven, and who tend to view others as less ethical than themselves. In a Foucauldian sense, it is a disciplinary device to encourage individuals to embrace a moral discourse which enhances visibility and becomes a means of judging and ranking other organizations and individuals in the industry. This is supported by Paul (director of a manufacturer), as a customer of FireStop he had attempted to replicate their approach. He implied that if organizations were forced to adopt and comply with a cultural framework like FireStop's then it would improve compliance:

That's what we've got here in passive fire...systems are applicable to some companies and not to others so you try and get that culture [*pointing to the culture book of FireStop*] filtered through...but government ought to say it is mandatory because then everybody would be working to something like this [*pointing to the culture booklet*]

This highlights how the moralists view government's commitment to deregulation as leading to undesirable practices, and if organizations were encouraged to adopt a culture like FireStop's, then it would contribute some way to enhancing compliance. In respect to this, the moralists also take a stand against others who they cast in a negative light and argue that their behaviour and conduct reflects the discourse of denial.

In denial: paying lip service to regulation

Research has been conducted into how enterprise is '...a free space open to all' (Fournier, 1998: 62) and suggests that in the process of encouraging individuals to embrace the discourse, it also marginalises those who do not conform (Ainsworth and Hardy, 2008; Cohen and Musson, 2002). This individualises subjects who 'do not fit' or are perceived as 'out of place' (Fournier, 1998: p. 63). The following section illustrates the relationship between the free market ideology and the creation of a counter-discourse, which enabled individuals to redefine the call for 'morality' and engage in 'denial'. Individuals who 'do not fit' into what has been defined as being 'moral' are not excluded from becoming entrepreneurial and enterprising, but are effectively creating their own space to use enterprising qualities to their advantage.

FireStop employees argue that their counterparts were unlikely to instigate any moral or ethical principles as their practices are based mainly on those of self-interest. Whilst morality promotes collectivism which is used to achieve objectives that are for the betterment of society as a whole, when situated in a self-regulatory, enterprising environment, such actions can instead lead to prioritising individualism and prompting people to ask 'what's in it for me?'. The emphasis that enterprise has on individualism leaves space for non-conformance to occur as everyone strives to achieve their own objectives whilst others' needs are ignored. For example,

Ken (site inspector) complained that *'There are companies in the market that know damn well what they need to do, and that's the scary part. Companies know what they should be doing but they just have no intention of doing it; it's all about 'how can we make money?'*. This supports Willmott (1998) who argues that morality is a challenge to achieve because it is linked to the cash nexus and *expected returns*. Unlike Fournier's (1998) account where the graduates did not have the same access to the discursive resources of enterprise qualities, and were left with limited opportunity to contribute to the company's excellence, in the passive fire industry, this is not the case. Whereas FireStop employees adopted a moral discourse in order to be compliant and enhance standards of safety, they categorised those that do not as 'in denial'. Yet these non-conformers participated in enterprise, but arguably became 'too enterprising' by using choice and autonomy as a means to undertake deviant practices. This indicates that 'Discourses do not operate in such a way as to inevitably or deterministically produce passive subjects' (Doolin, 2002: p.381). The contrast between individuals who embraced the 'moral' discourse and those who were practicing 'denial' is evident with regards to how they discussed the regulatory framework in place and the perceived importance of fire protection. For example, Derek (Chairman, trade federation) captured the problems of self-regulating through enterprise:

...in a state described as a nanny state, nanny took away the fire guard, you left it to the children to decide whether it was dangerous

Derek suggests that the free market, with its emphasis on risk-taking and competitiveness, has heightened risk with the result that individuals working in organizations (children) have been left to deal with ensuring that regulatory requirements are fulfilled, even if they are unaware of what is expected of them. The support and guidance from the government (nanny) is relinquished which leaves individuals, who are not necessarily knowledgeable, having to decide if and how to

comply. When asked why he thought some people were conforming, whilst others were not, Derek replied in a serious tone: *'Why can't they do it because they know it's right? I mean not to put too much of a finer point on it, but that's why I do it, because I know that morally it has to be done that way, conforming is the right thing to do...'*. Derek's response shows that he embraces the discourse of morality, and that enterprising qualities of self-responsibility and initiative are essential to his worldview and outlook. Daniel (consultant) who had been actively involved in FireStop's culture as a previous employee expressed his view on how they employed individuals who are:

...principled, you know, who don't cheat each other, work honourably with each other and then you can do things on trust. You can work on the assumption that your colleagues are...intelligent, *self-disciplined* and know what they're doing. But the challenge we've got in the fire industry is that there is no trust because it's consequently been blown apart by a large minority who are scandalous

Daniel's reference to employing '*self-disciplined*' individuals, which is at the core of FireStop's culture, illustrates productive power (Foucault, 1977) through the dispersal of the enterprise discourse. The problem is that governing through enterprise has the potential to minimise accountability and enforcement; this was recognised by Daniel who complained about how the non-conformers behave. He expressed his annoyance regarding the lack of inspection and how this resulted in non-conformance:

...the third party accreditation scheme [*set up by the testing laboratory*] means that companies are able to sign up to it and then work is subject to inspection...so you know you think 'brilliant' but if they're lucky they inspect one in twenty projects and when they do inspect they're only there a few hours, and ladders can be put up by people to prevent inspectors from going to certain places and so it's completely useless

Daniel is classifying the non-conformists as being in 'denial' as they are using the opportunity to exercise 'choice' not to comply, or comply partially. Moreover, due to the limited presence and

effectiveness of inspection bodies, non-conformists are able to engage in practices that the moralists see as deviant. This also became apparent when talking to Stephen (contractor) who informed explained the practices he experienced as an inspector:

It's not policed properly, that's the problem. We've got some inspectors who come around and that encourages us to conform, but I don't think it stops the cowboys, you know, because at the end of the day if you want something painted its how much is it going to cost me and Joe Bloggs in his white van says 'I can do it for twenty five pound an hour' and we say 'it'll cost you one hundred and fifty pounds', who are you going to go for? The trouble is with a fire proofing job, the only proof is if there is a fire (laughing), otherwise you'll never know...

This extract indicates the problems Stephen faced when he was involved in inspecting the organizations that were responsible for ensuring fire protection and he suggests that individuals engage in non-conformance as a commercial strategy to win the cheapest contracts. In one way we can make sense of this as an entrepreneurial move, by not self-regulating in line with what is deemed moral and virtuous. Roberts (2003) discusses how the distance between organization's practices and the individuals experiencing their outcomes can minimise the degree to which responsibility is felt, and in doing so, the organization is freed '...from the constraints imposed by human moral impulses' (Bauman, 1993: 128 cited in Roberts, 2003: 260). This resonates with what occurs in the passive fire industry because there is a physical distance between the producers and installers of the products and the potential victims of fire related incidents. Individuals engaging 'in denial' do not have any face-to-face encounters with those who work and live in the buildings; this makes it easier for them to avoid acknowledging or seeing the potentially devastating consequences of their undesirable practices (Roberts, 2003).

In a follow up conversation with Stephen, it was explained that problems he faced as an employee of an organization whose management chose to circumvent requirements:

There are always things going on in the background, everyone has their moments and they whinge when you ask them to do more work to make sure things are right; I know there's cheating in here, mainly driven by management. They use different paint from the one that the client has paid for and asked for. Paint of a lower quality is sometimes left over from another job; they don't want to waste it and nobody knows, unless the paint scratches off.

This extract is revealing and indicative of the problems associated with operating in a deregulated environment where inspection and enforcement are minimal. Stephen indicates that management engage in practices that reflect non-conformance as they 'choose' not to comply; this is a consequence of using the enterprise qualities to their own advantage. This resonates with Rosenthal's (2004: p.603) argument that the cultural, normative and bureaucratic controls designed by management, can be used by service workers as a 'resource' to further their own control. This means that '...the service quality discourses deployed by management to influence the attitudes and values of workers may in turn be deployed by workers to control *management* behaviour' (Rosenthal, 2004: p.612; emphasis in original). Adopting a moral discourse which encourages individuals to exercise their enterprising qualities enables them to also circumvent regulatory guidelines because it reinforces the necessity of exercising autonomy, responsibility and risk-taking. Without external enforcement, these qualities provide individuals with the opportunity to engage in undesirable practices. This is supported by another participant, Jim (development manager), who commented that the consequence of self-regulation was '*...mayhem, death and disaster*' because '*no-one makes the final move until there's an accident...there's not enough regulation and not enough control in place*'. Daniel reinforces this point when he distinguishes himself from his non-conforming counterparts:

...some of these other guys, quite big companies, they know what they're doing and so it's a form of conscious corporate crime in a way because what they're doing is putting up a structure which is not safe...and they know they're doing it. They like to switch off from the thought that if that building ever went up, people would die in it...*[they would say]*

‘yeah we’ve put something up and it’ll be ok’, you know, it’s scandalous really, it amounts to a form of felony

He continued:

...they currently survive on the basis that they give themselves an unfair advantage by cheating, therefore *[through legislation]* you’re removing the advantages that they’re got which *differentiates them* and enables them to win contracts...I believe they would prefer the status quo because they can criminally make money and survive by working improperly

These extracts indicate that in an ‘enterprise culture’ (Burchell, 1991: 275) which is promoted through a free market ideology, individuals have the ability to engage in practices which increases the risk that buildings are not thoroughly inspected which can lead to a rise in fire related incidents. Interestingly, it has been suggested that exposing individuals to moral wrongdoing can be of benefit because it encourages them to refrain from ‘...craven impulses to run for cover that authoritative commands obligingly provide’ (Bauman, 2003: 93). However, from Daniel’s quotes we can argue that the moral discourse, such as that exercised through FireStop’s culture, becomes the ‘norm’ from which to judge and rank individuals’ conduct and conformance. Due to non-conformance it also differentiates those who do not comply. But as Daniel implies, when organizations are differentiated, this does not result in them exercising self-discipline to move closer to the norm of morality. Instead they use the discourse of morality to cheat and engage in non-conformance. A number of contractors disclosed that there is a pressure to cheat just to stay in business. Philip (contractor) commented that:

...FireStop managers try their best and it’s a great company. I think they have it spot on, but overall, how do you regulate an industry when the client isn’t really bothered? Our customer isn’t bothered, as long as he gets his job done cheaply...I worked for a company whose management knew that operatives were mixing fifty, fifty emulsion paint with intumescent. They’d mix it, send it out, go on site and once it’s painted on, it’s virtually impossible to check, unless you get a paint sample...people forget about it, brush it under the carpet, that’s our industry.

Philip's comments are candid in terms of how the pressure to sustain a moral self and adopt enterprising qualities to conform leads non-conformers to exercise their ability to be self-regulating by engaging in deviant practices. It demonstrates that despite individuals fulfilling enterprising qualities, they are not using them to the ends that government had predicted. As Jim (project development manager,) commented:

...deregulation doesn't work in our industry...whilst government would very much like and is quite happy to devolve power downwards there is then responsibility too, you know with that power goes responsibility, it's not their problem anymore...

This quote encapsulates how regulation through enterprise involves the transference of responsibility and initiative to organizations such as FireStop. In doing so, a 'normalised' individual is produced which is '...an idealized conception of the self, as judged by professional experts...These professionals evaluate their [*subjects*] according to their expert knowledge and its established norms' (Randall and Munro, 2010: p.1486). By transferring these qualities on to subjects, the government can 'translate' (Rose and Miller, 1992: p.181) their aims of neo-liberalism, whilst cloaking it in the regime of self-discipline and voluntary compliance.

Becoming a moral, enterprising subject (by exercising choice and responsibility) was viewed by those deemed to be in 'denial' as a costly investment, with limited returns. The non-conformers still drew upon the opportunities that enterprise gave to them, that is, the chance to be 'autonomous', to exercise 'choice' and to operate in a space of 'freedom'. Rather than individuals feeling marginalized which is '...to have parameters binding your actions...to be constrained...' (Rose, 1997 cited in Fournier, 1998: p.71), when individuals embraced the discourse of 'denial', they did not see themselves as 'lacking' anything, but gaining by being deviant (cheaper projects, more custom, higher revenue). This is different to Doolin's (2002:

p.382) findings, which indicates that ‘...resistance arose from the positioning of clinicians as subjects within an alternative, medical professional, discourse’. In this paper, enterprise was not used to produce or repress another discourse, but instead, those operating as moral individuals became enterprising subjects, whilst those in denial used enterprise for their own advantage, despite these practices being directed towards what moralists might consider ‘undesirable ends’.

The discourse of denial, and the ways in which the non-conformers used enterprise to their own advantage, meant that it ‘...inhabits a space which is not of its own making outside the enterprise discourse but is created by the enterprise discourse’ (Fournier, 1998: p.72). By turning the qualities of enterprise back onto the government, by deciding for themselves how to use them to advance their own ends, those who are in denial are effectively demonstrating what happens when people are ‘too enterprising’. For example, the following extract from Denise (consultant) indicates that individuals know that even if they are not compliant, the consequences are minimal and hence they are not fearful of continuing their undesirable practices, engaging in non-compliant practices are not even sanctioned by trade associations:

...the worst that’s going to happen to you is you might get kicked out of one of these schemes...but they [*trade association/certification laboratory*] want to make money and therefore they’re not going to kick people out without giving them every chance to continue to pay money. Like the trade association is only going to discipline members so far, they’re going to do everything they can to keep them in the association because they need their money...

Denise implies that individuals who refuse to comply with the trade association’s code of best practice know that there will be few, if any, consequences. At the same time, it is a mistake to cast non-compliant behaviour as a failure of participation in enterprise discourse; rather individuals are just not engaging in it ethically; this is distinctly different to what FireStop employees generally espouse, especially those whose moral outlook drives them to correct

mistakes and ensure that they are being ethical in order to improve fire safety standards. Those who are in denial are in control of their conduct because they are exercising choice, yet refusing to apply the enterprising qualities to achieve the original intended objectives established by the government (enhancing voluntary compliance). Enterprise can be adopted in ambiguous and contradictory ways because self-regulation is being used advantageously to engage in deviant practices.

Discussion and Conclusion

This paper has sought to explore how deregulation and a commitment to enterprise can result in the adoption of additional discourses, which both originate and draw upon the same enterprising discursive framework. Successive governments in the UK, beginning with the Conservative Thatcher government in the 1980s have advocated that enterprise is a desirable means of regulating individuals' conduct by encouraging them to be responsible, conformist and risk-taking (du Gay and Salaman, 1992). When viewed through the lens of Foucault's (1977) productive form of power, it is also considered a necessary means of creating individuals whose subjectivity is reconstituted as they internalise enterprising qualities and become self-regulating. Using FireStop as a case study has demonstrated that the adoption of a moral discourse has driven employees to become enterprising subjects as they seek to save lives by ensuring that PFP is installed correctly. Being moral has the potential to encourage entrepreneurial behaviour as individuals embrace norms and values that lead to them becoming responsible and acting autonomously regarding decisions which are made about the importance of life and building safety. The moralists then use their subjectivity to classify their counterparts as being in 'denial'

because, within the context of a free market, individuals can effectively decide to engage in non-conformance by adopting enterprise qualities in contradictory ways.

The individuals who are in denial are thereby capitalizing on government's failure to effectively regulate and impose sanctions through enforcement. For compliant sections of the industry, who embraced a discourse of morality, their perception of self-regulation and the commitment to entrepreneurial practices was that it encourages non-conformance. Drawing on McCabe (2009: p.1574), it can be said that 'It was not that employees 'failed' to be seduced by enterprise because this presents an either/or situation as if the door to enterprise is either open or closed'. Alternatively, individuals used the enterprise discourse to seek an advantage by using it as a vital means to achieve their own objectives.

The adoption of the morality discourse in this empirical case study resulted in two different outcomes. Whilst it ensured compliance through the utilisation for example of FireStop's culture, it did not ensure compliance for all sectors of the industry. The position that FireStop and its employees adopt can be made sense of when it is considered that they are market leaders and authority figures within the passive fire industry. From this perspective FireStop has a vested interest in conformance to self-regulation, particularly as the organization has already invested substantial resources in designing the internal architectural of the organization to promote and encourage its employees to adopt a moral position viz compliance. Yet within any industry there can only be a few market leaders, and the likelihood of compliance by organizations and individuals below the elite level, within any particular industry in an environment characterised by deregulation, is uncertain. But as this paper suggests it is as likely that the discourses such as morality and enterprise which may have initially be designed to encourage compliance can equally be turned back upon themselves to promote, and act as a rationale for, non-compliant

behaviour. This indicates that productive and relational power can be exercised, not only by authority figures, but also by those deemed to be 'docile' (Foucault, 1977). The government's commitment to enterprise has clearly produced unintended consequences and the discourse of 'denial', emanating from the enterprise discursive framework acted as a resource for individuals. The outcome was that individuals who used enterprise to construct a discourse of denial were redefining enterprising qualities in order to achieve their own objectives. The organizations resisting conformance may however have rationalized their behaviour by arguing that the financial outputs for ensuring conformance to voluntary regulations outweighed the benefits.

During the research, individuals expressed concern that if the government remained committed to self-regulation, then they were, in effect, creating the conditions which exacerbated the very problems they were seeking to improve. Whilst there was support for notions of enterprise from those individuals working in FireStop, where it was used to exercise their commitment to 'morality', they also resented operating in an industry where their counterparts were able to exercise the same logic of enterprise to engage in what they considered deviant practices. These tensions indicate the multiple and ambiguous ways in which the enterprise discourse operates and demonstrates how the exercise of power does not simply originate from those deemed to be 'powerful', but also can be reflective of the endeavours to 'recruit the self-regulating capacities of the worker' (Miller and Rose, 1990: p.22).

Taking these issues into account, this paper contributes to the scholarship associated with deregulation and the conceptualisation of it as being efficient due to its ability to move beyond the traditional practices associated with bureaucracy. The existence of enterprise which emerged from two disparate discourses (morality, denial), and the ways in which these were adopted and applied in practice, indicates that government is not in control in a one-dimensional (Marcuse,

1964) way as management theorists have perceived. Instead, power is exercised productively (Foucault, 1977) amongst and between individuals who can decide for themselves how best to behave. It appears from this case study that individuals who were expected to be disciplined and self-regulating by operating ‘...in a space of regulated freedom’ (Rose, 1999: p.22) used this ‘freedom’ in ways that led to deviance and non-conformance.

The discourse of morality, which created enterprising subjects, within the context of the free market, resulted in inconsistencies and ambiguities; being moral was advocated as a means of promoting effective self-regulation, but this resulted in sectors of the industry embracing the opportunities available to them to be ‘too enterprising’. The argument here is that to rely on deregulation and enterprise as a means to encourage conformance through self-regulation results in questionable and uncertain ends. Perhaps this leads us to consider whether the proposal to regulate through enterprise is as desirable as once predicted and the implication that enterprise can improve upon the bureaucratic means of regulation clearly is challenged in this paper. A lack of stringent rules, regulations and effective inspection to police the practices occurring in an industry which promotes life and building safety is a concern which may only be rectified if a more forceful and control orientated process is implemented. Whilst we are not ‘against enterprise’, (du Gay, 2004), we argue that relying on it as the sole means to ensure regulatory compliance is insufficient. Enterprise encourages the desirable qualities of autonomy and responsibility, but how desirable are these practices when they fail to be backed up with any form of monitoring and enforcement?

Bibliography

- Armstrong, P. (2001), 'Science, Enterprise and Profit: Ideology in the Knowledge-Driven Economy' *Economy and Society*. 30 (4).524-552.
- Bauman, Z. (2003), *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brannan, M. J. and Hawkins, B. (2007) 'London Calling': Selection as Pre-Emptive Strategy for Cultural Control, *Employee Relations*, 29(2) pp. 178-191.
- Burchell, G. (1991), 'Peculiar Interests: Civil Society and Governing 'The system of natural liberty' in Burchell, G, Gordon, C and Miller, P. (eds) *The Foucault Effect, Studies in Governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf. pp.119-150.
- Callaghan, G. and Thompson, P. (2002) ' "We Recruit Attitude": The Selection and Shaping of Call Centre Labour'. *Journal of Management Studies*. 39 (2) 233-254.
- Du Gay, P. and Salaman, G. (1992), 'The Cult[ure] of the Customer'. *Journal of Management Studies*. 29 (5) 615-633.
- Du Gay, P. (1996), *Consumption and Identity at Work*. London: Sage Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1977), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane.
- Du Gay, P. (2004) Against 'Enterprise' (but not against 'enterprise', for that would make no sense) *Organization*, 11(1), pp. 37-57.
- Doolin, B. (2002), 'Enterprise discourse, professional identity and the organizational control of hospital clinicians' *Organization Studies*. 23 (3) 369-390.
- Ezzamel, M. and Willmott, H. (2008), 'Strategy as discourse in a global retailer: A supplement to rationalist and interpretive accounts' *Organization Studies*. 29 (2), pp. 191-217.
- Fournier, V. (1998), 'Stories of development and exploitation: militant voices in an enterprise culture' *Organization* 5 (1) 55-80.
- Fournier, V. and Grey, C. (1999), 'Too much, Too Little and Too Often: A Critique of du Gay's Analysis of Enterprise'. *Organization*. 6 (1) 107-128.
- Geertz, C. (1973), *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jensen, T, Sandström, J. and Helin, S. (2009), 'Corporate Codes of Ethics and the Bending of Moral Space' *Organization*. 16(4): 529-545.

Knight, K. (2009) *Report to the Secretary of State by the Chief Fire and Rescue Adviser on the emerging issues arising from the fatal fire at Lakanal House, Camberwell on 3 July 2009*, Department for Communities and Local Government

Marcuse, H. (1964), *One-Dimensional Man; studies in the ideology of advanced industrial society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

McDonald, R., Harrison, S. and Checkland, K. (2008) Identity, Contract and Enterprise in a Primary Care Setting: An English General Practice Case Study *Organization*, 15(3), pp. 355-370.

McCabe, D. (2009), 'Enterprise contested: Betwixt and between the discourses of career and enterprise in a UK bank' *Human Relations*. 62 (10) 1551-1579.

Miller, P. & Rose, N. (1990), 'Governing economic life.' *Economy and Society*, 19. 1–31.

Nayak, A. and Beckett, A. (2008) Infantilized Adults or Confident Consumers? Enterprise Discourse in the UK Retail Banking Industry *Organization*, 15(3), pp. 407-425.

Randall, J. and Munro, I. (2010), 'Foucault's care of the self: A case from mental health work'. *Organization Studies*. 39 (11) 1485-1504.

Reynolds, S.J. (2003), 'Perceptions of Organizational Ethicality: Do inflated perceptions of self lead to inflated perceptions of the organization?' *Journal of Business Ethics*. 42. 253-266.

Reynolds, M and Yuthas, K. (2008), 'Moral Discourse and Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting' *Journal of Business Ethics*. 78. pp. 47-64.

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

Rose, N. (1992), 'Governing the Enterprising Self' in Heelas, P. and Morris, P. (eds), *The Values of the Enterprise Culture*. London: Routledge. pp. 141-164.

Rose, N. (1999), *Powers of Freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N and Miller, P. (1992), 'Political power beyond the state: Problematics of Government' *British Journal of Sociology*. 43 (2) 172-205.

Rosenthal, P. (2004), 'Management control as an employee resource: The case of front-line service workers' *Journal of Management Studies*, 41. 601–22.

Russell, S (2011), 'Internalizing the brand? Identity Regulation and Resistance at Aqua-Tilt' in Brannan, M.J, Parsons, E. and Priola, V. (eds), *'Branded Lives': The Production and Consumption of Meaning at Work*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. (Forthcoming).

Salaman, G. and Storey J. (2008) Understanding Enterprise *Organization*, 15 (3) pp. 315-323.

Snell, R.S. (2004), 'Managing Ethically' in Linstead, S, Fulop, L. and Lilley S. (eds) *Management and Organization: A Critical Text*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan

Sturdy, A. and Wright, C. (2008) A Consulting Diaspora? Enterprising Selves as Agents of Enterprise *Organization* 15 (3) pp. 427-444.

Townley, B. (1998), 'Beyond good and evil: Depth and Division in the Management of Human Resources' in in McKinlay, A. and Starkey, K. (eds), *Foucault, Management and Organization Theory*. pp. 191-210. London: Sage Publications.

UKAS (2004), Update 33. *The newsletter of the United Kingdom Accreditation Service, Spring Edition*. http://www.ukas.com/Library/downloads/Information_Centre/Update/UPDATE33.pdf. (accessed on 15.08.09).

Vaara, E, Tienari, J. and Laurila, J. (2006), 'Pulp and Paper Fiction: On the Discursive Legitimation of Global Industrial Restructuring. *Organization Studies*. 27 (6) 789-813.

Willmott, H. (1998), 'Towards a New Ethics?' The Contribution of Poststructuralism and Posthumanism' in Parker, M. (eds) *Organizations and Ethics*. London: Sage pp. 76-121.