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Abstract

Corporate codes of ethics (CCEs) have become increasingly prevalent as overarching ethical guidelines for multinational corporations doing business around the globe. As formal documents, governing corporations’ work, policies, and ways of doing business, CCEs are meant to guide all business activities and apply to all of the corporation’s employees, suppliers, and business partners. In multinational corporations, this means that diverse countries, cultures, and a myriad of heterogeneous actors are expected to abide by the same standards and guidelines, as stipulated in the CCE. Despite this empirical reality, CCEs have previously been approached by academics mainly as passive company documents or as marketing or management tools, in the contexts of their country of origin. Building on Actor-Network Theory this thesis applies an interactionist ontology, and relational epistemology, seeing the code as a sociomaterial object with both material and immaterial characteristics, and moving in a global arena. Furthermore, the CCEs are assumed to be susceptible to change, i.e. translations. With these assumptions, the CCE of a multinational corporation is followed as it travels between its country of origin (Sweden) and another country (China) and goes to work in different contexts. Heterogeneous empirical materials such as interviews, company documents, observations, shadowing, and emails are used to present stories from different contexts where the CCE is at work. The overall purpose of the thesis is to contribute to the theorizing of CCEs, thereby providing further understanding of the possible consequences of CCEs in contextually diverse settings. By following traces of a CCE, this study posits the need for a simultaneous understanding of three dimensions of CCEs for CCEs to be understood in contextually dispersed settings. The three dimensions are a) material translations of the code, b) enactments of these translations, and c) ideas associated with the material and enacted code. The study contributes to the understanding of CCEs by highlighting a specific country-context (China), by putting together knowledge from codes in various contexts, and the overarching contribution lies in highlighting codes as different kinds of objects and adding to the existing literature – specifically, contextualizing the CCE as a vaporous object
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1. Introducing Corporate Codes of Ethics

Corporate codes of ethics (CCEs) have under various names existed for a long time (Svensson et al. 2006; Helin and Sandström, 2007), but only recently have CCEs become so formalized. This formalization of CCEs has not only led to an upsurge in the number of corporations that have CCEs, but also has increased researchers’ attention on CCEs (Svensson et al. 2006; Helin and Sandström, 2007). The upsurge of corporations with CCEs as well as the increased academic attention on them might be explained by some of the business scandals revealing unethical and/or illegal behavior since the 1980s: “[CCEs] are not a new phenomenon, just one that now has become more prevalent as corporations, in particular strive to ensure that they are seen as ethical in the marketplace” (Svensson et al., 2006:390).

CCEs have been defined in different ways. Although CCEs is the generic term (Wood and Rimmer, 2003), codes of conduct, codes of professional ethics, corporate ethical standards, etc. have been used to denote the same concept. Commonly accepted definitions usually include that CCEs are formal written statements that state a corporation’s philosophical values (Wood and Rimmer, 2003).

As formal documents, governing the corporation’s work, policies, and ways of doing business, CCEs are meant to guide all business activities and apply to all of the corporation’s employees, suppliers, and business partners. In multinational corporations, this means that diverse countries, cultures, and a myriad of heterogeneous actors are expected to abide by the same standards and guidelines, as stipulated in the code.

In most countries, CCEs are not regulated or even required. However, starting in 2004, U.S. legislation requires all companies on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) and the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotations (NASDAQ) to have a public CCE (Holder-Webb and Cohen, 2012). Despite the growing number of regulatory documents being termed CCEs, in practice there is no consensus on what exactly constitutes a corporate code of ethics (Farrell, Cobbin and Farrell, 2002). Furthermore, in most countries, the adoption of a CCE remains to be voluntary. These documents vary in size and form from company to company, with the larger corporations showcasing more formalized texts, often accompanied with corporate ethics programs, usually under the umbrella term ‘ethics and compliance’. Over the last several decades, such ethics and compliance programs (ECPs) have become a central part of many corporations as they respond to pressures from various stakeholders.
In this study, we will look at a Swedish corporation that has voluntarily adopted a CCE. This publicly available document is intended to guide how company employees and business partners conduct themselves while performing their daily business activities. Since this study began in Sweden, the choice of corporation was made from the largest multinational corporations in Sweden. Hence, a search was done to identify the number of Swedish companies that have publicly available CCEs. An online search of the 50 largest Swedish corporations found that these documents exist online for a majority of the leading (by turnover) corporations (46 out of 50). Some of these corporations refer to these documents as a 'code of ethics' or code of “business ethics” (e.g., Ericsson, H&M, The ICA group, and SSAB), some refer to these documents as a 'code of conduct' (e.g., Vattenfall, Astra Zeneca, and Volvo), and some refer to these documents using a combination of the terms ‘conduct’ and ‘ethics’ (e.g., TeliaSonera, Nordea, and Statoil). Several corporations have an additional document directed solely to suppliers – a 'code of ethics for suppliers' (e.g., Husqvarna) or “code of conduct for suppliers” (e.g., KF).

Our current knowledge of CCEs owes much to a multiplicity of academic approaches in the area. In an attempt to acknowledge this multiplicity and the knowledge gained from these studies and as a way to position this study, I categorize the literature into five main approaches. The approaches differ primarily in how they view CCEs and the context in which they situate the studies. The categories are briefly introduced in the list below, and discussed in further detail in chapter 2.

(a) Situated among a myriad of other company policies and documents, the CCE has been approached as a corporate document. Research within the area has contributed to knowledge on code content (e.g., Langlois and Schlegelmilch, 1990; Kaptein, 2004; Singh, 2006) and adoption rates and motivations for adoption (Schlegelmilch and Houston, 1989; Weaver, Trevinño and Cochran, 1999; Svensson, Wood, and Callaghan, 2006).

(b) Situated as the centerpiece of company ethics and compliance programs, the CCE has been approached as a management tool. This approach is dominated by a view of the CCE as non-mediated, uni-directional communication from top management intended at shaping employee behavior. A major focus in the research in this area concerns the effectiveness of CCEs in achieving behavioral modification (e.g., Schwartz, 2001; Adams, Tashchian and Shore, 2001; Somers, 2001; Valentine and Barnett, 2002; Singh, 2011), the quality of codes (Erwin, 2011), and the implementation of CCEs (e.g., Svensson, Wood and Callaghan, 2006; Schwartz, 2004; Valentin and Johnson, 2005).

(c) Situated in a context of management and employee interaction, this type of research approaches CCEs as...
forms of textual, discursive, regulatory, or marketing communication, messages necessarily subject to interpretation and mediation (Norberg, 2009) as well as discursively potent in its textual message (e.g., Canary and Jennings, 2007; Stohl, Stohl and Popova, 2009; Winkler, 2011; Helin, Jensen, Sandström and Clegg, 2011).

(d) Situated as a potential solution for environmental and labor rights abuses, the code is oriented mostly towards suppliers in developing countries; a few studies look at the impacts that codes have in terms of ameliorating such problems. These studies take place in developing countries where the suppliers to multinational corporations are situated. Examples include studies from Mexico (Locke and Romis, 2006), China (Egels-Zandén, 2014; Egels-Zandén and Lindholm, 2014), and several South African countries (Bezuidenhout and Jeppesen, 2011). Within this category are also a few studies that are context specific, analyzing CCEs on different organizational levels (Preuss, 2009; Preuss, 2010). (e) The final category consists of a three studies that situate the code theoretically in a global arena, approaching it as a travelling management idea (Czarniawska and Sevón, 1996; 2005) and as an active agent among other actors (Jensen et al. 2009; Helin and Sandström, 2010; Jensen et al. 2015). Of these studies, only one includes a developing country² perspective (Jensen et al. 2015).

Although this study contributes to the last two categories (i.e., d and e) from a theoretical perspective, this study empirically builds on the knowledge from all the categories. This approach means that the CCEs is approached theoretically as an object that is sociomaterially (Mol, 2002; Orlikowsi, 2007) entangled with other actors, humans as well as non-humans. The CCE is seen as having a reach at least as far and widespread as a corporation’s operations, placing it in the context of the global arena. Furthermore, the CCE is seen as a moving object that travels between different places. And finally, as a travelling sociomaterial object that comes in contact with its surrounding context, the CCE is seen as susceptible to changes to its own construct as well as to its surroundings. Empirically, this means that the CCE is explored in its different sociomaterial forms, material (e.g., a document or a text) as well as immaterial (e.g., human actions based on the code or an idea associated with the code). The details concerning these ideas are presented briefly below and in more detail in chapters 2 and 3.

² The term ‘developing country’ is a contested term, and is used in this thesis to denote countries with relatively low labor costs, and hence more susceptible to being fraught with worker safety and labor rights issues as well as environmental degradation to a higher degree than most North American and Western European countries. These countries are often more production-heavy as labor is typically outsourced to these countries from richer parts of the world.
1.1 The CCE as an Actor in the Global Arena

The global corporate world, as earlier noted, is seeing an increase in the development and implementation of CCEs. CCE documents detail the company’s espoused responsibilities in regards to environmental concerns, labor conditions, financial regulation, etc. While much of the content in the codes focuses on protection of the own firm (Sigh, 2006; Stohl et al, 2009), CCEs often also contain minimum requirements or tolerance levels for human and labor rights and environmental concerns and often these expectations reflect international standards (Carasco and Singh, 2003).

Several reasons have contributed to the increasing number of corporations adopting CCEs. These include an increase in stakeholder pressures (Wood and Rimmer, 2003), legislation demanding CCEs for U.S.-listed companies (e.g., the Sarbanes Oxley Act) (Bondy, Matten and Moon, 2004; Braswell, Foster, and Poe, 2009), copy-cat behavior among firms (Weaver, 1993; Holden-Webb and Cohen, 2011), as well as genuine attempts to foster ethical guidelines for corporate engagement (Weaver, 1993) with respect to environmental degradation and labor right abuses.

One of the interesting aspects of CCEs is their applicability as a company-wide set of ethical guidelines – that is, the CCE applies wherever the company does business. Considering the transnational reach of many of today’s corporations, this means the same CCE is applicable in several countries, spanning over several cultures, languages, political systems, and national legislations (Langlois and Schlegelmilch 1990; Thorne and Saunders 2002; Helin and Sandström 2008). For example, Airbus’ webpage proudly notes that it employs a “multi-cultural workforce exceed[ing] 58,000 – including over 100 nationalities from each region of the world – and contribute to a dynamic, enterprising business environment”3. Airbus’ operations literally cover the globe, yet they have one code. Similarly, Nestlé, with operations in 197 countries4, has one code. Typically, the country where the company headquarters are located is where a CCE is developed. The CCE applies both in the home countries and in any other location where the company does business. That is, the same CCE applies to many different places simultaneously. The CCE draws together these places in that they all fall under the same overarching guidelines. In the literature, the CCE has often been addressed as such, a single company document, with the same ethical guidelines for everyone. However, such an approach imposes the idea of one code in all contexts where the code finds itself. This study, as does a few previous studies (e.g., Jensen et al. 2009, Jesnen et al.

questions this assumption by seeing the code as having the potential to transform as it moves between different contexts, e.g. different cultural settings, different departments, and different countries. The majority of the academic literature about CCEs, however, tends to focus on CCEs in the country where the corporate headquarters are located, where the code is developed, or putting it in a different way, the focus lies in countries characterized by stable political and functioning legal systems, unions, and activist organizations. Therefore, the legal and academic understanding of CCEs is still dominated by a perspective that prioritizes a company’s home country, ignoring the wider reach of company operations.

When we look for example at the majority of the worlds production and manufacturing, the countries where the majority of codes are developed and studied, are not where the majority of the processes putting pressure on the environment or workers are taking place. Processes such as excavation, production, assembly, welding, dyeing etc. are increasingly outsourced (Doig, Ritter, Speckhals, and Woolson, 2001) and this outsourcing takes place to countries known for lower labor costs and often also associated with poorer politico-legal structures. In lack of a global governance system to address matters of global pertinence e.g. environmental exploitation and degradation, climate change, horrendous working-conditions, and the use of hazardous toxins, CCE’s could be a giant step towards addressing the aforementioned problems. However, in order to ask questions as what codes do outside their country of development, researchers need to be in those places.

The global reach and influence of CCEs has been ignored because it takes time for any academic field to catch up with real world changes; however, this lack of attention is also the result of how previous studies have conceptualized CCEs (Jensen et al. 2015). Previous studies view CCEs as passive policy documents or as management or marketing tools. These approaches, focusing mostly on increasing compliance, have increased our knowledge about CCEs only on a very general level. Moreover, these studies seem to assume that continued implementation and control at home and abroad will lead to higher compliance and thus help solve the aforementioned problems, mainly by encouraging changes in human behavior. Therefore, questions that address global ethical dilemmas become matters of management control and corporate governance (Jensen and Sandström, 2010). These research questions tend to focus on CCEs mostly as a matter of compliance. Furthermore, the majority of the literature has tended to investigate CCEs using surveys and databases from developed countries rather than using empirical material based on traveling to the places where codes are developed and the places where they are meant to solve problems. Existing accounts of the latter approach have
mainly been provided by journalists and activists rather than academics\(^5\). The few studies that address the global reach of CCEs indicate that the effects that these codes have, both in a developed country (Helin and Sandström, 2010) and in developing countries (Locke and Romis, 2006; Bezuidenhout and Jeppesen, 2011) are far from straightforward. These studies indicate that codes may actually produce a negative effect if they are used as instruments for coercion and domination (Helin, Jensen, Sandström and Clegg, 2011).

To understand what happens when codes of ethics are used as guidelines in corporations, we need to be on the ground collecting data in all the different places where the codes are being applied. This includes operations all around the globe. That is, we need more empirically grounded accounts of the diverse places where these codes go to work.

### 1.2 The CCE and Associated Ideas about Responsibility

As mentioned above, we have a range of global problems, some which may be argued to be occurring locally, but nonetheless global in terms of our interconnectedness through consumption and production chains, which are global. The question is then whether we through CCEs have a potential solution to these problems. There seems to be little disagreement that in order to solve such global problems, someone needs to take responsibility, (monetary, in terms of engagement with time, or a reduction in consumption, a protection of labor rights etc) however, disagreements usually regard who should take that responsibility. There is a growing consensus that citizens of relatively free and affluent countries have responsibilities towards those working in other parts of the world, to produce the goods they buy (Young, 2004). It can be argued that CCEs are a way for affluent, influential corporations to take heed of this consensus. So, the question then begs, are CCEs related to such a responsibility which would improve the lives of those who work for minimum wages, far away, producing the good that the affluent countries buy? In order to delve deeper into this question, let us discuss the relationship between codes and responsibility, in relation to the literature. Several authors in the field have attempted to establish the relationship between CCEs and responsibility, mainly through two distinct perspectives.

The most common approach in the field assumes a direct relationship between CCEs and ethicality, assuming that the proper implementation and compliance of these

---

\(^5\) Activist organizations such as Greenpeace and Amnesty International are dedicated to following, monitoring, and reporting the effects of activities such as deep sea oil-drilling, felling of trees for palm oil production, and the situation in terms of human rights in different parts of the world. Similarly, investigative journalism seeks to answer global questions which cross borders and defy fitting into national legislations.
codes will lead to more responsible behavior from individuals working for and with the corporation. Studies using this approach typically aim to establish code effectiveness in achieving behavioral modification (e.g., Schwartz, 2001; Somers, 2001; Valentine and Barnett, 2002; Pater and Gils, 2003; Stevens, 2007) and supplier compliance (e.g., Oehmen, De Nardo, Schönsleben, Boutellier, 2010). Therefore, these studies have tried to relate CCEs to ethical behavior, usually equating compliance to ethicality. Because these studies have produced mixed results, it is difficult to generalize their conclusions (Kaptein and Schwartz, 2008; Erwin, 2011). These studies assume that effective CCEs (i.e., proper development, implementation, and compliance of CCEs) will lead to more responsible behavior, possibly bringing us closer to solving ethical dilemmas and problems associated with global corporate work.

A few studies take a more critical approach by emphasizing moral philosophy and ideas about responsibility stemming from scholars of ethics such as Zygmunt Bauman, Jacques Derrida, and Emmanuel Levinas. The argument here is that responsibility in a moral sense is an impossibility if it is guided by rules (Bauman, 2009), a view that would see CCEs as incongruent with ethics (Bevan and Corvellec, 2007). Furthermore, this approach views responsibility as a corporate impossibility, as responsibility (and by extension ethics) lies solely with the individual, our subjective constitution (Jensen et. al, 2009; Jensen, 2010; Bauman, 2009). This approach to responsibility relies on an individual’s morality, a condition that cannot be guided by rules, prescription, or calculation (Campbell, 2003). The questions posed then become whether codes of ethics can in fact enhance individual morality in this manner. Empirical studies incorporating such a perspective are rare. Jensen and Sandström’s (2010) study of the Woolf Committee Report hints at how individual morality can be enhanced through a re-articulation of corporate ethics in the BAE defense corporation. However, the study remains on the level of a textual analysis, so these conclusions have limited explanatory power. Most of these critical studies, however, indicate that a CCE risks limiting, restricting, or in other ways pacifying individuals (Preuss, 2010; Winkler, 2011; Helin et al. 2011).

Both approaches mentioned above lead to different kinds of research programs. Neither of them, however, brings us closer to what happens when a code of ethics is used in global practice when it travels between different countries, cultures, and languages. What happens when a code goes to work?

To answer this question and to problematize the relationship between codes and responsibility, I would like to turn our attention to the vast empirical knowledge that we have about these codes in general. Empirical studies on codes suggest that codes consist of textual statements that make claims on ethicality and philosophy (Schwartz, 2001; Wood and Rimmer, 2003). Studies on textual content also suggest
that the text inscribed in the CCEs has for many years been and continues to be focused mainly on a certain idea about responsibility. This idea rests on a responsibility centered on the protection and preservation of the company (Kayne, 1992; Lefebvre and Singh, 1992; Singh, 2006; Stohl, Stohl and Popova, 2009). Given this focus on corporate preservation, it may be the case that codes cannot solve global problems which entail others, outside the typical boundaries of the corporation; however, we also know that the textual content of CCEs often coincides with several international standards such as the UN Declaration for Human Rights and ILOs conventions regarding labor rights and international environmental law (Carasco and Singh, 2003). These international standards set minimum requirements; if respected, they would arguably improve the labor conditions, environmental problems, and human rights abuses in many countries where these codes are enforced. Moreover, the minimum requirements promulgated in CCEs are often better than the minimum requirements promulgated by national laws (Jensen and Sandström, 2010).

To come closer to answering questions such as “what happens when the code goes to work?” there are two issues that need attention: what is meant by “going to work” and how does a CCE function in a global corporate context. The second part has to do with a conceptualization of the CCE itself.

To investigate a CCEs empirically, we first need to define what we mean by CCEs. Based on the empirical and theoretical insights already available, I argue that these codes are complex sociomaterial objects that can take on various characteristics, some more material and some less material. Based on this background, a CCE can be described as material inscribed with text, i.e., inscription devices, a term borrowed from Latour and Woolgar. An inscription device was originally defined as “any item or apparatus or particular configuration of such items which can transform a material substance into a figure or diagram which is directly usable” (Latour and Woolgar, 1986:51). Latour and Woolgar’s studies were done in a laboratory setting where material substances such as soil were transformed into numbers and figures that could later be used as analytical tools. A CCE can be seen as an inscription device because it is a physical object in its material form (often written as a pamphlet or a book) and it includes textual content, based on international standards, and it brings together ideas about protecting the firm on behalf of the firm. A CCE is neither a figure nor a diagram, but a package that once developed can be seen as ready to use – applicable to all employees and all suppliers in all the countries the corporation has operations and business connections. That is, a CCE is a document with a multinational mission.

Furthermore, the CCE is not seen as a static phenomenon as it moves between contexts. Borrowing from the travel of ideas literature (Czarniawska and Sévon,
996), the assumption is that the CCE will change as it travels. The CCE is seen as performative, the understanding of which relies on using active concepts such as enacting, becoming, changing, and moving rather than more static concepts such as merely existing or being.

In addition to being both material and textual, we have also seen that it attracts ideas about responsibility and ethicality. These ideas, arguably stem from hopes that this document, with its inscribed text, will work to ameliorate some of some of the most pertinent global issues of our time, e.g. environmental degradation and labor injustices. Hopes are that they might lead to more ethical behavior, and responsibility for the externalities associated with production, consumption and trade. There is a huge amount of expectation which these CCEs are laden with. And it is only natural to wonder if CCEs can help solve these huge global problems? And if so, how? Hence, codes of ethics attract ideas about responsibility, regardless of what kinds of responsibility this might be, or what it might entail. My argument is that there is no inherent relationship between the two, this relationship between CCEs and ideas about responsibility is created through enactments (Law and Mol, 2008) of the CCE in particular actor-networks (Latour, 2005). These actor-networks reflect a particular time and location – e.g. the time and place where we live and where these ideas are produced, in the case of CCEs, global corporations, primarily North America and Western European – together with ideas about universal standards and legislative changes (e.g., the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and CSR reports consumer demands for eco-friendly, fairly-traded, and non-toxic products, activist exposures, thanks to the internet; the sheer spread of knowledge regarding laborers conditions in developing countries, as well as a growing body of knowledge regarding the environmental impacts of our collective behavior leading to climate change. The relationship between codes of ethics and ideas about ethics and responsibility are seen as relational (Law, 2004) as a result of academic as well as non-academic interest in such a relationship rather than because they are inherently related.

Although we may want these codes to be about practical responsibility, they may actually only be addressing a theoretical responsibility, so we study and analyze them as such. But what happens to this theoretical configuration when a CCE goes to work in places where poverty and corruption are the norm rather than consumer demands, NGO activism, and awareness of global warming? Previous studies looking at codes as they go to work outside of a corporation’s home country suggest that a CCEs is highly susceptible to change and transformation (e.g., Jensen et al. 2009; Helin and Sandström, 2010; Jensen et al. 2015). This thesis suggests that if a CCE is susceptible to such transformations in material and non-material form, the code will naturally also be susceptible to changes in the ideas associated with them. Clearly, my argument is far from saying that the CCE is about responsibility.
However, the CCE in different ways is associated with ideas that make claims about “responsibility”. Naturally, when there are different approaches, there will be debates about which one is right. However, seeing the two arguments above as “ideas” about “responsibility” rather than the right or the wrong kind of responsibility allows us not only to decouple a CCE from any kind of ultimate responsibility but also to add another dimension to the CCEs network – ideological associations. So, a CCE is a material inscribed with ideas (i.e., an inscription device) about corporate responsibility addressed to different stakeholders. In addition, a CCE is discursive as it uses text to articulate these ideas while also attracting ideas about corporate responsibility other than those explicitly stated in the code. This definition of CCEs suggests that associations of ideas about the code are in addition to the immediate material and discursive code. Furthermore, the code is a basis for individual actions, which means the code may or may not be used (enacted) by people, adding yet another dimension of activity. In order to answer questions about whether these CCEs can contribute towards solving the above-mentioned problems, then, we must empirically investigate the CCE (actions, ideas, discourses and materials) in relation to such problems, in the places where they occur.

This study intends to open up a space, a potentially controversial space, that lies between, but perhaps sometimes overlapping with, ideas about corporate responsibility (literature) and moral responsibility (Levinsonian ethics; Bauman, 2009; Jensen et al. 2009). This space makes no a-priori claims about the code being related to responsibility once it starts to travel. This space, on the contrary, is grounded in the empirical stories which unfold as a code of ethics; material, discursive, and ideological is followed on a journey as it goes to work in a heterogeneous materiality. These descriptive stories lend themselves to the assumptions that actors struggle to realize.

In this thesis, compliance with CCEs is not used as a proxy for responsibility. The definition of responsibility is inspired by Bauman’s postmodern view of ethics (Bauman, 2009), a perspective that sees individuals as morally ambivalent rather than inherently good or bad, ethics as contentious, and morality as ambiguous. In the modern secularized way of living (where religion’s influence is waning), people and cultures have formed different ideas about right and wrong, good and bad, no longer appealing to a single authority such as a religion. My argument is that the idea of a CCE as something good, something that could enhance responsibility, is just that: one of many possible interpretations. Responsibility in this thesis is defined as ideas about what is right. These ideas are assumed to differ in different times and in different places. A CCE, seen as a travelling object, moves between these different places and times and contributes to new understandings about right and wrong, sometimes clashing with local understandings and sometimes meshing with local understandings about right and wrong. In this way, a CCE document has the
potential to change local realities, realities that might be positive or negative in terms of improving local as well as global environmental and labor conditions.

1.3 The CCE as an Object Travelling in a Heterogeneous Materiality

The surroundings we live, work, breathe, and act in affect us in different ways, and the humans and non-humans inhabiting this space contribute to the composition of and possible interactions and consequences to their surroundings. Expressed in another way, things are connected with one another, and these connections can be seen as what Latour (2005) calls a network. When the associational ties or relations in the network hold together, this constellation is called an actor-network (Latour, 2005). When humans or objects move or are moved from one context to another, the constellation of relations changes, so the object itself, in this case a CCE, is susceptible to change.

Inspired by the ideas of actor-network theory, especially writings entitled ‘and after’, Jensen et al. (2009) outline what such a context, a heterogeneous materiality, looks like. This is a context where humans and non-humans both share space and contribute to the construction of epistemic reality:

“Sharing epistemological space with nonhumans is an empirically realist and epistemologically relativist position in which humans and nonhumans have, potentially, similar capabilities. Both are essential to the construction of different strategies of, and different routes to, knowledge”. (Jensen et al., 2009:531-32)

Therefore, CCEs are seen as material objects that are associated in a network with other materials, humans, and less material ideas. This association holds together in the form of translation into an inscription device (Latour and Woolgar, 1986: 51) – the object and ideas intricately intertwined and appearing as one single unit. When the material CCE moves into a different context, however, these translations may fall apart, revealing the material traces in the form of debris and unclear ideas about what the shattered pieces mean, until someone picks up a piece and starts repairing old ideas or perhaps associating new ideas with it. As with the example above, the idea about CCEs as good, as pertaining to responsibilities of the firm, plays a part in the constitution of the realities around them. That is, non-humans (in this case CCEs) as well as humans play a part in the constitution of realities.

A CCE, when it gets enough support, can be translated into rules and policies that actors must abide by or they will be punished. This basis for a CCE being an active constituent, along with other human and non-human actors, in the production of
realities reflects the arguments found in actor-network theory (Callon 1986; Latour 2005) and the idea that reality is as diverse as the different actor-networks, that is reality is seen as multiple (Law, 2004). This understanding means that both humans and codes can affect worldviews and construct realities (Jensen et al. 2009). Furthermore, these realities are empirically assumed to be different depending on the constitution of the associations in specific contexts. For example, a CCs has been seen as a document (e.g., Singh, 2006), communicative act (e.g., Norberg, 2009), a coercive tool (e.g., Helin et al. 2011), and a source of resistance (e.g., Helin and Sandström, 2010). This study assumes that these differences are attributable to different contexts of study as well as differences in the constructed realities, all of which are relevant in understanding how a CCE is shaped as well as contribute to shaping the realities around them.

Based on such a framework, this study expects to find different translations (Latour, 2005) of CCEs, which in varying ways influence the way in which things are seen and done. At a specific point and specific time, these events are seen as one of many possible realities. In order to study these multiple realities and to understand the effects of the different actor-networks, we must move with the CCE, into different contexts, constellations, and countries where the CCE is at work. We must travel with the CCE. But as the code moves, as constellations of the actor-network holding it together change, the code is both capable of and susceptible to transformations. These transformations are called translations.

“To translate is to make two words equivalent. But since no two words are equivalent, translation also implies betrayal: traduction, trahison. So translation is both about making equivalent, and about shifting. It is about moving terms around, about linking and changing them”. (Law, 2009)

To understand the different translations that a CCE may have in a global context, a CCE needs to be approached in a manner that allows an a priori denaturalization of the CCE and a simultaneous acknowledgement of the heterogeneous contexts in which it goes to work. This thesis began as part of a larger project aimed to do precisely this6. Using an analytical framework based on actor-network theory, the overall research question for the project was explorative: “When a corporate code of ethics travels into the world, what becomes of responsibility?”

---

6 The project (P2008-0077:1) began in 2008 and was financed by Handelsbanken. The project builds on a previous project focusing on codes traveling in to a contest and the aim was to explore what happens when codes travel into outbund contexts.
Existing contributions in the project have dealt with this question in different ways, exploring the effects of CCEs on the moral capacity of individuals (Jensen et al. 2009), the implementation of a U.S. parent company’s CCE by a Swedish subsidiary (Helin and Sandström, 2010), and the enactments of a British company’s CCE in Brazil, India, and Canada (Jensen, et al. 2015).

This study focuses on the corporate code of ethics of one Swedish multinational corporation and follows subsequent material translations of the CCE as it travels from the sourcing department in Sweden to suppliers in China and then back to the Swedish headquarters through the company’s global reporting channel. The concept of responsibility is dealt with in the form of ideas associated with the material code at the onset, but like the material CCE, these ideas are also seen as susceptible to translation. The contribution of this thesis lies in an extension of the empirical context both geographically and temporally, following the same code and subsequent translations for a longer period. This thesis further contributes to a denaturalization of the conception of CCEs as a material object inscribed with texts and associated with ideas about responsibility.

Compared to previous studies about CCEs, this thesis combines views of sociomateriality with the empirical contexts in which the CCE goes to work. This means that a CCE is seen as empirically encompassing both material and immaterial characteristics, both of which have the potential to change as the CCE travels from one context to another. In addition, this means that a CCE is seen as a phenomenon, the effects of which cannot be understood unless the contexts in which it operates are taken into consideration. That is, the context considers the reach of corporate activity. This global reach is also seen as both material and immaterial: material in terms of movement of goods and physical objects over geographical space and immaterial in term of the movement of ideas over epistemological space.

Thus, a CCE is assumed to change shape and is studied in its natural habitat, encompassing travels between its country of origin (where the code is drafted and goes to work as it is communicated to employees and implemented as sanctions or policies) and other parts of the world associated with raw material procurement and production (where the code is translated, literally and metaphorically, into different languages and broken down into supplier training – i.e., where the code goes to work).

To travel with a CCE that covers both in discourse and in reach the entire operations of a corporation, stretching far beyond the organizational headquarters, requires a target to follow. It is for methodological reasons that it is beneficial to approach a CCE as primarily a material object (Law, 2000; Law and Singleton, 2005). The material object is then in turn seen as entangled with ideas about responsibility,
moving and performing in a corporate network of action. That is, the material CCE is not more or less relevant theoretically than the less material ideas associated with it, but to approach the phenomenon methodologically the material object is given precedence to allow for an “object” to be followed and hence investigated. It is important to note that this approach is methodological and not theoretically relevant.

For instance, in this study, I argue that it is the non-material form of the CCE that can primarily be related to responsibility. But to approach the non-material associations, the material (which can be easily seen, touched, and talked about) must be addressed first. Once this is done, we can come closer to the less tangible ideas associated with the CCE. There are, for example, already existing ideas about what a CCE entails and what a CCE can achieve. An idea commonly associated with CCEs is one based on a universal ethics – i.e., there is one idea that is in the code and this idea is the code everyone should follow. Another common idea is that protecting the corporation, while following the laws, is the right thing to do – that is, companies must have CCEs if they are to be responsible. These ideas, mind you, are not the only ideas associated with CCEs. The assumption is that once we start moving outside the codes’ breeding grounds, we might find new, sometimes conflicting and other times converging, ideas about what is right and what is wrong, what behaviors are responsible, and what are irresponsible. These ideas play a crucial role, together with material translations of the code, in the emerging realities in different local contexts. And like other objects with both material and non-material characteristics, sometimes the ideas converge and are able to stick, becoming closely associated with the material object, whereas other times the ideas float adrift, potentially resulting in their own translations.

1.4 The Research Question and Purpose

This thesis, viewing a CCE as a phenomenon, examines how a CCE both takes shape and gives shape to its surroundings. To methodologically approach this phenomenon, the CCE is approached primarily in its material form. I assume a CCE is a sociomaterial object, an object entangled with other humans and nonhumans in a heterogeneous materiality. Furthermore, I assume as a CCE travels it undergoes translations as well as causes translations.

Such a study necessitates that a CCE be followed, that the researcher travels with the object of study. A CCEs of a typical corporation travels to all managers, employees, suppliers, and other business partners around the world where the corporation has operations. Where a CCE ends up cannot be determined a priori. Rather, it is the journey of the CCE and the opportunities and limitations associated with its access that ultimately reveal the empirical stories told in this thesis.
Although a CCEs is approached primarily in its material form, the two characteristics of a CCEs – the material and the non-material – mean that translations of both forms are possible. In order to follow a CCEs, this study not only looks at material translations but also looks at the non-material, discursive, and enacted translations. The main research question asked in this thesis open and exploratory:

How is a CCE sociomaterially translated when it travels between its country of origin and other contexts in the global arena?

The research question is answered by providing empirical insights regarding material translations of a traveling CCE in different contexts and by analyzing these translations in light of enactments of and ideas associated with the CCE. That is to say, the thesis examines what happens to the material code and what happens in terms of people’s ideas and actions in association to that material, thus exploring potential sociomaterial translations of the CCE. The overall purpose of the thesis is to contribute to the theorizing of CCEs as a sociomaterial object, thereby providing further understanding of the possible consequences of CCEs in contextually diverse settings.
2. Review - Empirical Studies on Corporate Codes of Ethics

This chapter discusses the literature on Corporate Codes of Ethics (CCEs) with an emphasis on empirical field studies. The literature is categorized into five major areas based on the approach with which the CCEs are studied. The categories and different studies within them are then discussed in detail, shedding light on the approach and the knowledge we have gained regarding CCEs. Finally, this chapter positions this thesis in relation to the existing literature.

On a general level, the literature on CCEs in the 1990s is dominated by a focus on the content of codes and the adoption and prevalence of codes. The influence of these studies resulted in a focus on mapping and measuring the effectiveness of codes in different ways. Towards the end of the 1990s and into the early 2000s, we see a shift towards studies focusing more on implementation, communication, and perceptions of code receivers, particularly employees. Steven’s (1994) review of the literature concluded that the most studies were content analysis, so they produced little knowledge about how codes are communicated, accepted, and used by employees and whether they affect behavior. Subsequently, Helin and Sandström’s (2007) literature review, looking at empirical studies since 1994, categorized the literature into three areas: content-oriented, output-oriented, and transformation-oriented. The content-oriented studies focused on the content of the codes, the output-oriented studies focused on the effectiveness of the codes, and the transformation-oriented studies focused on that which is in between the code and the output, e.g. the codes’ effects on employees and managers. The review found that content- and output-oriented studies still make up the majority of the literature and that there still is a lack of knowledge regarding how codes are communicated and transformed inside organizations, focusing particularly on the process. Taking heed of a call for more studies on what happens when codes are put to work, a number of noteworthy studies since the late 2000s added to our knowledge regarding codes and their consequences in different contexts. These studies will be discussed further in the literature review.

Furthermore, Jensen et al. (2015) identified three existing streams in the CCE literature, and propose a new one based on their own empirical findings. The first stream includes a wide body of literature that approaches codes as texts, as corporate documents encompassing moral guidelines. The second stream approaches codes as a marketing tool, an artefact created because stakeholders demand them. The third stream approaches codes as a management tool, dealing with organizational governance and control. They then make the case for a fourth stream, codes as fluid objects, where a grounded approach to the context in which the code travels is seen.
as highly relevant for the definition of what a code is and how it is used. The context is defined not a priori, but rather as a result of studying the code in action in specific contexts.

Borrowing from and building further on the two systematic reviews (Stevens, 1994; Helin and Sandström, 2007) of existing literature and the proposed streams (Jensen et al, 2015), I categorize CCEs literature into five major categories with an empirical focus. These categories are based on how CCEs as phenomenon of study are approached. It is through this categorization that I then discuss what has been learned from these studies and position this thesis next to existing knowledge. A brief overview of the five categories discussed in further detail in this chapter are as follows:

a) A first category of research approaches CCEs as corporate documents. Research within the area focuses on code content (e.g., Langlois and Schlegelmilch, 1990; Kaptein, 2004; Singh, 2006) and adoption rates and motivations for adoption (e.g., Schlegelmilch and Houston, 1989; Langlois and Schlegelmilch, 1990; Weaver Trevino and Cochran, 1999; Svensson et al., 2006; Bondy, Matten and Moon, 2004). This approach is dominated by a view of codes as passive documents, focusing on what they contain textually and why companies have them.

b) A second category of research approaches CCEs as management tools or managerial tools, set in the context of a program for shaping change in employee/supplier behavior. This approach is dominated by a view of the CCE as non-mediated, uni-directional communication from top management to employees. This approach measures the effectiveness of CCEs in terms of changing employee behavior (e.g., Schwartz, 2001; Adams, Tashchian and Shore, 2001; Somers, 2001; Valentine and Barnett, 2002; Pater & Van Gils, 2003; Schwartz, 2004; Erwin, 2011; Singh, 2011). A second area within this approach focuses on the implementation of CCEs (e.g., Svensson et al., 2006; Schwartz, 2004; Valentín & Johnson, 2005).

c) A third category of research approaches CCEs as forms of textual, discursive, or regulatory communication (from top management to various stakeholders who read and interpret the code or from regulatory bodies to firms), a message being sent out by people and being received by people. In this approach, the code can be seen as a communicative or marketing tool. These studies acknowledge a relation between sender and receiver of the code, opening up the possibility of mediation between them. Examples in this case include studies focusing on the role and involvement of different
stakeholders in how the code is used (e.g., Norberg, 2009) and discursive analyses that shed light on the potency of the language used in codes (Farrell and Farrell, 1998; Farrell, Cobbin and Farrell, 2002; Canary and Jennings, 2007; Stohl, Stohl, and Popova, 2009; Winkler, 2011; Helin, Jensen, Sandström and Clegg, 2011).

d) A fourth category of research approaches CCEs within different geographical and organizational contexts as an operative tool in context that potentially influences, e.g., labor standards. Most studies in this category shed light on the different contexts in which CCEs operate. These approaches study locations such as factories in developing countries. What differentiates these studies from earlier identified output-oriented studies is that they add a dimension of context-specificity in terms of CCEs as problem solvers for locations other than the company headquarters. These studies are characterized by context specificity and provide insights into the intricacies of CCEs in these specific contexts. Areas of focus include codes within the context of legal structures (Preuss, 2010; Holder-Webb and Cohen, 2012), case studies in developing countries (e.g., Egels-Zandén, 2014; Egels-Zandén and Lindholm, 2014), and different supra- and sub-organizational levels (e.g., Preuss, 2009; Preuss, 2010; Sethi and Schepers, 2014; Perez-Batres, Doh, Miller and Van Pisani, 2012).

e) Only a handful of studies encompass shifting and divergent empirical settings and travel with the CCE approaching it as a traveling management idea (Czarniawska and Sevón, 1996; 2005) or a fluid object (de Laet and Mol, 2000). These studies are characterized by their ambition to try to study the code where it travels rather than as fixed. These studies include Jensen et al. (2010) who show various side-effects of codes as they are translated, and Jensen et al. (2015) who introduce the idea of a code as a fluid object.

The purpose of this review is twofold: to review existing knowledge within the field as well as to distinguish between different approaches that have been used when studying a CCE. As such, my categories discuss the orientation of the different studies as well as the approach toward the CCE as phenomenon of study. This means that the categories are often, but not always mutually exclusive. The overlap is most evident between categories b and c, as many of the studies that look at communication of codes in different ways also contribute towards the literature relating to the effectiveness of codes. Similarly, there is a focus on effectiveness also in category d; however, the distinction exists in the contexts in which CCEs are studied, adding more nuance to the contexts in which codes need to be understood.
2.1 Codes as Documents

Although studies in this category are still popular, the majority of studies in this category focus on the late 1980s through the early 2000s, a time when there was a significant interest in CCEs. This means that we needed to know more about these codes, what they look like, and why corporations around the world were voluntarily adopting them (today CCEs are no longer voluntary for listed U.S. firms, but they continue to be so for most non-U.S. firms). The interest from researchers in the surge of corporations adopting CCEs resulted in a number of studies that have enhanced our understanding regarding both what these codes contain and why they were adopted by the companies. Below, I go through some of these studies, highlighting their contributions to the field.

2.1.1 Code Content

From content-oriented studies, we know that common topics covered in CCEs include legal issues, social responsibility towards different stakeholders (customers, employees, the environment, etc.), sanctions or reprimands for violation, protection of company assets, etc. Several content analyses are based on a model proposed by Cressey and Moore (1983) and further developed by Mathews (1987). These have been used by Lefebvre and Singh (1992), Wood (2000), and Carasco and Singh (2003). The ten major areas of categorization used in these studies are listed below:

1. Conduct on behalf of the organization (i.e., environmental concerns, product quality and safety, and relations with the government, competitors, and consumers);
2. Conduct against the organization (i.e., conflict of interest, insider trading information, and other white collar crimes);
3. Integrity of books and records;
4. The basis of the code – legal or ethical in nature;
5. Reference to specific laws (i.e., anti-trust, securities);
6. Reference to specific American federal agencies (i.e., Food and Drug Administration);
7. Internal and external compliance or enforcement practices;
8. Codes mentioning enforcement/compliance procedures;
9. Penalties for illegal behaviors (i.e., dismissal, legal prosecution); and
10. References to maintaining the organizations’ good reputation.

Based on these topics, evidence exists mainly from the U.S., Australia, Germany, France, England, and Sweden. However, studies on the world’s largest corporations have also given us insights into the content of CCEs. We will look at some of these studies in more detail.
Evidence from North America, Europe, and Australia

A study of U.S. firms found that CCEs mainly addressed honesty and integrity, general legal compliance, harmful acts, and obligations related to social values. Business-specific topics included confidentiality, specific legal and technical compliance, and responsibilities to different employers and clients (Gaumnitz and Lere, 2002). Murphy’s (1995) survey of Fortune 500 companies in the U.S. concluded that most codes are broad and generic, covering issues such as conflict of interest. Furthermore, most of the surveyed codes contained statements regarding sanctions for violation.

A study of Australian firms reports that emphasis in the codes is mostly on law compliance and protection of the interests of the company (Kayne, 1992). The same results were found regarding Canadian firms (Lefebvre and Singh, 1992). A follow-up of the same firms as studied by Lefebvre and Singh (1992) in 2003 showed that the primary concern continued to be conduct against the firm as opposed to conduct on behalf of the firm (Singh, 2006). This follow-up study, however, also found an increase in the frequency of references to environmental affairs and compliance procedures (Singh, 2006). In a more recent study, Stohl, Stohl, and Popova (2009) looked into whether there has been an ethical progression in the content and focus of codes of the Global 500 companies; they found that the majority of codes still primarily focus on profits and law compliance, what they call first and second generation ethics. Evidence was found, however, that the codes of companies headquartered in the European Union to a large extent (87%) included concerns regarding what the authors call “third-generation ethics”, codes that focus on responsibilities to the larger environment, moving beyond the immediate corporate environment. Wood (2000), looking at the codes of the 500 top companies in Australia, found that in comparison to U.S. codes, Australian companies are more likely to have a more social view of corporate relations and to be less reliant on activists and legal representatives.

Langlois and Schlegelmilch (1990) compared the codes of the top 200 British, French, and West German companies with codes of U.S. companies. The comparison between the countries is based on seven categories: employee conduct; community and environment; relationship to customers; relationship to shareholders, suppliers, and contractors; political interests; innovation; and technology. While the authors assert that there are no substantive differences in content between the countries, they found differences in emphasis. The major differences found between European drafted and U.S. drafted codes are in the areas of employee relations and political interests. Whereas all Europeans codes addressed employee relations, less than half of the U.S. codes did. The tone, however, varied between all countries. Common themes in the area of employee relations included statements about insider
dealings, confidentiality, and acceptance of gifts. U.S. codes, however, were far more likely to discuss political interests in terms of relationship to local and federal governments, whereas no such statements were found in the European codes. These differences are explained by differences in the legal environment of the countries.

Svensson, Wood, and Callaghan (2006) used a survey to analyze codes from the top 100 (based on revenue) Swedish corporations; 56% of the responding companies had codes of ethics. The analysis suggests that codes are most often communicated to employees in the form of a booklet, through electronic communication, or internal publications. A majority of the companies (78%) identify consequences for breaching the code – termination of employment, demotion, formal reprimands, verbal reprimands, and legal actions. The findings of the study suggest that codes of ethics are well developed in many of the largest companies in Sweden, but that supporting measures such as staff training, ethics committees, and whistleblowing procedures are not being used.

**Evidence from the World’s Largest Firms**

An analysis of the CCEs of the world’s 50 largest transnational corporations (ranked by foreign assets) shows a correlation between these companies’ codes and international standards such as United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Labor Organization’s Conventions, and international environmental law (Carasco and Singh, 2003). Furthermore, the study found that CCEs address concerns both on behalf of and against the companies, but concerns against the companies are dominating in the CCEs. Similarly, Stohl et al. (2009) found that content on a general level remains to be biased towards protection of the firm, although EU-based firms have started to include concerns and responsibilities on behalf of the firm regarding the environment.

Kaptein (2004), analyzing the codes of the world’s 200 largest corporations, found that 52.5% of these have a CCE. Common themes in the codes include the quality of products and services, adherence to laws, protection of the environment, principles governing stakeholder relations, corporate values, and employee conduct. Seven categories of stakeholders are identified in the codes: i) customers, ii) capital providers, iii) employees, iv) suppliers, v) society, vi) competitors, and vii) the environment. Furthermore, the study finds that the target group is a determining factor for code content. Noteworthy, similarities are found within the groups when codes are categorized according to whom they primarily target – i.e., internal or external stakeholders. When targeted at external stakeholders, the focus is mostly on responsibilities towards these stakeholders and the principles on which these responsibilities are based. When the codes are targeted at internal stakeholders, focus is on rules for conduct.
2.1.2 Code Adoption

Studies on adoption rates and reasons for adopting have taught us that the trend started primarily due to regulatory changes in the U.S., later spreading to the rest of the world, initially through a U.S. parent company (Langlois and Schlegelmilch, 1990). While U.S firms have largely adopted and implemented CCEs, studies from Europe and Australia suggest that this trend is increasing outside of the U.S. Of the top 100 Swedish companies in terms of revenue, 56 (56%) had CCEs (Svensson, Wood and Callaghan, 2006). The comparative percentage for British firms 42%, for French firms 27%, and for West German firms 31% (Langlois and Schlegelmilch, 1990). The median introductory date for European codes sampled by Langlois and Schlegelmilch’s (1990) study was 1986.

The increase in the adoption of CCEs, however, may be inversely related to community perception of ethical business behavior (Wood and Rimmer, 2003). If this is the case, the use of CCEs is not just a trend blindly followed, but is a conscious response to the concerns of stakeholders.

Several motives for code adoption and implementation have been suggested, including ethical action per se, response to specific stakeholder demands and expectations, response to non-specific elements of the business environment, response to internal organizational dynamics, and isomorphic mimetics (Weaver 1993). Content analyses looking into the concerns raised in codes in three countries suggest, more specifically, that codes may be adopted as an act of self-preservation and protection of the organization (Wood, 2000).

As mentioned earlier, studies of codes and their content have revealed that codes of ethics from different organizations and across industries are often similar (e.g., Laczniak and Murphy, 1991; Holder-Webb and Cohen, 2012), suggesting imitative behavior in the formulation of codes. These finding are also compatible with Murphy’s (1995) study, which found that most of the surveyed codes were not tailored to the industry, but were generic.

Bondy, Matten, and Moon (2004) identified three reasons that Canadian, UK, and German top-25 companies adopted CCEs: 1) to guide for employee behavior; 2) to communicate principles or commitments to stakeholders, and 3) to protect and enhance reputation. Bondy et al.’s (2004) analysis shows that a large percentage of the adoption can be attributed to companies being required to have a code in order to be listed on a national stock exchange. They concluded that the CCEs were primarily used for self-regulation, ensuring that the company was abiding by national laws and regulations. Hence, the authors highlight that codes may be
operating as quasi-legal documents used to regulate employee and supplier behavior rather than to promote ethics beyond legal compliance:

“In other words, codes of conduct, as they are currently used, may in fact represent more of a desire to control the actions of groups within and outside the corporation for risk management purposes and not an attempt to become more environmentally, economically and socially responsible”. (Bondy et al. 2004: 467)

2.1.3 Summarizing Codes as Documents

The main emphasis in the content of CCEs seems to be protection of the firm rather than conduct on behalf of the firm (Kayne, 1992; Lefebvre and Singh, 1992; Singh, 2006, Stohl et al., 2009); however, firms based in the European Union have recently started including in their codes a concern and responsibilities for the larger environment (Stohl et al., 2009). Furthermore, like other professional international guidelines, CCEs are often ethnocentric, reflecting ethical and cultural standards of the parent company’s country (Cohen et al., 1992). We know from code studies focusing on content and adoption that the codes of most large corporations are general in nature and rather generic (Murphy, 1995) and correlate to a high degree with international standards such as UN’s Declaration for Human Rights, ILO’s conventions, and international environmental law (Carasco and Singh, 2003). The differences that can be found can largely be attributed to differences in the parent company’s legal requirements (Langlois and Schlegelmilch, 1990), indicating a home country bias in codes that reflects cultures in the country where the code is drafted and possibly ignoring other contexts where the codes go to work.

The upsurge in the adoption of CCEs is most likely attributable to legal changes in the U.S. (Langlois and Schlegelmilch, 1990) and the trend has spread to the rest of the world via U.S. parent companies. This trend is still increasing as more and more companies are adopting codes (Svensson, Wood and Callaghan, 2006). Codes are adopted for legal purposes as a response to stakeholder demands or due to imitative behavior (Weaver, 1993; Holden-Webb and Cohen, 2011).

This category of research has taught us a lot about codes in general, but gives insight only from the perspective of the developed nations in the world, the countries where the codes are drafted. Furthermore, the approach to studies in this category has been that of codes as passive company documents, knowledge about which has been gained primarily through focus on the textual object and company reports as rendered through surveys. Clearly, this limitation should be addressed.
2.2 Codes as Management Tools

Typically, studies examine CCEs as management tools that promote compliance through sanctions (Kolk et al. 1999) or promote ethical action (Hegarty and Sims, 1979) by influencing employee attitudes and behaviors. These studies approach codes as management control mechanism. The code is generally seen as embedded within the context of a wider ethics and control program that requires training and monitoring in order to influence employee behavior.

2.2.1 Code Effectiveness

Studies dealing with code effectiveness usually focus on one of two themes: either the effectiveness of codes in terms of altering employee behavior (e.g., Stevens, 2007; Schwartz, 2001; Somers, 2001; Valentine and Barnett, 2002; Pater and Gils, 2003) or the effectiveness of codes in terms of increasing firm value (e.g., Donker et al. 2008).

In Relation to Altering Employee Behavior

Some studies focus on the perceptions of ethical behavior (e.g., Adams, Tashchian and Shore, 2001; Somers, 2001; Valentine and Barnett, 2002; Schwartz, 2004; Singh, 2011), some use hypothetical scenarios and benchmarks against theoretical ethical philosophies (e.g., Cleek and Leonard, 1998), some focus on content and quality (Erwin, 2011), and many index effectiveness as compliance with the stipulations of the code, essentially measuring code-compliance. A review of effectiveness studies in terms of employee behavior shows that these studies have yielded conflicting results (Kaptein and Schwartz, 2008; Erwin, 2011). Kaptein and Schwartz (2008) found 79 studies that empirically examined the relationship between codes and employee behavior, of which 35% find that codes are effective, 16% find a weak relationship, 33% find no significant relationship, 14% show mixed results, and one study concludes that codes can be counterproductive. Kaptein and Schwartz (2008) attribute these findings to differing definitions of codes and various methods for data collection.

In contrast, Stevens’ (2008) review of effectiveness studies suggests that there is ample evidence proposing that CCEs can be effective instruments for shaping ethical behavior in employees. The study concludes that codes are effective when the right conditions are in place, emphasizing communication of the code and perceived ownership of the code accompanied with alignment of company strategy. Perhaps not so surprisingly, it seems the mere existence of a code is not enough to change employee behavior, but if the code is communicated and aligned with company strategy, it ultimately influences employee behavior.
Although studies on effectiveness have given us more insight into the effects of CCEs, they fail to really shed light on the process being studied. What is measured is at best rule compliance and altering of human behavior through sanctions and incentives, an approach that is not new to management literature. CCEs, therefore, can be seen as a form of strategic management control.

**In Relation to Increasing Firm Value**

Studies looking into the effects on corporate performance show a relationship between interlinked systems of governing documents, CSR reports, and public opinion, but do not shed any light on the context of responsibility. Erwin (2011), for example, found that the quality of the content of the code correlates with higher CSR rankings and better public perception. Donker, et al. (2008) provide evidence that companies high on a value-index (measured as occurrence of content as listed in the CCEs) are likely to have better financial performance.

**2.2.2 Code Development and Implementation**

As a part of the management control focus, there is an interest not only in whether codes are effective but also in whether they achieve effectivity. Effectivity has to do with development and implementation. However, a literature review did not find any empirical studies with a clear focus on development. Existing studies in the area are of a conceptual nature. The area of code development is covered in this review. This lack of empirical studies is interesting as many studies discuss the issue of development of CCEs on a conceptual level. This could be attributable to issues of access. As the development of CCEs usually takes place on the board level, access to the process could be difficult. However, we will look at some reflections by CCE researchers that indicate relevant areas of concern regarding code development. The discussion and concerns regarding code development are outlined by Wood and Rimmer (2003) in their critical review of code studies, which partly deals with this topic. Wood and Rimmer point out that several researchers discuss code development (Rayborn and Payne, 1990; Stead et al. 1990; Benson, 1989) and based on this research, Wood and Rimmer (2003) conclude the following:

“"The prescriptions of all these authors – Weber, Rayborn and Payne, and Benson – are founded in research that shows the development of codes to be problematic. Rather than uniting stakeholders around a shared set of ethical values, they may codify divisions in existing ethical positions, reflecting only the political dominance of a particular stakeholder. Research by these authors shows the political aspects of code
development to be important in shaping their acceptance and use.” (Wood and Rimmer, 2003:188)

Therefore, code development has been conceptualized as a political process that will give varying outcomes depending on the involvement and power of stakeholders.

Several studies look at the implementation of CCEs as a management tool. These studies are distinguished from other implementation studies in that they tend to focus on implementation primarily as a one-way communication, or when it is two-way, the focus is about gaining insight into how to further enhance management control through surveillance and monitoring. For example, some of these studies have established that the vast majority of firms disseminate their CCE to their employees in the form of printed booklets or electronic communication and in return require employees to acknowledge receipt of and compliance with the CCE (Weaver et al. 1999). A 1999 survey of the top 1000 Fortune firms in the U.S. concluded that corporate codes of ethics have been adopted to a high degree (78% of responding companies), but that the prevalence of supporting structures varied greatly, with a majority of firms having adopted a code without providing supporting structures (Weaver et al. 1999), which arguably is needed for successful implementation. Another topic related to the implementation of codes has to do with surveillance, monitoring, and follow-up on the stipulations in the code. Wood et al. (2004) looked at the implementation of CCEs in Australia, Canada, and Sweden and report a number of interesting findings: failure to comply with CCEs are monitored and the frequency of reported failures is high in all countries but the consequences for non-compliance are more severe in Australia and Canada as compared to Sweden. Consequences of non-compliance reported by all countries include termination of employment, formal reprimands, verbal warnings, legal action, and warnings. Although Wood et al. (2004) compared the results of the three countries, they found evidence of the use of performance appraisals and ethics audits in all countries. The differences in this frequency are attributed to differences in culture.

2.2.3 Summarizing Codes as Management Tools

Studies focusing on the effectiveness of CCEs as management tools aimed at altering employee behavior have yielded conflicting results attributed to different methods of data collection as well as different definitions of CCEs (Kaptein and Schwartz, 2008; Erwin, 2011). However, these studies do not question the underlying assumptions that CCEs as well as organizational structures and programs supporting CCEs should be the same so comparisons can be made between studies and therefore between countries. The main critique against this stream of studies is that it fails to acknowledge the effects of CCEs outside the realm of corporate ethics programs (Jensen et al., 2015). Furthermore, the assumption that codes can be
Studies that look at a firm’s value in relation to CCEs can draw general conclusions – e.g., companies with CCEs have higher CSR rankings, indicating that CCEs increase a perception of ethicality in relation to firms (Erwin, 2011). These results are interesting, however, as pointed out by Kaptein and Schwartz (2008), it is difficult to say what other factors are at play and it is difficult to determine what is the cause and what is the effect (2008:121).

Because code-development studies only exist on the conceptual level, there is a gap in the literature regarding the development process of codes. In terms of the implementation of codes, we have learned that the forms in which CCEs are disseminated to employees can take different shapes as well as the prevalence of the use of affidavits to confirm employees’ reception of a CCE (Weaver et al., 1999). A study that monitored code non-compliance found that non-compliance is reported to a high degree but that each country has its own way of dealing with non-compliance (Wood et al., 2004). Implementation studies in this area tend to focus on CCEs as one-way communication, from top management to employees.

### 2.3 Codes as Communicative or Marketing Tools

Typically, studies that focus on CCEs as a communicative or marketing tool presume a CCE is a message devised primarily by senior management and communicated with company employees and sometimes external stakeholders. These studies also tend to acknowledge that CCEs have a history, as they have taken form over time and in interaction with international organizations, governments, and social interest groups (Tudler and Kolk, 2001) and are one of many intertwined sub- and supra-organizational governing documents (Preuss, 2010). Furthermore, these studies acknowledge that CCEs often have the perspective of senior management, including CEOs and the board of directors (Svensson et al. 2006). Problems regarding the representation of stakeholders in codes have been noted; codification and division of stakeholder groups may result in a CCE reflecting political domination of particular stakeholders (Wood and Rimmer, 2003). The majority of studies in this category, however, focus on employees as receivers of the code. As mentioned earlier in the section discussing code content, seven categories of stakeholders mentioned in codes have been identified: i) customers, ii) capital providers, iii) employees, iv) suppliers, v) society, vi) competitors, and vii) the natural environment (Kaptein, 2004). Kaptein (2004) found noteworthy similarities within the groups when codes are categorized according to whom they primarily target – i.e., internal or external stakeholders. When targeted at external stakeholders, the focus lies mostly on responsibilities towards these stakeholders and
the principles on which these responsibilities are based. When targeted at internal stakeholders, focus lies on rules for conduct. Below I discuss empirical studies focusing on internal as well as external stakeholders.

2.3.1 Communication with Employees

The empirical studies approaching codes as a form of communication process focus primarily on employees as receivers and interpreters of this communication. These studies tend to overlap to a certain extent with implementation studies, although the focus here lies on implementation as a two-way communicative act, dissemination from management and reception from employees or dissemination from headquarters and reception from a subsidiary.

Norberg (2009) looked more deeply into the implementation and communication process by focusing on how a CCE is translated into practice by brokers and traders. The study suggests that the mentality of stock brokers and traders influences the way codes are understood; in this case, they are seen as restrictions. Norberg’s study is the only study that examined professional characteristics of code-receivers as a factor in how a code is understood. Relying on reception theory, Norberg (2009) concluded that individuals will approach a text with their own individual attitudes and knowledge – i.e., readers do not understand the same text the same way. Since both the reader and the text have views about society, the reading of a code will result in a social negotiation. Helin and Sandström’s (2010) case study focused on the implementation of a CCE at a Swedish subsidiary of an American parent company. Difference in national identity led receivers of the code in Sweden to resist it. This article sheds light on the complexities related to the implementation of codes drafted in one country and culture but implemented in another.

2.3.2 The Potency of Language used in Codes

Only a few studies have examined the language and tone that CCEs contain. Comparing pre- and post-Sarbanes-Oxley (SOX) codes, Canary and Jennings (2007) found an increased emphasis on compliance in post-SOX codes, indicating a change in codes in response to changes in legislation. This finding is in line with previous findings. For example, Stevens concluded that “the morals and values articulated in these codes embody the prevailing ethic of the time” (1994) and Schwartz concluded that “[…] codes of ethics by their very definition imply that they contain normative guidelines for behavior” (2002:28). Furthermore, Farrell and Farrell’s (1998) study of CCEs from five large Australian enterprises found that authoritarian language is often used in codes, disallowing a possibility for discretionary decision making for the addressees of the code. Similarly, Winkler (2011) showed how the use of
particular language in CCEs recreates power structures, representing employees as passive receivers of rules and regulations rather than a morally empowered group.

2.3.3 Summarizing Codes as Marketing Tools

We have learned from this category of studies that CCEs are intertwined both with management and with other groups of stakeholders; however, we have also learned that most empirical studies focus on employees as receivers of the CCE. These studies emphasize that language and communication play an active part in code work, revealing how contextual factors such as who drafts the CCE (Svensson et al., 2006), professional mentality (Norberg, 2009), and country culture (Helin and Sandström, 2010) can affect the way a code is perceived and put to use. We have also learned the language used in codes is typically authoritarian, recreating existing power structures (Farrell and Farell, 1998; Winkler, 2011).

This group of studies acknowledges a complexity related with codes that has been missing in categories a and b. There is more of a process focus as codes are seen as not only disseminated by management but also necessarily received by individuals who in different ways react to the codes – e.g., interpretative (Norberg, 2009) and resistive (Helin and Sandström, 2010). In addition, the process focus reveals how codes discursively signal power structure (Farrell and Farell, 1998) and pacify employees (Winkler, 2011). The CCEs can here be seen as active, but only in terms of different results when humans come in contact with and must relate to them in different ways.

2.4 Codes as Operative: Solution-Oriented Tools in Developing Country Contexts

The codes in this category overlap to a certain extent with previously discussed studies in category b, categories that position CCEs at the center of a corporate ethics program (Brenner, 1992; Weaver et al., 1999). However, the studies discussed below tend to differ in that they focus on the specific context in which the code works. Several studies have turned attention to how CCEs address or could solve problems such as labor rights abuses, safety and health issues, as well as environmental degradation. These studies take place in production-oriented countries where factories supply natural and labor resources for multinational corporations.

Locke and Romis (2006) for example, look into two Mexican factories supplying the same products to Nike and subject to the same CCE. Although both factories have similar employment practices and receive similar scores when audited on the basis of the CCE, the factory management had two very different ways of organizing
working conditions, labor standards, and human resource management. One factory had an enabling management style, empowering the workers; the other had a coercive management style, seeking mostly to reduce labor costs. The differences are attributed to differences in work organization and human resource management policies. However, both factories used the same CCE and were subject to the same system of monitoring and control by Nike. Locke and Romis (2016) investigated what can be learned by scoring suppliers based on quantified measures of evaluation.

In a different study, Lund-Thomsen (2008) uses evidence from Pakistan, India, and China and problematizes the exportation of a predominantly European and North-American conception of CSR through the use of CCEs. The study argues that the models used in the western world are ill-suited for these countries due to reasons such as a lack of infrastructure to ensure safe disposal of hazardous waste even if companies producing the waste are environmentally certified, and poverty and low minimum wages disallowing workers to fully support their families. In this case, the CCE regulated the number of hours an employee can work and the amount of pay an employee can receive for that work, regulations that made it impossible for a typical worker to feed his or her family. Lund-Thomsen concluded that failing to consider the social, economic, environmental, and linguistic contexts in developing countries can result in codes that have unintentional negative effects on employees.

Amaeshi and Amoa (2009) analyzed the influence of type of capitalism (coordinated, liberal, or mixed) in the country where a CCE is written. The case study involved the Nigerian gas and oil industry. Based on the literature that examines varieties of capitalism, the authors built an argument that examined how coordinated market economies are more stakeholder- and society-oriented, whereas liberal market economies are more shareholder-oriented. The studied corporations are managed by US or European parent companies operating in Nigeria in the form of joint-venture subsidiaries together with the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation owned by the Nigerian government. As with previous studies, this study confirmed a home country bias with respect to a CCE. The CCE and the ideas of responsibility associated with the CCE corresponded with the ideas of capitalism in the home country, at least in public code documents available for scrutiny. Although this study adds contextual knowledge, it does so primarily thorough content analyses. Nonetheless, this study adds a unique perspective both in terms of focusing on an African country and in terms of representing the CCEs of corporations in the oil and gas sector.

Bezuidenhout and Jeppesen’s (2011), in another case study that focuses on African countries, examined how garment factory workers in Lesotho, Swaziland, and South Africa perceive the interaction between labor code audits, government function, and
trade unions. The three studied countries were chosen due to the differences in terms of labor conditions and governing systems (Lesotho, e.g., is one of the world’s poorest countries). The study differs significantly from other studies in the field as it focuses on Taiwanese-, Chinese-, and South African-owned garment companies rather than European or North American garment companies. The study found large differences between the factories in South Africa and Swaziland and a more homogenous situation in Lesotho, with generally higher levels of code awareness among garment industry workers in Lesotho. The study concluded that workers in general in all three countries perceived that codes had little effect on their labor rights.

Furthermore, a series of studies have looked deeper into the effects of codes on labor rights in China in terms of specific areas such as unionization rights (Egels-Zandén and Merk, 2014), workplace democracy (Egels-Zandén and Hyllman, 2007), and supplier compliance regarding labor law, over time as an effect of changes made by the buying corporations in their demands as a result of knowledge regarding previous code-violations (Egels-Zandén, 2007; Egels-Zandén, 2014). Rather than relying on secondary data or self-reported data from corporations, Egels-Zandén (2014) directly interviewed employees at the same factories over five years. Egels-Zandén found that over time Chinese suppliers eventually exhibited high compliance with the CCE developed by the Swedish company that bought their products. That is, the policies promulgated in the Swedish-developed CCE and the Chinese supplier’s practices converged over time. This study makes an argument for private regulation as worker’s rights improved when the Swedish CCE was coordinated throughout the industry and when transparency was valued higher than initial compliance (Egels-Zandén, 2014).

### 2.4.1 Summarizing Codes in Developing Country Contexts

This category of studies pays attention to developing countries, production focused context within which CCEs are meant to work. Previous calls for context-sensitive code studies – e.g., by Weaver (1993) and Helin and Sandström (2007) – resulted in several empirical code studies that have approached codes in different contexts and in methodologically different ways, increasing our knowledge regarding CCEs. The view of codes as existing within corporate management control systems does not restrict these studies, as the studies approach the CCE from the context where it goes to work.

This category of studies is diverse in the contexts in which the code is approached. The studies are generally context-sensitive and the findings add to the breadth of knowledge rather than the depth of generalizable knowledge. These studies shed light on the complexity of code use, and inform the field in a way that allows for
codes to be seen in a more critical light, resulting in higher ethical standards or in little or no effect or, in certain cases, seven to negative or unintended effects. Several studies in this category focus on the effects of CCEs on labor conditions specifically, as this is a pertinent problem in low-wage countries where production is often outsourced. These studies often focus on factories of suppliers to specific multinational buyers and as the labor conditions, laws and culture differ, studies in different countries and industries yield varying results. In this category of studies, a CCE is viewed as a passive object even though workers may use the CCE, resist it, or re-interpret it. The strengths of this category also have a limitation; the studies are context specific and hence do not provide theoretical insights that could be used for studying codes at work elsewhere.

2.5 Codes as Travelling Ideas and Fluid Objects

This category of studies exhibits a stark shift from the previously noted categories in that they are empirically grounded, emphasizing the geographical as well as the socio-material context in which codes are put to work. Borrowing theoretically from literature based on the ideas of Actor Network Theory, these studies encourage a varied discussion regarding the effects that CCEs can have, including unintended or unexpected consequences.

Jensen et al. (2009) is the first study to view a CCE as an active agent epistemologically capable of influencing the way humans perceive their world. The study examines how employees in a Swedish subsidiary of an American company translate (i.e., enact) a CCE written from an American perspective. A CCE draws together numerous actors and includes numerous ways of thinking about ethics. Using theoretical perspectives of ANT (Callon and Latour 1981; Lee and Hassard, 1999; Law, 2002), Jensen et al. (2009) argued that CCEs can travel and “bend” moral space:

“With the theoretical concepts proposed in this article, the CCE ‘comes alive’ in a ‘heterogeneous materiality’, travelling as a result of a wide range of translations, and with a capability of bending moral space.” (2009; 530)

In this analysis, humans and non-humans are given the same potential capabilities to influence their surroundings, a view that allows for a CCE to be seen in a new light.

“The CCE, in this article, is considered as a sociotechnical instrument (Law, 2002) with an epistemological capability to: (i) reduce, compress and order worlds (‘draw things together’) and to (ii) re-present different versions of worlds"
(expressed in double plural, because multiple realities exist), in which abstractions and concretions, subjects and objects, languages and symbols, are assembled (Jensen, 2004, 2006). CCEs are therefore not only rhetorical devices or carriers of information, but also have the capability to organize the very things (humans and nonhumans) that they describe (Callon, 1998; Jensen, 2004). In other words, CCEs might bend space, make others dependent and translate wills.” (2009:532)

Jensen et al. (2009) describe this human and non-human context as heterogeneous materiality. The bending of space takes place in translation processes. These processes are described as occurring through, e.g., simplification of things, the piling up of simplifications resulting in complexity, and along the way some things get lost while others remain blurry⁷.

Jensen et al. (2009) further uses an empirical illustration to show how these translation processes in a heterogeneous materiality take place. Often, the code reflects U.S. regulation, ethics, or leadership, but sometimes the code intends to protect the parent company, competitiveness, or Swedish legal issues. Different epistemological accounts, Jensen et al. (2009) argued, are followed by different moral accounts:

“In such an approach, the understanding of codes does not lend itself easily to the golden question of CCE-research (‘are they effective?’). First of all, the ways CCEs influence practice are more fundamental that this at an epistemological level, and to view CCEs as nonhumans capable of drawing things together and of re-presenting different versions of worlds, means new possibilities to enhance the understanding of CCEs in organizations. Second, as nonhumans bend space, moral space is also influenced, which means that CCEs also raise issues of moral practice and or moral responsibility”. (2009:541)

Jensen et al.’s approach to CCEs illustrates a wider scope of effects and possible side-effects of a CCE.

---

⁷ For a detailed account of simplification, complexity and blurring through translation processes, see Jensen (2004).
Helin and Sandström’s (2010) case study of the implementation of an American parent company code in a Swedish subsidiary shows how employees distance themselves from the code as a form of resistance and how this distancing enables them to sign the code and thus reinforce management control. The approach to the study is based on the travel of ideas literature (Czarniawska and Sevón, 1996; Sahlin-Andersson, 1996), which borrows from ANT but has been adjusted to fit the empirical realities of the field of organization studies. Focus in this approach lies on understanding the changes between ideas as something abstract, conceived in people’s heads or in discourse, and ideas becoming materialized and enacted in different practices or actions:

“This [approach] means being sensitive to how a discursive idea, such as the CCE, is edited by human beings into a more specific idea; it means an awareness of what happens to the tenor of the code and to how members of the organization targeted by the code relate their work to it. (Czarniawska and Sevón 1996; Rovik 1996; Sahlin-Andersson and Sevón 2003; Morris and Lancaster 2006).” (2010:585)

Unlike the approach suggested by Jensen et al. (2009), this study does not grant the code direct agency, but rather looks at the receivers of the code, managers as well as employees, in the Swedish subsidiary of an American parent company and shows how employees actively edit the code. The receivers of the code are active agents in the translation of the code:

"Editing the code is in that sense a process in which a series of actors modify (in different degrees) the code in form and content (Czarniawska and Joerges 1996). Elements of the code are discarded and others are added when the code is re-packaged (Czarniawska and Joerges 1996), re-formulated (Sahlin-Andersson 1996), or constructed anew (Czarniawska 2009). The focus is on describing how the code travels from one place and time to another, and on how people shaping the code make sense of it, explain it to themselves and to others, and infuse it with meaning (Czarniawska and Joerges 1996)" (2010:585)

The study concludes that the parent company succeeded in implementing the code in the Swedish subsidiary as all employees signed the code, affirming that they had read and understood it.
”…[. . .] the way the receivers in our case distanced the code was characterized by rather defensive practices seeking to downplay their engagement in the parent’s effort to implement the code. It became a way for the receivers to position themselves as separate, unique, and outside of the corporate power relations; a way to carve out a space for autonomy that could also allow them to get on with their work.” (2010:594)

The acceptance of the code (via signatures) was thus possible because employees edited the code in ways that allowed them to distance themselves from the code. The study thus suggests that codes may succeed in enhancing management control but whether they succeeded in the construction of “more ethical” companies remains doubtful.

2.5.2 Fluid Objects

Furthermore, based on the conceptualization suggested by Jensen et al. (2009), Jensen et al. (2015) use multi-site case studies (Sweden, India, Brazil, and Canada) to empirically show how codes are enacted in different contextual settings. The study looks into how different contexts influence the enactment of a CCE.

The study also makes the case for a new stream of research within the field. Identifying three previous streams of research (codes as texts, codes as symbolic artefacts, and codes as management tools), an argument is made for a fourth stream – codes as fluid objects.

The narrow scope of the previous streams as situated within formal ethics programs is problematic, as a stream based on the concept of networks, which are typically revealed empirically, are less predictable. This is explained by the authors as follows:

“Organization and organized practice have firm inside and outside boundaries, which means the formal ethics programs are considered effective when they can fend off the influence of contexts that are defined as outside the organizational context. Questions of how ethics programs are generated and assembled and how their boundaries are drawn are important, but the assumption of different contexts as stable and predictable, in short controllable, is too narrow and risks making code research insensitive to contexts. Instead of
assuming that contexts, outside as well as inside organizations, are possible to steer through management control, the concept of networks can be used to highlight that contexts can also be of a radically different character, where the insides and outsides become blurred (Jensen et al. 2009) and uncontrollable. Consequently, assembling a network so as to implement and organize a code is viewed as a much more complex matter: A code travels through networks that can be unstable, unpredictable, non-calculable, non-routinized and unique (cf. Callon 1986, 1991; Latour 1987, 1992; Law and Singleton 2005; Law and Mol 2001; Mol and Law 1994). Networks also consist of numerous different materials that patch together or even generate different places and contexts by crossing boundaries and spreading themselves (Mol and Law 1994). Following the changed notion of context, we cannot easily assume that a code will remain the same across 100 countries and 120,000 employees—especially when the assumption of the code itself is also reconsidered”. (2015; 263)

The study finds that that code significance increases farther away from home as it encompasses the core operations of the managers working abroad. However, although the code’s significance increases, so does its fluidity, as it is enacted in ways that are more abstract and ambivalent.

The enactments of the code found in the empirical study show that the code becomes more intrusive as it encompasses the core operations of the managers as opposed to a previous local study of the same code. The empirically noted enactments are summarized as the code:

(i) Improves the ethical climate (more transparency and honesty, helps you to decide what to do, protects the company from scandals, triggers through processes, it is the book) AND leads to concerns about unethical behavior (the termination of valid contracts with agents)

(ii) Improves business (a competitive discriminator, whitewashes the company, secures future profits, is required by customers, guards corporate reputation) AND is a barrier to business (slows business down, puts the screws on, prevents pragmatic business solutions, clashes with specific business practices)
(iii) Increases management control (regulates employee behavior in an out of work, focuses on law and liability) AND is about common sense (you have to adapt to certain contexts, context specific business practices also have their specific rules, what is in the code is in accordance with the way we think and act)

(iv) Is present AND yet absent (managers do not recognize the code but talk about its effects, some have not heard of the code yet their speech acts sometimes reflect it). (2015:274)

The study shows how the code, as it travels, can be seen as a fluid object, showing configurational variance (Law and Mol, 2001). As illustrated in the summarized enactments, dynamic and unstable contexts are able to allow for contradictory enactments of the same code. These contradictions are able to exist, and are seen as functional by organizational members.

2.5.3 Summarizing Codes Travelling Management Ideas and Fluid Objects

This category of studies sees codes situated in a grounded empirical setting encompassing geographically disperse, a priori unpredictable contexts theoretically explained through the ANT-inspired idea of networks and comprising heterogeneous actors. By looking at enactments of the code in different contexts, these studies give insights into the unpredictable effects that CCEs can have. These studies also highlight the importance of contextual sensitivity in understanding the consequences that CCEs have as they are put to work. The code is assumed to travel and move, and it is in this movement the code changes via translations, editing, and configurational variance. The studies show that codes can be effectively implemented, signed by all, yet not have any ethical impact (Helin and Sandström, 2010) and that codes can be simultaneously good and bad for businesses as well as simultaneously present and absent (Jensen et al., 2015).

Interestingly, these studies implicitly combine two different characteristics of codes – the material or physical code and the ideas inscribed in or associated with the code. The code is seen as a material artefact, a physical object with ideas about ethics inscribed in them. As the code travels, it is primarily these ideas associated with the code that change and are enacted in different ways, but material translations are not followed. Helin and Sandström (2010) focus primarily on understanding the meanings that people construct when they receive a code. Jensen et al. (2015) focus on how managers at trade fairs enact different codes.

The emphasis, although including contextual differences, is primarily on the discursive aspects of translation, as talked or argued about or as logically framed.
Different people in different settings enact the code in different ways. They talk about it, they resist it, they make sense of it, and at times they construct new ideas about it. Although the code is given agency, the material aspects of the code and the translations of the code are not focused on in these studies. Furthermore, only one of these studies (Jensen et al. 2015) actually travels with the code, yet the focus is still mainly on how humans enact a CCE. Methodologically speaking, only one study follows the code as it travels (Jensen et al. 2015). This thesis aims to advance our knowledge regarding material translations of a traveling CCE and to analyze these translations regarding the enactments of and ideas associated with this code.

2.6 From Previous Code Studies to this Thesis

The table below summarizes the approach, focus, capabilities ascribed to the code, as well as the geographical scope of the above-discussed studies. It also shows where the contributions of this study lie.

This thesis builds empirically on the existing knowledge about CCEs in general, but contributes methodologically by extending the scope of the study to encompass the country of origin (home country where the CCE is developed) as well as a distant production-oriented country, and contributes theoretically to category d and e by arguing that a CCE need to be studied in the environment in which they work or are put to work in a heterogeneous materiality. Building further on the ideas of ANT, human and non-human actors are seen as equally important for such an analysis. Hence, a CCE is seen as an object, associated with ideas about responsibility, but as both the object and ideas travel, these are susceptible to translations that are not known a priori. To make such a study, the researcher must travel with the code under investigation. Furthermore, a CCE is seen as having the potential to influence its surroundings in its material and idea form. That is, the CCE is seen as a potentially active agent.

Henceforth, this study is theoretically positioned in category d and e, but empirically open regarding findings concerning the CCE studied in this thesis. This means that categories a, b, and c are all seen as potential ways to understand the empirical phenomenon as it is studied. Below, I go through these five categories of approaches to shed light on what has been learned from the studies in each category. The contributions of the thesis are further explained after Table 1.
### Table 1 - Five Categories of Approaches to CCEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristics of Approach</th>
<th>Focus of the studies</th>
<th>Capabilities Ascribed to the Code</th>
<th>Scope of context in which CCE is studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A: Codes as Documents</td>
<td>Sees the code as a passive document, and studies the contents of these and the adoption of these. The scope is local, focusing mostly on North American, northern European, and Australian codes.</td>
<td>Content Adoption</td>
<td>Code is passive</td>
<td>Country of Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B: Codes as Management Tools</td>
<td>Sees the code as a management tool to be implemented in the organization. Communication and implementation in this process is primarily uni-directional, i.e., top-down. Most studies have been done in a local context (North American, northern Europe, and Australia), which is the country of headquarters. Focus is often on effectiveness of codes on different parameters.</td>
<td>Effectiveness Implementation</td>
<td>Code can be active through human use</td>
<td>Country of Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C: Codes as Communicative/Marketing tools</td>
<td>Sees the code as a form of communication that is influenced by both authors, senders, and receivers. Incorporates aspects of stakeholder influence on the contents of the code as well as perceptions of employees as receivers. Most studies have been done in context of country of headquarters. Language used in codes can be potent.</td>
<td>Multi-directional Communication Potent Code language</td>
<td>Code can be active through human use Language in codes seen as active agent</td>
<td>Developed Countries (North America and northern and Continental Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category D: Codes as Operative tools in Contexts</td>
<td>Sees the code as a document and a management and communication tool in a global context, incorporating the multinational operations in various parts of the world.</td>
<td>Codes in various legal, geographical and organizational-level contexts</td>
<td>Code can be active through human use</td>
<td>Wider geographical context theoretically acknowledged – case studies from local sites in developing countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category E: Codes as Travelling Idea and Fluid Object</td>
<td>Sees codes as traveling ideas and artefacts in a multinational context and as active agents capable of influencing their environment.</td>
<td>Codes in a heterogeneous materiality</td>
<td>Code, like other actors, has potential to be active or passive with or without human use</td>
<td>Global Reach theoretically acknowledged – 1 case study following the code as it travels putting together different local sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content-oriented studies focus only on the physical artefact and view the code as a passive document. Attempts to study the effectiveness of codes on altering employee behavior have led to mixed results and proven that codes do not lend
themselves well to studies of causality. Attempting to do so must first and foremost acknowledge the complexity of the environment in which codes operate: “The assumption that companies with codes will less frequently violate laws is not valid” (Kaptein and Schwartz, 2008:121).

The problem, however, not only relates to methodology but also relates to the framing of these studies. These code effectiveness studies see the code as embedded within a management control program, the overarching purpose of which is to enforce the code. This approach reinforces the view of codes as a tool for management control (Jensen et al. 2015; Bondy and Starkey, 2014; Stansbury and Barry, 2007). While studying effectiveness in these ways legitimizes the management control perspective, these studies do not address the overall effects that a CCE has on corporate actors’ ability to act responsibly. Helin and Sandström (2007) reviewed studies by looking into code effectiveness:

“Placing too much faith in the cause-and-effect relationship between the establishment of a code and “more ethical” behavior might be misleading. It might also enforce more of a reductionist view of an implementation process that is highly complex”. (2007:254)

With the exception of the studies discussed under heading 2.5, codes have in most previous studies been seen as passive objects, an independent variable to which human behavior may be correlated. In this thesis, I contribute to the literature by shifting the role of a code from passive to active and by viewing the code as situated in a heterogeneous context within which it has the capacity to act, be acted upon, and be enacted while also being passive. Studies on content and adoption rate have focused on mapping the terrain, getting to know codes. Studies focusing on behavior modification as a result of the introduction of a code can be seen as an opening towards looking at the effects that codes have in an organization. With the exception of a few studies (see Jensen et al., 2009 and Jensen et al., 2015), most of these studies have approached this question in a manner where the code is seen as passive, not in itself able to generate consequences. Although this literature has added to our understanding of codes, we still do not know very much about what happens when CCEs are used in corporate practice (i.e., daily business operations), especially in the setting of the multinational reach of these businesses in geographically and culturally disperse locations. Most previous studies have focused either on country of headquarters or on a specific geographic site where the code has been implemented (e.g., Egels-Zandén, 2014 and Locke and Romis, 2006). Only one previous study has traveled outward with the code, studying it as a traveling artefact that moves from the country of origin (i.e., the location of its headquarters) to countries where sales and marketing activities take place (Jensen et al., 2015).
The review of the literature on codes gives two insights that are important for this study. First, whether the code is viewed as a document or a tool for management control or as an active object has immense implications for the types of analyses that are possible. Allowing the code active capabilities in a grounded empirical context opens up the discussion for ideas about responsibility in a broader perspective. Second, in order to provide an empirical basis for the discussion of whether and how CCEs influence their surroundings, the material analyzed must be set in the CCEs’ natural habitat, a geographically dispersed and heterogeneous materiality.

Therefore, his study takes its theoretical starting point in the assumptions put forward in category e in three specific ways:

1) The potential for non-humans such as codes to bend space (Jensen, 2009). I differ somewhat in my stance from Jensen (2009) and call this the possibility for influencing epistemological space rather than moral space. This difference is attributable to the fact that I do not see space as inherently moral, but see ideas of various kinds, which are for different purposes associated by different people with the things they do and the objects they are surrounded by and use. The ideas that stick – that have the most power, most allies, and most power of attraction – are assumed to do something with the epistemological space around them and therefore with the way these ideas are put to use in talk and actions.

2) The code as a traveling idea and fluid object. I see code, as does Helin and Sandström (2007), as a travelling management idea. But at the same time, the code also has a physical form, the object or artefact, and it is the translations of these objects that I am primarily following during this study. It is by following these material traces, acknowledging that they travel in a heterogeneous materiality, that I uncover associated ideologies and changes.

3) The code is seen as an actor within a setting of numerous other human and non-human actors in a heterogeneous materiality. This means that the code exists in a globalized business world and is not bounded by traditional corporate boundaries (e.g., country of headquarters), but rather is the place where the actions on behalf of or for the corporation are performed. This includes production sites and the work done there as well as the actors involved in that work and all other work sites and associated actors. Geographically speaking, predominantly production- and consumption-oriented countries are drawn together in this type of analysis.

This study adds to the literature by looking closer at both material and discursive elements in translating a CCE as it travels form headquarters in a developed country (i.e., Sweden) to a predominantly production-focused developing country (i.e., China) and then back to the country where the corporation’s headquarters are
located. Such an analysis was made possible through in-depth interviews and observations but primarily due to unprecedented access to internal company documents and practices.

There is a dual (at times interrelated but at times separated) translation process that is being unfolded empirically. This process encompasses the material transformations of the physical code as well as associated transformations in the ideas attributed to or associated with the physical object. As the code travels, these ideas as well as the physical document change. The material changes such as new documents based on the code and practices based on the code have implications for both discursive and ideological enactments of the code that influence the way things are seen (world views) and done (actions)⁸.

This approach means that codes in this study are seen as having two dimensions worth acknowledging in terms of understanding the potential influences of a CCE – material dimensions and immaterial dimensions. Codes are seen as having a material form, which is inscribed with ideas about the way to conduct business. This content can be seen in different ways. These inscribed ideas are argued to be one set of ideas associated with the material artefact, typically seen by Western corporate heads and by researchers as ideas concerning ethics or responsibility. These immaterial ideas are associated with a physical CCE, but as we travel with a CCE both material and non-material translations are possible.

⁸ Sahlin-Andersson (1996) uses the terms “edited” and “enacted” to denote physical vs. action-based translations. I do not make this distinction as both kinds of translations are seen as influencing their surroundings.
3. Worldview – Conceptualizing a Sociomaterial Code in Becoming

I see the very act of attempting to understand the world, as a sociomaterially construed endeavor, so a discussion about epistemology needs to allow for constant re-negotiation. Therefore, my study is informed by a third belief: both the world and knowledge are sociomaterially constructed and construed. Times and trends change, and so does the construing of science. Making such a claim, of course, requires me to reflect on and identify what sociomaterial influences have informed my process. The construing of science is done through the use of different scientific methods of investigation and analysis. This chapter discusses the inspirations I have had in the approach I used in this thesis.

This means that I do not believe in the existence of an objective world, as far as the purposes of science are concerned. Whether an objective world exists or not outside of the realm of the claims of science, I believe here to be an irrelevant question. That is, we are and will (together with a few others) to one extent or another always be a part of the realities we construe. In other words, this thesis is written with a firm foot in a postmodern skepticism towards objectivity, and therefore on the basis that the observer cannot be separated from the observed (Barad, 2003; Roth, 2006; Griffiths, 2007). Knowledge construction is thus seen as an act of co-creation, a negotiation, if you will, of power (e.g., the right to interpretation or the right to address issues) between researcher/author and readers as well as between humans and non-human objects drawn into the study.

3.1 Sociomaterial Associations

This thesis is underpinned by a framework that does not uphold traditional boundaries between nature and culture, between natural sciences and social sciences, between human and non-human. The main underpinnings stem from proponents of Actor Network Theory and a Baradian metaphysics (interactionist ontologies), so reality is seen as multiple and entangled ongoing chains of sociomaterial events/actions. Reality thus, happens rather than exists. To approach these happenings we can focus on e.g. events or actions. These events/actions entangle or enmesh with the actors (human and nonhumans) involved, and since the chain of events is seen as ongoing, it naturally has a historicity (Barad, 2003). Events, in

---

9 See Law’s book “After Method: Mess in Social Science” (2004:45-67) for a full explanation about the multiplicity of reality. Law describes how realities are more than one but less than many, yet argues against pluralism.

other words, are ongoing. However, to study these events, agential cuts (Barad, 2003) must be made by the researcher, decisions that influence when, where, and how to draw boundaries. The observer cannot be in several places simultaneously, but events unfold simultaneously, in different forms and settings, in different constellations of space and time. Moreover, when seen as chains, events might also be interlinked in different constellations, where the role of the researcher comes into question. Because researchers are never disentangled or objective, they need to be thoroughly reflexive in their presentation of their view of the world and knowledge construction. A reflexive approach entails allowing me as researcher as well as my readers to reflect on my theoretical views, what experiences and beliefs that, as Kim Etherington puts it, “influence the research process and the outcomes” (2004:27). Etherington (2004) calls the kind of transparency that brings the researcher’s story into relief, researcher reflexivity. This epistemological approach allows my own experiences “to be reflected upon, analyzed, and interpreted within their broader sociocultural context” (Chang 2008; 46).

I present how and why I make the decisions I do and on what grounds these decisions rest. Nonetheless, chains of events “out there” can be approached in different ways. Agential cuts (Barad, 2003) seem to me to be the best way to approach these decisions as observer, interviewer, reflector, and author and allow me to see myself as having a noteworthy influence in the process that led to and the product that has come to be this book. For this study, a material object identified as having both material and non-material properties is followed, in its material form in order to get close to the chains of events that occur as a part of organizational work with a Corporate Code of Ethics. Time and Space are used as dimensions for the agential cut (Barad, 2003). To present this material empirically, I experimented with various presentations in the form of traditional interview presentations and descriptions of documents before I ended up with dividing the material into thirteen short stories. These stories are presented as if they represented different rooms in a large building, a metaphorical spacecraft. The boundary between these rooms is not always clear-cut since actors are involved in drawing things together across time and space. In general, however, these rooms are based on a separation of time and space sequences, each room representing a specific context. This means that sequences of time in a particular geographical space are represented in the form of different “rooms” in the empirical stories. There are times, however, when I as a researcher also draw things together in the presentation of these rooms. This happens, for example, when I ask questions about a specific translation of the code that the actors in the room otherwise might not focus on or attend to. The rooms presented in chapter 5 are a result of a series of agential cuts.

The chains of events discussed above include discursive/non-material as well as material associations between both human and non-human actors, and these
associations are heterogeneous in character (Latour, 2005). Taken together, I choose to call these sociomaterial associations. Action lies at the center of these entangled chains of sociomaterial events, and the associations made between various actors is called an actor network (Latour: 2005). This view of reality that underpins the thesis has been established based on Barad’s agential realism (2003), Latour’s variable ontologies (1993), and Law and Mol’s depiction of multiple realities (Law, 2004; Mol and Law, 2004; Mol, 2002).

The main point to be made is that a CCE and ideas about corporate responsibility are historically and materially entangled. Agendas to introduce certain ideas regarding ethicality can be launched, refuted, and re-launched in organizations. What a CCE ends up looking like and doing is the result of many actors’ knowledge, creativity, technicality, programming, etc. Acknowledging multiplicity and historicity adds a context to the actors and practices being studied. It also means it is impossible to arrive at a complete understanding of all the casual links that contribute to a practice. What is possible, at best, is then a partial, co-created, understanding. Understanding these actions then becomes a matter of becoming a part of the actions as events unfold.

Introna argues that “our existence has become so entangled with the things surrounding us that it is no longer possible to say, in any definitive way, where we end and they begin, and vice versa” (2009:26). Although Introna’s argument focuses on our entanglement with things (i.e., humans’ entanglement with non-humans), it can also be seen as an argument for the increasingly complex manner in which humans along with non-humans are entangled with others despite our separation in time and space (Young, 2004).

Another aspect of entanglement regards that of the relationship between the phenomenon being studied and the production of knowledge. According to Annmarie Mol, realities are produced in practices and beliefs (Mol in Law 2004:59). If we are to take Mol’s argument about realities seriously, we are necessarily studying as well as contributing to the production of a reality when we are studying a reality or a phenomenon. As Law (2004:70) puts it: “[…] method is productive of realities rather than merely reflecting them”. So, the methods used to study phenomena categorize them and produce dualities. These separations do not exist inherently in the phenomena being studied, but are rather crafted in the studying and depiction of these. An account based on such methodological underpinnings is about avoiding an imposition of asymmetry among heterogeneous actors a priori (Latour, 2005:76).

---

11 See Orlikowski (2010) for a review of how social science (specifically management research) has a long tradition based on an ontology of separateness.
I will explain the methodological underpinnings in more detail and discuss the implications of using such a framework for this study. The framework, however, entails that studying a CCE as it travels through time and space also entails studying the becoming of that code as well as the corporate actions that it potentially contributes to. To elaborate on this point, I would like to use a quotation from Annemarie Mol’s study of atherosclerosis, a study also noted by Law (2004; 59):

“… [. . .] after a shift from an epistemological to a praxiographic appreciation of reality, telling about what atherosclerosis is, isn’t quite what it used to be. For somewhere along the way the meaning of the word ‘is’ has changed. Dramatically. This is what the change implies: the new ‘is’ is one that is situated. It doesn’t say what atherosclerosis is by nature, everywhere. It doesn’t say what it is in and of itself, for nothing ever ‘is’ alone. To be is to be related. The new talk about what is, does not bracket practicalities involved in enacting reality. It keeps them present.” (Mol, 2002, 53-54)

Mol (2002) approaches arteriosclerosis as a phenomenon that takes its shape in various medical practices. The different practices show differing but not discrete versions of the disease. The realities in different practices overlap, but they are not the same. Approaching the phenomenon in practices where it takes shape rather than as a phenomenon with one reality necessitates an “is” that “is situated” in its relation to others. In addition, Mol shows that these differences in what the disease is interplay with different enactments of the disease. Mol’s inquiry makes a strong case for the use of performative rather than ostensive definitions (Latour, 1986), focusing on how a phenomenon is done, focusing on actions as becoming rather than phenomenon merely as being.

These insights are also applied in this thesis, as things are defined by what they do or have the potential to do, in activity and relatedness rather than what they are in static terms. Things such as a CCE are thus allowed to come alive. Where an ostensive definition is one that exists in principle (Czarniawska and Sevon, 1996) a performative definition is shaped in practice (Latour, 1986). Hence, a CCE becomes through action in relation to and in the specifics of a situation. A CCE, for example, can become a coercive tool (Helin et al. 2011) when used to fire individuals. The code has a potential to become, through alliances with human or non-human actors, various kinds of objects. All objects, human as well as non-human, are seen as potential actors, potential agents that can influence their surroundings. When actors act, they are also transformed at the same time as they transform things around them. These transformations are called translations (Latour, 2005).
“So the word ‘translation’ now takes on a somewhat specialized meaning: a relation that does not transport causality but induces two mediators into coexisting. If some causality appears to be transported in a predictable and routine way, then it’s the proof that other mediators have been put in place to render such a displacement smooth and predictable …” (Latour, 2005:108)

So translation is neither something that can be attributed to one actor nor a force that lies behind all actors. It is rather a connection between actors that allows or follows with the transportation of actors in time and/or space.

3.2 Actor Network Theory

Actor-network theory (ANT) emerged as a critique for the asymmetry found in anthropocentric approaches that explain phenomena traditionally understood as belonging to the social. ANT can be seen as an analytical perspective on the set-up of the social world but has been claimed to be and been used as a metaphysics, a theory, a method, and an epistemological stance. ANT has proven to be a versatile approach to scientific inquiry. Stemming from science and technology studies, it has been applied in many different fields – e.g., feminist studies, sociology, and organization studies. ANT was founded by French philosopher Bruno Latour and sociologists Michel Callon and Steve Woolgar. A second generation of proponents, such as John Law and Annemarie Mol, have contributed considerably to the development of ANT. This thesis uses ANT as an approach for empirical inquiry and analysis. ANT is therefore seen not so much as a theory but more as a set of tools, sensibilities, and methods that have epistemological relevance. ANT allows for an analysis that treats “everything in both the natural and the social worlds as continuously generated effects of the webs of relations in which they are located” (Law, 2009). In ANT terminology, these webs of relation are referred to as networks or actor-networks. The reason ANT is better understood as a set of tools than a theory, despite its name, is that ANT is grounded in empirical case studies. The approach is best understood through such case studies that describe different kinds of practices: “ANT is descriptive rather than foundational in its explanatory terms” (Law, 2009). ANT case studies are therefore specific rather than general: they describe specific logics, actors, orders, and the realities that the relations between them make possible. Borrowing from ANT and the diverse case studies using an ANT approach, below I discuss central concepts and the analytical tools used in this thesis.
3.2.1 Symmetry

According to Latour (2005), studying the social is about studying associations, and the ingredients making up these social ties are heterogeneous. This means that humans and nonhumans are constantly interacting in the realization of the social. Therefore, traditional boundaries between the natural and social world, between the material and the non-material, are dismissed by ANT. Furthermore, the make-up of the social world can be investigated only if we a priori do not take these various actors as different in their capacity to influence their surroundings (Latour, 1998), a view also known as “general symmetry”. Order, which is stability over time, in social associations are hence an “effect generated by heterogeneous means” (Law, 1992: 383, emphasis original) rather than an inherent quality or characteristic attributable to a thing, person, or organization. This means that stable ideas and definitions, things as we see them, are only seen as stable because they have been so positioned in the heterogeneous actor network. It is our collective action and belief that allows these things to be what they are.

All ingredients in social associations are seen as potential actors, be they human, non-human, material, or discursive. All actors are in essence the same, but what differentiates their size and strength at certain points in time is their ability to successfully bond with other actors, combining their conglomerate energies to pursue a common mission or goal (Latour, 1998). A powerful entity is one that has managed to accumulate resources by silencing other actors and making them representations of one goal, mission, and voice (Callon, 1986a). Together, when acting and in their association with one another, actants become actors and form an actor network. Note that all potential actors might not act, i.e., may not utilize their potential agency. ANT does not offer a stable theory of the actor, rather actors are assumed to have what Callon (1999: 181) calls “radical indeterminacy”. This means that characteristics that could explain action such as the motivations behind actions or size of the actor are never predetermined.

All actors can, however, also be seen as a network in themselves (Law, 1992: 384) since each unit of analysis can be broken down further. For example, the human body can be seen and analyzed as one individual unit or as a network of organs, system of blood vessels, the atoms composing the body, and so on. The same example is valid for organizations and institutions (Law, 1992: 384), which often are seen as a single unit, but can also be analyzed as a network of people, processes, machines, texts, etc. The level of analysis has consequences for which associations and relations are focused on, and in this thesis the focus is on relations between a CCE and other actors enacted in networks around a CCE. There is no corporate level analysis; the corporation is seen as a conglomerate of the humans and non-humans involved in everyday corporate practices.
3.2.2 Stability

Stability in networks is an effect of the relational ties that make up the network. It is these ties that can make a network more or less durable. Law (2009) discusses durability in both material and discursive terms. Material durability has to do with the physical materials in a network. He uses the example of prison walls making it easier to imprison people, yet not always possible as knotted bedsheets or the passage of time might subvert these walls. Law argues that “the social arrangements delegated into non-bodily physical form tend to hold their shape better than those that simply depend on face-to-face interaction” (2009).

Law’s (2009) discursive durability is related to the logics of language, philosophy, and modes of ordering, relating not to the individual alone but extending through individuals to include technologies and organizational arrangements. In his ethnographic study of a large scientific laboratory in the UK, Law writes the following:

“Enterprise, for instance, generated self-reliant individualism and demands for performance, organizational cost centers, and management accountancy systems. Bureaucracy, quite differently, generated a Weberian respect for administrative due process, organization as a set of competent offices, and an accounting system designed to prevent fraud”. (Law, 1994)

Law argues that these two strategies are easy to enact as they are well known by managers and because they entail standard ways of interaction among organizations in the UK. This ease of enactment as well as the differences between them, contribute to stability:

“...because every discourse sets limits to its conditions of possibility so it cannot recognize certain kinds of realities. But those realities exist and they have to be handled. For instance, the laboratory needed bureaucracy but would have been strangled by red tape if this had been the only ordering mode. It likewise depends on enterprise, but would have run the risk of illegality if it had ordered itself in this way alone. It was the multi-discursive ordering of the laboratory that secured its relative stability. When one mode of ordering became problematic other might be more effective” (Law, 2009)
3.2.3 *Actors and Agency*

According to Latour’s argument, the world is made up of actors who may be human or non-human, material or social. Actors are anything that act or are acted upon, i.e., made to be or enacted. Mol reminds us that this shifting play between active and passive “is one of the pleasures of engaging in actor network theory” (2010; 255).

Actors are heterogeneous and are associated with one another, and all have the potential to act, to change something around them. However, not all of them might act. As mentioned earlier, social entails associations and can be described as a “movement of re-association and reassembling” (Latour, 2005:7). The actors are associated with one another; however, these associations are a constant negotiation of agency. This means that all actors in their associations with one another can affect things happening around them. For example, a CCE can be seen as one actor in a network of associations of people and technologies that author the code, proof-read the code, print the code, and implement the code as well as the associations with non-humans, such as documents that define standard operating procedures based on the content of the code, policy documents used to base the code on, printers, on-line training systems used to implement and train personnel, etc.

Now we have identified a number of actors that potentially could be involved in everyday corporate practices, but we cannot a priori know how agency is divided among them. We cannot beforehand know who or what has agency when. Only after the code, along with associated actors has been studied empirically can we begin to discuss agency. This means empirical material must first be used to tell a story of what goes on, what happens, how, when, and why, and who is involved. It is after this storyline has been established that analyses regarding agency are made possible.

By focusing on objects, Latour denies a divide between nature and culture and social and material (Harman, 2009:13). He places all objects, human and non-human, on a symmetrical level, so freshwater springs and bus drivers stand on their own and have a potential force (agency) to affect other things surrounding them. No actor, however small or unimportant it may seem, is dismissed a priori. It is only after the alliances between different actors have been studied that we discover where the power and agency lies and how they are constructed.

Agency, in simple terms, can be defined as power exerted on the surroundings. Latour explains how to track or see when agency is exerted:

“If you mention an agency, you have to provide the account of its action, and to do so you need to make more or less explicit which trials have produced which observable traces..."
– which does not mean, of course, that you have to speak about it, speech being only one of the many behaviors able to generate an account and for from the most frequent”. (2005:53)

If things change, agency has been exercised. However, the interesting thing is not that actors act, it is rather who acts and the possibilities that these acts condition (Law and Mol, 2008).

3.2.4 Distinguishing Actors – Mediators and Intermediaries

An actor may or may not have agency in any given relation or in given time as ANT does not recognize a finalized, stable (in the long term) ordering of events (Law, 1992). To understand how to determine whether an actor has agency or not, Latour (2005) makes an important distinction between actors – intermediaries and mediators:

“An intermediary, in my vocabulary, is what transports meaning or force without transformation: defining its inputs is enough to define its outputs. For all practical purposes, an intermediary can be taken not only as a black box, but also as a black box counting for one, even if it is internally made of many parts. Mediators, on the other hand, cannot be counted as just one; they might count for one, for nothing, for several, or for infinity. Their input is never a good predictor of their output; their specificity has to be taken into account every time. Mediators transform, translate, distort, and modify the meaning of the elements they are supposed to carry”. (Latour, 2005:39)

In interpreting Latour’s distinction between mediators and intermediaries, it can be said that intermediaries have no agency, while mediators have agency although an actor can be a mediator in one situation and an intermediary in another. Intermediaries are stable, so within the time and space of a particular relation they do not change. A mediator, on the other hand, changes things around it through translations. Actors compete for agency and in order to remain as mediators, the actors must remain or be kept present and active. To stay present and active, an actor must move within the network and associate with new actors and this process of negotiations and renegotiations of agency may involve new translations. Translations occur when one actor associates with others and in doing so changes while changing other actors around it. So as it changes, translates, or is translated it is actually transforming or becoming something different. An object becomes
something else through translations and these things can be seen as multiple (parallel rather than fragmented) forms of the same – i.e., multiple realities (Law 2004; Mol 2002).

A gun, for example, can be both a mediator and an intermediary (Latour, 2004). To represent this complexity, Latour uses two slogans: “Guns kill people” (pro gun control groups) and “Guns don’t kill people, people kill people” (National Rifle Association, NRA). With respect to the first slogan, Latour wants to know what guns add to a shooting – i.e., a materialist account. He concludes that guns add everything. The gun control group wants a gun to be a transformer, so any citizen possessing a gun is a criminal. The NRA’s slogan, makes the gun a neutral object, adding nothing to a shooting. Here a gun is a passive conductor through which a personal will flows. Only the person holding the gun and his or her moral state is granted agency.

This complexity, however, arises when we look at a specific scenario involving a person, a gun, and a shooting of another person. It is merely impossible to say what role the gun and person played before hand. Was it a person with a plan who acquired a gun as a means to do something he/she was planning to do? Was it a scared or angry person who had a gun in their hand when the shooting took place? Was it a police officer who shot (as in the Michael Brown case in Missouri12)? Was it a hunter who shot a bullet that went through an elk and then hit a skier?13

Although many questions arise and cases must be looked into further in order to understand what might have happened, one thing is certain: the presence of a gun enabled a shooting that otherwise would not have been possible. Depending on the situation, the gun might have played a more or less active part, sometimes being a mediator, other times being an intermediary. The example illustrates that people do things, but guns do things in that they enable other actors to fire a shot. Seeing it this way, guns can make people do things as well as people can make guns do things. This view illustrates that both people and objects (i.e., nonhuman things) interact in complex ways. This similarity is symmetry. This assumption of symmetry allows us to investigate networks of action and actors that are related to and act in relation to one another rather than seeing them as isolated units.

3.2.5 Enrolment and Entanglement

The actions or events that take place in networks are attributable to actors, entities that can act only if they have agency. If they act, they are mediators and contribute to the production or performance of action or creation of meaning. If they are intermediaries, action and meaning flows through or bypasses the actor. But no actor acts alone. So what happens when actors act and interact in an organizational work setting? In Latourian terms, actors are linked through translations, and actors cannot inherently be powerful or unpoweful; they gain their strength through their alliances. The term describing the act of drawing together and building such alliances is enrolment (Callon, 1986a).

Much of what takes place in modern organizational work settings can be explained with the help of the economic market. Actions as such include planning, calculating, selling, procuring, producing, profiting, etc. Callon explains how actors entangled in the economic market must use disentanglement and framing to make their relations calculable:

“There are always relations which defy framing. It is for these relations which remain outside the frame that economists reserve the term externalities. The latter denotes everything which the agents do not take into account and which enables them to conclude their calculations. But one needs to go further than that. When, after having identified them, the agents, in keeping with the predictions of Coases’s famous theorem, decide to reframe them – in other words internalize the externalities – other externalities appear. ”(Callon 1999:186-188)

Callon (1999) is explaining the impossibility of total framing, and uses the term ‘overflowing’ to represent this impossibility. The problem of framing which Callon discusses is extremely relevant to the context of corporate organizations and CCEs. Corporate organizations are part of creating the calculating internalization and externalization of ideas and actors that matter. At any given time, actions are made for production, marketing, sales, recruiting, expanding, etc. and at the same time produce a set of externalities, the ideas and actors not included in the calculation. For example, cost-benefit framing allowed the Ford Pinto, a lethally dangerous car, to stay on the market despite tests that demonstrated the car’s lethal design and several deaths as the result of low-impact collisions (Gioia, 1992).

A CCE is a material object, but in its non-material characteristics it can be seen as an actor designed to internalize negative externalities associated with corporate activity, such as horrendous working conditions in developing nations,
environmental exploitation, degradation, and pollution, misuse of investors’ funds, what happens when we follow a CCE, what may be internalized, and what new externalities might be produced. This is the type of question which becomes feasible when a CCE is seen as an actor within the corporate context defined as stretching as far as the consequences of corporate activity. The context itself is overflowing, and defies framing. As a researcher, I see it as extremely important to consider these matters because an unreflected one-sided framing negatively affects the world. Seeing the world as built of actors (human and nonhuman) allows a view that tries to resist falling into the error of pre-established frames. Let me elaborate on this.

In a corporate context, numerous actors are brought together in the market, let us call it a corporate network. Some actors are more and others less entangled with each other if we use time of contact as a framing mechanism. For example, people who buy Levi jeans can be said to be relatively loosely entangled in that they make a short appearance in the network – i.e., they choose and buy a pair of jeans before becoming a passive on-looker. Yet, the entanglement during the actual purchase is quite strong, as it entangles the buyer with a store, the store’s employees, transportation services typically including overseas flights, trucks, ship containers, factory workers in Pakistan, Bangladesh, or Vietnam. The entanglement includes cotton growing farmers and pesticides, dyes, sewing machines, packaging, and packaging facilities, waste-dumps, and the list goes on. Yet, customers are seen as loosely entangled not because they are seen as having a smaller responsibility but because they are often framed as entering into the chain of connection only momentarily, at the moment of purchase. Yet, the reality is quite different when looked upon with a frame of moral responsibility. A typical buyer of Levi jeans typically earns 10 to 100 times more than the factory worker who sewed the jeans. Young (2004) frames this situation in terms of a political responsibility and pinpoints that our expectations from those who buy Levi jeans must be different than those who sew them. Similarly, there are differences in what should and can be expected of different actors in the corporate context. The corporate context is one that draws together actors from all around the world. Within this context, the focus of an empirical investigation is on one actor, a CCE and its networks, and is made to act or enacted – i.e., translated. The translations are made visible by following the material CCE and its translations. However, as mentioned earlier, the CCE is seen as also having non-material characteristics, carrying with it a certain set of ideas about responsibility. Furthermore, the CCE exists in networks with other actors, which necessarily also become a part of the story as they have a role in the translation processes that the CCE is subject to or contributes to. To understand this more evasive side of the CCE and the network it moves in, we need to focus on actions and events in a performative sense.
3.2.6 Action and Enactment

Central to the concept of enactment is performativity (Law, 2009): action and practice are prerequisites for enactments. Actors act only in relation to other actors, and these actors are associated with one another in the actions that take place (Law and Mol, 2008). Therefore, an actor is always being acted upon or is enacted. Just because one actor acts, does not automatically make it a powerful actor or one which can be termed master, because the results of what is being done are often unexpected (ibid). The changes that occur when an actor acts or is enacted are called translations. Hence, actors interact, but they also intra-act (Barad, 2003). Interacting entails acting together, whereas intra-acting means that actors also can act on each other. When actors act, they create associations with other actors; that is to say, they create networks. When one actor agentially overpowers another, this is called enactment (Law and Mol 2008). So, intra-action can be seen as ongoing negotiations for action; when one actor manages to overpower another, it has enacted the other actor.

The term enactment adds to the ANT vocabulary in that it provides a terminology for the interconnectedness of actors that form ties to create a certain reality. This means that it would be reasonable to expect actors of different kinds acting as well as interacting with a CCE and enacting the CCE. These actors may be human or non-human. The more evasive and non-material side of a CCE carries with it ideas about corporate responsibility, so it is made visible when actors act in a CCE’s network.

For example, a study about sheep and the mad cow disease examined how sheep could become a “veterinary sheep”, an “epidemiological sheep”, and an “economic sheep” (Law & Mol, 2008a). These are ideas about sheep, created and reinforced in the context of specific actions. Note, however, that it is not the sheep doing the “talking”, defining their roles in relation to humans. It is empirical material gathered by researchers in which these different sheep are revealed because they are created in a dialogue between the researchers and the empirical material they have gathered. It is thus the researched sheep, or the scientific sheep if you will, that becomes categorized as the “veterinary sheep”, an “epidemiological sheep”, or an “economic sheep”. Similarly, this thesis is seen as a dialogue on two simultaneous levels, between me as researcher and the observations and interviews regarding the use of a CCE and between me as narrator and author and you as a reader. In each encounter, different realities might have or might come to present themselves. This thesis is not an all-encompassing truth about codes of ethics and does not provide answers to all questions but is rather an ongoing dialogue that adds insights into how a CCE is situated in networks of corporate practice.
As Mol and Law (2008 a) show that enactments become manifested in different practices. In relation to a CCE, there are possibilities for the ideas of responsibility inscribed in a CCE, as well as the material if a CCE changes form and shape as it travels and is enacted in different settings. At the same time, what is interesting is how these two characteristics of a CCE interact in different settings to give rise to different conceptions and practices. This idea of an interaction between material and discursive/non-material aspects in the realization of specific enactments is similar to what Law and Mol refer to as “material politics” (2008b). They describe material politics as being involved in words, but not in itself a discursive practice. Where Law and Mol (2008b) focus on politics, the ideas of interest in this thesis relate to conceptions about responsibility (as associated with the code).

3.2.7 Punctualization and Discrimination

ANT treats social structure as a verb rather than a noun (Law, 1992: 387) and the core concern of the ANT approaches changes with respect to the following:

“…[. . . ] how actors and organizations mobilize, juxtapose, and hold together the bits and pieces of which they are composed; how they are sometimes able to prevent those bits and pieces from following their own inclinations and making off; and how they manage, as a result, to conceal for a time the process of translation itself and so turn a network from a heterogeneous set of bits and pieces each with its own inclinations, into something that passes as a punctualized actor”. (Law, 1992: 386)

A punctualized actor is a cohesive unit, its parts no longer visible, as they are working silently to uphold the successful new unit. But this is possible only as long as the network is stable and this is always a matter of time. According to Bruno Latour (1998), to understand the dynamics of power we must begin by treating all actors, large and small, as building blocks of the same material. Furthermore, instead of seeing order as a rule and change as exceptions, the sociologist of associations sees performance, that things are happening, as a rule and that which needs explanation is “any type of stability over the long term and on a larger scale” (Latour 2005:35). This approach tries to understand how stability is achieved and retained, and in order to answer such a question we need to look closely at the actors and the associations between them. What kind of associations are these? When and what actors have agency? And these questions cannot be answered beforehand, but only after an empirical investigation (Latour, 1986).
3.2.8 Inscriptions and Inscription Devices

Inscriptions and inscription devices are both important in terms of understanding how actors act and how they form networks. Despite their similarity in terminology, inscriptions and inscription devices are slightly different, mostly in their potential. An inscription is a material trace that has a very distinct meaning in the corporate context. It could denote meeting notes, documents, or a file on a computer, anything that can be used to trace the history of an action:

“Organizers talk to each other constantly, but this talk does not emerge out of thin air, and it leaves material traces; all conversations and meetings have texts that caused them, texts that were the basis for the discussion, and texts that are to be produced as a result”. (Czarniawska, 2008)

Note that an inscription is before analysis, a neutral actor albeit with potential agency, but we cannot identify an inscription before observing it in action much less know if it has agency in a given context. An inscription, however, can become an active part of an inscription device that aims to produce and exert a certain understanding or way of doing things. Inscription devices are complex apparatuses. Latour and Woolgar define them as “any item or apparatus or particular configuration of such items which can transform a material substance into a figure or a diagram which is directly usable” (1986:51). The main difference between inscriptions and inscription devices is the perceived or actual usability. An inscription device becomes a more powerful actor in a world that is obsessed with measuring and counting, whereas inscriptions gain power when used as symbols or patents or logos, often creating a new world order. Reading Czarniawska (2008) and Latour and Woolgar (1986) might make it seem as if inscription devices come together in a fairly predictable manner. However, in empirical settings it might be quite the contrary. For example, all conversations do not leave material traces, but some definitely do, and these are the traces that can be picked up at later stages in follow-up. In addition, meetings and conversations may be preceded by texts that would be entangled with these conversations and meetings, but might not have caused them. Similarly, making a configuration of items into a figure or diagram may be extremely successful, but there is always the possibility that it will fail. Even though it might be seemingly “directly usable”, it might not be used. The point is that the entanglement between preceding and succeeding actions makes it difficult to assign causality.
3.2.9 Translation

Taken together, the terms and concepts discussed above help the researcher focus on the changes that occur as actors act or interact. These changes or transformations are called translations. To map changes, there must be some form of movement in time and/or space.

Actor network theory is sometimes referred to as the sociology of translation and as dealing with the “mechanics of power” (Law, 1992). It is called the sociology of translation because it deals with what happens to actors as a set of translations that occur when new actors cross their path or vice versa. It deals with the mechanics of power because in its translations it can reveal why certain actors appear as powerful and how they have managed to stabilize this power over time; this could be an organization or a successful entrepreneur or an aircraft. That is, these actors are not inherently functioning in the way we see them today; a lot of historical work has gone into creating the structures that are upheld at any moment in time and space.

Translation is a process, never completed, and it may fail (Callon, 1986). Taking the example of a specific study, Callon (1986) outlines several important steps that can be of relevance in studying translations. Inspired by Callon (1986) and his thorough analysis of a foundational ANT study (The Scallops of St. Bueric), I discuss the steps that I see as important when studying translations of a CCE.

1) An interdefinition of actors – this relates to drawing together different actors and bringing them into the story together. Rather than different perspectives, the same story brings various actors together. This is important both during the data collection and the writing process.

2) Describing how allies are locked into place – this involves empirically questioning how different actors interact and how attempts to stabilize and impose their identities end up in specific realities. This can involve punctualization or discrimination.

3) Describing and showing enrolment and mobilization processes – this involves showing how alliances are built through acts of persuasion, negotiation, or coercion; these are drawn together in order to create support for an idea or process.

4) Describing and showing betrayals and controversies – the above-mentioned three points would not be possible to highlight without also showing tensions and disputes, which contribute towards the realities being construed.
The four processes described above have been important in guiding the arrangement and presentation of the empirical material. The table and figure below summarize the concepts and illustrations used for the analysis of the empirical material.

**Table 2 - Concepts used for Empirical Analyses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor-network</td>
<td>A variable set of allied actors that are connected to one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>The potential to influence the power which a mediator exerts, i.e., the potential for agency can exist with any actor, but whether it is exercised or not is an empirical matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enactment</td>
<td>A form of translation - when an actor is acted upon by another; when it is, e.g., hijacked, silenced, or spoken for, it is enacted. Enactment involves some kind of action or interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment</td>
<td>Mobilization of support attained through building alliances with other actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>A material trace left behind in the process of organizing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription device</td>
<td>“An inscription device is any item or apparatus or particular configuration of such items which can transform a material substance into a figure or a diagram which is directly usable” (Latour and Woolgar, 1986:51).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediary/non-mediating actor</td>
<td>An actor that does not change things around it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator/mediating actor</td>
<td>An actor that changes things around it when acting or being acted upon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctualization</td>
<td>A simplification of a network, so that it counts as a single unit, i.e., a single actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Changes that occur as an actor acts or interacts. These changes or transformations are called translations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the analysis of the empirical material, when several actors are involved in explaining an event, visual illustrations are used to complement the text. When this is done, the key on the following page indicates the role of the actor as seen in a particular setting. These figures can also be found on the bookmark in the book, allowing you as a reader to use the key while looking at the different figures.
Figure 1 - Figures for Analyses
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3.3 Critique of ANT

ANT, like any other scientific perspective, has its share of sceptics who have identified issues with the approach. Most of the critique is directed towards ANT pre-1999, when John Law and John Hassard published *Actor Network Theory and After*, where proponents of ANT respond to the critique. Although all disagreements have not been settled, this work has been the basis for a more reflexive and open focus “post-ANT” (Gad & Jensen, 2010).

As I do not see a conflict in the earlier and later works, only subsequent clarifications of the concept through empirical and reflective texts, this thesis builds on several ANT arguments that come from earlier sources such as Law (1992) and Latour (1998); however, inspiration is also drawn from the “post-ANT” literature. Nonetheless, for the purpose of clarifying the use of ANT in this thesis, I will go through some of the critique that are relevant to the assumptions on which this work builds.

Presented originally as an ontological framework that puts humans and non-humans on par (general symmetry), ANT has been criticized for ignoring human feelings, values, and morals, basically dehumanizing humans. This deficiency is seen as a consequence of leaving out the meaningfulness of human action and hence not being able to answer questions such as “where does responsibility lie?” (Kamal & Jones, 2004:570). This critique has to do with humans’ and non-humans’ symmetrical possibilities of exerting agency, which would leave no room for moral agency, an agency with thinking, intentionality, values, and planning usually attributed to humans. ANT has also been accused of the opposite, an anthropomorphizing of non-humans, attributing human intent and desires to objects (Whittle and Spicer, 2008). Despite ANT’s claims to treat humans and non-humans as equals (i.e., symmetrically), critics have noted that ANT actually reconstructs the asymmetry that it aims to deflect by attributing essentialist characteristics to certain actors. Critique regarding this essentialism stems from the outcomes of certain studies that have attributed network breakdown (e.g., Callon, 1986b) or durability (e.g., Callon & Muniesa, 2005) to specific objects. These critics argue that these objects would have to have certain qualities that would explain the relative durability or weakness of the network (Mutch, 2002). Below, I discuss both the issue of symmetry and the essentialization of actors.

3.3.1 Symmetry

When it comes to the issue of symmetry, I understand why it is extremely provocative to treat humans and non-humans as ontologically equal. This view,
however, does not have to be so daunting if seen as an analytical tool in describing reality as it is done, and re-done rather than as a determination of how things are, once and for all.

Adding moral agency to human’s conduct is perfectly doable, a matter of choice and an element that can be added to the analysis after the description of events has been done, depending on the purpose of the study. In my reading of Latour’s (2005) discussion of agency, there are no set characteristics for what a non-human or object agency might entail. The discussion on agency primarily places objects on par with humans before the analysis. Latour’s argument is that, we cannot a priori ignore objects when studying the world because they play an important part in the production of reality. Many studies, however, are conducted that intentionally exclude non-human objects, and it is such a metaphysics that excludes non-humans a priori that Latour is critiquing.

Graham Harman’s (2009:25) explication in terms of Latour’s critique is that

“the absence of rats, lions, and lakes from mainstream philosophical debate speaks not against Bruno Latour, but against the bland default metaphysics that reduces objects to our human access to them”. (2009:25)

The problem arises when symmetry means that humans and non-humans are essentially the same, and this relates to the second point of critique. However, as many ANT studies have shown, actors are not the same. Some are more intentional than others, some are more powerful than others, but a priori ignoring asymmetry becomes an analytical tool for the researcher to help understand how and why these differences have come about. Hence ANT helps explain complex contexts.

14 A similar debate between critics and proponents can be found in the field of Feminist Theory discussing the ‘subject’ and ‘agency’ between Judith Butler and Seyla Benhabib. Butler argues that, “any effort to give universal of specific content to the category of women, presuming that that guarantee of solidarity is required in advance, will necessarily produce factionalization, and that “identity” as a point of departure can never hold as the solidifying ground of a feminist political movement. Identity categories are never merely descriptive, but always normative, and as such, exclusionary” (Butler, 1995: 50). She further argues that, ”To deconstruct the subject of feminism is not, then, to censure its usage, but, on the contrary, to release the term into a future of multiple significations, to emancipate it from the maternal or racialist ontologies to which it has been restricted, and to give it place as a site where unanticipated meanings might come to bear” (Butler, 1995: 50). Butler’s approach is problematic according to Benhabib, because it jettisons the agency of the subject, a necessity for any emancipatory vision for feminists. She comments on Butler’s idea of the performativity of identity, “if this view of the self is adopted, is there any possibility of changing those “expressions” which constitute us? If we are no more than the sum total of the gendered expressions we perform, is there ever any chance to stop the performance for a while, to pull the curtain down, and let it rise only if one can have a say in the production of the play itself?...” (Benhabib, 1995: 21). My reading of these debates, however, lead me to a different point than Benhabib’s. I believe, Butler’s point is to make possible a constant reconstitution of the subject though a sort of Baradian onto-epistemology, although she never fully expresses it so (and this was before Barad). Although Butler wants to remain in the realms of epistemology, it seems to me her struggles comes from, and her critics remarks stem from, a fear of losing touch with the ‘real’ in an overemphasis of the discursively constituted. Butler states e.g. that a Foucauldian reinscription of the subject is, “…rather a call to rework that notion outside the terms of an epistemological given” (Butler, 1995: 48). See e.g. Benjamin et al. (1995) for a more complete picture of these debates.
Some researchers such as Jensen et al. (2009) and Star (2010) use a compromise, suggesting an epistemic symmetry instead of ontological symmetry. This view allows human and non-human actors equal potential to influence the epistemic world, i.e., the potential to affect worldviews. Such an approach differentiates the human actor from the non-human actor in terms of morality and intentionality. I, however, believe that a focus on symmetry in ontological terms is important. An approach emphasizing epistemological symmetry risks not fully acknowledging the materiality of the non-human objects of concern, in this case a CCE. The epistemological approach would see the CCE as an agent in a construction which is still predominantly dominated by human actors in a social construction and consequent effects of CCEs then would only be able to affect human worldviews (C.f. Jensen, 2009). This thesis rests on the assumption that both epistemological and ontological influences are possible, and rests on Barad’s onto-epistemology described as “the study of practices of knowing in being” (2003: 829). This entails a focus on the materiality of the code as well as the non-material aspects and understandings associated with it, as it is working.

3.3.2 Essentialization of actors

Essentializing actors is problematic because it critiques ANT for something that ANT does not do. This critique stems from a misunderstanding of and conflicting ideas regarding general symmetry. The critique is that ANT relies on the assumption that non-humans have certain “real” properties that explain the relative durability or weakness of a network. However, non-humans as well as humans have emergent properties rather than inherent properties realized in particular contexts (Mutch, 2002; Muniesa et al., 2007). If the world is seen as stable rather than emerging, any properties will be seen as essentialist. It is this mismatch of properties of the real that create a misunderstanding. The ANT researcher does not see stability as norm, rather as things that emerge and become as they unfold. Because there is constant re-negotiation, every time that new cases are considered they will suggest new lessons about the nature of actors (Mol, 2010).

3.3.3 Summing up

In this thesis, I take a pragmatic approach where humans as well as non-humans are given the same capabilities to affect things around them in the observations and presentation of the empirical material. In an analysis regarding responsibility and consequences in a corporate setting, I differentiate between human and non-human actors where human actors are seen as moral and capable of intentional action. There is a very pragmatic approach to this differentiation of agency in data collection and analysis. Although I see humans, as opposed to non-humans, as intentional beings, it is impossible for me to know how or why a specific individuals act the way they do.
I would need to follow each individual around and even then I might only get a hint at why they act as they do. I can, however, identify their actions to uncover what seems to constrain or aid these actions in specific settings. For this purpose, focus needs to be on the empirical actions. If we a priori make the distinction, focusing on human morality and intentionality, we risk falling into finger pointing (he or she did this while he or she did that) rather than understanding the mechanisms at play when humans act. Going back to Latour’s example of the gun, all we could say based on the second statement would be that a shooting was wrong or bad or hateful and the person who shot should be punished for their act. However, if a researcher ignores the role of the gun, we would never open up discussions about whether guns should be a part of the world we live, why and why not, what they enable, and what their true cost is. In a world that is increasingly heterogeneous and entangled, people have significant power. Ignoring that would be wrong, but for the purpose of closing in on how things work empirically, I strongly agree with the value of avoiding an appropriation of difference in agency during the collection and presentation of empirical material.

Once the researcher has the data, making sense of it allows for and calls for identifying the intentionality of the researcher and that is where I believe the distinction of responsibilities, moral and intentional, becomes a relevant factor. To this end, I do my best not to make distinctions between human and non-human actors that come to my attention when investigating what happens when a CCE goes to work. When I start analyzing the material, however, feelings of intentionality and responsibility can and do become part of my analysis. Although these characteristics are human, they also manifest themselves through non-humans, so an a priori distinction is not made.

Although ANT is unable to provide a leak-proof framework on which this thesis can rest, ANT does provide a useful vocabulary for understanding CCEs in the corporate context and acts as an alternative to the often “over socialized” or “under socialized” (Granovetter, 1985) accounts that dominate the literature. To me, this means in a first step of describing reality, trying to take on the role of the young child who observes and does not yet question why things are the way they are. After the observations are done, I let the analytical thinking and questioning mind do its job.

It has also been debated whether ANT is a theory, ontology, or a method. Although it is tempting, I avoid these disputes as they only seem to invite argument for the sake of argument, leading to an unproductive disagreement. For the purpose of this thesis, ANT is seen as an approach or a post-plural attitude (Gad & Jensen, 2010). This means that reality is done rather than observed (Mol, 1999). Taking into consideration the critique against ANT, we also learn that ANT cannot completely dissolve traditional distinctions between dualities as new complexities necessarily
produce new distinctions. This means that a symmetrical analysis will not dissolve all differences between humans and non-humans. However, a symmetrical analysis can allow researchers to expand their “analytical capacities for imagining new orders or perceiving the emergence of them” (Gad & Jensen, 2010:70). This means that we can only start by refusing to uphold the established boundaries, and delving into the empirical material to find the boundaries that actors are creating as well as breaking themselves and showing how these distinctions are made. The point is then to unveil and understand how humans and non-humans interact and intra-act in order to modify each other (Mutch, 2002). Non-human objects are thus seen as capable of action and affecting others through their association with others (Kennan, Cecez-Kecmanovic and Underwood, 2010). Using such an approach can be seen as pragmatic and is in line with several studies in economic sociology. Muniesa et al. describe such approaches:

“They tend, for instance, to avoid ex-ante explicative principles and they adopt an anti-essentialist positions that is particularly suited to the study of situations of uncertainty. They also focus on actors’ capacities to operate across multiple spaces and are attentive to the empirical intricacies of agency. They pay particular attention to the trials in which actors test the resistance that defines the reality of the world surrounding them”. (Muniesa, et al., 2007)

### 3.4 Conceptual Understandings of the Corporation and the CCE

The assumptions put forward in the previous chapter have consequences for how the empirical phenomenon will be approached. The underlying assumptions also have consequences for how certain things in this thesis are defined. This chapter is devoted to discussing the consequences of using performative and pragmatic definitions and sheds light on the central empirical concepts in the study. The empirical concepts discussed include the corporation and corporate codes of ethics.

#### 3.4.1 The Corporation

A corporation is commonly seen as a large legal entity of people organized to work for a common goal. A corporation typically includes certain non-humans, usually called assets, seen in economic terms. Merriam Webster defines a corporation as a “large business or organization that under the law has the rights and duties of an individual and follows a specific purpose”. I would like to discuss both the humans and the non-humans first separately and then together and then present a different conception of the corporation. The issue of the corporation as a legal entity is also addressed.
During most of human history, humans living short distances from one another could practically have been living in different worlds, at least considering the influence they had on one another. Today, people living in different hemispheres of the world are entangled with one another in ways that were previously inconceivable. This conception of the way we live is Singer’s (2003) argument for a new kind of ethics that takes into consideration the idea that we live in “one world”. This is an argument that has an ethical aspect. As humans, we influence one another through effects on the atmosphere, the ozone layer, the world’s oceans, glaciers, and forests. There is an ethical dimension to seeing the world as one, but there are also very practical, empirical reasons with which this entanglement may be approached. The increasing movement of goods and people around the world is a testament to this entanglement.

Corporations are amidst this entanglement and contribute to a large extent to globalization through the movement from one place to another of, among other things, products, people, and processes. Corporations, through the business activities that are connected with them, contribute to a large amount of movement and transport across the globe. This kind of movement is a prerequisite for this increasing entanglement (Singer, 2003; Introna, 2009; Young, 2004) that creates associations between, for example, you and me as consumers and factory workers in Bangladesh, China, and Vietnam.

In this thesis, the definition chosen for the corporation stems from what corporations do rather than what they are. There are two reasons for this. First, this definition is a less static, open to being molded as the case study unfolds. Second, it allows us to come closer to the definitions being used within the corporation as well as the boundaries that are drawn by the actors themselves; that is to say, empirical questions examine where the corporation begins and ends (where the activities of the corporation begin and end).

Czarniawska (2004) explicates what a shift from an ostensive to a performative definition entails when studying organizations. Organizations are seen as a social representation varying between contexts rather than a distinct entity. The corporate organization is seen as comprising of actors whose actions contribute to the construction and maintenance of the organization. Moreover, Czarniawska depicts how this shift in definitions also creates a shift in the focus of organization studies. Instead of exposing the principles of organizing, the focus with a performative definition of the organization explores the practices of organizing (Czarniawska 2004).

To study corporate actions of actors entangled in the corporate network, it is necessary to come in contact with and preferably follow the actors. For this purpose,
it is of interest to explicate how we set the boundaries for the context of the corporation. Traditionally, it may be depicted as a headquarter building, a group of board members, a logo, etc. For this study, all the above are significant parts of the corporation, but even more significant are the actions involving the actors that make up the practices associated with what a corporation does. Such a view allows us to consider the global span of the corporation (the global span of the associated actions of buying, selling, producing, contracting, negotiating, employing extracting, dumping, etc.). Corporations are amidst the entanglement discussed in the previous sections, and information and technology is part of our very being (Introna, 2009) as global business operations can provide a vivid empirical case on exactly these entanglements. Therefore, I extend Introna’s argument on entanglement, applying it to the global corporation, and suggest that it is far from easy to talk about where corporations begin and end. This difficulty is especially evident when talking about doing and not being, i.e., becoming rather than remaining static. The corporation cannot be confined to the walls of the headquarters, the factories, the transport routes, and the actors therein. The corporation is associated with all the places and spaces where minute parts are made, where employees and their families live, where end users dispose or dump their unwanted objects, where animals graze, where investors retire, and where things are made, remade, and unmade, where life happens. The span of the corporation in this study is global, and the study focuses on the activities associated with and linked to decisions and actions made by actors involved through associations with the corporate-network. The corporation is in flux and its boundaries are blurry. The actors within this network are heterogeneous, including many non-humans as well as many diversely thinking and acting humans. Some non-human actors include computers, machinery, heavy metals, chemicals, software, transportation vehicles of different sorts, and organizing mechanisms such as charts, diagrams, calculations, quality programs, and corporate codes of ethics. Together these actors form the corporation and define the boundaries of the corporation.

Here I would like to use Latour’s insight on groups. There are no groups, only group formations and as social scientists a study of a group, e.g., the corporation as group is seen as “a part of a parcel of what makes the group exist, last, decay, or disappear” (Latour, 2005:33). Therefore, the focus of the analysis becomes finding these delineations made by the actors and highlighting these to understand how the said chains of events take form in the specific context.

3.4.2 The Becoming CCE – Material and Non-Material

A CCE is what it is doing and what is being done to it. This reveals itself when closing in on a CCE and the actors around it. A CCE is thus seen as a becoming actor that gets its shape in the situation. CCEs are artefacts, but they are also ideas,
so they can be both material and immaterial; their most commonly studied and written about manifestations are expressed in written documents. However, these written documents are far from enough to scrutinize if we are to understand these codes and their implications. By shifting from ostensive definitions to performative ones (Latour, 2005; Barad, 2003), ones that are not about what the code is but rather what the code does, we begin to see a CCE in a different light. This study stretches the doing to more than just compliance/effectiveness, i.e., exploring what the code does more broadly by following traces left by actions associated with a CCE in practices which take it outside its country of origin.

Studying what the code does is different from what the code is, but doing is related to becoming, and when studying actions, there is a constant becoming and re-becoming, a translational continuum rather than a static being. In studying the doings of a code, we need to look at the multiple versions of the code. It could be a physical project, a case of discussion (discussing), a cause of disagreement (disagreeing), it could be inscribed in an infinite amount of material and immaterial objects, it has a variable ontology (Latour 1993), differing manifestations in different sociomaterial encounters.

“The world is intra-activity in its differential mattering. It is through specific intra-actions that a differential sense of being is enacted in the ongoing ebb and flow of agency. That is, it is through specific intra-actions that phenomena come to matter – in both senses of the word” (Barad, 2003:817)

From a sociomaterial angle, a CCE is involved in numerous intra-actions (Barad, 2003) shaped depending on the code’s association with other actors (Latour, 2005), a relationship that must be considered when trying to understand what the code does. In light of the previous statement, nothing can be a doing of the code alone, but rather everything is a conglomerate of agential activities working together. The code will act or be enacted differently at the various points in time and space where intra-actions occur. The code is expected to have multiple realities.

For example, Mol describes atherosclerosis as a phenomenon of body multiple. That realities are multiple does not entail that reality is fragmented: “The body multiple is not fragmented. Even if it is multiple, it hangs together. The question to be asked, then, is how this is achieved” (Mol, 2002:55). Law’s comment on this is that rather than fragmentation

[The body multiple] “implies something much more complex. It implies that the different realities overlap and interfere with one another. Their relations, partially
coordinated, are complex and messy: [The term atherosclerosis] [. . .] is a coordinating mechanism operative in conjunction with the various distributions. It bridges the boundaries between the sites over which the disease is distributed. It thereby helps to prevent distribution from becoming the pluralization of a disease into separate and unrelated objects”. (Law, 2004:61)

Similarly, I see a CCE as a potential coordinating mechanism that has the potential to draw together empirical realities in different geographical sites and at different points in time. However, it is seen as a potential coordinating mechanism; it is assumed that situations could arise where a CCE indeed is fragmented and other times where it draws together multiple realities. How a CCE does this is what we shall observe in the empirical chapters of this thesis. Codes exist in organizational associations and have the potential to act and be enacted by other actors. They exist together in a heterogeneous materiality and this study approaches and studies the CCE and translations thereof, within such a view of the world.
4. Method – Approaching and Presenting the CCE

I see my role as a researcher as significant with respect to the methods I use for data collection, presentation, and analysis. Nonetheless, in the collection of data, there have been several crossroads where decisions needed to be made where my intentions and interests had to merge with opportunities and practicalities. This chapter describes how and why I found myself in the places that I did and this is followed by a discussion on how the knowledge that can be attained through these methods allows for a deeper understanding of the practicalities associated with enacting responsibility in a corporate context. In addition, this chapter discusses issues such as confidentiality, anonymity, and the research process and methods of data collection. In a global corporate setting, it is difficult to gain access to a case company, its documents, and its employees as they perform their daily work and these difficulties limit the data that can be collected.

4.1 An Iterative Process with Empirical Precedence

Writing this thesis and conducting this study was to a large extent an iterative process where I moved between data collection, transcription, presentation, reading, collecting literature, and writing. Literature on CCEs was searched for during 2010 and 2011 and a preliminary review of the literature was made for the research proposal presented in 2010 and my mid-seminar, defended in 2012. The search for literature was updated and expanded during 2015 and the beginning of 2016. Papers were also added to the review along the course of the PhD process through regular searches on Google Scholar, through updates from colleagues and peers, and by reviewing reference lists in relevant papers. The review of CCEs presented in this thesis was mostly a draft that kept changing shape and was one of the last chapters to be finalized, so the questions raised and analyzed in this thesis were to a large extent interactively driven through dialogue between the empirical material, the literature, and the method.

Similarly, the literature on ANT was reviewed throughout the research process. I began my PhD journey by reading classic ANT texts such as Latour (1998), an anthology of Latour’s writings. I moved on to literature focusing on later works of ANT proponents, including the collection of works gathered in ANT and after by John Law and John Hassard (1999) and Latour’s (2005) introduction to ANT. The reading provided a good basis for my conceptualization of the study at hand, but I gained more practical knowledge regarding how to approach the data collection and analysis by attending two doctoral courses, one focusing specifically on ANT and another focusing on materiality and the “in-between”. My interest in the approach to data collection and analysis has kept me open to broad reading and interacting with
the empirical material, and I only finalized the choice of terminology and vocabulary after the empirical analyses. The goal was to choose terms and settle on how to use the ANT vocabulary to theorize the empirical stories.

As noted above, all this work was performed iteratively. As I began collecting the data, I transcribed it and experimented with the presentation. After receiving comments on my text at an internal seminar in 2014, I decided to present the empirical material in pieces, depicting a specific context (roughly according to time and place) in each empirical story. This process led me back to the ANT literature to find relevant terms and explanations for the stories being told as the empirical stories unfolded. Furthermore, critical comments and advice during the internal seminar guided me in terms of reviewing and updating my references. Apart from Bruno Latour and John Law, major influences include the works of Dutch ethnographer and philosopher Annemarie Mol, particularly her work depicting the multiplicity of phenomenon and hence reality (Mol, 2002), Barbara Czarniawska, professor in Business Administration, who has contributed toward an understanding of the field of management through an ANT lens, urging in particular for a shift from established ideas and phenomenon such as organizations to a focus on performative processes of making or doing, such as in organizing (Czarniawska, 2004a; 2007; 2008a).

Writing, reading, empirical work, as well as presenting and analyzing the empirical material were interactive process and the final text in this thesis is the product of many separate chapters that have evolved in relation to one another. The empirical stories (presented as rooms), however, had precedence over the other chapters in terms of being the first to be written. It was after these stories had been arranged that the theoretical and analytical focus was completed.

4.2 Criteria for Case Selection

The main ingredient needed to make this study possible was a CCE at work. To study a CCE, I needed to approach corporations that had a CCE in place. To address the overarching research question in the project, the CCE also needed to be investigated as it moved at least in two different country contexts. This entailed two criteria for the case selection; a corporation with a CCE and with transnational operations. This meant that there were many options for selecting a case. Based at a Swedish University, I decided to establish contact with a multinational corporation with operations in Sweden and using a CCE. I searched the web for large corporations. I did not limit myself to any particular industry, but rather contacted corporations that seemed to have interesting operations in a global supply chain. My ability to travel with a CCE would be contingent on the corporation’s operations as well as access. I was mostly focused on industries that intrigued me personally. I
contacted several corporations before I was able to get access for a full study – both in Sweden and abroad – and these were from industries as diverse as the oil and mining industry, the pharmaceutical industry, the textile industry, and the food industry.

The main issue turned out to be access as several corporations were interested in the study, but had issues with the part of the study that needed to be done outside Sweden. The CCE that is followed in this study belongs to a large Swedish-owned multinational in the manufacturing industry. Details, with respect to anonymity issues, regarding the studied CCE are provided throughout this chapter.

### 4.3 Approaching the CCE Empirically

The main object through which this study is approached is a CCE at a Swedish multinational corporation in the production industry. The corporation is, for confidentiality reasons, referred to as Corp. The CCE at Corp has been given a fictitious name – The Purple Booklet. Because ANT requires the researcher to have no pre-knowledge or expectation about where an object will lead, so here I will tell you how I ended up studying the code in Corp’s supply chain, which stretched all the way to China.

As discussed earlier, the code is a material object that moves in Corp’s organizational work in time and space. When an object travels, it enters into new contexts, with different actors, and often this changes the object, the meanings ascribed to it as well as the way it is used (Czarniawska, 2014: 83-93). These are translations of the CCE, and the translations that the code goes through are the material changes I follow. Although we know how codes have been characterized and rhetoricized in previous literature, the CCE in this study was approached as a mysterious phenomenon.

So, we begin with the Purple Booklet, but delve directly into the material translations of the Purple Booklet as we come into contact with the work being done at Corp’s Sourcing Department in Sweden, my first point of in-person contact with Corp.

When I came across the first translation of the code as an auditing tool, I followed this tool and its material traces left behind when the audit tool was used for a social audit in China. The code is situated, enacted, and brought to life by different actors in different forms and settings. Consequently, the empirical material does not always say something about the code, per se. At times, we are instead looking into associated actors’ worlds in order to understand how daily organizational activities are done. One approach to following the code is to look at different leads in different
directions, i.e., follow the code (starting off with the physical document) in different settings. This could lead to translations in different locations that refer to similar empirical settings. Another approach is to follow the translations of the code as a chain of events, wherever they lead, as far as possible. This study does the latter. As we shall see in the empirical chapters, a social audit leaves behind new traces in the form of a document called an action plan, which I then follow-up on and where I come in contact with new translations that lead me to new contexts. This method of following-up on leads can be compared with purposive or snowball sampling, where one interaction leads to hunches about where to go next (Charmaz, 2006). For me, this entailed going through the empirical material I had gathered and asking myself this question: What is the next step in the process of organizing or where could this possibly lead?

However, although the aim was to follow material traces left by translation processes, this was done whenever possible. Because I continually needed to negotiate access and to understand what was going on at Corp, sometimes I had to follow or follow-up on people rather than materials, as I would not know where the traces went or how they were used subsequently. The empirical rooms therefore present this journey in search of material traces left in the wake of translations of the code.

The initial idea for method of data collection for this study was to shadow (Czarniawska, 2007:20-58) the object of study – i.e., to follow the code as it travelled. This was not as easy I thought it would be, for both practical reasons and confidentiality reasons. I was not granted the access to freely follow the code, although direct observations were made during a two-day audit based on translations of the CCE. Apart from those two days in September 2011, I had to rely on traces that were left behind in the form of documents, action plans, and reports, evidence that allowed me to find trails to follow. These traces led to different people who were doing different things. These traces left as inscriptions of various sorts allowed me to contact people who added insights to my investigation of what the CCE does. I was inspired here by Bloomfield:

“Networks cannot be observed directly, any more than the organization can, hence we must focus on their traces – for example, on the inscriptions which circulate within and between them.” (Bloomfield, 1995:495)

It was precisely such inscriptions in printed form (diagrams, reports, or texts) or digital form (PowerPoint presentations, e-mails, or software) that allowed me to find traces of the code, although they looked nothing like the original CCE. It was through such translations of the code that I came in touch with and came back to
people who were using these inscriptions in different ways. These trails can be summarized into three intensive periods of fieldwork, even though there was some correspondence between me and the empirical field in-between these periods. Time was also spent analyzing company documents and external documents. The first round of fieldwork was conducted by colleagues in the project, second round was done by me and a colleague, and the third round was conducted solely by me.

Table 3 - Three rounds of fieldwork interspersed with rounds by the desk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fieldwork</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Corp Sourcing Department, Charlesburg, Sweden&lt;br&gt;Cop Headquarters, Sweden&lt;br&gt;By the Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Corp Sourcing Department, Charlesburg, Sweden&lt;br&gt;Cop Sourcing Department, Ewing, China&lt;br&gt;Cop Supplier outside Ewing, China&lt;br&gt;Cop Headquarters, Sweden&lt;br&gt;By the Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Corp Sourcing Department, Charlesburg, Sweden&lt;br&gt;Cop Sourcing Department, Ewing, China&lt;br&gt;Cop Supplier outside Ewing, China&lt;br&gt;By the Desk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this sense, this study is a mobile ethnography (Czarniawska, 2007) of a CCE at work, so I focused on moving with translations of the CCE to incorporate the aspects of time and space. Shadowing has been used previously in the field of management, but under the term “direct observation” (Czarniawska, 2007). Direct observations can in turn be categorized into participant observations and non-participant observations, differing with respect to the involvement of the researcher in the activities being observed. Czarniawska (2007:55) further divides non-participant observation into “stationary observation” and “shadowing”. Shadowing entails moving with whatever it is you shadow –like the term suggests, a shadower follows you around and shadows someone or something. It is this mobile aspect of shadowing that differentiates it from other forms of observation. The advantages of mobile field research (such as capturing contemporary, fast moving life), however, cannot be mentioned without stating some of its disadvantages. The disadvantages include the issue of access that constantly needs to be re-negotiated and “continuous ethical decisions” (Czarniawska, 2007:58) that need to be made. Another issue with shadowing, as Czarniawska puts it, is that we are still faced with “the issues of simultaneity and invisibility” (2007:59). To capture simultaneously occurring activities, shadowing must be complemented with other methods of data collection such as interviews, log studies, diaries, and direct accounts. Furthermore, complementary data must be gathered in order to shed light on what is invisible to
the researcher as the researcher can only follow one object at a time. However, only when we are able to make visible simultaneous events does a network begin to reveal itself and allow for a heterogeneous materiality to become visible. Therefore, observations were coupled with follow-up interviews and informal discussions, documents, policies, and manuals were often studied by the desk and later followed-up on in subsequent interviews and observations. The table below summarizes the empirical material used in the thesis.

Table 4 - Summary of empirical material collected between 2010 and 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>How many sessions</th>
<th>Researchers present</th>
<th>Time/Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On site interviews, meetings, or discussions</td>
<td>25 (1 was present during 21)</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
<td>approx. 20 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mails exchanged</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>between 2011 and 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone interviews</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>approx. 4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>about 50 pages of handwritten text</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents reviewed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>6 formal sessions during 2 days + informal observations during 7 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>approx. 16 hours + approx... 40 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent informally in the organization/with organizational members</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>approx. 120 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded reflections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>approx. 1 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table above come from different sources, but these different source materials have one thing in common: my intent was always to get as close as possible (as allowed by time and confidentiality issues) to the actors, human and non-human, in the networks that I found myself in as I tried to understand the translations of the CCE. My intention to get as close as possible to what I was studying also explains why I was drawn to using different sources, sources that I needed to understand what was going on.
The initial plan for the study was to use techniques like shadowing to follow people and objects in the CCE network, starting with the CCE itself. This was only possible during round two of the fieldwork, but it allowed me to investigate later why, when, how, and who was tied to events that were observed during one supplier audit in China based on the CCE. The stories that come after the audit story (presented in room four) stem from subsequent translations of the CCE.

4.3.1 The Three Rounds of Fieldwork—The Process of Empirical Investigation

The interviews conducted and documents collected during round 1 (see Table 1 and Appendix 1) were done by my colleagues in the project and I had access to these before I began collecting data at Corp. I reviewed the four interviews that were done with head of sourcing, the corporate responsibility manager at the headquarters, and two sourcing engineers. These interviews were about finding out how they work with the CCE at the Swedish sourcing department. These interviews as well as the company documents pertaining to supplier auditing provided a background for round 2, where one colleague, here called Tom, and I followed sourcing engineers from Charlesburg, Sweden to a supplier audit in China. We made observations at the audit, and made follow-up interviews with Corp’s sourcing engineers after the audit. The audit left new traces in the form of action plans, which marked the beginning of round three of data collection. During round three, I further followed the traces left by the work done with the CCE and these led me back to China, where I investigated both the aftermath of the action plan, a new action plan, and sustainability reports.

**Documents**

Documents of different kinds have had a crucial role in understanding the translations of the CCE and knowing which direction to continue investigating. The CCE was, of course, a central document to begin with, but very soon when I entered the sourcing department I found that the code had been translated into different work processes. A central process was the evaluation of suppliers’ quality and environmental performance. If I agreed to the terms of the confidentiality agreement, I had access to all of Corp’s internal working documents. I had access to PowerPoint training manuals, assessment guides, and reports and was able to get all the material that I requested. In this study, the scrutiny of many of these material/digital documents complemented through interviews provided an understanding of how these objects come about, how they are used, and how they are changed as they move between people or geographical locations. Some of the documents proved to be more important than others in understanding the work that is done, and these pertain to work related to the sustainability reporting processes,
the supplier evaluation and scoring, and the management and control of employees and suppliers.

**Interviews**

A large part of the material used in the presentation of the data consists of transcripts of interviews. These interviews were at best semi-structured, but often completely open-ended, based only on guiding questions that asked the interviewees to consider something in a particular way: why something is done, how something is done, how it is done in other countries or with smaller/larger suppliers, who is responsible for what and when, and how often this action is performed. This approach was done to help me discover how the CCE is translated in different corporate work processes. See Appendix 2 for examples of specific questions asked during the interviews.

The interviews were conducted in Swedish with Swedish-speaking Corp employees and in English with Chinese-speaking Corp employees. The Swedish interviews were transcribed in Swedish first and then translated into English. As I am equally comfortable with English and Swedish, I did not at first think this task would be too difficult. However, I soon realized how wrong I was. In the translations, I cannot say that I could find equivalents of Swedish words, idioms, and phrases in English. I had to try rather to understand and do my best to re-explain the context in which the words were being used (Dingwaney, Carol and Maier, 1995: 3). Similarly, when conducting interviews with Chinese speaking interlocutors, many times I had to ask follow-up questions, as did they, to make sure we understood one another. Some spoke more fluent English than others, but as none of the researchers speak Chinese, English was the language we could use. The interviews were generally of an ethnographic and open-ended nature. The interviews, although only a part of the empirical material used in this thesis, are an important ingredient in the empirical chapters as these interviews are crucial in telling the story as it unfolded. The documents, observations and accompanying field notes, and e-mails that are also part of the empirical material are drawn into interview settings and expanded upon within the empirical rooms (different points of contact with the empirical material).

**Observations, Field Notes, and E-mails**

The empirical material collected for this thesis also involves scenarios where work was observed in a form of participant observation and time was also spent interacting with the company’s employees, both in China and Sweden. This interaction involved borrowing a temporary office space in the company’s offices, eating lunch with the employees, and occasionally accompanying them for social evening activities. I shadowed a few workers as they worked (Czarniawska, 2007). I observed them working, perhaps interacting with a supplier or a software, after
which I would ask them questions about how and why they were doing what they do. This added to my contextual knowledge regarding the business that was being conducted. Understanding the work that was being done also helped me ask relevant questions when I was interviewing managers or executives. Much of the time in between the three rounds of data collection was spent in my office in Umeå, so to stay up-to-date on specific issues I exchanged regular e-mails with employees from Corp. The total number of e-mails exchanged was 292. The information in these e-mails largely complemented material gathered in other ways. Company specific documents such as training manuals, statistics, and reports were often sent to me via e-mail.

4.4 Access and its Consequences

For the completion of this thesis, access to empirical material has been a perpetual matter of concern. The opportunity for data collection in this thesis was made possible by good access, and was not a straightforward or easy task. The work with access began with contacts with various global corporations, where representatives working with corporate responsibility were contacted. I contacted five corporations with varied success. The company representatives wanted to know exactly what I was going to study and my open and exploratory approach seemed to intimidate them. After being turned down by four corporations, I finally seemed to have a chance to study the code of a multinational in the pharmaceutical industry. Interviews were initiated and I established contact with the head of research and development. However, when news of my project reached the vice president of the company, I was contacted and told that there was too much going on at the company for them to keep track of a researcher. This seemed to me as a polite way of informing me that they were intimidated by the research I was interested in conducting.

Finally, thanks to a research colleague, I came into contact with representatives from Corp. I was back to square one and two years into my PhD studies. I was frustrated and was considering re-thinking my project as access seemed to be impossible. But I was lucky! Ongoing negotiations with Corp regarding a different study, a social history between the head of sourcing and my colleague Tom, and good timing where Corp was focusing on trying to get researchers on board, conspired to open doors for me – a company was finally willing to let it be the part of my study. I got access to my colleagues’ (Tom and Richard) four interviews that they had conducted. These interviews gave me insight into the way they worked at the sourcing department at Corp. In June 2011, I was introduced to the Corp representatives who were planning a supplier audit in China only a few months later. I met with Jakob and Johanna, who worked with strategic purchasing in June 2011. They informed us about how the audit was going to take place and which methods they used in order to conduct
the audit. They shared their internal material with us and the next time I met them was in Ewing, China in September 2011. Tom and I accompanied Jakob and Johanna on a two-day audit and held follow-up interviews with them as well as a few other company employees in Ewing. This access, for me, was almost impossible to believe.

This type of access, of course, meant that certain things were not of my choosing. The audit that was observed was chosen by Corp representatives and not by me. However, the approach to the study, using material changes to track what happens in terms of work related to the code, still allowed for a very interesting analysis. Obviously, this limitation meant that I had to complement the observations with other material, but having been part of an actual audit done by Corp gave me an understanding of the work being done and an opening for follow-up questions that were of interest to different parties: suppliers, the vice-president of corporate responsibility, and sourcing engineers.

Gummesson (2000) describes access as the management researcher’s primary challenge. Without being able to come close to the object of study, the empirical material necessary for the study cannot be acquired, so it is of utmost importance to gain and maintain good access throughout the research process. Gaining this access, however, proved to be a tedious and challenging task. Negotiating access for conducting a qualitative case study in a corporation can include many tedious steps, many individual actors to convince and build a trusting relationship with (Czarniawska, 2007). As such, I knew I was not alone in experiencing trouble getting access. If everything goes well, if the researcher is able to communicate the benefit that the research will have for the case company, access might be granted. However, even when access has been achieved, it may need to be re-negotiated as the researcher comes in contact with new actors (Czarniawska, 2007).

My own experience with access and non-access led me to think about what implications this might have for the project, where it was uncertain for quite long which company’s CCE would ultimately become the focus of my study. I reflected on my access attempts with the help of others’ accounts about difficulties with access. As I consulted the literature on the issue, I learned that for a case study where observations and interviews with individuals are combined to answer questions such as how they actually work, access was needed on various levels. It needed to be secured on a rather high level before an outsider was “let in”. Identifying and getting in touch with the right people and building a trusting relationship with them is only a first step. They might not have anything to do with the data you need for your study, but must still approve the study. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) argue for the importance of the researcher to find a role in the field of study and their ideas accurately depicted my experience trying to gain access:
“Where participant observation is involved, the researcher must find some role in the field being studied, and this will usually have to be done at least through implicit, and probably also through explicit, negotiation with people in that field. Access may need to be secured through gatekeepers, but it will also have to be negotiated and renegotiated with the people being studied; and this is true even where ethnographers are studying settings in which they are already participants. In the case of interviewing, too, access cannot be assumed to be available automatically, relations will have to be established, and identities co-constructed”. (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007:4)

As I went back to the textbooks and read up on access issues, I realized that I might need to start with an interview or two and then re-negotiate access for further empirical investigation. I also realized that I might need to talk to people that I already knew. I turned to a former HR manager working at a large Swedish pharmaceutical company and through him managed to get an interview with the head of R&D. This contact led to several additional interviews, a meeting with the Swedish directors and a greenlight for my study, although this request was eventually turned down by the corporations’ international board of directors.

Hence the process of negotiating access started all over again, and I learned that another issue is that of the topic being studied. Codes of ethics or corporate responsibility can be somewhat sensitive issues for corporations, especially with regards to media disclosures that could tarnish the image of the company and potentially affect stock prices. Since I wanted my study to incorporate at least two countries, the access seemed to be tougher. Regardless of how serious a company is in their work with corporate responsibility, their reputation is vital. This makes the topic of corporate responsibility sensitive in yet another way and this issue can create barriers to access if a trusting relationship cannot be established. For me, this also raised ethical issues, because I felt that seeking access became a fine-tuned strategy where fully disclosing my research intentions from the start could deter access. As Hammersley and Atkinson suggest,

“[n]egotiating access is a balancing act, then. Gains and losses now and later, as well as ethical and strategic considerations, must be traded off against one another in whatever manner is judged at the time to be most appropriate, given the purposes of the research and the circumstances in which it is to be carried out”. (2007:58)
4.5 Anonymity and Confidentiality

The access to study Corp’s CCE was in many ways a relief, but of course it came with a price. First, I had to sign a confidentiality agreement with Corp, promising not to disclose the name of the corporation. This made working with the material that I had access to quite challenging. I have used several aliases and found a way to work with metaphors and fiction that provided me with some leeway in terms of the creative process of presenting the empirical material. More details on the use of metaphors and fiction is found in the section presenting the empirical rooms, but to make this transition workable I needed to use fictitious names. The first, of course, is Corp – the alias for the corporation under study. Similarly, Charlesburg is an alias for a real Swedish city and Ewing is an alias for a real Chinese city. And all individuals who have been interviewed are presented using fictitious names.

4.5.1 On Individual Level

To gain an understanding of how the code was translated and what was being done at the different departments of the company, I often needed to follow individuals around and ask inquiring and probing questions. Through access to material translations of the code, I had a possibility to ask them questions that would be impossible to ask otherwise. I was able to use knowledge of the internal workings of the company to ask for explanations for why things were done the way they were done. This possibility brings with it a responsibility when it comes to the portrayal of individuals. The individuals portrayed in this thesis are seen as people who all in some way care about the organization they work for and also care about doing a good job. The individuals portrayed are all people who were willing to speak to me, explain to me, and show me how they work and discuss with me their views and rationales for action. All individuals portrayed were informed about my study and the purposes of the study.

Since it is near impossible for me to guarantee complete internal anonymity (individuals working at Corp might be able to identify a co-worker or manager through their portrayal in this thesis), it is important to note that the purpose of the thesis is not to pinpoint an individual’s work, work ethics, or views regarding specific issues. I never asked questions of this kind, and responses are often in relation to material translations, which means they often needed to look for answers and show me what they mean. In addition, sometimes we figured things out together. Furthermore, I sometimes felt I was asking questions that had never before been considered. The portrayal of individuals’ quotes, actions or talk, should in this study therefore not be seen as representing an official stance on matters regarding the individual, the CCE or Corp’s work. This thesis aims to understand the collective effects of several actors in specific contexts – not human actions per se;
however, I depended on several gate-keepers (individuals with information or authority) to gain access to the settings where collective effects could be studied therefore, much of what I have been able to learn about Corp’s work and its CCE is through the help of (talk and actions) these individuals who opened up their work environments to me. The insights and information provided by the individuals who helped answer my questions, show me how they work, and share with me internal documents have been vital for the process of writing this thesis and advancing CCE knowledge. Indeed, this project could not have been completed without their support.

4.5.2 On Organizational Level

As noted above, the name of the company is also an alias. Corp is the fictional name of the multinational corporation that provides the empirical research field for this study. Corp is a large international actor in the production industry. It is a Swedish-owned company and operates in over 160 different countries, employing about 50,000 people around the globe. Corp’s CCE has also been given a fictitious name as have the stakeholders mentioned in the CCE. The use of aliases for the different actors mentioned in the code I studied as well as for the CCE and the corporation itself came to serve two purposes. The first was of course a practical purpose: maintaining anonymity for the company while providing the reader with enough empirical contexts to understand the analysis and conclusions. The second purpose turned out to be an unexpected advantage that I discovered during the writing process: I was more clearly able to differentiate between different terms and ideas that were used by different people when my starting point (e.g., helper-shuttles rather than suppliers) was completely disconnected from any prior associations with the meaning of, for example, “supplier”. Of course, this level of anonymity always entails a loss more than a gain (in terms of what I can show the readers and how deep my explanations can go). Nonetheless, I found the aliases to be of great support in tracking changes in both the rhetoric and the processes that I observed. Perhaps there was also in my writing and analysis process a desire or tension to return from a somewhat “going-native” syndrome, as I often found myself struggling to return to an analytical approach after spending time in the field or with the empirical material. I often felt as if things are the way they are portrayed by the people telling me and showing me, as they are the experts. Removing some of the typical categorizations and jargon used by those I interviewed allowed me to question what was going on and see connections that otherwise would not be so obvious.

I would like to believe that I, after many re-writings and experiments with the material, have managed to make the presentation of the empirical material fun and readable but at same time draw together simultaneous events, depicting the
complexity, messiness, and incongruences associated with the methodology of following a CCE. More on what this process looked like follows in the next section.

4.6 From Transcripts and Field Notes to a Research Text

During my field research, I often found myself in a situation where I was in between transcriptions, analysis, thinking about what is going on, and looking for contacts to ask further questions. My contact with different people through e-mails kept me up-to-date on what was going on and provided answers to some of my questions. Often, these answers came from a document or description of a process or program. This information, together with transcriptions and notes from previous meetings, suggested the next set of questions to ask or follow up on. I had to put together a large set of documents, transcripts, field notes, e-mails, reflections, and observations.

My first attempt to present the empirical material was in the form of a chronological story that included all the gathered material, seeing it as an interlinked chain of chronological events. This text was read by supervisors and opponents for internal seminars and no matter how many headings and sub-headings I added, I had to accept that the text was unbearable to read. There was too much text, and although I felt like I was working on an authorial narrative, the immense amount of material did not give room for a story to take form. Furthermore. This first version provided a fake sense of chronology, which was too intimately associated with my time-periods in the field – making the analysis blant. In my first attempts to present the data, I also tried using Nvivo – a software used in qualitative data analysis. I was advised that a software like this could help me code the data and would be especially useful since I had gathered so much empirical data. Using Nvivo, however, proved to be more of a restriction than aid. My material was so heterogeneous it did not lend itself easily to being categorized and thematized into hierarchical nodes. So I soon abandoned Nvivo and went back to manually handling the empirical material. This entailed dividing the material into “time-space” chunks associated with a specific event or set of events, e.g., the construction of auditing tools in Sweden, the audit preparation, the audit at one supplier in China, and the follow-up audit. After this, I began working on these stories, building on them using the interviews, documents, observations, e-mails, and field notes to depict the work that went into these different events or the occurrences at these places. I used printed versions as well as digital versions of the empirical material to find details that belonged together in terms of telling a story about what happened in a specific place at a specific time under specific conditions or activities. This necessarily meant that some of ‘historical’ things which happened previously were relevant to talk about in terms of a specific event, whereas at other times the focus is merely on what happens now.
This possibility existed only because I had contact with the field over more than two years.

The final version of the empirical material that you’ll soon be reading in this thesis was organized around events or happenings, often involving the construction of a narrative plot (Czarniawska, 1999:65). I see the plot as way of arranging the empirical material where I use different translations of the code as central to the storyline, drawing together the empirical material that show the reader how these translations took place. More specifically, the material is arranged around what is being said and done and what can be learned about what is happening in a particular setting. Quotations from interviews and scribbled notes from informal discussions are combined with my observations and recollections from different settings in order to retell the stories in the different empirical rooms. In the writing of these empirical rooms, a very basic empirical analysis was already taking place in my search for the plots that wanted to come through. Identifying these plots was done by re-reading my transcripts and notes, re-visiting documents of relevance, and arranging a plot around each meeting that took place between me and the field in a different time and place. Soon these different places and times revealed explanations of documents, summaries of my notes, and my own recollections of physical environments. You could say that the empirical material had now taken the shape of several authorial narratives in the form of the thirteen empirical rooms.

To put together different pieces of the empirical material to construct the narrative story, I was inspired by Denzin and Lincoln’s (2000) theorization of the term bricolage. Bricolage, which today means construction (e.g., construction of a sculpture or a structure of ideas) achieved by using whatever comes to hand or something constructed in this way, was originally used as a meaning-making metaphor in a structuralist context by anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss in the 1960s (Rogers, 2012). Inspired by Levi-Strauss’s metaphor, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) conceptualized bricolage as an eclectic approach to qualitative inquiry, focusing on the multiple and gendered perspectives of the qualitative researcher (2000:4) such as a scientist, field worker, and social critic and on the multiple methodological practices of the qualitative researcher. Denzin and Lincoln (2000:6) see the practice of qualitative research as a site of multiple interpretive practices. As a qualitative researcher, I see myself very much as a bricoleur or quilt-maker, as I used not only various methods of data collection but also self-reflection and introspection, resulting in a collage of empirical rooms put together using the pieces of heterogeneous empirical material. The construction of the narrative that tells the empirical story in this thesis is seen by me as what is very well described by Denzin

---
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and Lincoln (2000:6), a reflexive collage of interconnected representations. I see this piece of research as an interactive process shaped by contextual factors both within and beyond my imagination. History, gender, politics, and paradigms have all contributed towards shaping the text, which in its own right, now takes the shape of this thesis.

When global matters are investigated (concerning the questions that a CCE engages, e.g., global climate change, socio-economic rights and injustices, and environmental exploitation), I believe objects cannot be understood as things-in-themselves, detached from the socio-historical contexts in which they are shaped. Pluralistic methods and approaches have been proposed by researchers to explain theoretically and to show empirically how context, relationships, and politics influence the questions we seek answers (See Kincheloe, 2001; 2005, Mol and Law, 2004 for, Barad, 2004).

4.6.1 The CCE in Thirteen Empirical Rooms

The empirical material was either transcribed, described, or tabulated before I started re-writing these in the form of empirical rooms. The empirical rooms, zero through twelve, are based on multiple sources of data – semi-structured and unstructured interviews, informal talks, participant observations, field notes, documents, and fiction. When you read the text in the rooms, you will encounter three different formats that identify text. Fictional text is indicated with italics font. Quotations from recorded interviews or re-created field notes from discussions are indicated with quotation marks. Conversational text is indicated by identifying the speaker as follows:

Maira: Hello.
Edward: Hi.
Maira: How are you?

When field notes are used as the basis for the presented material, quotations that were noted are represented in a similar fashion as above. When the gist of a conversation was noted rather than exact words, these conversations are depicted by telling the readers the main point of what was said and by whom – e.g., Edward explained to me that this document was important, or Jakob tells me that he is dissatisfied with the response. The authorial narrative, which is my voice, combined with observations and field notes are presented as regular text without any emphasis.

As you will see when you come to the empirical chapters in the thesis, these are presented in the form of thirteen rooms. Through first hand contact between me (the researcher) and Corp, these rooms depict people and things associated with Corp (in meetings and discussions with representatives, observations, through reading
documents, and visiting websites on the internet). On the other hand, the depiction of these rooms also tells a story about a CCE and the practices and discourses that are associated with the CCE’s application in practice.

The construction of this story was done to relate my empirical findings to readers in a textual format, resting theoretically on narrative as a mode of communication (Czarniawska, 2004:10). The authorial narrative, the story you read in this thesis, is the final version of many different kinds of texts (interview transcripts, field notes, documents, and self-reflective notes to myself) and the use of a metaphor for the corporation along with fictional characters portraying different stakeholders of the corporation. The construction of the rooms was an iterative process during which I constantly turned back to different versions of previous texts, transcripts, and notes. The rooms are organized around plots, which serve several purposes. The plots around which the stories in the different rooms are arranged are seen as serving a communicative purpose between me as an author and you as a reader. Moreover, these plots allow for an organization of fragments of empirical material into a whole (Czarniawska, 1999) with focus on the actors of relevance and how they build or break connections.

The following table shows the kinds of analytical activities that went into the construction of the empirical text. The tabular form does not indicate linearity, as several times I went back and forth between these stages before the final version was ready. The table merely lists the different activities that went into the construction of the final empirical text.

**Table 5 - Empirical Material and Presentation in Text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of empirical material</th>
<th>What was done with it?/How was it used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews and discussions</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listened to recordings and transcribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translated relevant parts (if interview in Swedish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic coding based on a question I ask myself as a researcher: “What is happening here?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation in the form of rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Noted in field notes based on what is said and done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voice-recorded reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lived-experience through senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incident to incident coding (Charmaz, 2006:53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation in the form of rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes</td>
<td>Incident coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Described in text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td>Downloaded read material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listened to and watched videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphors</td>
<td>Constructed based on theoretical view of the corporation along with my knowledge of Corp and the context within which the CCE acts or finds itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The story of the purple booklet (Corp’s CCE) is told through thirteen chapters, each one representing a room or a set of rooms. Each room depicts a fragment of the CCE’s network and looks closer at it; all together it is a story about how a CCE is translated as it travels from a sourcing department in Sweden to China and from China, through a reporting process, back to Sweden. A summary of the rooms together with the empirical material drawn on to construct the rooms can be found in Table 6 – Summary of Empirical Rooms, on page 89. The rooms are different in the material that they draw on and therefore also in their form. Some room descriptions are shorter and others are longer. Some offer more reflective text, while others are richer with excerpts from interviews or discussions. At the same time, each room tells a story of its own (a total of 13 stories), but taken together they tell a longer story, giving us insight into the changing realities as the CCE is translated and translates as it travels. Below, Figure 2. Presents the analytical order and main geographical context where each ‘room’ is situated.
Figure 2 - Order of Presentation of Empirical Rooms as Translations

- fictive - by researchers desk
- at sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden
- by researchers desk, documents from sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden
- at a hotel with crew from sourcing dept. Charlesburg in Ewing, China
- at Jianco's (supplier to Corp) factory and HQ, 60 km outside Ewing, China
- at Johanna's office, sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden
- on the line with Jakob from sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden
- meeting with Jing from sourcing dept. Ewing, at sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden
- at Chinese sourcing dept. Ewing, China
- at Jianco (supplier to Corp) factory and HQ, 60 km outside Ewing, China
- on the line with Edward, from sourcing dept. Charlesburg Sweden, in Ewing, China
- at Corp headquarters, Stockholm, Sweden
- internal reporting channel at Corp Ewing, China
Table 6 - Summary of Empirical Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordering of Story</th>
<th>The plot of the story</th>
<th>Empirical material on which story is based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prologue Room 0</td>
<td>This room introduces the reader to a metaphorical presentation of the corporate context in which the CCE lives and moves. The boundaries of the organizing context are blurry and span the world. Corp is likened with a cloud spacecraft and Corp’s CCE is introduced as the Purple Booklet in which five sets of stakeholders are presented with aliases. E.g., suppliers are called helper-shuttles and investors are called marions. The metaphor and aliases for stakeholders are carried forward into following rooms.</td>
<td>Metaphor for the corporation including a fictional pilot representing the CEO and aliases for shareholders, Video-recordings from Corp’s website, Corp’s Business Code, External Documents on which the Business Code is based. Review of interviews with CSR manager Sweden, sourcing manager Sweden, and General Manager China to create a cohesive presentation of the CCE, from a managerial perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>Here we meet with the head of the sourcing department and two sourcing engineers working at Corp’s sourcing department in the fictional city of Charlesburg, Sweden. The code is translated into a tool that can be applied and used for the sourcing department’s work, which entails scouting, evaluating, and choosing suppliers. The code is broken down into an auditing tool.</td>
<td>Interview with head of sourcing department, Charlesburg 20110406, Interview with Johanna 20101207, Interview with Viktor 20101007, Documents THSQ power point, HSAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>At the sourcing department, preparations are being made for the audit of a supplier in China. Two divisions at Corp are working together with this supplier, and each division has their own auditing tool. Two material translations of the code exist but only one can go east. Audit tool 2 wins the negotiations and becomes the tool that will go to China. The documents used in audit tool 2 are presented as two sets, one set for Corp employees and one set for potential Corp suppliers.</td>
<td>Field notes: Meeting with Johanna, Jakob, and Victor, internal auditing tools for division 1 and division 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>In Room four we meet with Johanna and Jakob, two Swedish auditors who have flown to China to audit a hydraulic parts supplier. Jakob tells us how he has prepared for the audit.</td>
<td>Field Notes: discussion with Johanna and Jakob 20110905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 4</td>
<td>In room five, we visit a Chinese supplier, Jianco, which is going to be audited by Jakob and Johanna who have flown in from Sweden. The translation of the code, which gets most attention here, is the ten criteria (and receiving the suppliers’ signature is of importance). The supplier receives a score of 63%, which would normally entail an approval, but Jakob is not entirely happy with the supplier and Jianco is left with an action plan (2011) with actions that need to be amended within a certain time frame in order to be fully approved.</td>
<td>Field notes: Shadowing Jakob and Johanna doing an audit, 110906, Shadowing Jakob and Johanna doing an audit, 110907, Meals and coffee with Johanna and Jakob, Transcripts: recorded internal Corp discussion on allocation of points, action plan, Documents: Ten Criteria, Action Plan 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 5</td>
<td>Following up on the action plan from 2011,</td>
<td>Interview with Johanna and observing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 6</td>
<td>We meet again with the lead auditor for the Jianco audit, Jakob. He doesn’t have any documents or updates anymore. He has passed on that responsibility to the Chinese crew in Ewing. He says that the action plan should be stored on a hard drive in the Chinese sourcing department in Ewing and that eventual follow-ups should have been handled by the Chinese sourcing crew. Jakob, however, refers me to Corp’s headquarters in Sweden, where all audits should be reported, and he suggests that I might be able to track the follow-ups on the action plan from there. I return to this issue in room 11 and 12.</td>
<td>Interview with Jakob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 7</td>
<td>Room 7 puts us in touch with the Chinese sourcing crew, when one of the Chinese sourcing engineers visits Sweden. The action plan from 2011 seems to have been forgotten about until I bring it back to discuss. The new lead auditor, Wendy, informs me that she will look into it and a few months later I am presented with a new action plan for 2013, which to my surprise is extremely similar to the one from 2011; the only difference is that Jianco on the 2013 audit received 80%. Some of the points on the action plan seem to have been copied and pasted, others no one seems to know why they are there. It is impossible to judge from the scorecard and documentation, why the score has increased. The hexavalent chrome 6+ has, however, moved, seemingly unmediated, from action plan 2011 to action plan 2013.</td>
<td>Interview with Jing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 8</td>
<td>Room 8 takes us to the sourcing department in Ewing, China to try to figure out why action plan 2011 and action plan 2013 came to look the way they do, and what has happened between Corp and Jianco during this time. The action plans (2011) seems to have been lying dormant until I brought it back in for discussion. It had been barred and set aside. Now, instead there was a new document that was relevant and showed improvement in the supplier’s score in action plan 2013.</td>
<td>Interview with Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 9</td>
<td>Room 9 takes us to the supplier, Jianco, to figure out what happened regarding the hexavalent chrome. The hexavalent chrome is not a concrete problem here, but rather a</td>
<td>Interview with Wane and Tim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Room 10 | Room 10 takes us back to China, where a Swedish specialist is working on training Corp’s crew in audits. He explains that the issue of hexavalent chrome is a competence issue. | Interview with Edward  
Documents: Action plan 2011 and Action plan 2013 |
| Room 11 | Following Jakob’s lead from room 6, and continuing to investigate the reporting of action plans, we now travel to Corp’s headquarters to meet with the individuals responsible for the sustainability report, which contains information on all Corp’s audits. Here, however, we learn that individual audits and preceding action plans only exist as an aggregate. At the headquarters, they have no idea what lies behind the numbers they receive from the different units around the world. They cannot say whether Jianco is part of the consolidated data which for 2011 states that 78% of audited suppliers are committed to Corp’s purple booklet. This means that we cannot say whether Jianco is part of these 78% or not or whether they have made the amendments that the action plan demands. Instead of getting answers, we are presented with an additional mystery. How is this number, 78%, arrived at? | Interview with Kate  
E-mail correspondence with Kate and Joan  
Documents: Corp’s annual sustainability report 2011, Corp Internal reporting documents (BPR) |
| Room 12 | Following up on the questions from room 11, we follow the reporting chain in China from supplier audit to the final report sent to the headquarters in Sweden. This process illuminates the work behind the 78% committed suppliers that we met in room 8. | Discussion with Wendy  
Discussion with Wushi  
Discussion with Robert  
Documents: Excel list for business partner report  
Interview with Alice |

For the analysis of the empirical stories, rooms zero through twelve are followed by subsequent syntheses called analysis room – followed by room number, which were constructed through two steps of empirical analysis. These are described and illustrated below.

### 4.6.2 Analysis I – Empirical, Zooming in

The first two rounds of analysis were empirical, paying close attention to what is happening and trying to explain that in synthesized, yet empirical terms. This is an example of the first round of analysis of the rooms (example from room 5). The
quotations and text depicting events are read through and commented upon in a synthesizing manner, analyzing what is happening.

In this initial analysis, I focus on what seems important to the actors, what actually becomes important, or what causes and creates certain results. The focus lies on bringing these details into relief.

4.6.3 Analysis II – Thematizing and Adding ANT Vocabulary

The next step in the analysis involved using all the comments from the previous round and looking for themes or events that could be depicted as leading to or hindering translations of different kinds. An example of this process, again from room five, is shown below. Here you can see some of the themes that I categorized into the empirical material and then used in order to write the analysis presented at the end of the room.
As mentioned previously, the rooms are different in the empirical sources they draw on. Therefore, the rooms are different in their depiction of what is going on. In some rooms, themes were necessary to categorize actors into different networks, whereas in other rooms this was rather apparent. To aid in this process, I also used figures to illustrate the actor networks I textually wanted to describe. During the beginning of the analytical process, all rooms were accompanied by figures, but as the analytical process progressed these were retained only in rooms where they seemed to add to particularly complex or messy associations, which were difficult to depict only textually.

In other rooms (e.g., room 7), the first step was the same as in room 5: quotations and text depicting events are read through and commented on in a synthesizing manner, noting what is happening. Thereafter, themes were not created but rather I saw two sets of ideas juxtaposed that created an overarching question that is used to synthesize the room. In addition, I showed how a tool meant for collaboration can become a tool for statistical analysis, feeding its data into a sustainability reporting system.
Analysis I and II were used as a basis for the syntheses that you find at the end of each room. These syntheses were first only empirical and then re-written using ANT vocabulary. These syntheses lead to the next round of analysis where the translations of the CCE started to become visible. To clarify the focus, initially for myself, but in effect also for the readers, I decided to work with the illustrations (Figure 1 – Figures for Analyses on page 60) used in the analysis. As mentioned above, in the rooms where these illustrations add to the text, they have been kept in the analyses as visual aids to complement the text. In other rooms, where a textual representation was easier, the illustrations have been removed.

Below I provide a short room-by-room analysis of the translations and enactments of the CCE that we encountered in each room. This analysis also shows the readers how these translations left material traces that were followed-up. These translations of and by the code (also called enactments involving the code) were used as a basis for writing the analyses found at the end of each empirical room. These were used iteratively with figures illustrating the translations to refine both the description of ongoing events as well as to highlight the ongoing translations of the code or involving the code.

Table 7 - Room by Room Summary leading to Contextual Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>The Code Enacted as or Translated into/Traces left by Translations or Enactments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Room 0   | On board Corp, a fictional cloud spacecraft.     | a) In text, the CCE serves as a discursive enactment of different stakeholder groups.  
b) In text, the CCE is a translation of top-management ideas into a discursive artefact.  
c) As enacted and in text, can be seen as a communication tool for purposes of enrolment.  |
| Room 1   | Sourcing Dept., Sweden                           | 1a) Enacted as a Management tool by Head of Sourcing.  
1b) Translated into a measurement and boundary management tool through the total supplier quality process (THSQP).  |
| Room 2   | Sourcing Dept. Sweden and by the Researchers Desk, Sweden | Translation 1b) here is shown through analysis of company documents to become two sets of inscription devices (id) 2idA and 2idB.  |
| Room 3   | Hotel lobby, China                               | The main actor here is Jakob, who draws on inscription devices 2idA and 2idB, additional documents, and Chinese employees 3a) accumulating power as a preparation for the upcoming evaluation of Jianco.  |
| Room 4   | At the supplier Jianco, China                    | Both inscription devices are at play here and 2idA is enacted as 3a) a negotiable score-setting exercise while 2idB becomes 3b)  |

16 Numbers used in the ‘The Code Enacted or Translated into/Traces left by Translations or Enactments’ column are merely for technical use, connecting the enactments or translations to the particular room.

17 2id A is a tool comprising a set of actors that have been designed for employees at the sourcing department to use the CCE when they compare, evaluate, and choose suppliers. 2idB is a set of 11 separate documents that are put together by the sourcing department to help suppliers comply with the CCE.
a coercive signing exercise.  
3c) Inscription device 2idA is enacted as a risk-assessment mind-set.  
The material trace left behind as a results of the two exercises is 3d) an action plan (2011), which is the next object we follow.  
This action plan has traces of one object of specific relevance, 3d) the chemical hexavalent chrome, which we find enacted as an admonition to the supplier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room 5</th>
<th>Sourcing Dept., Sweden</th>
<th>The action plan (2011) is absent here and the absence is enacted as 5), a shift from a responsibility mind-set to a reporting mind-set.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room 6</td>
<td>Sourcing Dept., Sweden</td>
<td>The action plan (2011) is absent here and the absence is enacted as attributable to 6a), reporting responsibilities. Material traces left behind as a result are 6b) reporting parameters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 7</td>
<td>Sourcing Dept., China</td>
<td>A new material trace pops up in the form of 7a), action plan (2013). We find that a new enactment of 2idA and 2idB is a new score-setting exercise that makes an interesting case of comparison with 3c), action plan (2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 8</td>
<td>Sourcing Dept., China</td>
<td>Here we get to follow up on 3d), the hexavalent chrome, and find that it is enacted in the same way as 8a), an admonition to the supplier. The action plan is enacted as 8b), quality-mind-set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 9</td>
<td>At the supplier Jianco, China</td>
<td>The action plans (2011) and (2013) are revisited and enacted as 9a), a rhetorical exercise, enacted as 9b), a quality mind-set, and a 9c), sales mind-set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 10</td>
<td>Sourcing Dept., China</td>
<td>The action plans (2011) and (2013) are revisited and enacted as 10a), an efficiency mind-set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 11</td>
<td>Head Quarters, Sweden</td>
<td>We see here the results of a complex inscription device 11a) 11id, the reporting process through which suppliers become numbers, percentages, and key-performance indicators. The reporting process is enacted as 11b), a green-washing mind-set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 12</td>
<td>Sourcing Dept., China, Accounting Dept., China</td>
<td>We here look closer at one part of the inscription device 11a) to find out how a supplier is translated into 12a), a committed business partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.4 Analysis III- Empirical, Zooming out

After the ANT analyses and illustrations were in place, I began looking closer at the translations illustrated by the figures at the end of each empirical room. Based on the ANT vocabulary presented in chapter 3, I thematized the illustrations into seven categories:

1. Enrolment;
2. Enactment;
3. Inscription devices;
4. Mediators;
5. Intermediaries;
6. Punctualization; and
7. Translations.
During this part of the analyses, the concept of translation was expanded to include different kinds of translations (material, discursive, and enacted translations). Since it is the traces left by translations that can be observed, these include physical, discursive, and enacted traces of code work, and are depicted as such. When physical traces are visible, these are referred to as material translations. When translations occur in talk or action, these are referred to as discursive translations or enactments. When a shift in ideology occurs, these are described as translations of associated ideas.

4.6.5 Analysis IV – CCE Translations and Proximity became a basis for theorizing

The final analysis puts together the translations from all the rooms into three categories, based on distance from headquarters (in terms of sociomaterial stability), where the code is initially drafted by the board of the company. Note that both geographic distance and network associations appeared to be relevant here. Although the idea to make this ‘agential cut’ came initially from geographic distance as observed empirically. However, this categorization further became relevant in terms of sociomaterial associations when I began looking at the material in the rooms in terms of stability. Just as following the CCE led me back and forth, proximity is therefore not always congruent with increasing room numbers – which would be the case if we only were talking about geographical distance. This is illustrated below in Table 8 - Initial Categorization of Rooms and Table 9 - Level of Proximity from Headquarters. The level of proximity is in my analysis divided into three categories – Proximal, Medial and Distal:

1. Proximal is the closest to the headquarters or point of code origin in terms of sociomaterial associations.

2. Medial is neither the most distant nor the closest from headquarters in terms of sociomaterial associations

3. Distal is the furthest away from the headquarters in terms of sociomaterial associations.

This categorization of empirical rooms into 3 different categories, proximal, medial and distal was based on reading and re-reading the empirical chapters and finding differences in these which were most evident closest to home (at HQ and Sourcing Department in Sweden) and furthest away (at the supplier). The rooms in-between showed different kinds of stories, but were not as distinct in their story. This categorization was therefore based on the basis of the largest relative differences in the code-object. This means that certain rooms were very easy to classify e.g. rooms 0, 1 and 2 were all in Sweden and contributing in different ways to the construction
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of a very stable object. Similarly, the code which comes about in room 9 tells a very
different story – and the object which comes forth is extremely vulnerable, making
the categorization easier. The categorization of the rest of the rooms, were made on
the basis of this initial categorization, but several rooms did not fit perfectly in one
category, wherefore I decided to categorize them according to what the story mostly
shows, mostly stability, instances of both instability and stability, or mostly
instability.

The initial categorization of the rooms was based initially only using geographical
parameters, however a summary of the rooms in the form of the figures (still
depicted in summaries of several rooms, illustrating various translation processes)
made things more complex and messy, there was certainly more that these rooms
seemed to have in common. See the table below, particularly the column on
translations and translation processes.

**Table 8 - Initial Categorization of Rooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Proximity</th>
<th>Geographic Location/Network Associations</th>
<th>Empirical Rooms</th>
<th>TRANSLATIONS AND TRANSLATION PROCESSES</th>
<th>Where and What is the Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td>Closer to Sweden</td>
<td>Room 0</td>
<td>PUNCTUALIZATION MATERIAL TRANSL.</td>
<td>Fictive, by researcher’s desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCURSIVE TRANSL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCURSIVE TRANSL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>ENROLEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERMEDIARY MEDIATOR</td>
<td>At sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INSC. DEVICE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INTERMEDIARY MATERIAL TRANSL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PUNCTUALIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCURSIVE TRANSL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>INSC. DEVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td>By researcher’s desk,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>documents from sourcing dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room 11</td>
<td>PUNCTUALIZATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>At Corp headquarters,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockholm, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>Intertwined</td>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>ENROLEMENT</td>
<td>At a hotel with crew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Event Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ENROLEMENT</td>
<td>At Johanna’s office, sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MATERIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INTERMEDIARY</td>
<td>On the line with Jakob from sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PUNCTUALIZATION</td>
<td>Meeting with Jing from sourcing dept. Ewing, at sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENROLEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>INTERMEDIARY</td>
<td>On the line with Edward, from sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden, in Ewing, China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENACTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ENACTMENT</td>
<td>Internal reporting channel at Corp Ewing, China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>Closer to China</td>
<td>At Jianco’s (supplier to Corp) factory and HQ, 60 km outside Ewing, China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ENACTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIATORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INTERMEDIARY</td>
<td>At Chinese sourcing dept. Ewing, China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEDIATOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENACTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INTERMEDIARY</td>
<td>At Jianco’s (supplier to Corp) factory and HQ, 60 km outside Ewing, China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENACTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTERMEDIARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISCURSIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the analyses in the rooms was revisited, re-worked and summarized, with a focus on trying to focus on the translations and simultaneously retain coherence both between and within rooms, the analyses were revised in favor of more textual
descriptions of the empirical material, and this categorization of the rooms was also re-visited. The final categorization was an active effect of re-readings of the empirical rooms. This time around I started focusing on what actually was happening in the rooms in terms of of the initial CCE actor-network which we meet in room zero. This had two effects; the distance (proximal, medial, and distal) becomes more explicitly relative (rooms in contrast to other rooms) rather than absolute (based only on geographical km travelled for example) and secondly, the focus shifts towards theorizing in terms of stability.

In this process, room 12 was moved to the category of distal rooms, although it could also have arguably been a part of the medial rooms owing to the relative (in contrast to other rooms) stability of the CCE. The reason for placing it in the distal rooms, however, stems from a focus on the relative (in contrast to other rooms) vulnerability of the achieved stability. Note that this categorization reduces messiness, allowing for an overlap between geographic distance and network-associations, which with a different focus would not allow for such a neat table, as can be shown below. The richness of the empirical material certainly allows more than one interpretation; my attempt has been to keep relevant both aspects of distance and network associations – however, room 12 was just too good to leave out only because it doesn’t really fit. I decided to keep it here, perhaps mostly as a reminder to myself and the reader, that things that do not always fit, are often made to fit, by all actors, including researchers like me. My focus on vulnerability rather than achieved stability is why room 12 shifted to the distal rooms. These changes marked a shift in focus from merely describing through empirical analyses towards theorizing.

Table 9 - Level of Proximity from Headquarters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Proximity</th>
<th>Geographic Location/Network Associations</th>
<th>Empirical Rooms</th>
<th>Where and What is the Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximal</td>
<td>Closer to Sweden</td>
<td>Room 0</td>
<td>Fictive, by researcher’s desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 1</td>
<td>At sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 2</td>
<td>By researcher’s desk, documents from sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 11</td>
<td>At Corp headquarters, Stockholm, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>Intertwined between Sweden and China</td>
<td>Room 3</td>
<td>At a hotel with crew from sourcing dept. Charlesburg in Ewing, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 5</td>
<td>At Johanna’s office, sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 6</td>
<td>On the line with Jakob from sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 7</td>
<td>Meeting with Jing from sourcing dept. Ewing, at sourcing dept. Charlesburg, Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 10</td>
<td>On the line with Edward, from sourcing dept. Charlesburg Sweden, in Ewing, China</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These categories are further used to discuss the types of translations that occur and the associated boundary setting. This forms the basis for the final discussion where the translations are discussed in terms of how they contribute to the construction of local realities and the associated, enacted, or espoused versions of responsibility – and the stability of the CCE.

4.7 The use of fiction in the presentation of the empirical material

I use fiction to illustrate certain parts of the presentation of the empirical material. The use of fiction primarily served the purpose of presenting material that otherwise would have been too sensitive to present, even when the case company was anonymized. The use of a metaphorical fictitious setting representing the case company along with fictitious characters allowed for a presentation of a case company and their code of ethics. The use of metaphors and fiction, however, also serves as a secondary function: illustrating a setting that positions the empirical context theoretically in a heterogeneous materiality (Latour, 2005; Jensen et al., 2009).

The use of fiction takes place in Room Zero, the first empirical subchapter. Aliases are introduced for the company and their stakeholders, i.e., suppliers, investors, employees, the environment, and customers. These aliases are then used in the following empirical subchapters. The presentation of the material in room zero was done using a bricolage method, drawing on several empirical sources and the construction of an authorial narrative (Markham, 2005) use of a metaphorical fictional spaceship with a fictional characters – the spacecraft is the corporation, the first pilot, representing Corp’s CEO, the northeastern wing director is a general manager, cosmos represents the environment, including society meteorites external shocks, and other space crafts are competitors. The Marions represent investors, ground control is NGOs, government, etc., passengers are customers, helper clouds are business partners, mainly suppliers, districts are an alias for countries, and wings are an alias for larger geographical regions covering Corp’s operations. Cloud density is a metaphor for socio-material resource density. As a background for the construction of this room, I reviewed interviews with a general manager, information on Corp’s website, Corp’s CCE, and internal policy documents. I then
created the metaphor of the corporation as a cloud-like spacecraft to depict the corporation and its CCE. This is a presentation of the researcher’s view of the corporation and an introduction to the corporation’s code of ethics.
5. The Code at Work in Thirteen Rooms

The following chapter comprises thirteen subchapters, called rooms. Each room tells a separate, yet connected story. The story in connected because I follow up on translations of Corp’s CCE in the form of material traces that are left behind by different actors. As these translations are followed, we are taken to different times and different places. We meet with different actors who deal with the CCE and we see what happens when the code goes to work. The rooms are different in the empirical material they draw on, as well as length. They can be seen as snapshots of the code at work. However, when put together, they tell a bigger story, which we will get to in subsequent chapters.

ROOM ZERO

(Fictive representation of Corp, introducing the Purple Booklet)

Room zero is a dynamic place; it cannot be confined to a single geographical location or to a specific time. It is a difficult room to grasp all at once, but to aid in describing it I shall ask the reader to let go of any previous thoughts and follow me, for a moment, into a land of fiction and imagination; and imagine room zero as a floating cloud. This cloud is large in its spread; it’s really large, denser in some areas and thinner in others. But by spread, it’s approximately as large as our planet earth. Let’s call the cloud Corp. Corp is in many ways similar to other clouds, it is versatile and it is adaptive and it can change its appearance as it floats through cosmos. The changing appearance could be likened with droplets of water accumulating into a cloud and seen as floating through the sky, letting go of a few raindrops along the way to accumulate new droplets as it moves on through space. Like the water droplets in the cloud change shape, size, and appearance, so does Corp. But the cloud that is Corp, is more heterogeneous than a traditional cloud, it is not made of only water in different forms. The Corp cloud is a conglomerate of innumerous material parts, metals, living bodies, inanimate things, and many different ideas. So, although Corp sometimes seems to act like a single cloud, it is at a closer look, a complex composite of various materials, which align and associate with each other through ongoing negotiations. Now, imagine Corp as a specialized cloud, somewhat like a spacecraft with a crew, passengers, and pilots, with goals and ambitions, material artefacts, symbols and all the things used to create ties of associations in a running organization. Also, as a running spacecraft, Corp needs associations of heterogeneous materials even on the outside, there’s ground-control of course, and then there are helper-clouds that could be likened with smaller space-shuttles, specialized in providing Corp with all the different materials they need to keep afloat. There’s for example the fuel-helper, the crew-recruitment helper, tools helper and innumerous others.
The size of Corp’s crew varies depending on the season but also depending on what the cosmos looks like in general. Cosmos consist of all sorts of floating materials, things like other spacecraft-clouds, helper-shuttles and of course there are meteorites. These are things Corp’s pilot and crew need to keep in check to secure their safety. But cosmos has been looking good for the past few months; there is clear sight ahead and no potential dangers; the pilot has a tracking system for all approaching meteorites, and has given his crew a green light. The course is clear. With a green signal from the first pilot, the crew at Corp has been focusing on accumulating heterogeneous materials of all sorts to build out their eastern wing. Experts have been employed, and projects of all sorts are on the agenda. It’s an exciting time.

Corp, as you by now might be starting to envision, is a space that continuously connects and let’s go of materials to be able to ensure its safe journey through cosmos. The Corp spaceship has existed for 170 years, and has grown larger and larger over these years, and there seem to be almost no threats to the spacecraft’s continued expansion. But there are always other competing spacecraft’s, which Corp must continue to try to outperform, and then of course there are the Marions, those with the money, that must be shown results that they like. All this, Corp tries to do through achieving their mission to be the preferred spacecraft for passengers who want to buy machinery. Corp’s crew has a lot of work to do, and a lot of people to please. Luckily (or perhaps unluckily), Corp has a guide, a book with a set of standards to abide by in all the work that they do. The pilot is happy that this book exists.

And it is here, on board this dynamic cloud-spaceship, in room zero that our story begins. On a late November afternoon, after checking in with the flight deck who confirm continued clear sight, the first pilot retreated into his private den located at the far west end of the spaceship. He poured himself a glass of eighteen-year-old Lagavulin and opened the top drawer to his mahogany desk and took out his very own copy of the book. A purple booklet! He gently dusted it off and sat back in his reclining chair, took a sip of his drink and sighed with pride.

He thought to himself, before he opened the purple booklet, that this was it. This is the book that made sure Corp could hold together in case of a crisis, and to make sure that the aforementioned rumors and ideas about the mission of Corp didn’t get the best of the crew, and most of all so that the crew have somewhere to turn to for answers to all the difficult questions that come up regarding how to handle passengers, approaching meteorites, cosmic changes, other spacecrafts fighting for the best flight routes and helper shuttles from time to time. These standards were simple yet all encompassing.
The pilot was proud because he had made sure that every crew member had gotten a personal copy of the purple booklet. He knew one of the people who had envisioned the purple booklet, and he also knew that the Marions, who very much existed, though they didn’t all live on a golden planet, had been a part of the planning behind the purple booklet. This was one of the reasons that it was decided to clearly mention the Marions in the purple booklet. Many wise beings were contacted and asked about their opinions before the purple booklet finally came into print.

Although it meant a lot to know that the entire crew had a purple, shining booklet to call their own, Corp’s Board members had decided and then made sure that the booklet also was available ‘en nuage’ or in-cloud. This meant that from any place on the spaceship, the booklet could be retrieved in a matter of nanoseconds. He didn’t have to worry about the distance between the wings, or that the crew didn’t all speak the same language, or that certain divisions of Corp were separated by low cloud density, necessitating shuttle-transport between these units. The in-cloud services were accessible from all Corp units. The purple booklet was available in twenty-six different languages, accessible from anywhere on the spaceship, regardless of cloud-density.

As the pilot looked down on the glossy purple cover shining in his lap, he momentarily paused and reflected on their most recent decision, making the purple booklet accessible even out-cloud, ‘à l’extérieur de nuage’. Anyone, everyone could now access the standards in the purple booklet.

The pilot carefully opened the purple cover and flipped to the first page of the book. At the very same moment, an out-cloud researcher, fascinated by booklets of this kind, the all-encompassing kind, leaned back in her wooden armchair and turned to the first page of the book.

The out-cloud researcher clicked open Corp’s web-based purple booklet as a Pdf file on her computer. As she read through the document, she noted that what in the scientific literature is categorized as a CCE (corporate code of ethics) or CoC (corporate code of conduct) is by Corp referred to as their business code (BC). The name does not suggest any association with ethics, but the document brings up Corp’s values and visions in regard to five differentiated categories of stakeholders. The categories are cosmos (society and the environment), crew (employees), passengers (customers), helper shuttles (business partners), and the Marions (shareholders). See the figure below for a summary of the purple booklet.
At Corp we envision to be the primary choice for passengers, potential passengers and other stakeholders. We want to be frontrunners. We set high standards and we exceed expectations. We at Corp want to maintain our leadership in cosmos through respecting our past and meeting the future with innovation.

There are always better ways of doing things, and we strive to find these. In order to guide us in our endeavors, we have the purple booklet. All clouds and sub-clouds within the Corp spacecraft are expected to adhere to the policies and ethics stated within the booklet. In short, in relation to each of our stakeholders, we abide to the following:

**Cosmos** – recognition of our cosmic interference, ISO certifications, UNDHR, in-cloud information, cooperation, and continuous training. We also contribute to a water project.

**The Marions** – we aim to create and continually increase value for our Marions and we do all we can to ensure that this is done through a responsible use of all cosmic resources, human, natural, and capital. We aim to provide a higher long-term return to our Marions than other spacecrafts.

**Passengers** – strive to achieve highest number by delivering best service, keeping in mind quality and safety, and with a long-term commitment.

**Crew** – we strive to be a good employer, attract motivated and qualified crew. We do not discriminate and believe in development opportunities for our crew. Crew members are free to affiliate and organize themselves according to will and will under no circumstances be forcefully employed, and will always be fairly compensated for their work. Crew members will be appraised annually. They will receive training of the purple booklet.

**Helper shuttles** – We want the best helper shuttles and select them impartially based on factors such as their productivity, delivery, reliability, price, quality, and commitment to cosmic development. We inform helper-shuttles of our commitments and expect them to abide.

All of this we aim to do with honesty, transparency, respect and accountability.

Training and further details are available and accessible through in and out-cloud services.

Figure 3 - Paraphrasing of the Purple Booklet Introducing Main Actors Mentioned, with Aliases
She made the following notes on her computer: Corp’s business code bears many similarities with other corporate codes of ethics that I have read. Much like other CCE’s, the business code refers to four overarching international standards; the OECD’s (The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) guidelines for multinational enterprises, the United Nations Global Compact, ILO’s (International Labor Organization) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the United Nation’s Bill of Human Rights. The booklet is a short summary of all the guidelines that any person interested in Corp needs to abide by. It states what Corp expects and what it promises in return. In total the booklet comprises of twelve pages in A5 format.

There’s a section on governance, stating that the ownership of the purple booklet belongs to Corp’s Board. There’s a picture which explains the purple booklet in relation to how things work in Corp, and the booklet here refers to itself in the form of a pyramid; something like the illustration below (Figure 4 - The Idea of the Overarching Code). At the top is the code. Below it is Corp’s internal, in-cloud management system that is a database with all their working documents. The implementation of the code takes place, according to the illustration, through the in-cloud system, a database where all material on Corp’s policies, practices and processes are stored and shared internally. The in-cloud system, which is placed directly under the Code in the hierarchy, is managed, according to the Purple booklet, by Corp’s executive management. The procedures on the operational level are delegated and managed by the different district units. These units are specialized in different areas and are oftentimes spatially (geographically) separated.

![Figure 4 - The Idea of the Overarching Code](image-url)
She turned back to the physical booklet in her lap, and then typed in the out-cloud address to Corp on the out-cloud browser-page open on her screen. She found there, as she expected, that the purple booklet, also exists in other forms. The same message, but in more detail is presented through both the in an out-cloud systems. The researcher, at this point, only had access to the out-cloud system. But here began understanding the importance that the Board and management at Corp give this guiding document. A video link with Corp’s North-Eastern wing director explains how this works. He has previously worked in five different sub-wings of Corp and knows that given the spread of Corp, the local ways of doing things (read laws) are often very different, and in many cases the guidelines in the purple booklet are stricter, demanding more, than local ways of doing things. Like certain other CCEs, the purple booklet has higher demands than local laws or regulations, with the CCE having precedence over local laws and regulations.

The booklet doesn’t say much about Corp itself, but it does introduce readers to the Corp Group, an industrial group which produce machines and tools of various kinds. Corp’s activities are carried out through separate operating divisions, but working globally. A shared vision and a common identity, through adherence to the purple booklet is meant to guide the Group.

**ANALYSIS ROOM ZERO**

Room zero is the home-turf of the Purple Booklet. The time and place in room zero are fictional, and so is the first pilot. But the metaphor of the cloud-spacecraft represents an existing multinational corporation, nicknamed Corp, and the Purple Booklet represents Corp’s actual corporate code of ethics. Corp’s CCE is similar to other multinational corporations’ codes in that it builds on international standards such as ISO, UN, ILO, and OECD. The Purple Booklet exists in several different forms. In a printed booklet form, and in digital form on Corp’s internal cloud system, making it accessible from all Corp units which are connected to the internal system. The CCE is also accessible on the internet, on Corp’s public webpage, making it accessible to anyone who has internet access. All these versions are available in 26 languages.

*Discursive Enactments – Text Inscribed in the Purple Booklet*

The language used to signify and characterize different groups in the purple booklet, are discursive enactments (Law and Mol, 2008) of stakeholder groups. As a governing document, the CCE discriminates (Law, 2004) between different groups of actors and speaks on behalf of them, with different forms of Corp’s expectations to and/or from each group. It is possible that these groups have been involved in the
development of the text in the CCE however, the CCE is for now a punctualized actor (Law, 1992).

The Purple Booklet explicitly mentions five groups of stakeholders to which Corp’s relationship and responsibilities are demarcated. These five groups are i) Cosmos (representing Corp’s external environment and society), ii) Marions (representing shareholders), iii) Passengers (representing customers), iv) Crew (representing employees), and v) Helper-shuttles (representing business partners; including suppliers, subcontractors, distributors, joint ventures partners, and agents).

As you see when you read Figure 3 on page 105- Corp’s CCE as it is printed in its booklet form holds the Marions in high esteem compared to other stakeholders. Society and the environment, all that is surrounding Corp is categorized as one homogenous group, where individual actors are silenced. Helper-shuttles are lowest in rank. They are expected to abide by the rules and must be committed to striving for Corp’s cosmic (environmental and societal) development goals. Passengers (customers) are important to please, but not really an important group here. Crew members (employees) are important but only to the extent that it is made clear that they will be trained in the teachings of the code, by which they should abide. The language used in the purple booklet creates understandings of the different groups and how they are seen in relation to one another, as has been noted in other codes (Winkler, 2011). The language used in the code is authoritarian, in line with previous code studies (Farrell and Farrell, 1998). The language is most strongly authoritarian towards helper-shuttles, communicating obligation.

The code reinforces the hierarchical status of different actors through the use of words which signify their place in relation to one another. The Marions, e.g. are in the Purple booklet, held in high esteem. They are to be provided with returns. Those who need to do the work to ensure that the Marions remain happy, are the crew member and the helper shuttles. The crew members and helper-shuttle members are crucial in order to carry out the work which the purple booklet expects to be done. This can be viewed in terms of an enrolment, which can be described as a “mobilization of support by creating a body of allies through translations” (Jackson, 2015:30). Crew and helper-shuttle members need to be on board, allied with the purple booklet in order for the Marions and passengers to be pleased. Corp management are therefore using the purple booklet, in an attempt to mobilize momentum through the purple booklet. The helper-shuttle personnel as well as Corp’s own crew are left in a powerless state, where their only option is to oblige with the teachings of the Purple Booklet.

Similar aspects of language being used to reinforce power have be noted by e.g. Farrell and Farrell’s (1998) finding that typically authoritarian language is used in
codes, disallowing a possibility for discretionary decision making for the addressees of the code. As Winkler (2011) noted, the Purple Booklet uses language in a way which recreates power structures and represents employees as passive receivers of rules and regulations rather than a morally empowered group.

Cosmos, in the purple booklet is passive, it doesn’t have a voice of its own. Cosmos represents the environment and it black boxed, i.e. temporarily simplified and made into a single unit (Latour 2005). But ‘recognition of cosmic interference’ allows for various interpretations. The Purple Booklet does not say where the boundaries of Corp start, i.e. what belongs to the external environment, so it is difficult to say what a recognition of Corp’s interference with this environment entails.

*Ideas Punctualized as the Purple Booklet*

The CCE however, is not only the purple booklet in its material form. It is also an idea, in its official presentation together with videos, policy documents, and website texts, it is a set of *universal commandments*, aimed to reach all Corp units around the world. In Figure 3 on page 105 - we see that here are hints of *virtues*, the assumption is that training and knowledge of the CCE will enlighten crew members and helper-shuttles to become better corporate citizens, making Corp a better corporation. The code is also the *highest power* in that it is placed above all other policies and governing documents and procedure. All operations undertaken by Corp are therefore, as stated in the CCE, governed by the code.

The Purple booklet is here a communication tool – talking to and about different stakeholders. It could be said to be a stakeholder management tool and an employee mobilization tool, i.e. enrolment (Callon, 1986a) which aims to get employees on board. Without employee support and belief in the CCE, it would be difficult to do anything with it. At the same time, the Purple booklet also communicates a demarcation of status in how the stakeholders are discussed, e.g. Marions are to be pleased while crew and helper-shuttles are expected to abide.

But the code is also, at the same time *a copycat*; it doesn’t give much attention to the industry or type of work it is meant to govern. It could be a code belonging to almost any multinational corporation. In this sense it follows a trend or a fashion (Czarniawska and Sevón, 2005) Holder-Webb and Cohen (2012) suggest that codes in general have widespread convergence in structure, content, and language and fail to provide firm specific guidelines. The codes are ‘generic carbon-copies of one another’ (2012:504).

The purple booklet in its printed form shows potential to be both a mediator and intermediary. This however, depends on how it is used by management, received by
employees and suppliers, in short – what happens when it goes to work. It has the potential to be an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for a management and control mindset, if it succeeds in the implementation of the stipulated expectations to and from different stakeholder groups. It can be a mediator (Latour, 2005), however, in its discursive enactment, and reinforcement of the relative status of different stakeholder groups, making explicit in the inscribed text, the ideas of the board. Or maybe it becomes something completely different. The written Purple Booklet is itself in room as a translation (Latour, 2005) of management ideas referring to international standards, into explicit discursive and physical material. Depending now, on how and if the Purple Booklet is launched into the world, it has the potential for endless new translations.

**Summary of Analysis Room Zero**

The CCE we meet with in Room zero seems stable, but the story in room zero illustrates the work put down in order to make the code appear as such. It is stable as long as the code in its material form, the Purple Booklet is held together with the ideas inscribed in it. The ideas are about ‘responsibility’ in conducting business, based on international standards about what this entails. These ideas are inscribed into the Booklet in the form of text. The first pilot and the board at Corp seem adamant about these ideas encompassing the correct or responsible way of conducting business. The language used indicates that different stakeholder groups are viewed differently and is line with previous studies, which discursively analyze code texts (e.g. Farrell and Farrell, 1998; Winkler 2011).

The stability of the Purple Booklet is highly dependent on Corps first pilot and the board, who share these ideas as inscribed in the text. The survival of the Purple Booklet is dependent on how well these ideas remain associated with the Booklet. Training programs are thus important in order to help employees connect the purple booklet with these ideas inscribed into it. Following are the take-aways from the context of room zero which has its epicenter in a fictional Company headquarter.

**The code:**

(i) Is punctualized as The Purple Booklet as ideas are materially manifested by Corp’s Board.

(ii) Is a communication tool (stakeholder management, employee mobilization).

(iii) Has potential to become both mediator and intermediary

(iv) Appears stable as inscription matches protagonists’ (fictive managements) ideas about responsible conduct.

(v) Appears stable and gains power of alliance through reference to international standards guiding responsible business conduct.
(vi) Enacts stakeholders and reinforces power structures by communicating liabilities of and obligations to different stakeholder groups.

Associated ideas: stem from internationally accepted ideas primarily in the developed countries of the world, regarding good international business conduct. The ideas are visionary in their conceptualization and are borrowed from e.g. ILO, UN, and OECD and drawn into the Purple Booklet. These ideas are at Corp based on a monistic approach to ethics, i.e. one code for everyone, everywhere.

At the same time, these ideas accept a certain amount of pluralism based on a typical stakeholder approach, reinforcing different approaches in terms of expectations from and responsibilities towards different stakeholder groups. This differentiation is biased in terms of fiduciary duties towards shareholders and hence prioritizes a profit-making motive.
ROOM ONE

(First encounter with the sourcing department in Charlesburg, Sweden)

The meetings in room 1 take place at the sourcing department at Corp, which is situated in the Western hub-city of Charlesburg (fictive city in Sweden where Corp’s operations began 170 years ago). The sourcing department is where all the contracts with helper-shuttles (suppliers) are managed. The head of this department is called Henrik. He is among other things responsible for the implementation of the Purple Booklet at the sourcing department and making sure that crew-members (employees) adhere to it.

Viktor and Johanna work here as sourcing engineers, and their work involves applying the Purple Booklet to the actual work of sourcing parts from different helper-shuttles in different geographical locations. The room presents findings from meetings with Henrik, Johanna and Viktor, complemented with descriptions and analyses of the documents, processes and tools that are introduced.

Meeting with Henrik, Head of Sourcing

Meeting one takes place on the 4th of April, 2010 and two of my colleagues in the research project meet with Henrik, the head of the sourcing department. They meet Henrik in his office and talk about Corp’s code.

Henrik is responsible for the operationalization of the code at the sourcing department. He also needs to make sure the code is being followed and this is done through making the code a contract, by putting in writing a commitment to following the code. This process is described by him as rather straightforward, especially because the code is seen by him as something very natural and clear to everyone. He has never experienced and queries regarding the code.

“It’s so obvious that, now we’ve had it for ten years so everyone knows that it exists. We have also compared our [code] with other big corporations /…/ the ten basic OECD guidelines are there, for example child labor, you should yourself be able to negotiate your wage and so on.”

When it comes to the operationalization of the code into the daily work of the sourcing department, this entails breaking down the values in the code into elaborate tools used to evaluate helper-shuttles. There are a lot of helper-shuttles out there, and if Corp is to follow the code, they can work with only those who commit to
Corp’s code, specifically regarding their concern for cosmos (society and the environment).

To Henrik, the message in the code is clear, and it comes from the first pilot (CEO). A specific focus on ethicality in the business has been emphasized.

“We’ve had a new pilot since the first of July last year /…/ actually, quite big changes. Partly the ICS (integrated cloud-system) portal. We have very little paper so you can now go directly in to all processes, so we do more or less everything from our ICS-portal. /…/ I thought a lot would happen then but it hasn’t. We’ve kept the organizational structure. But one thing that has happened is the focus on ethical business, this is new. We have been working quite a lot with environmental issues and received several environmental prizes but this aspect of ethical business…[is new].

As mentioned above, Henrik’s job is to make sure the code is being followed at this department and to apply the code to their daily operations, sourcing – choosing the best helper-shuttles for Corp’s production. Henrik also needs to assure higher management that he himself, as head of a department, is committed to the code.

“Recently we received this Corp Group Compliance Statement. The main message is that even though we have the business code, everyone in the highest management needed to sign a paper confirming that we are following the code. Here it says that the business should be clean, it also says that you shouldn’t have any relations with a company you are working with. It’s pretty profound.”

Henrik has signed the Group Compliance Statement, and has taken this a step further. He has taken the initiative to send out this compliance statement to all his crew, of seventeen people, and asked also them to sign it. Although crew members are not obliged to sign this document, Henrik thought it was important. The Compliance Statement has not been designed for crew members to sign, but to Henrik it shows a commitment to follow the code. He’s got his crew on-board. They understand that the code is important, and therefore the work with operationalizing the code now becomes more legitimate. Let us discuss how it is given meaning and legitimacy.

When Henrik talks about the code, he mentions that it is about keeping the business ‘clean’ and avoiding relationships that could entail vested interests, but goes quickly
into what the code means at his department. Signing the code is something that people in the purchasing department seemed to have done without any major remarks, just a few queries about the form of the document, as it was perceived as a contract. The code in its written booklet form does not mention anything about repercussions or consequences of failure to comply. Henrik, nonetheless, is certain that a failure to comply with the code could lead to a termination of employment. Henrik’s understanding of the code shows that a commitment to the code is serious business, and failing to follow it could have serious consequences.

“Everyone signed it, even though we didn’t have to. We chose that ourselves. This was meant for the highest level of management but I took the forefront on this one since we are responsible for three billion (monetary units) in purchasing volume, I thought it would be really good for us to be proactive. So we are the only purchasing department at Corp which has signed this. It gives us more credibility, having signed this. And we work with the business code. /.../ of course, it doesn’t say here that if you do not follow this, then…. But you can figure out for yourself that if you don’t follow it or infringe, that would be reason for termination [of employment]. It’s crystal clear. /.../ we also have a hotline here, to get guidance on what is what. It also allows us to call in, anonymously, if you want to turn in a colleague.”

So everyone has signed the compliance statement, but the values in the code also have to be applied to the work of the sourcing department. The daily work of the sourcing department involves finding and choosing the best helper-shuttles. This classification has previously been done based only on quality and price. But now, with the prescriptions in the code, the evaluation and selection of helper-shuttles needs to include also a cosmic focus (environmental and societal factors). Much of the ongoing expansion of the Eastern wing of the spacecraft has been possible because of associations with helper-shuttles of high quality, and with low prices. They are oftentimes much cheaper, primarily because labor costs are lower in the Eastern district. But now, all new helper-shuttles must be evaluated on the basis of a new process, called THSQP (Total Helper-Shuttle Quality Process). This process, as Henrik explains, has been created by integrating cosmic (societal, environmental and ethical) issues of concern into the evaluation, selection and retention process of contracted helper-shuttles. The new process also entails a new organization of responsibilities for the crew working at the sourcing department.

“What has happened here is that we have become more cautious when it comes to choosing helper-shuttles. We’ve
also tried to follow up in a way that you as a single purchaser shouldn’t be able to choose helper-shuttles, rather we follow it up with a process, based on an audit, a full audit. And then the head of quality and I sign it. So it’s at least two [people].

The operationalization of the THSQP thus entails more signatures, a full audit, and at least two people involved in the process. Henrik explains, however, that it would be impossible to re-evaluate all existing helping-shuttles, and to evaluate all potential new helper-shuttles is not deemed feasible either. To be able to differentiate between which helper-shuttles to evaluate using the THSQP, the sourcing department therefore use another a tool called the Kraljic Matrix. The Kraljic Matrix is a four-field matrix, which allows the sourcing crew to isolate a limited number of helper-shuttles, and these are termed ‘strategic’ or ‘critical’. These are helper-shuttles from whom Corp purchases large volumes, but might also include helper-shuttles providing Corp with parts that are vital for them or difficult to produce or hard to find elsewhere. One axis on the matrix measures volumes sourced by Corp and the other measures the monetary value of the sourced items. Henrik explains how this works:

“… We look at the Kraljic Matrix, how it looks, where they are [the helper-shuttles]. /…/ if it is a strategic shuttle, they should have a dot here. If it’s an outlier it should be here in the bottom left corner.”

All existing helper-shuttles are plotted in the matrix and each shuttle is represented as a small dot somewhere on the matrix. The shuttles with the highest sourced volume and the highest monetary value are plotted in the top-right corner of the four-field matrix. These dots represent the strategic, critical shuttles. It is these helper-shuttles that will be subjected to the THSQP. We will get back to the details of what the THSQP entails, but for now what is important is that these critical shuttles are those that will be evaluated according to the new rules. An evaluation of a helper-shuttle is at the sourcing department also known as a Shuttle Audit. According to sourcing department policy, a full audit should be done within a maximum of five year intervals, if no larger changes have occurred in the scope of the helper-shuttle that is to say that they have been bought or changed their location, or that a completely new product is to be sourced from them. An assessment and evaluation should, according to policy, encompass two tiers. The helper-shuttle is a tier one partner, but if the helper-shuttle itself sources from other helpers, these are categorized as sub-contractors to Corp. These sub-contractors are called tier-two partners. Sometimes tier-two partners can also be classified as strategic, whereby also these helpers would be subject to an audit. Also, if tier-two partners’ products or values are at risk of violating Corp’s code, they will be subjected to an audit. In
other cases, the tier one helper-shuttles are expected to take responsibility to pass on Corp’s commitments to their own helpers.

Now, coming back to the operationalization of the code, we return to the TSHQP, a process that all sourcing crew need to learn in theory before they apply it on helper-shuttles. The process, which they need to learn, is broken down into the three following steps:

“1. Qualification, 2. Delivery to serial production, 3. What to do when helper-shuttles are not achieving targets and expectations. /.../ Step one involves monitoring the key competences of the helper-shuttle and sending a request for a quotation. The helper-shuttles are, with a request for quotations, supposed to be sent a copy of a Helper-Shuttle Manual, which includes general standards, requirements for different parts, and also describes “expected behavior from the shuttles in the daily communication regarding parts, components, drawings, corrective actions, and cosmic concern...”” 18

The next procedure in step one involves the audit, which is divided into two separate parts. These parts are called chapter 1 and chapter 2. The first one is mandatory (also called helper-shuttle evaluation) and the second one is supporting (also called chapter 2 or process evaluation). The audit starts with sending an invitation letter to the helper-shuttle, informing them that Corp is planning to visit them on a certain date. Attached with this letter is also a cosmic (environmental) self-assessment questionnaire, which they are meant to fill out before the actual audit and hand back to the Corp audit-crew when the audit takes place. Chapter 1 and 2 audits focus on different areas. The table below shows these areas, and here cosmic concern is broken down in the chapter 1 shuttle evaluation into two categories on which the shuttles are evaluated, ‘environment’ and ‘social and business ethics’. The italicized purple categories are categories that are based on the code.

---

18 Total Helper-shuttle Quality Process Powerpoint 2010 (Document 2)
According to the THSQP, after step 1 is completed it should be secured that; Corp’s requirements and expectations are met, that the helper-shuttle’s manufacturing process is reliable and that delivered parts correspond to the technical specifications.

Step 2 starts when the helper-shuttle has started delivering to serial production. This step includes handling claims reports, an 8-Disciplines\(^\text{19}\) report, QPI (Quality Performance Indicator) measurements and a follow-up audit. During the process of step 2 the aim is to secure that the helper-shuttles are informed about any failures in order to give them the possibility to prevent future failures, information is required back from the helper-shuttle on short and long term corrective action and the helper-shuttle is invoiced for direct costs. During this step, there is continuous monitoring.

Step 3 is also called HSQDP (Helper-Shuttle Quality Development Process) and is supposed to be initiated if the helper-shuttle does not reach the quality performance indicators.

“The intention with HSQDP is to help the shuttle to improve themselves to meet Corp’s demands and expectations through working together in a team.”

\(^{19}\) A tool used to analyze defected parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Chapter 1 Shuttle Evaluation</th>
<th>Chapter 2 Process Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Company profile (in the code called reliability)</td>
<td>Quality system and documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Management (in the code called reliability)</td>
<td>General organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Process Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social and Business Ethics</td>
<td>Incoming area (goods reception)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Key position of manufactured process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Logistics (in the code called delivery)</td>
<td>Maintenance program TPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>After-market</td>
<td>Work instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Control instructions and checking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Product development</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Finance (in the code called price)</td>
<td>End of line, final inspections packaging and shipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sourcing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This step entails notifying the helper-shuttle with a letter informing them about the process that has been started based on their quality and delivery problems. First a process evaluation is made together with the helper-shuttle at their plant. An action list is then supposed to be created with a timeframe for when these actions should be completed. The outcomes are then to be monitored continuously, and if the QPI (quality performance indicators) do not improve within a reasonable time, Henrik explains, that the helper-shuttle is to be phased out.

As mentioned earlier, an invitation letter is sent out prior to the audit, and during the audit a chapter 1 evaluation will always be carried out. A chapter two evaluation is a supporting function and is only carried out if the auditing crew deem it necessary. The audit ends with the helper-shuttle receiving a numerical and color-coded result, potentially along with an action list which consists of a list of amendments which they must make within a given time-frame. Henrik explains,

"You have red for not approved, yellow for partially conforming and green for fully conforming. Then you have several stopping parameters, like this red one saying that the contents of the quality policy coincides with the company’s alignment and way of working. If you get a ‘no’ here, then you can’t continue."

The stopping parameters that Henrik talks about are special questions within the audit tool used for chapter 1, the obligatory audits (the audit tool from now on called HSAG, which is short for helper-shuttle assessment guidelines) regarding areas that are necessary that the helper-shuttle comply with. The HSAG contains questions on all the areas mentioned in Table 11, which can be found on the following page. Each question is followed by four grading options with short descriptions. The grades on each question range in whole numbers from zero to three. Also, you see in italicized and underlined text, the areas which contain questions, which are stopping-parameters. If the helper-shuttle receives a zero on any of these questions, they fail the audit and receive the color red in their assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subcategories within each area</th>
<th>Total # of Questions and %</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Company profile</td>
<td>1.1 Ownership, 1.2 Global ability, 1.3 Dependency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Management</td>
<td>2.3 Management, 2.2 Customer satisfaction, 2.3 Risk management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Environment</td>
<td>2.1 Env. Management system, 3.2 environmental criteria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Social and ethics</td>
<td>4.1 Business ethics and social criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Quality</td>
<td>5.1 Quality system, 5.2 Quality planning, 5.3 Quality performance of deliveries, 5.4 Reliability, 5.5 Problem solving, 5.6 Management of critical characteristics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Logistics</td>
<td>6.1 Capacity management, 6.2 delivery precision, 6.3 electronic communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 After-market</td>
<td>7.1 Documentation, 7.2 Service literature, 7.3 Co-operation &amp; support, 7.4 Provide spare parts for minimum of 10 years, 7.5 Spare part service life knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Competence</td>
<td>8.1 Product and industrial technology, 8.2 Industrial engineering, 8.3 Customer support and communication, 8.4 Language, 8.5 Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Product development</td>
<td>9.1 Product development process/project support, 9.2 Product engineering technology, 9.3 Prototypes, 9.4 R&amp;D, 9.5 Design changes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Finance</td>
<td>10.1 Financial evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Productivity</td>
<td>11.1 Productivity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sourcing</td>
<td>12.1 Sourcing process, 12.2 The helper-shuttle subcontractor performance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A corresponding excel file is used to compile and tally the grades when all the scores are put together. The excel file also makes sure that the auditor is warned in case a stopping parameter has been missed. Of the total 37 questions, seven questions are stopping parameters.

Henrik tells us that the employees at the purchasing department at Corp learn about the code as it is part of their training. The code is always referred to in every contract that is signed in doing business with Corp. Henrik therefore feels certain that all employees are aware of the code, but also believes that employees make their own associations with the code, and probably have their own ideas about what is ethical. But this is why it is so important that the code has been made available through physical copies and the in-cloud system. It has been operationalized, and signed.

**Meeting Strategic Sourcing Engineers**

In a small conference room, located at the sourcing department in Charlesburg, my colleagues meet with two separate crew members at two different times, in July of 2010 and December of 2010. The crew members are called Johanna and Viktor and both work with strategic sourcing, which entails that their job is to work with the assessment tool based on the code to evaluate and choose helper-shuttles. Both Johanna and Viktor show in different ways, frustrations with the practical application of the managerial vision in the code.

Viktor works with strategic purchases and is in charge of hydraulic parts used for Corp’s own production as well as after-market services. He says about his work at Corp:

> “I have worked four years at purchasing, approximately a year and a half with hydraulics, before that I worked with indirect materials and system support. So I have designed some of the tools that we use in purchasing to follow helper-shuttle performance, deliveries, precision, lead time and similar things. I have also been involved in developing many of the documents that are here in the in-cloud-portal which describes how we are supposed to work.”

Viktor is in his work involved in the operationalization of the code, and is concerned about the practical application of the essence of the code and indicates that this is not a straight forward process. In practice you have to deal with certain constraints which define your work. He gives an example:
"We talk about a lead time of less than ten days... we're on that level and, well, there's a huge difference between theory and practice, that's how it is."

Viktor explains that the main work carried out by the strategic purchasers includes the responsibility for choosing helper-shuttles, assessing the price, lead time and commercial conditions and writing overarching contractual agreements with helper-shuttles. He also says that the Business code is a document which feels very clear to him, but he has some problems with another document, namely the compliance statement, which all managers are expected to sign and which all crew members also signed at the sourcing department. Viktor sees no problems with the code, but expresses that:

“It’s more other documents that have been developed later, where I know that sometimes things are taken too far. But this one, this one I have no problems signing.”

Although the code itself is not expected to be signed by crew member or managers, Viktor feels that he could have signed it. The compliance statement, however, he has some problems with.

“I didn’t think that document [compliance statement] was really up to the mark, but I guess it was developed primarily for people in management positions where it was about well, that I cannot have any interests in a company that I’m doing business with. I can’t be a partner and then at the same time place my business in that company, which is obvious. Principally, [there are] no problems with it at all. But then it’s different when you have to sign it and put it black on white and you can see that this is quite vague actually. There’s so much that can be encompassed. Because if you draw it to the edge, my girlfriend can’t work at IKEA because we occasionally buy tables from IKEA. That’s when you’ve taken it to the extreme, but still, ask a lawyer to look at the document and they can make that judgment. So, I guess it’s slightly unfortunate how it’s written, in my opinion.”

Viktor has signed the compliance statement, but he dislikes it. He, in turn, is involved in creating documents which helper-shuttles are expected to sign. Not so surprisingly, he understands that getting helper-shuttles to agree to Corp’s demands might be tricky. Viktor explains the procedure as straightforward, yet laden with
uncertainty because it is hard to say if the helper-shuttle s have actually read and understood what they are agreeing to.

“…and they should, that’s when we do an audit of a helper-shuttle, then we ask them, ‘do you know of the business code, and do you accept it or to you commit to follow it? /…/ “Usually they say, it’s no problem, we accept it and then, yeah, they sign it. /…/. But then, you could wonder whether, well, they have all read it? You know that, okay, this is a business code, yes but it is a, they are usually quite general; of course we don’t have any child labor so we can sign it. So it, it is a question of how much information they have. We don’t sit with the helper-shuttle and, now we’ll start on page one, the first sentence states. We don’t go through and look at everything on that level.”

Much like Viktor, Johanna also indicates a tension between higher level managers on e.g. group level who have very high expectations as to what should be done in terms of implementing and following the code, and the practical work that it entails. She says:

“I’m part of this group, which has members from all the business areas and moreover there are people from…/…/…group level, who maybe aren’t out as much at the helper-shuttle and who have very high expectations.

When talking about the code, Johanna draws a parallel between the Business code and another document, Corp’s ten minimum criteria. She explains,

“[But] bluntly speaking when I had a meeting with a quality manager in China and discussed this, we have this 10 criteria letter…/…/…anyway, it is a summary, you could say, of, of the Purple Booklet.”

The document that Johanna is referring to is one, which internally is called Corp’s 10 minimum criteria. This is a document which lists ten criteria which all business partners to Corp must agree with. These minimum expectations are divided into three categories, 1. Social performance, 2. Environmental Performance and 3. Compliance with Corp’s prohibited and restricted list. There are seven points under social performance, two under environmental performance and compliance with the prohibited and restricted list is on its own the 10th criteria. The document explicitly refers to the Global Compact Guidelines, OECD’s guidelines for multinational
enterprises and The International Labor Organizations Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

Johanna is new to the company, and it seems she is able and willing to question some of the ideas that have been more or less established. One such thing is her concern about the questions in and scoring of the helper-shuttles based on the HSAG.

“But there we also have this difficulty, that there are certain, if we put these demands on the helper shuttles that they should /…/ if they cannot agree with it, then they aren’t a helper-shuttle to us…something that we actually did discuss in China with this third party company, there we talked about what happens if we find child labor? Should we stop doing business with them then? Well [if we stop, then we destroy a, as we also have, according to our business code, we also have a social responsibility. If we stop buying from a factory, what happens then? Then we’ll most probably make even more people destitute. So it’s more about, a partnership that we should in that case try to establish action plans, how can we help this helper shuttle?”

Johanna opens up the complexity of taking the code seriously. What is to be done if they find child labor? Johanna believes that this is a situation when their social responsibility comes into play, that Corp has a responsibility not to leave the helper-shuttle, but rather to develop a plan in order to solve the problem together. She does not have any examples of whether this has been done; her questions are of a rhetorical nature.

Johanna indicates that the talk and the work done based on the code is entangled with demands and values which may be both intrinsic and extrinsic.

“…I think that, you want to believe that the world is good and that the citizens in the world are relatively good, so it comes from the inside too. But of course we also have stakeholders, who have an interest in this and the reporting that we do, that’s because it needs to go in the sustainability report, and it’s supposed to be presented. But that’s not the only reason we do it, those of us who work with this we have a genuine interest.”

20 More details about Corp’s ten minimum criteria are found in room three
Several reasons are brought up by Johanna. She wants to believe that the world is a good place and that citizens of the world want to do good, thereby implying that the work that is being done, evaluating helper-shuttles, moving towards green purchasing, talking about the environment, safety and health issues and putting demands on the helper-shuttle to comply with Corp’s 10 minimum criteria and the Purple booklet, is good. It is the right thing to do. Also, she says that this comes from the inside, being something intrinsic. At the same time there are stakeholders who have interests, and reporting which must be done. But working with helper-shuttles in this manner, monitoring and evaluating them is not only a matter of what the stakeholders want or what intrinsically feels good, it is also has to do with priorities regarding resources at Corp since this is something that costs Corp money. Johanna indicates that this is a matter of negotiation, how much is Corp willing to spend is part of the overall strategy.

“When we sit and do the strategy for the next four years. /.../ I asked, okay, we’re supposed to talk about green purchasing. Well, how much can it cost then? And this is also interesting, but I think that we are closing in on that it can cost. Not any price, but it can start costing, and that’s fun, that things are starting to happen.”

Money, in the business world, is often equated with, or measured in time. Although resources and purchasing of materials also costs money, doing audits and working with helper-shuttles entails mostly office work, that is to say man-hours. Johanna indicates that it can boil down to not just collective priorities at strategic level but also how individuals prioritize their work. How things actually get done once the helper-shuttles are evaluated, seems to still be open for negotiation.

**ANALYSIS ROOM ONE**

Two sets of translations of the Purple Booklet are noted in room one, the management code and the measurement code. These are both carefully crafted, and a lot of work is put down to hold these networks in place (Law, 2005). These are both discussed in more detail below.

In room one we also see conflicting demands and causes for uncertainty which indicate vibrations, disturbances of kind, in the stability of the noted translations. This is discussed in further detail below.
The sourcing department in Charlesburg is headed by Henrik who has decided to take his role as enroller of the Purple Booklet a step further than top management demand. He is expected by top management to sign the Compliance Statement which is supposed to confirm a commitment to follow the Purple Booklet. He has, however, encouraged and managed to get his entire department to sign this Compliance Statement. Henrik is in this process a mediator (Latour, 2005), changing the policy and getting his employees on board by having them go the extra mile. In the creating of the management code Henrik has had a vital role in making the code familiar and prominent at his department. In terms of the code, it seems to be gaining momentum, by attracting allies, accumulating resources by silencing employees concerns and making them representations of one goal, mission, and voice (Callon, 1986). Through the involvement of the entire department in signing the Compliance Statement, Henrik now speaks for the entire department indicating that the department ‘chose this ourselves’ (Figure 5). Through this process, the code has in Henrik’s view of the department been legitimized through signatures, and the code has become obvious and straightforward. The Compliance Statement is an intermediary (Latour, 2005) enrolled (Callon, 1986a) by Henrik who in his mediating endeavor of getting his department to sign the compliance statement, also acts also as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for a management and control mind-set. The code is dependent on Henrik here, and is given importance through a head of department.

*Figure 5 - Henrik Acts as an Intermediary for an Efficiency Mind-Set, and a Mediator for Legitimization, through which the Code Gains Importance*
The measurement code – An inscription device is crafted

The measurement code is created through new responsibilities for crew and helper shuttles, based on the code. These responsibilities involve a higher cautiousness when choosing helper-shuttles (they must be audited on additional factors as compared to before, including business ethics, environment, and society) coupled with a control system where a head of quality as well as Henrik as head of department must sign to verify new helper shuttles. The sourcing employees are no longer able to choose helper-shuttles on their own. But in order to know which helper-shuttles to audit, the department must first discriminate (Latour and Woolgar, 1986) between existing helper-shuttles, in order to classify them, and this is done using the Krajlic Matrix. The Krajlic Matrix, a very clear mediator (Latour, 2005) helps classify helper-shuttles as strategic or non-strategic based on the criticality, volumes or monetary value of the sourced materials. Once the strategic are separated from the non-strategic, the THSQP (Total Helper-Shuttle Quality Process) can begin. The THSQP is a punctualized actor (Law, 1992) involving many steps that are followed by the sourcing crew. A prominent inscription device (Latour and Woolgar, 1986) in the THSQ process is the auditing tool (Helper-Shuttle Assessment Guidelines and related documents).

Well within the THSQP, the strategic helper-shuttles will now be subjected to measurement and control in the process of getting these shuttles qualified, keeping them qualified for serial production or disqualified. In order to qualify the shuttles, the THSQP continues to the obligatory shuttle audit, which all strategic shuttles must go through (see Table 11 on page 119).

In the final column of Table 11, which shows the areas covered during an audit, we can see that the relative number of allocable points for each area depicts a large weight on quality, competence and product development, with quality as the absolute leader. The environment and social and ethics have a relatively low number of allocable points, however, all questions within these areas encompass stopping parameters (cf. “order qualifiers”; Seuring and Müller, 2008:1704). These stopping parameters are a system, which is aimed at making it impossible for auditors to accidentally approve a helper-shuttle. The excel file in which the scores are entered will not sum up the total unless all stopping parameters have been marked with a score. If the score is zero, the excel file has been programmed to alert the auditor. The stopping parameters therefore act as boundaries toward helper-shuttles but also as an extra control-mechanism to make sure that the helper-shuttles really commit to the code in terms of Corp’s environmental, societal and ethical criteria, have stable finances and robust quality, risk management and ownership.
The code is still closely associated with the auditing tool, HSAGs but as we see, Viktor’s work involves actually designing these tools in order to follow helper-shuttle performance, delivery precision, lead time etc. Viktor thus has a mediating (Latour, 2005) role in the construction of the inscription device (Latour and Woolgar, 1986) as he is a part of the production of the auditing tool (HSAG). Working with the evaluation of helper-shuttles is in Viktor’s talk about the responsibility of assessing price and writing contracts with the helper-shuttles. Price, one of the factors used to evaluate helper-shuttles mentioned in the purple booklet, seems to be a central actor, and the Krajlic matrix allows helper-shuttle engineers to make evaluations based on price. Viktor thereby also acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for an efficiency mind-set. [See Figure 6 - The Measurement Code, an Inscription Device is Crafted, Below].

Figure 6 - The Measurement Code, an Inscription Device is Crafted

Working with the HSAG to assess the helper-shuttles involves a number of practical concerns, wherefore it becomes important to make the code understandable, both at the sourcing department and to helper-shuttles and one way this is done, is through Corp’s ten minimum criteria. These criteria are ten clear statements on what Corp demands of their helper-shuttles. A translation of the code occurs here in the form of a simplification and explication directed to the helper-shuttles in the form of Corp’s
ten minimum criteria (see Figure 7 on the following page). These criteria are explained to be a summary of the Purple Booklet. This is an example of how the Ten minimum criteria are made into a punctualized actor (Law, 1992); when defined as a summary of the purple booklet. The text in the ten minimum criteria, as can be seen in room 2 is very different from the text in the Purple booklet. A summary is defined by Merriam Webster’s Online Dictionary as “using few words to give the most important information about something” (retrieved 2015-05-28 http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/summary). Johanna’s idea of a summary is somewhat different, her idea silences (Callon, 1986) the difference of tone, language, and content between the two documents. In other words, Johanna enacts (Mol and Law, 2008) the purple booklet as equivalent to Corp’s ten minimum criteria. When working with helper-shuttles, the ten minimum criteria are the code. Johanna is here a mediator (Latour, 2005) in her enrolment (Callon, 1986a) of the Purple booklet in the establishment of a new punctualized actor (Law, 1992). We will return to this discussion in room 2.

Figure 7 - Idea Translates the Purple Booklet into a new Punctualized Actor

Conflicting Demands, Punctualized

Although a lot of work has been put down into the translations of the Purple Booklet into the management code and the measurement code, the demands placed on helper-shuttles, might often be in conflict with other quality or time-related demands that Corp puts on their helper-shuttles. These must be handled through action plans, which are seen as a ‘partnership’, a kind of punctualization (Law, 1992) where Corp can help the helper-shuttles to enhance quality for serial sourcing.
In Johanna’s perspective, there is a clear responsibility which she allocates to Corp here. However, these uncertainties of conflicting demands also indicate a grey zone, how it works in practice is still not quite clear, as these processes of evaluation are as much about doing the right thing and at the same time creating the input needed for relevant reporting. Johanna also indicated that there are conflicts between the ambitions with the evaluation process which are high and each individual who has their work tasks. Contrary to Henrik’s management code, there is more uncertainty and contradiction in Johanna’s enactment of the code. Johanna acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for a mind-set which acknowledges conflicting-demands. But she quickly provides a solution to the problem of such conflicts, enacting the action-plan as a solution for a ‘partnership’ between Corp and helper-shuttles (See Figure 8 on the following page). This way, a potential breach of the code need not mean that the helper-shuttle is cut off. Rather, Corp and the helper-shuttle should work together to achieve the compliance of demands which Corp has set up.

**Figure 8 - Contradiction Rhetorically Punctualized**

![Diagram](image)

All together at the sourcing department, we see two parallel, but not incoherent code-perspectives. The first is a top-down management perspective; the code is, with the initiative of Henrik, made legitimate through signing of affidavits. The code
is made into a contract, which Henrik as well as his crew commit to by signing the compliance statement. The management perspective at the sourcing department exudes clarity and simplicity. The code has been broken down and clearly integrated into the helper-shuttle evaluation process and helper-shuttle assessment tools. The processes based on the code are clear and accurate. There are control mechanisms and clear instructions for the sourcing crew to work according to. The translation of the code into an auditing tool is to Henrik straightforward and uncomplicated, but as shown above, involved several translations with explicit mediation (Latour, 2005) e.g. through Henrik and through the Krajlic Matrix.

The purple booklet at the sourcing department, when it is translated into the helper-shuttle assessment tool is used for categorization allowing sourcing engineers to decide who to source from and whom not to contract. The Kraljic matrix is a mediator (Latour, 2005), it is an obligatory passage point (Callon, 1986a) a matrix for categorization through which all potential and existing helper-shuttles must pass before they are labelled as strategic or non-strategic. An obligatory passage point can be described as something which creates an obstacle for actors to act freely, their road is blocked. The enactment of helper-shuttles must pass through the Kraljic matrix before any decisions on how to work with them are made.

The second perspective, on the contrary to the managerial, top-down perspective, is a more practical approach to the translations of the code i.e. the helper-shuttle assessment tools and processes. The translations are still clear, but when we meet Johanna and Viktor we see that how to work with these tools in practice is not at all straightforward. Here there is room for uncertainty and questions. Theory and practice don’t always match up and Johanna and Viktor both show signs of frustration. Their job involves taking the clear boundary management tool and using it on helper-shuttles. Doing so, however, demands interest and understanding from the helper-shuttle, wherefore they use the ten minimum criteria, another translation of the code. Also here we learn that the demands based on the code are often-times in contradiction with other demands that Corp places on their helper-shuttles, e.g. a 10 day lead time. The boundary management tool is no longer clear and simple, but rather also, a source of uncertainty. To deal with this, Johanna sees action plans as a recourse to establish a partnership, to help helper-shuttles in case there are any conflicts with the ten criteria.

Johanna and Victor both act an intermediary (Latour, 2005) though which a responsibility mind-set is manifested. Victor also acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) through which a risk-assessment mind-set is manifested.

The code does not always seem to fit, trade-offs need to be made, but it must be applied in the form of the assessment tool and the questions therein. Here the code
is, through its translation into an assessment tool, made into an obligatory passage point (Callon, 1986a). The Purple Booklet must be adhered to by signing an affidavit and ensuring compliance, even though there might be contradictions with other agreements.

**Summary of Analysis Room One**

The Code in room one goes through several translations, and shows signs of both stability and instability. The stable codes can here be seen as a management and control tools, similar to the approach in previous studies looking into the implementation of codes (e.g. Weaver, Treviño and Cochran, 1999). As previously noted, the code at Corp is implemented by demanding a receipt of compliance from management and employees. The monitoring and control involved in process of launching a code has also been previously noted (e.g. Wood et al. 2004).

What differs from previous studies is that we also see how this stability is achieved, and how it is dependent on several different actors for its success. What differs is also that we see instability, a kind of uncertainty. This instability, is managed in room one by acknowledging but downplaying the uncertainty and utilizing practical tools to solve the conflict. A lot of work is put down into upholding the network (Law, 2005) and resultantly, the code appears stable, and under control. However, this stability is dependent on the head of department, the proper use of inscription devices and employee commitment to the code. Following are the take-aways from the context of room one.

**The Code:**

(i)  Is translated into the material document - compliance statement (which is signed by all, but not necessarily liked).

(ii) Is powerful (thanks to a head of department who makes all employees sign the compliance statement and indicates sanctions for non-compliance).

(iii) Is dependent on head of department and employees buying into the implications, operationalizing the code into their daily work.

(iv) Is translated into an inscription device (to be used by sourcing employees in the form of the THSQP).

(v)  Translated into the material document – Ten Criteria (a simplification and explication directed to the helper-shuttles in the form of Corp’s ten minimum criteria).

(vi) Is straight forward but SIMULTANEOUSLY grounds for uncertainty

**Associated ideas:** stem from a reality which entails operationalization of visionary ideas. This operationalization is done based on risk-assessment, management-
control and efficiency mind-sets. The use of a rationalistic approach to the operationalization of the visionary ideas of the board is seen as robust but also practical.
ROOM TWO

(Presenting the audit tool)

In the summer of 2011, on the fourteenth of June, Tom and I travelled to Corp's sourcing department located in the Western-hub city of Charlesburg. We are welcomed by the sourcing department head, who introduced us to Jakob, he is a cosmic (global) sourcing engineer, meaning that he works with evaluating and selecting helper-shuttles from all parts of cosmos. Johanna and Viktor (who we met in room one) are also present during an informal lunch that we share in one of the many hub-cafeterias. After the lunch, when we've all presented ourselves, Tom and I are escorted into room 2, a conference room with tables placed in a U-shape with chairs along the table edges. On one end of the room, a large projection screen clad the entire wall. Jakob, Johanna and Viktor sit at one of the long ends of the table, while Tom and I seat ourselves across them, on the other end.

This is when Tom and I are introduced in detail to the auditing tools which are used in order to evaluate helper-shuttles. Viktor and Johanna work at the sourcing department in Charlesburg. This department belongs to division 1 of Corp. Let's call it D-One. Jakob works as a sourcing engineer at a different division in Charlesburg, division 2. Let's call it D-Two. However, they are all working together on trying to find the best way to translate the purple booklet into an audit tool (a set of questions to ask and evaluate helper-shuttles on). Although this has been done separately by both divisions, they are now trying to consolidate their tools to make one. They have agreed to a certain extent, although there are still vast differences between the documents that are used by D-One and D-Two. Depending on which division is doing the audit, the number of questions as well as the questionnaires, vary. D-One uses a set of three different questionnaires, one on quality, one of safety and health and one on environment. D-Two, uses one questionnaire where all these areas are combined. The questions are similar in nature, but the D-One questionnaire is more detailed in its questions. The D-Two questionnaire, however, comes with a manual in which there are additional, detailed questions which are meant to help an auditor do a more in-depth evaluation.

As our discussion proceeds, it becomes clearer that the D-Two tool is an example that is advised to be followed, although the extent to which it is to be followed, is not clear. Jakob works for D-Two, but he also works for the Corp Group on auditing issues and is supposed to support the different units in breaking down the code and finding uniform ways of working with helper-shuttle evaluations. This role seems to give his version of the audit tool power over the D-One version, as he insists that the D-Two tool is more suited to the entire Group. Johanna and Viktor seem to want to hang on to their own version, but accept that in this particular case the D-Two tool
wins. The reason for this is that Jakob is responsible for the planned audits in China where the audit tool is to be applied. Since he is in charge, his choice of audit tool is accepted, at least for now.

Jakob is in charge of the presentation today, and he starts with presenting the areas which have been standardized for all divisions, e.g. ‘the audit invitation letter’.

“The audit always begins with an audit invitation letter. We inform the helper-shuttle that we plan on visiting them.”

The following explication of the documents was done back at my office desk after Tom and I left Charlesburg.

**Audit Invitation**

The audit invitation is a six page document comprising of four distinct parts; (i) an introductory letter, (ii) Corp’s general criteria (iii) Corp’s ten minimum criteria, and (iv) an environmental self-assessment questionnaire.

(i) The first part is a letter, addressed to the helper-shuttle, informing them that representatives from the Corp crew will be visiting them at a specific date. There is also a short list of what a helper-shuttle and process-audit comprises of. This first part of the letter is signed by two Corp managers.

(ii) The second part of the audit invitation comprises of Corp’s general criteria on Business Partners in regards to business ethics, environment and social performance. This part of the audit invitation consist of one A4 page introducing the Corp group and their vision regarding passengers, business partners and ‘other stakeholders’. It states that Corp wants to achieve these visions by working with partners that share similar standards, and:

“This includes a commitment to being aware of and improving safety, health and environmental and social performance and encouraging learning and development through cooperation with local communities, i.e. sustainable development.”

---

21 Excerpt from audit invitation letter
Following the introduction and the group’s visions are three sentences which are direct excerpts from the Purple Booklet. All three relate to business partners. A description of these sentences follows:

1. The first sentence states that Corp has an endeavor to be the prioritized business associate to their business partners (helper-shuttles, subcontractors, agents and joint venture partners).
2. The second sentence briefly describes that Corp seeks partners whose ethical, social and environmental policies are in line with Corp’s policies.
3. The third sentence explains that business partners are impartially chosen on the basis of objective factors including quality, delivery, price, reliability, a commitment to environmental and social performance, and development.

Following the excerpt from the Purple Booklet is a statement explaining the purpose of the Purple Booklet as a document intended to support Corp’s implementation of policy regarding business ethics, social, safety, health and environmental performance. This is done by giving brief explanations of the Group’s basic expectations from their business partners.

The document also explains that there is a following list of ten minimum criteria (see point iii) which are based on the Purple Booklet, and the document also states that the Purple Booklet itself is based on specific international guidelines which are supported by the Corp Group; United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UNDHR), ILO’s Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (ILO), United Nations Global Compact (UNGC), and OECD’s guidelines for Multinational Enterprises (OECD).

Finally, the general requirements are outlined in three paragraphs stating that business partners such as helper-shuttles, subcontractors and agents are made aware of Corp’s commitments and expectations according to the Purple Booklet. Also, if helper-shuttles use subcontractors of their own, it is their responsibility to make sure that the entire supply chain complies with Corp’s requirements. National laws and regulations must be followed in the country of operation, and if any criteria in the Purple Booklet are in conflict with laws or regulations, the law must always be followed. If such a case occurs, the helper-shuttles must inform Corp before signing the audit invitation.

It appears from the text on general requirements that national laws and regulation would have precedence over the Purple Booklet, but the final and closing statement in the general requirements could add to certain confusion, as it states that:
“Corp requirements may go beyond the requirements set out in national law.”

Indicating that laws must be followed as a minimum, but Corp’s requirements must also be met, as long as these are not in conflict with laws and regulations.

(iii) The third part of the audit invitation comprises of Corp’s ten minimum criteria for helper-shuttles. These ten criteria are a specification of particular points taken from the international standards on which the purple booklet is based, but refer mostly to the UNGC. The ten criteria are described as Corp’s expectations from helper-shuttles in regards to business ethics, environment and social performance. Nine of the ten criteria refer to the Global Compact (GC), International Labor Organization (ILO), or OECD. The tenth commandment builds on a European Union program called EU-REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorization, and Restriction of Chemicals) Program.

The ten issues taken up in the document concern (1) respect of human rights (GC 1 and GC 2), (2) elimination of forced and compulsory labor (GC 4, ILO 29), (3) rejection of child labor (GC 5, ILO 138), (4) elimination of discrimination related to employment or occupation (GC 6, ILO 111), (5) safe and healthy working environment (ILO 115), (6) integrity (GC 10, OECD 9), (7) freedom of association and recognition of right to collective bargaining (GC 3, ILO 87), (8) initiatives to promote environmental responsibility (GC 8, OECD 5), (9) a precautionary approach to environmental challenges and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies (GC 7 and 9, OECD 5), and (10) compliance with the Corp prohibited and restricted list (REACH).

The language in the document is strict, bureaucratic and stringent implying that these are requirements the helper-shuttles must, have to or are required to follow. Each of the ten points in the minimum criteria list is explained in a short paragraph stating what is expected from the helper-shuttle.

The ten minimum criteria are presented in a firm, almost judicial manner, with an official tone stating clear demands of the helper-shuttles. See Table 12 below for examples of the language used when expectations are presented.
Table 12 - Excerpt from Ten Minimum Criteria

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>‘Have to support and respect human rights…/…/…and have to be able to confirm that….’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>‘Have to take necessary preventive measures to ensure….’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>‘Must support equal opportunities…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>‘Are required to make…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>‘Have to work against…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>‘Have to confirm their commitment to….’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>‘Have to confirm that…..’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>‘Should ideally have…/…/…or be committed to developing…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>‘Must conduct their business so that…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>‘Must confirm their compliance with….’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) The fourth and final part of the audit invitation consists of a self-assessment questionnaire. The questionnaire has a list of twenty questions concerning the helper-shuttles cosmic interference (environment). Sixteen of the questions have corresponding check-boxes for answers. Most of these answers can be ticked as either ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Four questions require more elaborate answers to be written out.

The questions inquire into whether the helper-shuttle has an ISO 14001 (or equivalent) certification, if yes how long till it expires, or if not, whether they have plans to get certified, and if so, when. The questions also ask of the helper-shuttle has an environmental policy and if there is an appointed person responsible for environmental issues, if yes, the name of the person is asked for, and whether he/she is part of the management.

Then the questionnaire asks whether the helper-shuttle has documentation showing that they fulfil local environmental laws and regulations, if they have documented objectives and plans for the reduction of environmental impact, and whether they inform and monitor subcontractors in their supply chain regarding environmental issues.

Four questions are asked regarding the use of chemicals. Whether if, and which if any chemicals from Corp’s restricted and prohibited list are used and if there is a plan to replace these, and whether there is a documented register of chemical usage regarding these chemicals.
Furthermore, the self-assessment questionnaire questions whether the company has a register of hazardous waste, whether they have an emergency plan and whether the company performs life cycle assessments of their products. Finally, questions are asked on whether the company uses a process regarding design for the environment, if they consider ‘end of life’ waste treatment when selecting materials and if the company considers the total environmental impact regarding their products.

**Helper-Shuttle Manual**

The helper-shuttles are, with a request for quotations, supposed to be sent a copy of a *Helper-shuttle Manual* (HSM), which is a 13-page document. The document includes general standards, requirements for different parts, and also describes

> “…expected behavior from the helper-shuttles in the daily communication regarding parts, components, drawings, corrective actions, environment, and etc…”

The HSM is categorized into seven major areas with sub-areas. The major areas consist of 1) an introduction, 2) Basic requirements for Corp helper-shuttles, 3) Helper-Shuttle behavior, 4) Spare Parts, 5) Invoice Management, 6) IT support, 7) Requirements and Standards.

The most detailed areas are 3) Helper-Shuttle behavior and 7) Requirements and Standards. Most of the areas in 3) are covered very briefly, with one or two sentences, but providing reference to specific links on Corp’s out-cloud webpage where the helper-shuttle representatives can read more about the specific requirements regarding e.g. quality assurance, design changes, non-complete deliveries, claim handling etc.

Under point 3) the HSM also describes what is expected of the helper-shuttles in terms of environmental behavior, and that is to preserve the environment by having an environmental management system in place and minimizing negative environmental effects. In relation to this, Corp’s prohibited and restricted list of chemicals (Based on the policies of several local and foreign regulations/directives such as EU REACH, RoHS, WEEE and CHINA RoHS)

---

22 Total Helper-Shuttle Quality Process Powerpoint 2010 (Document 2)

23 EU REACH stands for the European Union’s regulations concerning the registration, evaluation, authorisation and restriction of chemicals.

RoHS is a European Union directive restricting the use of heavy metals and flame retardants. The acronym stands for Restriction of Hazardous Substances.

WEEE is a European Union directive relating to electrical waste.

CHINA RoHS is a regulation put in place by the Chinese government, in order to control the use of certain materials.
Is referred to, and elaborated later under point 7). In the area of social and ethics, the HSM refers directly to Corp’s Purple Booklet and states that Corp expects helper-shuttles to share these values.

Point 7) takes up specific requirements regarding e.g. painting, welding, casting, forging, heat treatment, packing etc. and elaborates on prohibited and restricted chemicals and hazardous goods and chemicals. Links are provided to Corp’s prohibited and restricted list of chemicals. Prohibited chemicals are not allowed to be used, unless threshold values are provided. Prohibition does not apply if the substance occurs in unintentional impurities in concentrations lower than 0.1 percent of mass. The restricted chemicals are also allowed up to a threshold level of concentrations amounting to 0.1 percent of mass, but their use should be limited and the helper-shuttles need to have a plan to phase these out and find less hazardous alternatives.

Helper-shuttles are informed that they are responsible for providing Corp with an updated list of chemicals being used and informing Corp in case any changes are made in substances or brands of chemicals being used. Helper shuttles are also responsible for informing Corp if any of the parts they deliver to Corp are defined as hazardous goods by clearly marking such a shipment.

The helper-shuttle manual and the invitation letter exist in Chinese. But Jakob explains that the preferred language of the questions [in the helper-shuttle assessment] is English, to be able to compare and compile the results of different audits made at different times by different auditors. 24

**HSAG (Helper Shuttle Assessment Guidelines)**

Next Jakob presents the D-Two HSAG (Helper-Shuttle Assessment Guidelines). This document has been presented in Room 1 and the details regarding the document are the same. Jakob explains that the idea behind this document is that they want e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Indian, and Swede to be able to make the same assessment when conducting a helper-shuttle audit25.

Together with the HSAGs follows a corresponding excel sheet, with pre-programmed cells in which the auditor can enter scores on each of the areas being audited. A score of 0, 1, 2, or 3. In the excel sheet, the auditor also finds information on which areas are stopping parameters, as well as a short explanation (as a reminder, since it also exists in the HSAG) for what a 0,1,2 or 3 should correspond

---

24 Field notes from pre-audit discussion with Jakob and Johanna, 20110905
25 Notes from meeting at Corp Sweden, June 14 2011
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to e.g. on point 4. Social and Ethics, an orange highlight of the cell indicates that this is a stopping parameter. For each corresponding score it says:

0 – the helper-shuttle has NOT approved business ethics and social performance criteria for Corp business partners.

1 – The helper-shuttle has approved business ethics and social performance criteria for Corp business partners.

2 – The helper-shuttle has approved business ethics and social performance criteria for Corp business partners and is implementing some established ethical principles internally.

3 – The helper-shuttle has approved business ethics and social performance criteria for Corp business partners and is fully adopting established ethical principles and deploys them within the complete supply chain, upstream and downstream.

ANALYSIS ROOM TWO

Room two mainly presents documents, which were presented to me in a conference room at Corp’s sourcing department in Charlesburg. It became clear to me during the meeting where representatives from two different divisions were present, that there were at least two different versions of audit tools, the D-One and the D-Two. The role of Jakob, a D-Two sourcing engineer as project leader for the Corp Group auditing issues entailed that his version of the audit tool is the one that has been chosen to go to work in China. He also is responsible for conducting the planned audits in China, and his role as leader seems to be accepted by Johanna and Viktor who have worked on designing the D-One tool.

The different parts of the winning audit tool, the D-Two tool are analyzed below as two sets of translations of the Purple Booklet.

Two sets of translation: drawing together, explicating, and silencing actors

The code is through the documents presented in room 2, translated into and foreshadowed by two other sets of documents, one set for Corp crew to use during audits and a second set aimed for helper-shuttles to understand that they must comply with Corp’s requirements in order to do business with them.

Borrowing from Latour and Woolgar’s (1986) term inscription device, I call these two sets of translations, potential inscription devices, as they are intended to be picked up and used by different sourcing engineers and auditors working with
suppliers as well as different suppliers, but we cannot yet say how they are actually used.

Both sets of materials draw together several actors, although we cannot say at the moment if they will be mediating or not.

The materials drawn together for the two potential inscription devices differs in that the material intended for Corp’s employees is formal and compressed into two actors, one document, the HSAG and one corresponding excel macro with reference to the areas covered in the HSAG with corresponding cells for score setting. The excel sheet can be printed out and filled in manually but for the macro to tabulate total scores and indicate stopping parameters, it must be filled in directly into the software, on a computer. The HSAGs are enacted (Law and Mol, 2008) by Jakob as a comparative measurement tool to be able to make the same assessments around the globe.

Looking at the materials aimed at the helper-shuttles, we see that these are more disperse, the audit invitation letter and the helper-shuttle manual contain a lot of information. These documents together describe the demands that Corp has on them, what they must comply with and to a certain extent provides links and references to source material where the helper-shuttles can find more information regarding the demands. The material intended for the helper-shuttle draws together many of the same actors as the material intended for employees, but keeps them separated in different documents. One of these document, ‘Corps ten minimum criteria’ e.g. draws in international actors such as ILO, GC, OECD and REACH though reference to policies, conventions and recommendations created in these governing bodies. This material is only in the form of documents. It seems more work has been put down into aligning potential inscription device 1, whereas potential inscription device 2 is messier. The documents indicate that the helper-shuttles have a lot of responsibility, in terms of keeping track of national laws, usage of chemicals, different international standards, and Corp’s code. The language used in potential inscription device 2 is authoritative and demanding.

The figure (Figure 9) below illustrate the code being foreshadowed by two sets of materials (potential inscription devices) as analyzed by me though interaction with these documents. The next two figures show which actors are drawn together into these potential inscription devices. The purple booklet is enacted (Mol and Law, 2008a) in both inscription devices but result in different conglomerations of actors.
In the illustrations below you see the material actors enacted in the two sets of potential inscription devices. The first (Figure 10) draws together material actors for the auditor and the sourcing department to use in order to carry out the THSQP (their part of applying the code in sourcing, i.e. responsibly sourcing). The second (Figure 11) draws together material actors for helper-shuttles to use (in order to comply with Corp’s idea of what a responsible helper-shuttle is). Both figures 10 and 11, showing the two potential inscription devices, can be found on the following page.
Figure 10 - Potential Inscription Device 1 - Displaying Stability

Figure 11 - Potential Inscription Device 2 - Displaying Messiness
All actors are potential mediators (Latour 2005), but here they are static intermediaries (Latour 2005), we do not know yet whether and how they might be translated. The purple booklet, however, has been enrolled (Callon, 1986a) into Corp’s ten minimum criteria, by reference to e.g. OECD, UNGC, ILO and EU REACH. Changes have occurred in this translation from Purple Booklet to Ten minimum criteria. As an example, it can been seen in Table 12 on page 137, the language used when informing the helper-shuttles of the demands placed on them in Corp’s ten criteria, is strict and clear. This contrasts with the way helper-shuttles are referred to in the purple booklet, where it says that “We want the best helper shuttles and select them impartially based on factors such as their productivity, delivery, reliability, price, quality and commitment to cosmic development” and “We inform helper-shuttles of our commitments and expect them to abide” The comparison of the language used in the ten criteria and the Purple booklet suggests that the two documents have been formulated for different audiences. The 10 criteria explicitly talk to business partners, particularly helper-shuttles, whereas the Purple booklet is informing those who potentially might be interested in Corp, most probably addressing the Marions. Similar findings have been noted by Preuss (2010) indicating that coercive aspects of code implementation often are buried in lower-level documents.

Two sets of documents were introduced in room 2. The result is potential inscription device 1 (PID 1) for use by Corp crew members and potential inscription device 2 (PID 2) for use by helper-shuttle personnel.

The set of documents involved in PID1 are translations of the code for the purpose of use by Corp crew members when auditing helper-shuttles. Auditors use the HSAG with questions and comments and suggestions for probing along with guidelines on how to grade the issue in order to assess the helper-shuttle on various areas of concern. Along with the HSAG they have a corresponding excel sheet in which is meant to help in the score-setting. As illustrated in figure 5, the enrolled actors are tightly connected in the sense that, with one computer, with the office package or similar, containing excel and word software, an auditor can do his or her job. The HSAG exist as a word document and the macro for score-setting in excel. The potential inscription device is ready for use.

The actors in PID 2, on the other hand, are more scattered, they are in the form of documents with standards, signatures, and regulatory bodies. For this potential inscription device to function, Corp managers, as well as personnel from the helper-shuttles must be on board. Also, the amount of information that a user of this potential inscription device needs to keep a track of, is quite extensive. The information included here, is also continuously being updated e.g. the EU reach program where new substances and chemicals are listed regularly. The ISO standard
is also updated every several years. PID 2, therefore, does not lend itself relatively as easily to be immediately put to use.

Another way of indicating importance of the areas covered is by using stopping parameters, if the helper-shuttle does not get a passing grade on these questions, they're out no matter what they score on the other parts. All of the three questions on business ethics, social and environmental criteria are stopping parameters. Four other areas also have stopping parameters, ownership, risk management, quality performance of deliveries, and financial evaluation. Quality is both the area which is spent most time on and has a stopping parameter, it is definitely highly prioritized.

**Summary of Analysis Room Two**

The purple booklet is enacted in two sets of documents, one for sourcing crew and the other for helper-shuttles, resulting in two potential inscription devices. The purple booklet itself becomes a background of reference material for the new translations, which come to the foreground. The translations show that the code is not the same for everyone; it entails different demands and different translations for different groups for which different responsibilities are outlined though these documents. Different actors are prominent in the 2 potential inscription devices. In the translated material intended for Corp employees, the actors are more compact, and their purposes are defined. The documents for the helper-shuttles are many, and although they are put together physically into two documents, 1) the audit invitation and 2) the helper-shuttle manual, they explicate many different sets of actors. The complexity of this potential inscription device is larger. On the contrary, PID 1, which is a translation for crew, reduces complexity by tightly aligning evaluation criteria, stopping parameters, and an excel macro to help auditors. Following are the take-aways from the document analyses in room two:

**The code:**

(i) Is translated into a potential inscription device for auditors (reducing complexity, gives appearance of stability).

(ii) Is translated into a potential inscription device for helper-shuttles (authoritative in language, messy, and complex, and appears less stable).

(iii) Is not the same for employees and suppliers, but rather very different.

(iv) Translations are dependent on future users in order to survive (their survival will depend on acceptance and usage by auditors and by helper-shuttle representatives respectively).

**Associated ideas:** seem to stem from a further separation between stakeholders. Suppliers are supposed to be told what to do and therefore tools are created to help
Corp employees tell the suppliers what to do, as well as tools, which help the suppliers understand what it is Corp wants them to do. Suppliers are to be instructed, controlled, evaluated, and constantly monitored.
**ROOM THREE**

(On site preparations for an Audit)

Room three is located in a hotel-shuttle near the Eastern-wing hub city of Corp China, called Ewing. In September of 2011, Tom and I took a shuttle towards the East side of cosmos, the travel time was approximately fourteen earth-hours. Two Corp crew members from the Charlesburg sourcing department are also here. They are in the East to meet with representatives of a special helper-shuttle called Jianco, for a chapter 1 audit and Jakob will be using PID 1 for conducting this audit. Jianco has been working with supplying Corp with cylinders that are highly important to their production of mechanical equipment.

**Meeting the Auditors**

Johana and Jakob, the crew members from the Charlesburg sourcing department arrive at the hotel-shuttle during the afternoon and Tom and I have planned to meet with them in Room 3, the hotel lobby to have a chat about how they have planned the upcoming audit with helper-shuttle Jianco.

Jakob will be in charge of the audit tomorrow and he tells us that he has prepared for the audit by:

1. Checking up the status on the helper-shuttle, Jianco by talking to the Ewing sourcing crew who have regular contact with Jianco and sending an audit invitation letter. Jakob has been informed that Ewing has been having quality and delivery related issues with Jianco. He has also been informed that it is on Corp’s agenda to look for a new cylinder helper-shuttle. Below is an excerpt from our discussion.

   Jakob: /…/ an audit invitation letter has been sent to the helper-shuttle which they need to sign.

   I ask who signs this document and Jakob replies “Good question. We want someone who can represent the company to sign. Often it is a management representative who also stamps the document with a company stamp. But then there are also helper-shuttles who say ‘did we forget to sign?’ then we ask them ‘read it through and then sign it’. These are things that can distinguish serious helper-shuttle from a less serious helper-shuttle. We usually look through the
document together. When we later sign global contracts with the helper-shuttle the conditions are tougher. This (audit invitation letter) is more of a receipt that they have received the document.”

Maira: This [Jianco] is an existing helper-shuttle with quality problems. Is that the reason behind the audit?

Jakob: They are a large helper-shuttle to us in China, and deliver an important component. We are supposed to do follow-up audits regularly. But we are also considering another helper-shuttle and want to have a point of reference. We are, however, quiet towards the helper-shuttle. We are looking at other helper-shuttles who already deliver to Corp in Sweden and India.

Johanna: But the choice of helper-shuttle is also a consequence of discussions with Ewing about what would be a suitable helper-shuttle for you [the researchers] to come along to.

Jakob: if we had chosen a regular welding helper-shuttle it wouldn’t have given you [the researchers] very much. Jianco are expected to be aware of what we are looking for and [we] put up an activity plan on points [in the audit checklist] that are not completely fulfilled. If we had chosen a company with 25 employees, they don’t have their own corporate code. In such cases we suggest that they use our code.

(ii) Doing a background check on the financial situation of Jianco by printing a D&B (Dun and Bradstreet) report. This report can indicate risks and can be used as a basis to pose questions on the audit (point 10 in the assessment macro). The D&B report, Jakob explains, allows them to discuss the helper-shuttles costs and investments, but also gives him some basic information about the helper-shuttle (he shows us the document) for example that their unit is 160 00 m² and that they have between 700 and 800 employees. He tells us that Corp has previously helped helper-shuttles financially and that those are situations they would like to avoid in the future. “We want to have financially sound helper-shuttles”. Jakob adds that the helper shuttle’s answers to questions during the audit can be checked against the

---

26 From field notes during pre-audit discussion with Jakob and Johanna
D&B report and that they tell the helper-shuttles that they have printed a
D&B report. Jakob has also printed reference material on Chinese law.

Jakob: We have also printed a guide on Chinese law (which
also exists for India). [It is] good, because we know [from
the guide] which documents to ask [the helper-shuttle] for
e.g. the pollution control board in India which the company
must have a certificate from. Corp is part of a network with
others [Name of company a] …Green chain, where we pay
for these types of summaries [compiled guides on laws and
regulations]… We also use a risk analysis tool, a matrix
(country, size of the company – classified according to
corruption etc.). If it is a small company in China, the risk is
high. It [the risk analysis tool] gives us a risk summation.
The tool is easy to use. I was completely salvaged but don’t
know if it has changed the way I do the audits. It is good to
have in the back of one’s head.

(iii) Based the background work that Jakob has done, he sets Corp’s agenda for
the upcoming audit. Setting the agenda involved deciding which docu-
ments to hand over to the helper-shuttle and deciding which questions in the
HSAG were applicable at this specific audit.

The documents Jakob has prepared include Corp’s 10 minimum-criteria, the Purple
booklet, a manual with direct guidelines, a list with prohibited and restricted
chemicals, and a helper-shuttle manual and a document on hydraulic items
specifications (specifically for this helper-shuttle). The prohibited and restricted list
is based on directives from EU (REACH document) and other directives, but in
order to be able to give the helper-shuttles one document, Jakob has printed an up to
date version of this list. The list is only valid at the time it is printed, because
changes keep occurring continuously. Johanna adds that it is the helper-shuttles’
responsibility to stay up to date with the information on Corp’s webpage where for
example an updated version of their prohibited and restricted list can be found.

Jakob and I talked about how he went about deciding which questions in the HSAG
are applicable and which to skip. Our conversation touches upon this process
relating both to audits in general and this specific audit:

Maira: Do you change the audit for every new auditing
occasion and helper-shuttle?
Jakob: We want it to be the same from one time to the next.
But what happens [at the audit] depends more on whom you
get to meet [from the helper-shuttle]. Sometimes it depends
on the person and not the company. The shuttles’ commitment and attention is, as a rule of thumb, strongest before a business relationship.

Maira: will you adapt the audit tomorrow?
Jakob: Yes, but more in a way to see what can be gone through quickly and then move forward on the list. Here we will be looking more at SHE [short for Safety, Health, and Environment] and Q [short for Quality]. We will take up [the point on] ownership [on the checklist] only to ease up the discussion, it is otherwise easy to obtain information through other channels. Some of the other points are more difficult to tackle, e.g. management. How do you ask questions about the leadership (to managers or subordinates)? It is not really possible [to ask] directly, so we have to use organizational charts, business plans etc. Otherwise, it is difficult to ask. It is one of the hardest points.

Jakob also touches upon the parts in the audit tool that he will be crossing out for this audit. These include the areas related to after-market. He explains that the Corp purchasers in Ewing have ongoing discussions with Jianco on this issue and wants to leave it to them. Another reason is to win time. He believes after-market issues are generally becoming more and more complex.

Finally, Jakob informs us that he has contacted two Ewing sourcing employees who will be joining for the audit. This, Jakob explains is in the case that the Jianco crew does not speak English, but also as an opportunity to train the Ewing sourcing crew in how to conduct audits. Lee and Jing are the two sourcing employees from Ewing who will be joining the planned audit.

Meeting the Chinese Speaking Auditors in Training

It is the morning of September the 6th, 2011. Tom and I have together with Johanna and Jakob boarded a fast-track shuttle that is to take us from the Ewing area to a concentrated helper-shuttle district located approximately two earth-hours further east. It is in this industrious district that Jianco has its production of hydraulic cylinders which are vital for Corp’s production of machine equipment.

With us on board the fast-track shuttle are also two crew members from Corp in Ewing, Lee and Jing. Both Jing and Lee work at the Ewing sourcing department.

It’s 9:06 in the morning, approximately an hour before we will arrive at helper-shuttle Jianco’s station. These are the last few minutes before the Corp crew will meet with Jianco representatives and Jakob asks Lee and Jing, “Have you been on site at this helper-shuttle’s station?”
Lee responds affirmatively, “many times.”

Jing is a relatively new crew member; he’s only been on-board Corp for about three earth-months and it’s the first time he’s accompanying his colleagues on a helper-shuttle audit. He listens in and lets Lee, who is much more experienced in dealing with helper-shuttles and conducting audits, do the talking.

“Lee”, Says Jakob, “if you want to speak up during the audit, you’re welcome to.”

Lee nods his head. Lee is confident in these settings. He speaks Chinese which is a great asset in the districts we’re traveling in, and he has already conducted seventeen helper-shuttle audits during this year.

**ANALYSIS ROOM THREE**

This pre-audit meeting in room three takes place at a hotel in China and through Tom and my discussion with Jakob and Johanna we learn that there are several reasons for the planned audit at Jianco. Firstly, Corp is supposed to do follow up audits regularly, so according to policy (THSQP) it was time to do an audit.

*New Actors Enter the Stage*

However, a second reason is that Corp is considering a new cylinder helper-shuttle and want a point of reference, in order to compare this new potential helper-shuttle with Jianco. The third reason for this audit, is that it was deemed an interesting audit for us, Tom and myself, to observe. Jakob expects Jianco to be aware of what they will be looking for and asking at the audit, and this is seen as an advantage. A fourth purpose with this audit is to train Chinese sourcing crew in how to do audits. The audit will be carried out by Swedish global sourcing expert, Jakob, but is a training opportunity for Lee and Jing. Johanna has joined the audit in order to learn how the D-two tool works.

A new set of actors are added into this setting in practice when a helper-shuttle is to be audited according to the THSQP (See Figure 12 below). The THSQP is now only one of four reasons for why this audit is planned to be executed. We still do not know what role the actors might play during the actual audit though; only that new actors are a part of the pre-audit situation. So far, they are all intermediaries.
A large part of the pre-audit preparation is in some manner related to preparing, attaining, or analyzing documents. Either Corp documents which are prepared to hand over to Jianco or documents which can help Jakob understand Jianco, and make a risk analysis of the company. This means that Jakob has studied key figures for Jianco before he visits them.

Last but not least, having Ewing crew on board is important both because they have detailed knowledge of the helper-shuttle and for their training in conducting audits. Jakob is supposed to train the Chinese sourcing engineers, and the Chinese sourcing engineers give Jakob information about Jianco which he needs in order to do this audit.

Jakob is a central actor here (see Figure 13 on the following page) and has both a mediator (Latour, 2005) role in setting the agenda and is an enrolling (Callon, 1986a) actor in that he mobilizes support through building alliances with other actors, as a preparation for the audit. Several documents have been prepared and others reviewed to make sure he has information on the helper-shuttle that is going to be audited. The Ewing sourcing crew seem to play the role of an intermediary...
supplying Jakob with information and updates on Jianco’s quality and delivery. The visualization below shows Jianco as a silenced actor (Callon, 1986) as they are not active participants in this ongoing organizing around and about them. Furthermore, Jianco as an organization is represented here through Jakob’s knowledge based on figures, risk-analyses, statistics, specifications, and Corp’s policies. The Ewing sourcing crew has sent out an audit invitation letter which they believe should have arrived at Jianco.

**Figure 13 - Mobilization and Enrollement of Actors Concentrates Power**

The arrows in the illustration show the direction of flow of information as observed in the pre-audit discussion. Jakob seems, here to be a powerful actor, in that he has built many allies. Jianco, as an organization is enrolled (Callon, 1986a) in the discussion, but as a silenced actor. Jakob is powerful, also, because he is present and he tells the story of the preparation that he has done.

**Summary of Analysis Room Three**

The purple booklet is not a prominent actor during the audit preparations; it is rather other actors, including translations of the purple booklet that appear prominent here. Following are the take-aways from the document analyses in room three.
The code:

(i) Is one of four reasons why the audit is conducted (is competing with concerns regarding quality comparisons between suppliers, training of new auditors, and what is appropriate to show researchers)

(ii) Is present in the form of an altered inscription device 1 (as certain questions are skipped at certain audits)

(iii) Is present in the form of potential inscription device 2 - a number of documents, which Jakob prepared in order to hand over Jianco (including the Purple Booklet, two manuals, an up-to date list of restricted and prohibited chemicals and Corp’s ten criteria in the form of the audit invitation letter).

(iv) Is highly dependent on Jakob.

Associated ideas: seem to stem from a reliance on the support of different policies and documents including translations of the code.
At a few minutes to 10:00 a.m. on the 6\textsuperscript{th} of September, 2011, we (Johanna, Jakob from the sourcing department in Charlesburg, Lee, Jing from the Ewing sourcing department and Tom and I) arrive at the station in the eastern industrial district where Jianco is situated. A driver from Jianco picks us up in one of Jianco’s own private transport shuttles and takes us to Jianco, about twenty earth-minutes form the station.

It is very clear from the surroundings that we are in an industrial area with many factories. The air is thick with smog and emissions, and there are small workshops scattered along the side-lanes of our route. Once we turn onto a wider path, many helper-shuttle factories become visible in the distance. There seems to be much going on in this area, and many new shuttles are under production, so there is a lot of construction going on. Jianco is one of these shuttles. We get out of the transport shuttle and can see there is still some construction going on, on Jianco’s premises, and the first thing Jakob explains to us that it is very important to separate the construction work going on (where external contractors are employed by Jianco) and Jianco’s own production. Corp’s representatives are here to audit Jianco, and not the relations they have with external contractors. I notice that the construction workers seem to be working under precarious circumstances, high up in the air, not all wearing helmets. But Jakob demarcates a boundary as to what concerns Corp’s representatives and what falls outside this realm. The construction workers conditions are not Corp’s concern.

Jianco’s regional sales manager, Rob meets us outside the shuttle, hands us all yellow helmets, and escorts us to a conference room on the second floor of a large building. The regional manager does not speak English. Jakob realizes that he’s going to need help from Lee, and asks him to translate.

At 10:05 we are all sitting in the conference room and Rob starts a power point presentation with slides in English, presenting Jianco. There are slides on the history of the helper-shuttle, their revenue, customers etc. During the presentation Jakob asks questions which need to be translated by Lee. Lee discusses some of the
questions with Rob and then responds, but responds directly to some of the questions. Jing also responds to some of the questions directly.

Jakob tells Lee that he wants to take a tour of the factory as soon as possible, so after Rob is done with his presentation we take a tour of the factory.

Jianco’s factory, where different hydraulic parts are produced is located on the ground-floor of the shuttle. Jakob wanted to see the factory and the production of cylinders with his own eyes. He specifically wanted to have a look at the chroming plant and the testing of the cylinders. The chroming plant is where the cylinders are treated with chrome in order to give them a harder surface, making the cylinders less susceptible to all kinds of cosmic exposure such as rust and corrosion. Chroming the surface of the cylinders also eases cleaning. The testing of the cylinders is crucial and Corp demand 100% testing. The cylinders are here exposed to maximum pressure tests in order to test their resilience.

Rob escorted the six of us, Johanna, Jakob, Lee, Jing, Tom and myself, to the bottom floor and instructed us to put on the yellow helmets we had received earlier during the day. Since only Lee speaks the Chinese dialect spoken by Rob, he acts as translator between the regional manager and Jakob, who is in charge of asking the questions. Johanna is interested in what the common areas look like, and makes a detour to the washroom and kitchen area. The rest of us observe our surroundings and tag along.

The factory is huge, and divided into working areas and lines of production demarcated by yellow lines painted onto the floor. We are instructed to walk outside the lines. Within each set of demarcating lines is a specific production process for the production of cylinders. There are machines connected to the railing in the roof. An intricate system of pipes and tubes run across the ceiling. Workers with blue shirts and pants are standing at the different stations, working with the machines; assembling parts, welding, testing and painting. Following is an excerpt from my notes exemplifying the interaction between Jakob, Lee and Rob looked like.

Jakob asks Lee: Is this where our cylinders are produced?
Lee responds: Parts of our cylinders, yes.
Jakob looks around him and points at things and asks Lee: What is this one? I want to know what this chart is.
Lee asks Rob who explains to him in Chinese, and then translates to English to answer Jakob’s question: These are the operating steps”
Jakob asks: How do they fill in the chart?
Lee responds: If everything’s ok they just sign it.
Jakob continues with questions: How do they know how many pieces to produce?

Lee translates Jakob’s questions to Chinese, and asks Rob, who does his best to answer the questions. He works with sales, not with the production, so his knowledge is sometimes limited, Lee explains. But most of the information Jakob wants is plotted on large whiteboards near the working stations. These whiteboards can be likened with large, two by two meter charts with text and numbers. Some things are written in English, but most are written in Chinese, so Lee translates what the charts say.

The chart for figures on accidents shows a timeline with dates and corresponding numbers. This chart, like the others shows a short summary in English at the bottom. This one says:

“120 days without any loss time due to injuries. Most days without loss time due to injuries = 8888”

On the monthly timeline on the top end of the chart, the month June is marked with a yellow cross and a number ‘1’, indicating that this is when the most recent injury took place. All other months are marked with a green cross.

I look around and see busy men all around me, some are wearing helmets and large boots, probably in order to protect them if something were to loosen from the ceiling. It does not seem probable to me that a plastic helmet would help very much in such a case. Some of the men are wearing more protective gear, in the form of gloves, protective gear for their ears and goggles. For a moment, I lose my focus fascinated by all the activity going on around me, and only when Tom nudges me in the arm, I realize that we’re moving on from the charts to the surface-treatment plant located at a far end of the factory. This is where the chroming of the cylinders is done.

We walk into the corner of the room and see two men standing with their hands in a pool of black liquid. The pool is of a rectangular shape, about two meters long and sixty centimeters wide. The pool is firmly standing on four legs, elevated about a meter from the floor. These men have even more safety gear, in the form of masks covering their mouth and nose.

I walk a little closer to see what they’re doing with their hands in the pool, and see that they seem to be scrubbing a piece of cylindrical metal which has been inserted into the pool. I can hear Jakob talking to Lee in the background, “I’d like to see the description of the chemicals”. And then he turns to Johanna and tells her in Swedish,
“They told me they’re using trivalent chrome, and that’s not as dangerous as hexavalent chrome.”

I take a few steps back from the pool, toward the rest of the group and notice a machine that looks like a large oven behind the black pool of liquid. My attention is flitting between all there is to see and wondering what all these things are and any conversation that might be going on between Jakob and Lee or Jakob and Johanna.

Before I’ve been able to make sense of all the impressions it’s time to move on to the testing area. Jakob wants to inspect the tests done on the cylinders that Corp is buying from Jianco. Rob escorts us through the pedestrian lanes between all the yellow-marked work stations on to the testing area. There are seven table-tops with cylinders on, machines with tubes of different sorts are connected to the cylinders and we are told to keep a distance from the tables. Judging by the size of the rest of the plant, the testing area is relatively small, something that Jakob finds suspicious. He asks Lee, “is this where they’re testing our cylinders?” And Lee talks to the regional manager in Chinese and then responds, “No, this isn’t it.” Several ideas float through my head at this point and I wondered, did the Jianco representatives not understand what Jakob wanted to see, did Lee have problems with the translations, or did they perhaps want to show Jakob something that looked better than what he had asked to see? It’s hard to say, but all options seemed plausible.

Jakob seems critical and aware, demanding explanations. We walk out of the testing area and around the rest of the factory to a new room. Lee says this is where the Corp cylinders are tested. The regional manager picks up his phone and calls someone. “We demand 100% tests on our cylinders!” Jakob exclaims, as we walk towards the new testing area. This area is huge compared to the previous testing area. Jakob wants to have a closer look at some of the testing machines but this area is dangerous and we are all instructed to keep a safe distance from any machines. “How do the workers know which pressure to test what cylinders with?” Jakob asks.

Lee translates back and forth, “they have a check-list.” He responds.

After the tour of the factory we break for lunch, where after we reconvene in the conference room on the second floor. Jakob informs Rob in English, relying on Lee to translate:

“We’ll carry out a helper-shuttle audit based on a checklist. Tomorrow we will sum up the discussion and discuss an activity plan for improvements. If you are not able to answer directly, you can give me the answers later on this afternoon or tomorrow morning. Call
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other people if it is necessary. We can wait. For some of our questions we will ask for documents.”

After the introduction, Jakob proceeded to asking questions about Jianco’s management. A lot of time during the audit was spent trying to get the right people, or right documents in place. People were constantly entering and leaving the room. Below is an excerpt of what a discussion between Jianco representatives and Jakob, looked like. Since no one form Jianco seemed to speak English, and Jakob did not speak Chinese, Lee had again been asked to translate. Lee sometimes translated but other times answered the questions directly.

Jakob starts off with a key question. He knows that they have been having delivery problems related to Jianco, and he also knows that they have had some issues regarding design changes on the cylinders which they have been buying. He wants to know what this is about.

Jakob: Are our cylinders welded in this friction welding machine, or are they welded by other methods?
Lee: Yes.
Jakob: Perhaps we can take a look at the machine later?
Lee: [Talks to Rob in Chinese].
Rob: [Speaks Chinese].
Lee: Our cylinder is defined by them as special.
Jacob: Because of the low volumes or the small sizes?
Rob: [Speaks Chinese].
Lee: Both.
Jakob: Are our cylinders produced in the normal procedure?
Lee: I think it is normal.
Rob: [Speaks Chinese].
Lee: It is normal.
Jacob: So on which capacity are you running? The utilization of the capacity? Are they running on 70% or 100 %?
Lee: [Speaks to Rob in Chinese].
Rob: [Speaks to Lee in Chinese].
Lee: Half.
Jakob: On 50%? How can they have delivery problems to us then? We send them forecasts, we should have better delivery from them.
Jakob to Jing: They say that they can increase the volume with 50% if it is needed and still they have delivery problems to us, we need to look into that.
Rob to Lee: [Speaks Chinese].
Lee: Because it is a totally new factory and they need to buy some new equipment, so I think in the near future the delivery will be better.
Jakob moves on, he asks about the invitation letter (which had been sent to Jianco prior to the audit) including the self-assessment questionnaire which Jianco was to fill in and hand back to him. They haven’t filled in the self-assessment questionnaire and Jakob seems frustrated as he cannot get through to the helper-shuttle representatives. He explains that it is very important that he gets the self-assessment filled and thereby Corp’s ten criteria signed by them. So he brought this up again, and he also wanted to discuss specific issues concerning the work environment related to the use of chrome which was used in the production of the cylinders that we saw being coated during the production tour. At this time, the quality manager (Kim) from Jianco is present in the room.

Jakob: This is the invitation letter we have sent to you; in this we have 10 principals in our invitation. This needs to be read through and signed. Can you explain that Lee?
Lee: [Speaks Chinese].
Jakob: So I want you to read it through and then [get it] signed by someone who can represent Jianco.
Lee: [Speaks Chinese].
Kim: Hmm, hmmm.
Jakob: So we need to have this back before we can close the audit.
Lee: [Speaks Chinese].
Jakob: I would like to inform you about one thing in this invitation letter. It is the restricted and prohibited list; it is the list that I just want to start by asking if they are aware of Corp’s prohibited and restricted list, Lee? We have sent them the 10 principals; I would like to hear if they have read this.
Lee and Kim have a discussion in Chinese.
Lee: Yes, they have.
Jakob: So they have read it, and made sure that there and no [restricted or prohibited] chemicals in the process or the product?
Kim: [Speaks Chinese].
Lee: Yes they have.
Jakob: They are aware of the list, so they are not using hexavalent chromium?
Lee: No.
Jakob: We are still waiting for the specifications on what kind of chrome they are using.
Lee: [Speaks Chinese].
Kim: [Speaks Chinese].
Lee: [Speaks Chinese].
Kim: [Speaks Chinese].
Lee: So maybe there is some problem [with] this chemical material.
Jakob: But they can explain to me what is in the chemical.
Lee: It is 6 +
Jakob: Then they have not read the list, I’m not saying it is a problem but they have not informed me about this.
Jakob [Speaks in Swedish] (directed towards Johanna, Tom and myself): it’s not a problem, all producers use it but it means that the chemical pool is extremely poisonous.

Lee: Plus 6, so do we need to see the specifications?

Jakob: No, I just needed to know if it is +3 or +6. Now what they need to do is review this and sign this and give it back to us before tomorrow.

Jakob shows signs of stress and frustration at several times during the audit, he expresses some of his feelings in Swedish so only Johanna, Tom and I, can understand what he says. For example, he says, “I want them to speak English, even if it is not perfect. There seems to be more in this than the short answers tell us.”

Another pertinent issue during the audit was that during Jianco’s presentation of their company it came up that in terms of the turnover in the contract with Corp, Corp was a relatively small customer; about 1% of the helper-shuttle’s turnover. There are other large Western and Eastern space crafts which Jianco contracts to and supplies parts to and these other space crafts, larger in terms of turnover for Jianco, seem to be much more prioritized as customers. This seems to be a problem for both Jianco and Corp. Jakob reasoned for example that as, “we have the same requirements as the other customers, we should be treated in the same way” and seemed rather frustrated. He explained the problem he felt as follows, “The problem we have [had] these two days is that they were not fully prepared and they were not giving us the full attention that is necessary in order to do a really good audit.”

On a Hotel Shuttle Near Jianco

Since the audit was planned to take two days, Corp has arranged for our lodging on a small hotel-shuttle nearby Jianco. On the morning of Wednesday the 6th of September, 2011, Tom and I get ready for breakfast and walk down into the dining hall, adjacent to the hotel lobby, where breakfast is served. I try to fill my plate with an assortment of sea food and sit down at a table across Jakob. Jakob and I chatted informally and as I asked about the continuation of the audit, Jakob informed me that he would have to make some amendments. He seemed stressed about time. He explained that Corp-Ewing had sent out a team of experts who were to join us during this second day of the audit. The team was not working specifically on the audit, they were a specialized team of technicians and they had been send to Jianco to deal with technical specifications regarding some designs. However, it seemed as if Jakob thinks that this can add to the audit, giving more insights into some of the problems that Corp has had with Jianco.

The team of technicians comprises of Rick from Charesburg and three technicians from Ewing. They meet us at the hotel and we all take cabs to Jianco together.
Jakob, Johanna, Tom and I are in one car and it seems at this point that Jakob is uncertain how this new team might affect the audit and he seems frustrated as he was not made aware that Ewing was sending out this team to Jianco during the time of the audit

*Back in the Conference Room on Board Jianco, Day Two of Audit*

On the 7th of September, on the second day of the audit, now a group of ten persons, we escort ourselves through to Jianco’s second-floor. Here we split up, and Jakob, Johanna, Lee, Jing, Tom and I enter into the same conference room as we were in yesterday while Rick and his team keep walking through the corridor on to another meeting room.

Jakob has certain follow up questions to ask, but it takes time to get the right people from Jianco’s side involved. Jing uses his phone to call the people Jakob wants to talk to, and there is a constant running in and out of people who answer their phones, run out to fetch documents and randomly seem to enter and exit the conference room. The first hour in the conference room was extremely chaotic. Soon after we arrived, a Chinese woman who supposedly spoke English entered the room. When she was asked by Jakob if she represented the R&D department she said yes, but was corrected by Lee, “she’s from the sales department”. Her mobile phone rang and she answered. The first hour proceeded in that manner. The wrong people appeared, mobile phones rang, documents were missing, computers and projectors were out of order and people continuously left and entered the conference room.

Corp was now having two parallel meetings with Jianco representatives, and it seems that people were running between the two conference-rooms to be able to cater to both groups. It was a mess.

When the right people were in the room, Jakob tried to ask the questions that he needed answers to or documents that were required in order to grade Jianco according to the audit tool. Quality problems were one of the reasons why this audit had been initiated at this specific time, and today quality was one of the main themes. Although the other group from Corp is supposedly discussing quality issues, Jakob sticks to his agenda and puts a lot of focus on quality. So when the quality manager was finally in the conference room, Jakob tried to have a, mediated by Lee, conversation with him. But many times, Jakob received answers directly from Lee.

Jakob: This point is very important; do you have any system in place when you make changes in the design because we have had changes from [Jianco]?
Lee: I want to explain to you that this has happened once.
Jakob: Yes, I know.
Lee: I know that the answers cannot satisfy us so I will ask them also.
Lee and Kim: [Discuss in Chinese for a couple of minutes].
Lee: They have it [a system].
Jakob: But they are not following this for us.
Lee: Yes.
Jakob: I want you to inform them that this is serious; they need to follow our set process.
Lee and Kim: [Discuss in Chinese for a couple of minutes].
Lee: It is already done; I have this planned for them.
Jakob: All the deviations from the specifications will be sent back as a claim, they need to follow the specifications, nothing else is allowed.
Lee: I think they have corrected this already.
Jakob: Ok.

The dialogue about quality problems, which was intended to be a discussion between the quality manager and Jakob, ended up as two discussions: one between Jakob and Lee and the other one between Lee and Kim. Lee seems to not just be translating between Jianco’s quality manager and Jakob, but also acting as a negotiator between them.

Jakob proceeded to questions about social and ethical issues, questions about the working hours per day, ear-plugs, safety shoes, and the minimum age of workers:

Jakob: So when it comes to gloves and goggles, is this provided free to the workers by the company?
Lee: [speaks Chinese with Kim].
Lee: Yes
Jakob: Ok, but we found that some people in the production are wearing safety shoes and some are not. What is the reason for this?
Lee: [Speaks in Chinese].
Kim: [Speaks in Chinese].
Lee: Maybe some [were] customers.
Jakob: No, they were workers.
Johanna: They had Jianco shirts.
Lee: [Speaks in Chinese].
Kim: [Speaks in Chinese].
Lee: Maybe they [were] new staff.

Jakob is starting to show signs of frustration but he lets go of the question regarding safety gear and continues with questions.

Jakob: How is it with the regulations for working hours, do you have some policy in place….for overtime?
Lee: [Speaks in Chinese].
Kim’s phone rings
Kim: [Speaks in Chinese] (meanwhile, his phone is still ringing)
Kim: [Answers his phone and speaks Chinese].
Lee: [It’s] according to Chinese law.

As the discussions above indicate, Jakob often does not get very clear answers to his questions but he moves on and continues with more questions.

Jakob: Is there any written policy for the minimum age or workers?
Lee: [Speaks in Chinese].
Kim: [Speaks in Chinese].
Lee: 18 years. This you do not need to worry about in Ewing, Ewing has a population policy, a child always goes to school or university and then the age is at least 20.
Jakob: [Speaks in Swedish] This looks really good.
Johanna: [Speaks in Swedish] But you skipped this question [regarding union affiliation].
Jakob speaks in Swedish: It’s very complicated. In China they have to associate with the communist party.

Many relations between individuals show in different ways during the audit. Jakob sometimes speaks in Swedish, addressing questions or comments to Johanna and vice versa. Other times he talks to Lee in English, asking him to translate what he’s saying. At times he talks directly to Jianco’s representatives, even though he knows they do not speak the same language, expecting Lee to clarify and translate as he talks. Jakob and Johanna both make notes in their printed copies of the HSAG while discussions are ongoing. At one point during the audit, Johanna asks in Swedish what they were talking about and Jakob replies in Swedish:

Jakob: [Speaks in Swedish] They know that we have delivery issues.
Johanna: [Speaks in Swedish] So, on the scorecards they exclude the areas they know they have problems with?
Jakob: [Speaks in Swedish] When it comes to 8.2 [questions regarding production facilities] I usually need to make a judgment based on my understanding, it’s difficult to discuss so I leave it to my own discretion.

Jakob has asked to see Jianco’s scorecards on customer satisfaction and the scorecards show excellent responses on all areas. When Jakob digs deeper into these scorecards he realizes that Corp is not a part of the survey which the numbers in the scorecard are based on. This leads him to have to make a judgement based on his own understanding of the situation.
The Score-Setting Deliberation

In the afternoon Jakob asks for some time to discuss internally, (with only Corp representatives and the researchers present) the assessment of the audit and the action plan that will be presented to the helper-shuttle representatives. The action plan is a list of things that the helper-shuttle must do, or be able to show documented progress on within a specified period of time, in order to continue business with Corp. Jakob discusses the scores he has given on each area with Lee and Johanna, and takes in their comments. Although he at times takes in comments and suggestions, he is responsible for the final grading.

On the points where Jakob feels certain, he shares his scores with the rest of the team. There is room for the team members from Corp, as well as for Tom and me, to ask questions.

Jakob: Yeah, okay. If we look into the ownership, I have, let me see... I have said that we could give 2 or 3 here. The reason that I have put 2 here, because the ownership will change very soon.

Johanna: Yeah, exactly.

Jakob: We don't know what will happen. But actually, we don't have any major concerns about the ownership. But still, it will change, and that's why I put 2 here. Global ability, they have experience and license to export from, out from China, but they don't have any more production sites in Europe or in America or so on. They don't have any sales office, so that's why I just give them a 2 here. They will be able to export, if that is necessary, but the full support with sales agents or sales companies and so on, in Europe, are not there, so they will not have 3.

Tom: But they said that they are planning on opening production plants in Brazil and Canada and have sales.

Jakob: Three years from now, we probably will do another audit, and then they will have 3 there then.

There are however, some areas where the team members do not agree, and the point of disagreement lies both in a specific scoring, and what it is that is being scored. A heated discussion between Lee and Jakob affects the score-setting on customer satisfaction and dependency when Lee questions the differences the scoring makes depending on whether it is a new or existing helper-shuttle and also depending on Corp’s time-frame for analyses. Following is an excerpt from their discussion.

Jakob: Dependency. This is actually an issue for us. We are too small. So I have put 1 here. Management. No major concerns at all. I cannot see any reason to put 2 or 1 here. I think, seems to be a well running company. As well, they have a good management system in place. Certified ISO 14001 and ISO 9001, so... Customer satisfaction. This
was a little bit tricky.
Tom: Yeah, I can understand that.
Jakob: Because they have something in place, but...
Tom: Not for you...
Jakob: Not for us.
Johanna: It seems like they select certain customers to answer their surveys.
Jakob: So I have put 2 here.
Lee: There is a situation. Jianco is our current helper-shuttle.
Jakob: Is...? Current helper-shuttle, yes.
Lee: But this audit tool is also used for new helper-shuttles
Jakob: Yeah.
Lee: If they're new, they have no old conducts. So of course, they will not have the record to our products. So I just think, the aim is to find out whether the helper-shuttle is current or not, it is relative to our customer and helper-shuttles relationship. So it has nothing to do with their operations.
Jakob: Are you talking about the...?
Lee: Such as the customer satisfaction. As in current, for some customers of Jianco, may be the, the mark is 3, but for us, it is 2. But the operative can reach 3. So what is any of this audit? If we're just to find a new helper-shuttle, maybe we can only search for their historical customers’ record, and their record says 3.

Lee is referring to Jianco’s own customer satisfaction survey which they showed Jakob and Lee. The score they received from customers was high, but Corp’s results had not been incorporated into their scores. Jianco had used a select number of customers in their survey and shared the results of these with the Corp representatives. Lee feels that grading Jianco based only on Corp’s experience would be wrong.

Jakob: Yeah, but you need to do the best assessment that you can. I mean, if there is a new helper-shuttle that are not a helper-shuttle to us today, then you need to assess it in the best way you can, and try to understand how these routines and processes will work for us, later on. Take other customers as an example. You are right, if we went here today and [they] were not [an] existent helper-shuttles, and they show us their customer surveys and so on, perhaps we should give them 3 here. But today, we have better experience, from how it has been working for us, I will give them a 2 here. But I understand.

Lee is still critical. Jianco’s preliminary score on the entire audit adds up to approximately 60% at the moment and Lee wonders how Jianco is going to improve on their customer satisfaction. According to him, what they are scoring has more to do with Corp’s relationship with Jianco and not Jianco’s overall performance. Jakob responds to Lee’s concern in an instructing manner, as follows.
Jakob: Yes, and that is why we have put in these concerns into the action plan. So next time when we are here, three years from now, and do another audit, the same audit, perhaps they have increased from 60 up to 80, if they follow the action plan. So it's about developing the helper-shuttle.

We move on to the scoring of areas concerning the environment. There are two areas to be scored here, 3.1 environmental management and 3.2 environmental criteria. Here, there are no disagreements on the score, despite the fact that the area was hardly covered. What seems important is that someone from Jianco has signed the invitation letter which include Corp's ten minimum criteria and hence, as far as Jakob is concerned, agreed to comply. On 3.1 they get a full score and on 3.2 a score of 2.

Jakob: This should be 3. This is about the environmental management system, which they have in place. And in the self-assessment, they said that [they] have a lot of routines in place, and that's why we gave them a 3 here. Actually, we didn't have so much time to discuss about the environmental self-assessment.

Johanna: We hardly even touched it.

Jakob: No.

Johanna: But, on the other hand, we know that they're ISO 14001 certified, and if they have that certification, they have the EMS system in place.

Jakob: This too, we have already discussed. They have signed our minimum requirements, the ten principles that is attached to the invitation letter, and they have policies and routines and communication internally about this. But not externally.

Tom: But in a way, are they not conflicting with Corp, because the prohibited and restricted list? But this plus six.

Jakob: No, that is on the restricted list. So that means that they are allowed to use it if the concentration is 0, 1% of the total weight. But I asked them to review it once more, because they didn't lift these substances, hexavalent chromium, up to us.

Johanna: On their own.

Jakob: No, on their own.

Johanna: We had to ask.

Jakob: So my feeling is that they need to look into this prohibited and restricted list once more.

Maira: Did you ask them to sign that as well?

Jakob: Yes, in these ten principles we refer to the prohibited and restricted list, so they have signed it. So they know that they are responsible to comply with it as well.

Regarding the quality of the cylinders that Corp receives, however, Jakob needs to ask Lee for advice. On point 5.3 Quality performance of deliveries Jakob consults with Lee, and after some tricky questions from Tom, Jakob decides on a score of 1.
The score is supposed to correspond to how many parts per millions (ppm) that are allowed to be defected when they are bought.

Jakob to Lee: But now we are just talking about free item numbers, and that is discussed in the other conference room right now. We will try to go back to that and summarize that discussion as well, after lunch. But if we go back to this assessment, is your feeling that we should give them 0 here or 1 here? I mean, you have been following them much closer than I have.
Lee: I think you cannot give them 0.
Jakob: Okay.
Tom: Why?
Lee: Because, for the performance of quality management, they have the procedure and just for our special cylinders, they got confused. Maybe this has some responsibility from Corp.
Jakob: Okay, okay. But if you look at the general score card for Jianco, in general for all customers, they achieved 300 ppm. And those are really good figures, actually. I mean, internally at Corp, we have requirements on 1000 ppm for hydraulic cylinder helper-shuttles. So perhaps that will make it possible to give them a 1 here, and let’s see what we come up with, with these cylinders that we have problems with. Let’s see who is responsible for these quality issues, and follow this very closely, and give them 1 here then. Is that, is that a solution, Lee?
Lee: For our cylinders we always look for the ppm monthly, and every month we have several hundred cylinders, all for Corp Ewing, if we even find one or two cylinders with a problem, the ppm shows that you are higher than your target. So I think this ppm makes no sense.

Lee questions the way Corp manages their internal data regarding statistics on defected parts. He proposes that measuring the defects on a monthly basis could make the statistics look worse than they are over an entire year. He is critical of the way Corp Ewing seems to be managing their own statistics and suggests that there might be problems there with mixing different samples together. It seems Lee does not like the idea of Jianco receiving a score of zero. Jakob listens to Lee’s concerns but seems inclined to score the helper-shuttle with a zero on this question. This scoring concerns a question on quality which is a stopping parameter, 5.3 Quality performance of deliveries. A score of zero here would mean that Jianco no longer can source material to Corp’s serial production.

Jakob: Okay. Let us decide that we give a 1 here, and then, when we come back on Thursday, we can look into the helper-shuttle analysis and look deeper into the score cards.
The negotiation between Lee and Jakob leads to a score of 1 but after Tom asks for clarification, it becomes clear that the score is a 1, but with actions in the action plan written as if the score had been zero. So, both Jakob and Lee get their way.

Tom: Just a brief question, if you put 0 here, what would the consequences be?
Jakob: If there is a new helper-shuttle that is not supplying to us today we will not start up business with them before they have a more stable ppm level. If we put 0 here today, that means that they are not approved, according to this audit, before they have shown much better ppm levels and that means that we should have very close cooperation and very closely monitor the ppm level together with Jianco, and have this action plan to reduce the ppm. Still, we have that in the action plan. So, we actually have taken the action to give them a 0 here, in the action plan.

Also concerning point 6.2 delivery precision and service level, Jakob needs to ask Lee and Jing for their input. Lee insists that the precision has gotten better, and that some of Jianco’s problems stem from the shift of their plant. Jakob seems quite unsure on the scoring here, so he relies on the input from Lee. He asks Jing for help too, but Lee takes on the lead role in this discussion. According to the HSAG the scoring on this point should be based on zero points for below 85% delivery precision, 1 point for 85-90%, 2 for 90-95% and 2 point for above 95% precision.

Jakob: The issue is the lead time that needs to be improved. So, they have experience of working with it, but it's lacking a little bit in communication with us. So I will not give them a 3 here.
Lee: Of course not.
Jakob: But I will not give them 1 either. Because I think they have quite a good way of working with claims. I think that the production has these kinds of score cards, but I have not seen them, and that's why I was giving a 1 here. Jing, you need to help me with this one, delivery precision. Is it so bad that we should give a 1 here?
Lee: I think so.
Maira: But before June, it was better?
Jakob: Yeah. If we go back to the beginning of the year, it was better. Before they moved the factory.
Lee: I don't know, because we, we can check the last analysis.
Jakob: Analysis, yes. But you told us yesterday that the delivery performance was quite good in the beginning, but when they started to move the plant, we started to face some delivery issues. And you said that you think the delivery precision will be much better now when the construction is ready.
Lee: I think it is, it's better now, in September.
Jakob: So should we keep 1 here?
Lee: A score of 1 is acceptable.
Tom: How do you do this? In order to put 1, is that, for what time-period?
Jakob: That is a good question, it's depending on the situation, because in some cases, there can be some special cases, that is the reason for the bad delivery precision in the score cards, so I don't want to take just a specific time period. I would like to take case to case and take a discussion about the delivery precision. And my feeling here is that it's a 1 here.

The final score of the audit lands at 63% and Lee and Jakob are in agreement.
Lee: That's acceptable.
Jakob: That is acceptable, yes, it is.

For a summary of how scores on different areas were arrived at (See Table 13, below).

Table 13 - Summary of How Scores are Arrived at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Mediating actors/networks (manifested as)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Ownership</td>
<td>Jakob (person)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jakob suggests a score of 2 or 3. He sees no issues now, but a risk-assessment based on future uncertainty becomes a reason to pull the score down. Johanna agrees with Jakob and the score is set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Global Ability</td>
<td>Knowledge of ownership-change (fact) Global Ability (idea) License to export (material) Sales agents (persons) Sales company (material)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jianco have experience and a license to export but then Jakob reasons that a lack of sales agents and companies outside of China means they cannot get a 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Dependency</td>
<td>Jakob (person) Risk-assessment (logic)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corp is too small and using a risk-assessment logic, this is by Jakob seen as an issue for Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Management</td>
<td>Jakob (person) Elimination (sociomaterial logic) Documented process of management system (material) ISO 14001 certificate (material) ISO 9001 certificate (material)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jakob sees no reason to give a 1 or a 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Lee (person) Jakob (person) Jianco’s Customer Survey Results (figures) helper-shuttle (idea of relative length as contractors) audit tool (idea) customer (idea) Experience (idea) Us (idea of belonging to Corp)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagreement with Lee is won by Jakob and results in a score of 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Environmental Management</td>
<td>Jakob (person) Johanna (person) Tom (person) Maira (person)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jakob uses documentation of processes and the environmental self-assessment for scoring as there was no time to cover this issue. He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented process of Environment Management System (material)</td>
<td>seems certain that a score of 3 is appropriate. A signature of the ten criteria seems to add to his conviction that a full-score is fitting. For Johanna, an ISO 14001 certification brings with it the belief that an Environment Management System is in place. Tom asks about a possible conflict with the ten minimum criteria as Jianco is using hexavalent chrome. Jakob explains that they are allowed to use it, and through their signature of the ten criteria have agreed to their part of the responsibility. The discussion does not change the score.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment (material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (sociomaterial logic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14001 certificate (material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of ten minimum criteria (material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented Routines (material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented Policies (material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited and restricted list (material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexavalent chrome (material)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5.3 Quality Performance of Deliveries | Negotiation between Lee and Jakob saves Jianco from becoming a non-approved helper-shuttle here. Jakob asks Lee if the score should be 0 or 1, and Lee disapproves of a 0, referring to the way Corp analyses the PPM levels. Jakob and Lee disagree on how to interpret the score cards on the problematic cylinders, but Jakob agrees to give them a 1. Tom asks about the consequences and Jakob explains that these are dealt with in the action plan, i.e. a score of 1 is given but expectations in the action plan are written as if the score would have been zero. | 1 |
| Jakob (person) | |
| Lee (person) | |
| Tom (person) | |
| Score card (material) | |
| PPM (figure) | |
| Problematic cylinders (material) | |
| Action plan (material) | |

| 6.2 Delivery Precision | In lack of documentation from Corp’s side, a negotiation between Lee and Jakob lands in what they believe is acceptable | 1 |
| Jakob (person) | |
| Lee (person) | |
| Tom (person) | |
| Maira (person) | |
| Lead time (sociomaterial logic) | |
| Elimination (logic) | |
| Claims handling (sociomaterial process) | |
| Score cards (material) | |
| Feeling (emotional) | |
| Jianco’s Factory (material) | |
| Delivery precision (figure) | |
| Time period (logic) | |

Jakob finalizes the comments to put on the action plan list and prepares himself to deliver the verdict. Practicing, as if he were on his own in the room, he reads through the text on the final power point slide of his presentation, which is projected on one of the walls in the conference room.

Jakob: The use of chromium, hexavalent chromium, was not brought up by Jianco during the last review of the prohibited and restricted list. Maximum concentration value of 0, 1 %
by weight of the total weight of the product. I would like [them] now to review Corp’s prohibited and restricted list once more, to ensure that Corp receive information if substances stated in the list are used

Presenting the Scores and Action Plan

When Jakob has double-checked his papers and tallied the total score, he calls the representatives from Jianco back in again to present the assessment as well as the action plan. The helper-shuttle is approved, because they get a grade above 60%. They score 63%, which means that Jianco is approved for continued delivery to Corp, but there are certain things that Jakob is not satisfied with and therefore refers to the action plan.

As Jakob presents the results and the action plan to the Jianco managers, Lee translates into Chinese. Jakob shares the scorecard with the helper-shuttle, 53 points out of 84 applicable (63%) and then declared that they had passed the test and were still an approved helper-shuttle. He read out the strengths and then asked Lee to take up the weaknesses which are documented in the form of a list in an action plan (See Table 14 - Action Plan for Jianco on page 173).

Jakob: You have strengths; you have good management according to the ISO certifications 14001, 18001 and OHSAS, new modern facilities, good monitoring over accidents and injuries and clean and structured production areas.

The weaknesses include 11 points, including two points regarding quality issues (5.2 and 5.3), one regarding design changes (9.5), one regarding delivery precision (6.2), one regarding competence of workers (8), one on problem solving (5), two points regarding the environment (3.2 and 4), one point regarding sourcing (12), one point on customer satisfaction (2.2), and one point on product development (9).

In four of these points, Customer satisfaction, problem solving, competence, and part quality assurance the action plan refers to ISO 9001 and quotes what this certification requires that Jianco must do or have in place. In addition it is clearly stated what Corp demands of Jianco e.g. on problem solving (5) “Set up at routine to ensure that you follow expected lead time on 48h for short term corrective action and 14 days for long term corrective action.”

The action plan provides expected end dates for all the activities set up in the plan and these range from ‘end of September’ which gives Jianco approximately 20 days,
to ‘continuously’. There is also a column for the people responsible for these activities. This column, however, as you can see in Table 14 below- was at this time not filled in.

Reference is made to three Corp documents in the action plan, and two of these are also attached in the file electronically sent to Jianco together with the action plan. These documents include the helper-shuttle manual for the point on design changes (9.5), Corp’s prohibited and restricted list for Environment (3.2) and Corp’s ten minimum criteria.

After the presentation of the action plan, the Jianco managers and Lee and Jing had a discussion in Chinese for at least five minutes, which resulted in a brief response in English from Lee. In some cases they seemed to agree, in others they did not, but I never got any clarity on what the longer discussion in Chinese was about. Jakob ended the presentation by handing over the scorecard and the action plan to Jianco’s quality manager, Kim.

Lee is now left with the task to see to it that the action plan is implemented by Jianco. Lee will be in contact with Jakob regarding the follow up of the action plan. The audit will be closed once Jianco has made the necessary amendments.

We leave for the fast-track shuttle station and take a train back to Ewing, where we check back in at the nearby shuttle-hotel, and get ready for dinner.

### Table 14 - Action Plan for Jianco

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>row</th>
<th>Description of problem</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2 Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>Corp are not included in the customer survey that are followed for other customers.</td>
<td>According to ISO 9001 the helper-shuttle shall monitor information relating to customer perception as to whether the organization has met customer requirements. Methods for obtaining and using this information shall be determined. This could be to develop a routine for measure the customer satisfaction (with customer survey or other methods) Based on the outcome, set up an improvement plan on areas that can be improved.</td>
<td>Start a.s.a.p. and continuously.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2 Environment</td>
<td>The use of Chromium, hexavalent (Cr6+) compounds was not brought up by Jianco during the last review of the prohibited and restricted list. Maximum concentration value</td>
<td>Review Corp’s prohibited and restricted list once more to ensure that Corp receive information if substances stated in the list are used.</td>
<td>Before the end of September.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of 0, 1% by weight in homogeneous are allowed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>4. Working environment.</th>
<th>Ensure that the workers use and are provided safety protection where is needed and that they have the right appropriate training.</th>
<th>Start a.s.a.p. and continuously.</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2 Quality Assurance Leakage of parts</td>
<td>According to ISO 9001, the helper-shuttle is obliged to develop processes for product realization and records need to be kept. 100% final test on Corp hydraulic cylinders including pressure test together with the assembled valves. Record should be kept to show evidence that test has been performed.</td>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3 Quality performance of deliveries Jianco target on 300 PPM is not achieved for Corp.</td>
<td>Identify root cause and set up action plan with improvements activities. Keep monitoring the PPM level closely until acceptable level has been achieved. Action plan should be communicated to Corp</td>
<td>Before end of September</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6 | 5.5 Problem solving Jianco is not responding to claims and are not following the Corp expected lead time. | According to ISO 9001 the helper-shuttle is obliged to determine and implement effective communication with customers in relation to customer feedback and customer complaints.  
Regarding claims from Corp, a formal way of problem solving that includes, short and long term corrective action and root cause analyses, shall be implemented and sent back to Corp.  
Set up a routine to ensure that you follow expected lead time on 48h for short term corrective action and 14 days for long term corrective action. | a.s.a.p. | 2 |
<p>| 7 | 6.2 Delivery precision Jianco target on 95% in | Identify root cause and set up action plan with improvement | Before end of September | 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8. Competence</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | No documentation are maintained which describe the workers competence or which training that has been performed. | According to ISO 9001 the helper-shuttle is obliged to determine necessary competence for personnel performing work affecting quality, provide training, evaluate effectiveness of actions taken, maintain records etc.  
Continue the plan to improve the documentation over competence. E.g. Competence matrix etc. | According to existing plan. | 9/15 |
|   | For new Corp cylinders the general process and project model as for other customer should be used. D-FMEA, Process flow chart, P-FMEA and Control plan should be developed as a minimum in accordance to example showed for Terex, QAP, and Quality Assurance Plan. For next new cylinder and continuously. |   |   | 8/12 |
|   | 9.5 Design changes |   |
|   | Jianco has made changes in the design without informing and receiving approval from Corp. | All changes of the design need to be approved by Corp before implementation. See Helper Shuttle Manual 2922 K. Chinese translated version can be provided. |   | 1 |
|   | 12. Sourcing |   |
|   | Include SHE aspects (Safety, Health, Environment and Quality) as well for social performance in the helper-shuttle-assessment document. See Corp’s minimum expectations in Business Ethics, Social and Environmental Performance Criteria for Corp Business Partners attached to the audit invitation letter. |   |   | 4/6 |
ANALYSIS ROOM FOUR

Room 4 depicts the opening up of a black-box, the previously punctualized actor (Law, 1992) which was the THSQP, based on the Purple Booklet. Room four is about the audit of a helper-shuttle which ends with a score and action-plan. What is noted in the synthesis below is the role of different actors in the process which took place during the audit and contributed towards the final score-setting and action plan. The action plan is here an intermediary (Latour, 2005) carrying with it traces of the HSAG and the assessment of Jakob and Lee. But the action-plan is also a translation of the HSAG into something very different, admonitions for Jianco to follow through if they are to continue supplying to Corp. Several human as well as nonhuman mediating actors emerge as relevant in this process of evaluation which leads to the final audit-score accompanied by a material translation in the form of an action-plan containing admonitions for Jianco to take action.

The analysis can be seen as primarily two actor-networks competing with one another. One actor-network has Jakob as a central actor, and draws on the material created at Corp headquarters and Corp Charlesburg, e.g. the translations of the Purple Booklet in the form of the HSAG and the ten minimum criteria including the prohibited and restricted list. The other actor-network, with Lee as a central actor draws on a different set of allies, including e.g. the management team at Jianco, expertise of the Chinese language, laws and culture.

I present these below in terms of the role that these two actor-networks played during this process. The previously seemingly powerful auditor (Jakob) and the stopping parameters both encompass problems during this audit. Lee, emerges instead as a mediator and things take a different turn. Jakob is however, still an important actor because he is in charge of the final score-setting. Interacting together with mediations of language, Lee as an expert on Jianco, ideas about risk-assessment, a time constraint and feelings – means that the score-setting is influenced by several actors before it ends up looking like it does.

Jakob Enacts Board’s Idea of Boundary Setting – Still in Charge

Before we enter Jianco’s building, we see construction work going on, on their premises. Jakob here very clearly demarcates an invisible boundary between Corp and Jianco when we are asked by Jakob to throw a blind eye to the construction work and he separates between the external contracts between Jianco and other parties and Jianco’s own operations, which is what they are here to audit. Jakob draws a line for what is of concern for Corp, and how far his responsibility as a Corp employee stretches. The work on the building is not included in this concern. The construction workers lack of helmets and potential safety-gear therefore is put
outside what matters. Jianco’s workers and their operations and use of safety gear, however, are of concern. According to Corp, and as enacted (Law and Mol, 2008) by Jakob, Jianco should monitor such contractors on their own behalf. Jakob acts here as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for Corp’s boards’ ideas. The Purple booklet talks about helper-shuttles, and so does the THSQP, but neither of these says anything specifically about third-parties such as the construction company hired by Jianco. Recall that in Room 1 we learnt that tier two contractors, i.e. helper-shuttles supplying to Corp’s helper-shuttles also must be audited, but this applies only if the parts supplied by the tier-two helper-shuttle are being bought by Corp.

Figure 14 - Jacob Enacts Board’s Idea of Boundary Setting, Putting Construction Work Outside of His Realm of Responsibility

This boundary-setting by Jakob takes place before the actor-networks are put in contrast to one another, during the audit. Here, he is still unchallenged in control, makes the calls and decides what counts. Things, however, are not so easy for Jakob once the audit begins. We shall see below, how Lee’s presence has affected the audit.

Lee’s Mediating Role during the Audit – Shakes up Jakob’s Position of Power

Lee is the only one present during these two days who can communicate fluently with all other present. His knowledge of both the English and the Chinese language transforms his role of accompanying trainee into a central actor on whom both Jianco and Corp representatives rely completely for any form of communicative exchange whatsoever (See Figure 15 - Lee Acts as a Mediator during the Audit, on page 179). Not only does Lee handle the communication between Jianco and Corp, Lee also has ongoing contact with Jianco in his role as a sourcing engineer at Ewing
and exudes his own knowledge of Jianco’s business. Since I don’t speak Chinese, I cannot say anything about Lee’s translations from English to Chinese and vice versa but there are several examples of how Lee’s mediating role came into play. For example, during the factory tour when Jakob asks how the organizational charts are filled in, Lee does not really answer Jakob’s question, but responds instead in a disparaging manner. Jakob has done many audits, and visited many factory sites. His curiosity stems perhaps mostly from his inability to fully understand the text and information in Chinese and he relies heavily on Lee to help him understand. However, he often gets an uninterested, disparaging response which doesn’t answer his question. Lee’s response in this case was, “if everything’s ok they just sign it”. This could be an exact translation of what Rob, the sales manager who showed us around the factory, told him in Chinese, but nonetheless, it doesn’t answer the question that was posed. Jakob’s role, which could be expected to be that of an audit expert, is in this situation seriously destabilized. Note here that the power which Jakob had accumulated and showed in room 3, is not showing here.

Also, e.g. in the factory, regarding the chart with information on management of loss time, there was no mention of what the injury was or how it was handled. It’s difficult for Jakob to ask any technical questions as he doesn’t speak Chinese and because we’re guided through the factory by the sales manager, who isn’t an expert on the work going on in the factory. Also, Jakob must rely solely on the translations from Lee. Much of the checking therefore remains on a shallow level, looking at charts, check-lists and documentation, most of which Lee needs to translate for Jakob to understand.

Lee pinpoints that some of the question in the HSAG are not ill-adapted for the Chinese context, and Jakob’s questions are met with a nonchalance when e.g. asking regarding the minimum age of workers at Jianco, Lee responds with an explanation to why this question is irrelevant so Jakob never gets a direct answer to his question, only an explanation suggesting that in China the one-child policy means that all children go to school and are not employable before the age of 20. It is uncertain how Lee makes this conclusion, but it means that Jakob is left without an answer to a question that he needs to score.

The question on working hours is answered in a similar, generalized manner. “Jianco follows Chinese law”. Another example is the question regarding safety-gear. Although pinpointed that several workers in the factory, wearing Jianco shirts, were seen without safety shoes, the answer is that they might have been customers who were visiting the site or perhaps new workers. Jakob deals with this by moving on to asking further questions, but his basis for a score-setting is meagre. This lead to a score setting that was based on feeling, previous experience, and reliance on external certification.
Similarly, Jakob relies on Lee for translating his questions into Chinese and getting answers from Kim or Rob and then explaining to Jakob what has been said. And Lee’s knowledge of Jianco was sometimes a cause for frustration for Jakob, but at other times an essential support, without which he would have been asking the wrong people the wrong questions, e.g. in the case of the lady who spoke a few words of English that we all thought represented the R&D department. Were it not for Lee, we would have been fooled and probably received yes as an answer to most questions. Lee is a central actor and mediator (Latour, 2005) during the audit.

**Figure 15 - Lee Acts as a Mediator during the Audit**

![Diagram showing the roles of Jakob, Lee, Kim, and Rob during the audit. Jakob asks questions, Lee responds and answers a different question without translating, and Lee's allies with Jianco are stronger than Corp's allies.]

The central role that Lee had for the audit can also be depicted in another way, which shows two competing networks; one with Jakob’s allies and another one with Lee’s allies. As shown in room 4, Lee at several times during the audit, defends Jianco’s standpoint and also speaks on behalf of the Jianco representatives. Jakob, in his hopes of Lee’s translations, was expecting an ally which would add on to his enrolment (Callon, 1986a) of actors that we saw in room 3. However, Lee allies himself more with Jianco’s representatives than with Corp’s, and during the audit, Lee’s control of the conversation due to his superior linguistic skills (knowledge of both English and Chinese), makes the Jianco-network stronger than the Corp-network.
Lee’s central role as mediator (Latour, 2005) together with his propensity to side-with and defend Jianco, gives the helper-shuttle network more power. Lee’s reasons to do so are unclear, but his daily work (outside the audit situation) does involve regular contact with Jianco representatives, to a much a larger degree than his correspondence with Jakob or Corp Sweden. Together with his linguistic superiority, Lee also has local knowledge of Jianco’s business and the Chinese law. He uses all of these to control the audit situation. Jakob’s plan, therefore, is very seldom what determines the fall-out of the actual audit. Oftentimes, his questions are disregarded, Jakob is silenced (Latour, 2005) and Lee controls the audit situation. See the illustration below (180Figure 16) which shows how Lee manages to enact (Law and Mol, 2008) the Jianco representatives and his local knowledge in order to gain agency (Latour, 2005) over Jakob and his allies which are oftentimes challenged during the audit. Everything that gets to, or is communicated by Jakob, must pass through Lee, putting him in the positioing of an enrolling (Callon, 1986a) actor for the audit. Jakob and his network are dependent on Lee.

Figure 16 - Jacob's Question are Disregarded, as Lee Controls the Conversation

Given the two competing networks at play during the audit, there were instances where Jakob still had power and made important decisions which led to subsequent translations of the code. Lee, sometimes had a finger in this game too, as did some other actors. Below we shall have a look at these.
There are however, times during the audit, when Jakob is in charge and his network has more power. The two areas where he demonstrates more agency (Latour, 2005) are the questions regarding the environment (3.1 Environmental Management System and 3.2 Environmental criteria). He uses this power in his score-setting and the action plan which Jianco is left with. His agency, however, is used in a coercive and contradictory manner. Firstly because his admonitions on the action plan are in stark contrast to the high scores he gives Jianco on these areas, and secondly because the responsibility of following this up is left with Lee and the Ewing sourcing department, when Jakob leaves to return to Sweden. The result of all this is that Jakob, personally wins this area as his area of expertise, but the environment (the main area of concern) is completely silenced, as the use of hexavalent chrome becomes a matter of reporting rather than an environmental concern. Let’s have a closer look at how this happened.

Recall that, regarding the discussion on the prohibited and restricted list it seemed that Jianco’s representatives did not want to disclose their use of hexavalent chrome. In the dialogue (mediated by Lee) between Jakob and Kim the quality manager, it takes quite a while before it is confirmed that the chemical used for the chroming of the cylinders is indeed hexavalent. Through Lee, Kim informs Jakob that they have read and understood Corp’s prohibited and restricted list, but according to Corp’s policy it is the responsibility of the helper-shuttle to inform Corp if any of the materials on the list are being used, which Jianco have not done. The result of all this, Jakob asks them to review the list once more and then sign the ten minimum criteria. Singing the criteria would mean that Jianco have agreed to comply with Corp’s requirements, including the restricted and prohibited list, according to which they are allowed to use hexavalent chrome in a concentration amounting to maximum 0.1% of the total mass of the finished product. Jakob just wanted to make a point, although he suspected that they were using hexavalent chrome. This is indicated through his comment to Tom and me in Swedish when he finds out that it is hexavalent and not trivalent chrome. He tells us that it’s not a problem, all producers are using this chemical but it means that the chemical pool that we saw in the chroming plant is extremely poisonous. There is no discussion on the amount of concentration used, neither is there a discussion about the waste management in regards to this specific, extremely poisonous chemical, or the workers safety in regards to the inhalation of the airborne particles of hexavalent chrome aerosols. Once Jakob has gotten Jianco to admit what he already knew ‘all producers are using it’, he asks them contemptuously, to have a look over the prohibited and restricted list again and then sign the ten criteria.
The signature of the ten criteria is a coercive measure from Jakob’s side, but doing so maintains status quo- Jianco continues to source and Corp has effectively shoved the responsibility of dealing with the extremely poisonous chemical, over to Jianco. Compliance is not achieved, but it is created, on paper, through an almost forceful signature.

What is important is both how the signature comes about and what it means. The signature comes about through Jakob taking on a mediating role (Latour, 2005) in his demands to get someone from Jianco to sign the ten criteria by signing the audit invitation letter. What this now means is that scores on the environment are justified by Jakob who, acting as a mediator (Latour, 2005) decided that this signature is equivalent to Jianco taking responsibility. This is translated (Latour, 2005) by Jakob into a measure that effectively translates the signature into meaning that Jianco has agreed to comply with Corp’s ten minimum criteria, and therefore, also the purple booklet.

**Johanna’s Role as Intermediary – a Mitigated Challenge**

During the audit, Jakob shows signs of shifting between a heightened frustration and a sense of relief, perhaps from an acceptance of a situation he is unable to control, allowing himself to accept that the answers he is getting from Lee, are the best he can get. The short answers that he gets, and Lee’s stupefying responses to his questions, for an instance lead him to make the judgement that things look really good regarding the area of social and business ethics. He is, however, stopped by Johanna who reminds him that he hasn’t asked about union affiliation, but this question in his mind is already out of the picture and is not taken into consideration because it’s too complicated and his prior experience tells him that in China the workers do not have the free will to associate, but must be associated with the communist party. This question is skipped and the overall feeling that Jakob has persists to some extent, or at least weighs in together with his frustration, as the final score on this area is a 2 out of possible 3. Johanna here, and at several other places acts as a devil’s advocate towards Jakob, questioning him about things such as questions he has skipped and in her questions she often-times acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for a responsibility mind-set, e.g. when she reminds Jakob that they hardly touched the area on environmental self-assessment and during the discussion on safety-gear when she comments that the people they are discussing actually wore Jianco shirts, whereby they must be working in the factory and cannot be customers, as suggested by Jianco representatives.

However, Johanna’s comments get little attention. Jakob is the one in charge, and he has the final say. Regarding union affiliation he tells Johanna it’s complicated in China and moves on. Regarding the safety-gear he chooses not to push the
questioning further and moves on, but decided to put a remark into the action plan regarding this issue. Similarly regarding the environmental self-assessment, he reminds Johanna and us researchers that the ten minimum criteria have been signed, so there is no problem. The issue with hexavalent Chrome is a matter of reporting, which Jianco has not done, wherefore they also get a remark on the action-plan. Jakob is a mediator (Latour, 2005) in the score-setting and writing of the action-plan, translating cues that he gets during the audit into matters of concern and matters not of concern. Union affiliation is excluded completely from the audit, not scored, and not discussed. No remarks regarding union affiliation end up on the action plan either. The use of hexavalent Chrome and safety-gear, however, although not discussed further during the audit, show up in the action plan.

Johanna does not get much attention during the audit, but can be argued to contribute towards the destabilization of Jakob’s power as she does not act as an ally to him. She rather questions him in his approach. Recall that Johanna and Jakob work for different divisions in Charlesburg (D-Two and D-One respectively), and that these divisions have been working with audit tools of different kinds (See Room 2). However, as she only acts as an intermediary during this audit, her remarks don’t have much of an affect for the final outcome of the audit score. Had Johanna had more power here, there could potentially have been three competing networks.

**Hexavalent Chrome - Enacted by Jakob as an Admonition**

At the factory, there are many actors involved in the events taking place. Here, Jakob had a very distinct idea about what he wanted to see and he is able to control the agenda to a larger extent than during the discussions in the conference room. Possibly this is because he now not only relies on Lee’s translations but also can see things, as he wanted, to see with his own eyes. He gets a different set of sensory information which temporarily increases the power of his network. As we see in the conference room, the issues of chroming and the quality of deliveries which is related to the tests done in the factory are the two areas where Jakob pushes his agenda the hardest.

Jakob’s previously set agenda helped him here. During the factory tour Jakob knew exactly what he wanted to see. His background check on Jianco and their business with Corp with a history of delivery and quality problems meant that he wanted to see where Corp’s cylinders are tested. He also seemed to have reasons to believe (could stem from his general knowledge of cylinder production, previous experience, or some other information that he had access to) that they were using hexavalent chrome for the chroming of their cylinders, and wanted to see the chroming plant. These were however, the only two things that were specifically checked during the factory tour. For good or worse, they set the agenda for the
points of control. Given the amount of time set for the audit, there wouldn’t have been time for much more, but what else was going on at Jianco? It’s hard to say. In managing this situation, Jakob enacts (Law and Mol, 2008) previous knowledge and time, which become the basis for the agenda. The agenda which was a full audit, is translated into certain parts of an audit i.e. quality and environment.

The chemical is used by Jakob to make enact a different problem that he felt was central. He was not getting the attention he wanted from Jianco, and the fact that they did not notify him about the use of hexavalent chrome is made into an admonition in the action plan. As noted earlier, this chemical is highly poisonous but it is allowed by Corp (based on EU-REACH) to be used in a maximum concentration of 0.1% of total weight. Instead of demanding numbers which could verify this level of concentration, asking about the waste management associated with the use, or asking for specifications regarding the use of safety gear in and around the chroming plant, Jakob’s message to Jianco is that they must review Corp’s prohibited and restricted list again.

**An Extra Team of Technicians - Destabilizing Jakob’s Agenda**

Aimed to be a site for rest and recuperations between the two hectic days of the audit, the hotel-shuttle is not where it would be expected that events relevant to the audit would take place. However, as it so happened, a team of technicians from Corp Ewing, headed by a Swedish Corp representative had, without the audit-teams knowledge, joined us here at the hotel-shuttle. Why exactly they arrived at this point in time or who sent them is unclear. But Jakob now has, from his own company, a team of experts who will be competing for the Jianco representatives’ attention. Potentially, pleasing this team of experts is more important to Jianco than pleasing Jakob, the reason being that the team of experts are people who source directly from Jianco, to Ewing. This team, and their agenda, as we see during the second day of the audit, becomes a mediator (Latour, 2005) in the audit process, contributing towards a further destabilization of Jakob’s network as his agenda is now competing with another group of actors.

**Summary of Analysis Room Four**

The analysis of room 4 shows how two networks drawing on different sets of allies challenged one another, as one was dependent on the other, and at times engaged in negotiation. This process involved enactments of previous translations of the code as well as new translations. The material manifestations of the new translations can be seen in the form of a contract – a signature of the ten criteria by Jianco representatives confirming compliance and in the form of an audit score with an associated action plan (with a list of responsibilities for Jianco to carry out). This
action plan consists of responsibilities covered under three areas in the HSAG (Environment, Social and Ethics, and Quality – see row 3, 4 and 5 in Table 11 on pg. 119) In the action plan these are translated into four admonitions (see specifically rows 2, 3, 4, and 5 in Table 14 on page 173).

Following are the take-aways from the analyses in room four

The code:

(i) Is enrolled in two competing actor-networks.
(ii) Is enacted as a boundary-setting tool.
(iii) Is translated into a measure – a score of 63%.
(iv) Is translated into a new document - an action plan (based on the HSAG, responsibilities are handed over in the form of admonitions to Jianco to carry out).
(v) Is translated into a punctualized actor - compliance (through a coercive signature of the ten minimum criteria) – this is similar to an enactment of the code as a contract as previously noted by Helin and Sandström (2008).

Associated ideas: Stem from two different, competing actor-networks. One is based on the ideas associated with translations of the purple booklet, coupled with ideas about risk-management and quality control while the other tends to lean on protection of the firm (Jianco) and practicality.
ROOM FIVE

(Tracking the Audit Action Plan in Charlesburg, Sweden)

After the Jianco-audit in September 2011 I kept in touch with Johanna and Jakob via cloud-mail, asking them about the aftermath of the audit, what had happened with the responsibilities handed over to Jianco in the action plan? Johanna informed me via email that all information regarding audits (scores, action plans and follow-ups) are stored in a database called ‘helper-shuttle collaboration portal’ (HSCP) and agreed to show me the results in the database. So on the fourth of April 2012, I travelled back to Charlesburg to meet Johanna at the sourcing department.

I meet with Johanna in her office. She has a large desk and two computers, one laptop and one stationary. I sit across her, her desk between us. Johanna explains to me that the HSCP is a system which is supposed to allow Corp to store all relevant data, including audits and audit results and action plans regarding their helper-shuttles. The portal is also supposed to allow Corp to contact and interact with the helper-shuttles directly, e.g. to send them self-assessments or send them specifications and drawings for products. Since many different Corp divisions often share helper-shuttles, buying different parts from the same helper-shuttle, this portal is also supposed to help the different divisions to share and get access to all relevant information regarding each helper-shuttle.

Johanna turned the screen of computer sideways so both she and I could see it. She logged into the HSCP and showed me the different tabs at the top of the menu. The system looked intricate, and seemed to have many functions. However, as Johanna was showing me the system, it became more and more apparent that it was not completely usable at the moment. Partly, this had to do with a lack of training, and partly due to different divisions in Corp still wanting to hold on to their old systems which were not fully compatible with the HSCP. There also seemed to be a lack of agreement between the different divisions, as to whether they wanted to use the HSCP for sharing information about helper-shuttles or not. The new HSCP is competing with an older, different database system used at division 2 and works together with a third system, the ERP.

Johanna: you can see some of the tabs we have here, but we’ve got a lot here that concerns the helper-shuttles, and I must say that we are not that good at using this just at the moment, we’ve just updated it to make it more user friendly and we’re redoing a lot of related systems./.../ so at the moment there are some parts that are used more and others less, but the idea is that we should be able to get all information. Queries on orders, our whole handling of claims is here, but to a certain extent it’s also in our ERP [a different system] system
where you create the claim but you get the interaction with the helper-shuttles through this system.

I was most interested in finding out what had happened after the Jianco audit, if the action plan had been followed, if the audit had been closed or not, and asked Johanna if she could show me what the updates on Jianco looked like in the HSCP. Following is an excerpt from our conversation.

Johanna: Helper-shuttle audits, which I was going to show you. I must admit that we’re not very good at entering helper-shuttles into this system at the moment.
Maira: Why is that?
Johanna: Well, because it hasn’t really been functioning optimally, but now that we’ve done the update it’s more about [spreading] the information, that everyone should enter their audits. We’ve had it in a different database previously, where we’ve uploaded all the documents but this is much better, because the other divisions can also go in and see everything.

The new HSCP is supposed to make it easier to communicate with the helper-shuttles directly, and easier for different divisions in Charlesburg to share information regarding helper-shuttles. But the system is not being used as intended. It is unclear who should make sure that all the material that exists in the old database be moved over to the new one, and it is also unclear whether D-Two (which formally is the division Jakob, who was responsible for the Jianco audit belongs to) is currently using the system or not. However, Jianco is supplying to both D-One one and D-Two but currently only to these divisions at the Chinese assembly plants, i.e. they are not supplying to Sweden. So I ask Johanna how this works.

Johanna: When we do the approval its first the sourcing engineer who enters this and then it goes to a quality manager, so we’re not really following that [process] as yet, but the idea is that we’re going to.
Maira: So the idea is then, if we relate back to Jianco, that when Jakob does this audit, he enters the information into this system?
Johanna: I don’t think Jakob does that.
Maira: But that’s the idea?
Johanna: Our division [D-One], this was Jakob from division two who did [the audit], they use their audit tools, you’ve seen, I think you’ve gotten ours and seen theirs.
Maira: Yes. That’s right.
Johanna: Yes. But Jakob and those [division 2] guys, they work a differently. I think they put it in their database, but the idea is, as I said, that division 2 is a part of this. We are so different, you know. They are also supposed to use this system but there have been some technical issues that people have [responded] like ‘no, I give up, I’m not using this’.
Johanna explains to me that the system can be used in two ways, one is storing full audits and the other is sending out self-assessments to the helper-shuttles, which they can fill in themselves. The system hasn’t been used the way at least Johanna was hoping that it would be, but D-One is using it to send out self-assessments. D-Two is reluctant to using the new system due to technical difficulties, and I’m still not seeing any sign of the Jianco audit. I try instead to understand what the idea with the system is, how an audit would move through the system, who would be involved and what that might look like. I’m also curious as to whether the Jianco audit has resulted in an approval of the action plan which was set up by Jakob.

Maira: But then, the idea would be that Jakob should have entered the audit, and then it’s dormant in the system until the action plan is approved or has been followed up? Is that when it would show as approved?
Johanna: No, actually, if I go back here [clicks] I can show you, I can show you how we did with Amigo.

By this time in our conversation, I understand that the Jianco audit is not in the system. Jianco as a helper-shuttle has not been entered into the system, and Johanna now suggests showing me the approval process of another helper-shuttle, Amigo instead. She opens up a start page which shows all the ongoing cases, the summary shows 275 rejected or expired cases, and 24 approved helper shuttles. I ask her what this means.

Johanna: Well, this is because the helper-shuttles are not very good at answering and sometimes things end up in the spam filter and this is what we’ve been working with, so you shouldn’t take these numbers too seriously.
Maira: I understand. I’m just trying to understand what lies behind them.
Johanna: And it’s been a problem that if the answers to the questionnaire are entered in a wrong format, then it doesn’t accept them. And then you can’t move on after that so there are sufficient explanations. Like you need to enter the date as, year, year, year, year, date, date, month, month, day, day and so on. And then maybe they wrote 2nd of May 1983 instead of writing 19830503.

The problems with the functioning of the database are obviously a huge frustration. The problems are not only for the users at Corp, but also for the helper-shuttles. The system is highly sensitive to format and entering things in the wrong way, e.g. the date, could mean that a helper-shuttle self-assessment or query automatically gets stuck in the system as rejected. Sometimes things just end up going to the spam instead of into the system, and if they’re not handled, the cases on such helper-shuttles expire. Looking at the number of approved cases contrary to those that were
rejected or expired 24 to 275, this seems to be a really big problem. We move on and Johanna shows me the Amigo audit in the HSCP.

Johanna: We are going to start using this more and more [clicks]. This, here you can see, we at division one have done a full audit at Amigo auto-limited. It’s Anders Persson who has entered this here and then has said that Erik Allenius who actually is the one responsible should approve it here. /.../ and the approval is about, well, it’s the formal... this helper-shuttle is ok, it’s not about an action plan. We don’t follow up action plans like that, but it can be in here, also.

The audit that Johanna shows me in the HSCP is associated with two individuals, one who conducted the audit and then entered it into the system (a sourcing engineer). The other person is the one who has been identified as responsible for making sure that everything that has been entered into the system looks right and then approving the audit in the system (a quality engineer). Johanna explains that the follow up on the action plan, and what happens at the helper-shuttle after the action plan has been handed to them, is not really something that can be entered into the system. It is only the next time, when an audit it done, that a follow up can be made on the action plan. That will then become a part of the next entry into the HSCP. I ask Johanna about her view on this.

Maira: So in a way, it’s [the HSCP] quite disconnected then, from what happens with the action plan? The audit has been carried out and the helper-shuttle can then be approved /.../ now?”

Johanna: “Well, this is about us having the right statistics when we do our sustainability reporting./.../ Then we have to add on a statistics tool to this one, and then we can only add - because we get the question, how many helper-shuttles have you audited during this year?

A tool added onto the HSCP allows Johanna to extract statistics from the data in the HSCP by adding e.g. the number of audits in the system. The tool also allows you to add number of approved and not approved helper-shuttles. This addition of different metrics seems itself to be a reason to why some audits and helper-shuttles are in the system while others are not.

Johanna: /.../ Well actually we can say that in our process we don’t always enter [into HSPC] the helper-shuttles that are not approved. In principle you could say that the helper-shuttles we visit, we’ve already visited several times before and there needs to be a big mismatch for them to not be approved as a helper-shuttle. But then this action plan could very well still be there. It’s like this helper-shuttle that had a lot of waste on their back yard which I noted and they didn’t get a very good score on the environmental part despite the fact that they are very conscious.
The discussions with Johanna in Room 5 leave me with many unanswered questions, the most pertinent being, what happened to the Jianco audit and action plan? We will get back to that question in later rooms, but there are interesting observations about the prospects for HSCP which are worth noting. These follow in the analysis.

**ANALYSIS ROOM FIVE**

In Room 5 we learnt that the HSCP, a computer software, is a tool intended to enhance collaboration, and efficient sharing of information regarding audits and action plans in two ways. Firstly, internally at Corp divisions in the communication between sourcing engineers, heads of quality and helper-shuttles. Secondly, between Corp crew members and the helper-shuttles.

*The HSCP Acts as an Anti-Collaborative Platform*

Johanna shares that Corp management have visions of the HSCP as a Corp-wide system but it fails to work that way. There are several reasons as to why the HSCP is not used at all as a collaborative tool. The system is complicated to use, is not compatible with older systems that e.g. division 2 is using, i.e. two actors competing for power and resources. This is making people at division 2 frustrated. Also, the HSCP is fussy, it demands very specific formats for simple information such as the date, and many helper-shuttles do not manage to do this correctly, resulting in a large number of rejected or expired cases in the system. When Johanna sends out environmental self-evaluation questionnaires to the helper-shuttles, they might answer these but when filling in the dates the HSCP has agency as a mediator (Latour, 2005) (See Figure 17 – HSCP Acts as a Mediator for Environmental Self-Assessment, on the following page) over the people filling in the questionnaire. The system continues to have agency over the user at Corp as the cases therein become rejected, and the process would need to be done over again. When no one does this, the cases expire.

The HSCP, however, is overpowered by the division 2 database system. The two systems seem to be competing for agency. Resistance to new technological solutions is not uncommon (C.f. Zwick, 2002). And since the system isn’t used by division 2, where Jakob who was responsible for the Jianco audit works, the action-plan on Jianco is not in the system. It seems at this point to be lost in terms of sociomaterial traces.
The HSCP Translates Audit Information into Aggregates for Reporting

The add-on statistics tool to the HSCP helps Johanna at division 1 to efficiently collect the data that for her is most relevant in order to report to the creation of Corp’s sustainability report, as enacted (Law and Mol, 2008) as a justification for the importance of the right statistics for reporting. Statistics such as how many helper-shuttles have been audited and how many have been approved need to be reported annually to the headquarters. Reporting, as Johanna explains, is important and in order to report you need the right statistics. Johanna acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for a reporting mind-set, seen through which the add-on statistics tool becomes an important ally to the HSCP, together with which the HSCP gains more power as a reporting tool, and probably has a good chance of replacing the old database. If the add-on statistics tool is compatible with the old system, however, the odds are uncertain.

So, to summarize, the HSCP fails in its idea to be the intended information-sharing and communications system, but instead when it is used with a reporting mind-set and the statistical add-on tool to fill the purposes for the sustainability reporting, it gains substantial power. The HSCP’s biggest ally, which could be crucial for its survival, is the sustainability report (See Figure 18 below).
Since the HSCP is still new, it is not possible to say what will become of it in the future. But as reporting trends are increasingly including so-called sustainability statistics, this speaks for the HSCP. However, it will continue to fail as a collaborative platform unless all groups or individual actors (helper-shuttle representatives and Corp crew members) don’t want to or don’t know how to use it. Getting all actors enrolled (Callon, 1986a) is a difficult task, and in those terms, the HSCP’s chances of survival are shaky. However, the increasing trends of sustainability reporting, means that many actors are working towards establishing, standardizing, and reporting statistic measures. The actors supporting this trend, together with the statistics add-on tool are the HSCPs best friends and allies. Johanna’s explanations regarding which helper-shuttles are entered into the system and not, indicate that getting the correct statistics is a matter of what goes into the system and thus affects the statistics that can be extracted. The HSPC together with the add-on statistic tool, and sourcing engineers entering helper-shuttle data into the system, become an inscription device (Latour and Woolgar, 1986) which spits out figures directly usable for reporting.

Figure 18 - The HSCP Enrolled in a Potentially Powerful Network
Summary of Analysis Room Five

The only observable material trace of the Purple Booklet in room 5 is in the form of the self-assessment questionnaires, which are sent out to the helper-shuttles on areas regarding the environment. See room 2 (part IV of the audit invitation letter). This self-assessment is itself a translation from the audit-tool and HSAG where the Purple Booklet’s cosmic concerns are broken down and translated into Environment and Social and Business Ethics (as can be seen in rows 3 and 4 in Table 11 on pg.119).

There is however, a more subtle, but potentially much more powerful translation that occurs here in Room 5 also. The translation occurs in the form of a shift from a responsibility mind-set to a reporting mind-set.

Following are the take-aways from the analyses in room five.

The code:

(i) In its translated form of the Jianco action plan is currently absent in terms of sociomaterial traces (it’s not in the system it’s supposed to be in because different divisions use different systems)

(ii) Is translated into a new punctualized actor in the form of sustainability statistics (aggregated audits together with the use of a statistics tool, make the HSCP into an important inscription device which can spit out statistics of value for the Corp’s annual reporting).

Associated idea: seem to stem from a reporting mind-set, and practical concerns entail making the best of the situation, i.e. getting the best statistics possible given the discrepancies between divisions and their different ways of handling data internally.
ROOM SIX

(Tracking the Audit Action Plan, continued)

With no sign of the Jianco-audit documents in the HSCP, I turned back to Jakob at D-two in hope of finding some information on the whereabouts of the documentation.

Jakob tells me, much like Johanna did in room 5 that the idea with the HSCP is to have a global, in-cloud system, where all audits and information on helper-shuttles can be stored and accessed by all Corp units. At the moment, however, the information on helper-shuttles is documented on local hard-drives at the different divisions. So the Jianco audit, he tells, me, should be stored on a local hard-drive in Ewing.

Jakob informed me that he still has contacts with the Chinese team working with Jianco, but he also explained that the responsibility had been passed on to the sourcing department in Ewing. The sourcing department in Ewing had, according to Jakob put together a team of individuals from different departments in order to work with Jianco.

Jakob: Yes, if we say like this, in the autumn, after the audit, we saw that we have to put up an improvement-team from Corp’s side, so we have had one person responsible for sourcing, one responsible for helper-shuttle development, one from the technical [side] and then one from service…/#/#…to focus partially on the activities that we put up during the audit but also regarding the technical problems that we had out in the field, and our demand from Jianco was that they arranged with a similar improvement-team from their side…/#/#…but the character of the improvement-team has changed during the course of work from being focused on the audit activities and general things, we have moved more into the technical foundations and specifications…its more technical discussions that we have landed in and I can say this, we are not really content with the support we are getting from Jianco right now.

I wanted to know whether this shift in focus from the action plan to more technical specificities entailed that the action plan had been closed, making it ready to be reported. When I asked Jakob about how and when this audit would be reported, he explained,

---

27 From '20120424 Telephone interview with Jakob'
Jakob: “Yes, actually it’s so that every production unit should report which audits they have done but then there can be a grey zone if it’s so that it was on our [Charlesburg sourcing department] initiative if we have travelled [there] and made the audit even if they [from another production unit] have participated, who is then to report. We just agree amongst us so that we don’t double report.”

When I asked Jakob whether the Jianco audit had been reported yet it was uncertain, as he had passed on the responsibility of the audit to the Ewing sourcing department. The production unit he is referring to is the Ewing production unit which is separated in terms of reporting from the Charlesburg production unit. I ask Jacob questions to try to get leads on how I can find the audit documentation and find out what has happened after the action plan was handed over to Jianco.

Maira: ok. So who in Ewing took over or is responsible for the reporting there?
Jakob: it’s, well, we have made some changes in the reporting this year, we’re doing it in a new system and in a slightly different way, as compared to previous years. I am responsible for the reporting for Division two here in Charlesburg and Johanna reports for Division one here in Charlesburg. And then every production unit, or legal unit, company…and it’s actually the same company, legally, that Johanna and I work for so we do the reporting together. But we divide it between Division two and Division one, so that you can extract statistics for the different divisions or units, e.g. only Division one or what only Ewing reports for Division one.

Jakob tells me about the reporting, but he cannot say whether Jianco is part of the reports, and I wonder why that is. He tells me that the system is complicated, but he’s been supporting the crew who is working with reporting in Charlesburg and helped them to report with as good quality data as possible. I ask Jakob what needs to be reported and he tells me:

Jakob: Well, actually we report how many helper shuttles we have, how many that we have conducted an audit on during the previous year, and then we divide the audits, if they have been conducted based on quality or if it’s based on social and environmental aspects./…/ and then we say if we have failed them, we say if it is due to quality, environment or other social issues. We state the reason for non-approval. /…/ and then there’s tons of other stuff, have they signed our ten criteria, and if we have found any chemicals on the prohibited and restricted list, that we also report.
Maira: I see
Jakob: Yes, and then there are many, many other criteria that you can fill in. /…/ and they become more every year.
Jakob, much like Johanna, talks a lot about reporting. Jacob at division 2 does not use the HSCP but their own database in order to get the statistics for the reporting. Statistics are nonetheless relevant, and the criteria on which numbers need to be reported are increasing every year.

**ANALYSIS ROOM SIX**

The process after the Jianco-audit that I was expecting to follow-up on had in my mind to do with a continued interaction between Corp and Jianco and new information regarding what happened with the activities that were set up in the action-plan. Did Jianco implement these? Did Jianco do anything like implement new routines to measure and report on their use of hexavalent chrome? Did all the workers get safety-gear? Did Corp check on this?

In my talk with Jakob, however, I did not get any leads on these queries. The material connection with the Jianco action-plan seems here to have been lost, and a connection is enacted (Mol and Law, 2008) by Jakob, instead when Jianco’s absent action plan is discussed in terms of technical issues. When I asked about what happened after the audit, he tells me that the responsibilities regarding the follow-up of the action plan had been handed over to the Ewing sourcing crew. The documentation pertaining to Jianco is stored on a local hard-drive in Ewing. According to Jakob, there appear to be continued discussions and interaction between Jianco and Ewing, but focusing mostly on technical issues. The Ewing actors are not present here, and the use of local hard-drives to store the documents on means that neither Jakob nor I can access them. But this doesn’t stop business from continuing at Charlesburg.

I was looking for a process that was natural in my thinking, what happened after the audit, and trying to find material traces that would help me figure this out. In my talk with Jakob, however, his answers to my questions about what happened after the audit related instead to Jakob’s and Corp’s natural after-audit process in Charlesburg. This is the reporting process. So much like Johanna at division 1, Jakob at division 2 also acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for a *reporting mindset* (See Figure 19 below).
The reporting of helper-shuttles is to say the least, complicated. To complicate matters further, different units and divisions often share the same helper-shuttles for different parts, which means that one of the divisions or units must report, and this needs to be agreed upon in order to avoid double-reporting. Jakob calls this the ‘grey-zone’. It seems that these are matters that are settled locally, e.g. between Jakob and Johanna for the sourcing department in Charlesburg. But regarding the Jianco audit, there does not seem to have been such a discussion.

**Summary of Analysis Room Six**

The Purple booklet has taken new forms. The helper-shuttle that was audited based on the HSAG and given a score and an action plan, now takes the shape of reporting parameters, aggregated with scores and reports from hundreds of other helper-shuttles, the Jianco-audit is indiscernible. Reporting on helper-shuttles includes a large number of parameters. To begin with, whether they are approved or not, and if not, for what reason. Three possible alternatives for non-approval include i) quality, ii) environmental or iii) other social issues. Other criteria to report include whether the ten principles have been signed or not, and whether any chemicals on the
prohibited and restricted list were found. Jianco, however, is not counted in these parameters because Jianco belongs to a different business unit.

Following are the take-aways from the analyses in room six.

**The code:**

(i) In its translated form of the Jianco action plan, is materially absent but made present in a new light (as Jakob enacts it as relevant in China relating to technical issues but relevant in Sweden for reporting purposes).

(ii) Is again (like in room five) translated into a punctualized actor in the form of sustainability statistics (aggregated audits as statistics of value for the Corp’s annual reporting).

**Associated ideas:** seem to stem from a reporting mind-set, and practical concerns entail making the best of the situation, i.e. getting the best statistics possible given the discrepancies between divisions and their different ways of handling data internally.
ROOM SEVEN

(A Follow-up Audit and New Action Plan)

A Note on Method

After my visit to China, observing the audit in 2011, I had spent time working through the material and tried to follow up on material traces left after the audit, particularly in the form of the action plan and follow-ups in relation to this plan. I wondered what had happened with all the concerns that Jakob had with Jianco regarding e.g. their use of hexavalent chrome, or documentation regarding workers competence. I began the tracking by contacting Jakob and Johanna (as seen in rooms five and six) who were involved in the audit. Both of them had however, moved on and were mainly concerned with reporting and sustainability statistics. The responsibility to follow-up on the audit, I learned was left by the Swedish auditors right after the audit was conducted. It was now up to the Chinese sourcing crew to work with Jianco and follow up on their progress. I therefore got in touch with Jing, who was the only one I knew at the time who was working at the Chinese sourcing department. He referred me to Wendy, and that’s how I came in contact with a follow-up audit. I received all the internal Corp material pertaining to the follow-up audit via email from Wendy.

I couldn’t find any material traces after the specific Jianco-audit in Sweden, and it seemed that it wasn’t clear who exactly, in Ewing had the responsibility for the follow up of the audit. I therefore kept regular email contact with the sourcing department in Charlesburg and had heard that Jing, one of the Ewing sourcing engineers who was present at the Jianco audit in 2011, would be visiting the sourcing department in Charlesburg during the summer of 2012. In June 2012 I took a shuttle-train to Charlesburg and met with Jing. Recall that Jing was, during the audit in 2011, a fairly new employee at Corp Ewing and was learning how to conduct audits. Jing brings with him a perspective with local knowledge from the sourcing department at Ewing and tells me what he and other crewmembers work with.

Jing: For the daily job there are several sides, one side, a lot of production [related] work, they need to push helper-shuttles to deliver the parts on time, and we can’t stop production. That is the first mission. Then, we have some business like the initial sample orders, for the new design machine then maybe we need to have continued contact with the current helper-shuttle.
Jing was able to tell me generally about what had happened after the 2011 audit at Jianco. I asked whether the audit had been closed, and reported. He was not able to tell me if it had been reported to group level but he told me that it was time to do another follow-up audit and that this follow-up should allow them to make a decision on whether they could close the actions in the action-plan or not. Jing suggested that we call Wendy, the HSQE, (helper-shuttle quality engineer), who is responsible for the follow up audit.

We called Wendy in Ewing while Jing and I were sitting in Charlesburg, and I ask her about the 2011 audit at Jianco.

Maira: I was wondering if the Jianco audit has been closed, the one that was done in September [2011]?
Wendy: I think we don't close the action plan, because after Jakob made the audit, I didn’t make the follow-up audit.
Maira: Okay. So when will the follow-up audit be done?
Wendy: I think maybe... I can make a plan to take it.

Wendy responds to my questions regarding the audit by informing me that she must do the follow-up on Jianco before she can say what has been done. I was curious whether the Jianco audit had made it to the sustainability report, and if the action plan had been followed up, so I asked if the problems Corp had been having with Jianco had been solved. Wendy tells me that she will check, but according to her it is not her responsibility to keep track of such things. She wanted to go back into the details and check each point on the action plan before she could say if they had been solved.

Wendy: I should check one by one, because the audit is not mine to do.

Jing says Wendy is responsible for the Jianco follow-up, as HSQE, but Wendy seems to feel otherwise. Wendy seems to take my queries regarding Jianco as a reminder or perhaps an unwanted order to check up on Jianco and plan a follow-up. At the same time, she indicates that this is not her responsibility. If I were to track the follow-up on Jianco, however, I needed to stay in touch with people at Ewing. So Wendy and I agree that we will correspond via email and Jing shares her email address with me. A few days later I sent Wendy an email asking her specifically about the Jianco audit from 2011.

From my mail to Wendy: What is required to close the audit? Do you know if the audit has been reported for 2011’s sustainability reporting or if it will be reported for year 2012?
Wendy was unable to answer my question but she sent me the PowerPoint file, which summarized the audit along with the action plan from the 2011 audit. This file looked almost the same as the one Jakob had shared with me right after the audit, except that some Chinese text had been added to certain points in the action plan on point 9.5 concerning design changes.

I tried to establish contact with others in Ewing who might be able to answer my questions, but not knowing the right people was a problem. I continued to keep in touch with Jing and Wendy and a few months later, in the end of February of 2013, I received an email from Jing, informing me that a follow-up audit had been conducted at Jianco. Wendy was the lead auditor. Wendy sent me the results of the follow up audit and I began to compare the results (action plans, and scorecards) from the two audits to try to understand what might have happened during the time between the audits in terms of the actions specified on the 2011 action-plan. To my surprise, the action plans for the two audits were rather similar, on some points, identical – but the final score differed starkly (Table 15 on pg. 202 and Table 16 on pg. 208)

In the table below (Table 15) you see the actions that were put down in the action plan for Jianco after the 2011 audit and the 2013 audit. In the first two columns you see the description of the problem (for 2011 and 2013 respectively) which shows the point of action corresponding to the HSAG as well as a short explication of the issue which Corp has with Jianco. Columns three and four describe the action that Corp wants Jianco to take (for 2011 and 2013 respectively). Column five and six show the end date that was given to Jianco by which time to complete the action (for 2011 and 2013 respectively). Columns seven and eight show the score that Jianco received in accordance with the HSAG and corresponding excel sheet in the 2011 and 2013 audits. The specific scores are kept as internal information in Corp and not shared with the helper-shuttle. Only the final tallied scores are shared with the helper-shuttle, together with the action plan. As can be seen in the table, rows 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 16 (highlighted in grey) show that the action plans for 2011 and 2013 are almost identical on these points.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row/Column</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2 Global Ability</td>
<td>Didn’t supply all Division two factories in other areas</td>
<td>Continually do quality improvement projects and give support in all markets</td>
<td>a.s.a.p. and continually improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2 Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>Corp are not included in the customer survey that are followed for other customers.</td>
<td>According to ISO 9001 the helper-shuttle shall monitor information relating to customer perception as to whether the organization has met customer requirements. Methods for obtaining and using this information shall be determined. This could be to develop a routine for measuring the customer satisfaction (with customer survey or other methods) Based on the outcome, set up an improvement plan on areas that can be improved.</td>
<td>Start a.s.a.p. and continuously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2 Environment</td>
<td>The use of Chromium, hexavalent (Cr6+) compounds was not brought up by Jianco during the last review of the prohibited and restricted list. Maximum concentration value of 0, 1% by weight in homogeneous are</td>
<td>The use of Chromium, hexavalent (Cr6+) compounds was not brought up by Jianco during the last review of the prohibited and restricted list. Maximum concentration value of 0, 1% by weight in homogeneous are allowed.</td>
<td>Review Corp’s prohibited and restricted list once more to ensure that Corp receive information if substances stated in the list are used.</td>
<td>Before the end of September.</td>
<td>Before the end of September.</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15 - Comparison of Jianco Action Plan 2011 and 2013**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4. Working environment. Unclear what kind of safety protection needed around surface treatment area (Chromium). Mask was not used by everyone. In production only some workers had safety shoes. Unclear about what the requirements are. Not safe to bring visitors to the pressure test areas without stopping the production or providing appropriate safety protection gear. Unclear about required safety protection for workers in the pressure test.</th>
<th>Ensure that the workers use and are provided safety protection where needed and that they have the right appropriate training.</th>
<th>Start a.s.a.p. and continuously.</th>
<th>Blank</th>
<th>2/3</th>
<th>2/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2 Quality Assurance Leakage of parts</td>
<td>According to ISO 9001, helper-shuttle is obliged to develop processes for product realization and keep records. 100% final test on Corp hydraulic cylinders including pressure test together with the assembled valves. Record should be kept to show evidence that test has been performed.</td>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3 Quality Performance of Deliveries Jianco target on 300 PPM is not achieved for Corp</td>
<td>Identify root cause and set up action plan with improvement activities. Keep monitoring the PPM level closely until acceptable level has been achieved. Action plan should</td>
<td>Before end of September</td>
<td>a.s.a.p. and continually monitor</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Wane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3 Quality Performance of Deliveries 2012 Jianco target on PPM is not achieved for Corp</td>
<td>2013 Corp target is 3500 PPM. Identify root cause and set up action plan with improvement activities. Keep monitoring the PPM level closely until acceptable level has been achieved. Action plan should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4 Problem Solving</td>
<td>Jianco did not pay for the warranty cost until now</td>
<td>level has been achieved: action plan should be communicated to Corp.</td>
<td>End of June</td>
<td>Wane, Ralph and Wendy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>According to ISO 9001 the helper-shuttle shall determine and implement effective communication with customers in relation to customer feedback and customer complaints.</td>
<td>a.s.a.p.</td>
<td>a.s.a.p. and continually</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Wane and Wendy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5 Problem solving</td>
<td>Jianco is not responding to claims and are not following the Corp expected lead time</td>
<td>Improved and should be perfect and can forecast problem later.</td>
<td>According to ISO 9001 the helper-shuttle shall determine and implement effective communication with customers in relation to customer feedback and customer complaints.</td>
<td>a.s.a.p.</td>
<td>a.s.a.p. and continually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regarding claims from Corp, a formal way of problem solving that includes, short and long term corrective action and root cause analysis, shall be implemented and sent back to Corp.</td>
<td>Set up a routine to ensure that you follow expected lead time on 48h for short term corrective action and 14 days for long term corrective action.</td>
<td>Set up a routine to ensure that you follow expected lead time on 48h for short term corrective action and 14 days for long term corrective action.</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Wane and Wendy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.2 Delivery precision Jianco target on 95% in delivery precision is not achieved for Corp.</td>
<td>Identify root cause and set up action plan with improvement activities. Keep monitoring the delivery precision closely until acceptable level has been achieved. Action plan should be communicated to Corp.</td>
<td>Identify root cause and set up action plan with improvement activities. Keep monitoring the delivery precision closely until acceptable level has been achieved. Action plan should be communicated to Corp.</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Wane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4 provide spare parts for a minimum of 10 years</td>
<td>Identify root cause and set up action plan with</td>
<td>End of June</td>
<td>Wane</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12</th>
<th></th>
<th>13</th>
<th></th>
<th>14</th>
<th></th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | 8. Competence  
No documentation describing the workers competence or which training that has been performed. | According to ISO 9001 the helper-shuttle is obliged to determine necessary competence for personnel performing work affecting quality, provide training, evaluate effectiveness of actions taken, maintain records etc.  
3. Continue the plan to improve the documentation over competence. E.g. Competence matrix etc. | According to existing plan. |   |   |
For new Corp cylinders the general process and project model as for other customer should be used. D-FMEA, Process flow chart, P-FMEA and Control plan should be developed as a minimum in accordance to example showed for Terex, QAP, and Quality Assurance Plan.  
For next new cylinder and continuously. | For next new cylinder and continuously.  
According to existing plan.  
Continuously | Ralph and Wendy | 8/12 | 13/15 |
|   | 9.5 Design changes.  
Jianco has made changes in the design without informing and receiving approval from Corp. | All changes of the design need to be approved by Corp before implementation.  
Chinese translated version can be provided. |   |   | 1/3 (included in above 8/12) | 3/3 (included in above 13/15) |
|   | 11.1 Process of internal cost reduction  
Has cost reduction system but not used of Corp’s | Set up action plan how to continually do the internal cost reduction of Corp’s cylinders.  
Continuously | a.s.a.p. and continually communicate with | Wane, Elly, and Jing | 1/3 | 2/3 |
12. Sourcing

Include SHE aspects (Safety, Health, Environment and Quality) as well for social performance in the helper shuttle assessment document. See Corp’s minimum expectations in Business Ethics, Social and Environmental Performance Criteria for Corp Business Partners attached to the audit invitation letter.

Include SHE aspects (Safety, Health, Environment and Quality) as well for social performance in the helper-shuttle assessment document. See Corp’s minimum expectations in Business Ethics, Social and Environmental Performance Criteria for Corp Business Partners attached to the audit invitation letter.

Blank

a.s.a.p.

Blank

Wane

4/6

5/6
There are more points in the HSAG than have been taken up in the action plan, and the grading on these areas varied between the audits. If all questions are included, the total applicable points would amount to 108, i.e. a maximum of 3 points for each of the 36 questions. As you see in Table 16 below, some questions were removed in both 2011 and 2013, amounting to total applicable scores of 84 and 105 respectively.

In 2011, nine questions pertaining to four different areas were omitted and Jianco scored 53 out of 84 applicable points which equals to 63%. In 2013, only one of the questions were omitted from the scorecard, and Jianco scored 84 out of 105 which equals to 80%.

When looking at the points that Jianco received in 2013, a total of 15 points out of 21 applicable are allocable to questions that were omitted in 2011. If we compare the scores, adjusted for the omitted questions (i.e. only compare the scores on the same questions asked during both audits, the result would be 53/84= 63% for 2011 and 69/84=82%. With these results, it would be reasonable to expect improvements in the areas brought up in the action plan.

Even without the extra questions that were asked in 2013, Jianco received higher scores on average in 2013 as compared to 2011. What is interesting to note, however, is that many of the areas where Jianco received higher scores in 2013, have exactly the same problems according to the action plan. See for example, in table (3 and 4) areas 9. Design Changes, and 12. Sourcing. With the same actions in the action plan, indicating continued problems with the same issues, the scores have increased with 20% and 16% respectively (see table 4 rows 13 and 16).
### Table 16 - Comparison of Jianco Scores in 2011 and 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Score 2011</th>
<th>In action plan</th>
<th>Score 2013</th>
<th>In action plan</th>
<th>Score change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Company Profile</td>
<td>5/9=56%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8/9=89%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Management</td>
<td>6/9=67%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8/9=89%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Environment</td>
<td>5/6=83%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5/6=83%</td>
<td>Yes (same as 2011)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social and Ethics</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality</td>
<td>8/12=67%(two questions omitted)</td>
<td>Yes (5.5, 5.3, and 5.5)</td>
<td>11/18=61%</td>
<td>Yes (5.3, 5.4, and 5.5)</td>
<td>decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Logistics</td>
<td>2/6=33% (one question omitted)</td>
<td>Yes (6.2)</td>
<td>4/6=67% (one question omitted)</td>
<td>Yes (same as 2011)</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. After-Market</td>
<td>0/0=0% (all five questions omitted)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10/12=83%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Competence</td>
<td>9/15=60%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13/15=87%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Product Development</td>
<td>8/12=67% (one question omitted)</td>
<td>Yes (9. and 9.5)</td>
<td>13/15=87%</td>
<td>Yes (same as 2011)</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Finance</td>
<td>3/3=100%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3/3=100%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Productivity</td>
<td>1/3=33%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2/3=67%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sourcing</td>
<td>4/6=67%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5/6=83%</td>
<td>Yes (same as 2011)</td>
<td>increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Applicable**

53/84=63% 84/105=80%

In a comparison of the 2011 and 2013 action plans, the observed differences can be categorized into three types of material results for the actions (See
Table 17 - Shifting Traces of Actions and Table 18 - Changes from 2011 to 2013 below and on the following page) removed or made invisible, i.e. they were present in the 2011 action plan but have been removed from the 2013 action plan, 2) remained or kept present, i.e. they were present in the 2011 action plan and are still present in the 2013 action plan, and 3) added or made present, i.e. they were not present in the 2011 action plan but they have been added into the 2013 action plan. In the table below we can have a look at what these actions correspond to.
But what do these changes in the action plan mean and how can they be understood? The table below shows the points on the action plan which were involved (each is seen as a separate actor) in the process, what happened to these between 2011 and 2013 and a reflection on how to understand this change. The table is further discussed below.

**Table 17 - Shifting Traces of Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Removed/Remained/Added</th>
<th>HSAG points on action plan</th>
<th>Material Change</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>2.2. Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Illogical. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>4. Working Environment</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>2 years, nothing stated on what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>5.2 Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Illogical. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>8. Competence</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Logical/improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added</td>
<td>9.5 Design Changes</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td>Logical/improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>12. Sourcing</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>Counterintuitive. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>1.2 Global Ability</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>2 years, nothing stated on what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>5.4 Problem Solving</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>2 years, nothing stated on what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>7.4 Provide Spare Parts for a minimum of 10 years</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>2 years, nothing stated on what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>11.1 Process of internal cost reduction</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>2 years, nothing stated on what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Has the same score and has remained unchanged on the action plan</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>2 years, nothing stated on what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Has the same score and has remained unchanged on the action plan</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>2 years, nothing stated on what has happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Has increased in score from 8/12 to 13/15 but the comments have remained unchanged in the action plan</td>
<td>Remained</td>
<td>Illogical. Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Added**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Has been added to the action plan, but has the same score on the scorecard.</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Illogical. Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Has been added to the action plan with a score of 1 in 2013, was omitted in 2011</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Impossible to judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Has been added to the action plan and received a score of 2, was omitted in 2011</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Impossible to judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Has been added to the action plan but increased in score from 1 to 2</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Counterintuitive. Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main reason to compare differences between the action plans was to try to find out what had happened at Jianco and at Corp between the two audits. Looking at the differences however, seems to bear the question, ‘does the action plan correspond to what the auditors were evaluating?’ Judging from the action plan, many of the problems, which Jianco had in 2011, still persist. So why then do the scores differ so much?

In trying to explain the changes in the action plans (See Table 18 - Changes from 2011 to 2013 above), we can see that there are two that make sense logically, 8 and 9.5. These have both been removed from the new action plan and been scored higher than in 2011. However, many of the points are counterintuitive or illogical e.g. 1.2, 2.2, 3.2, 4 and 5.2 where the score is the same as the previous audit, but 1.2 has been added, 2.2 and 5.2 have been removed from the action plan, and 3.2, 4, 5.3, 5.5 and 6.2 have been kept unchanged. This is indicative of qualitative measures that are put into the judgement. The score could be the same, but the auditor at the time feels that there is something that must be improved, alternatively that a low score still indicates good-enough performance and does not need improvement.

Point 9 has received an increased score, from 0.67 to 0.86 but the activities remained unchanged on the action plan. Similarly, point 12 received a higher score but the activities in the action plan remain unchanged. Certain points don’t allow for a comparison, e.g. 5.4 and 7.4 because the corresponding questions were skipped...
during the 2011 audit. 11.1 is the only point that has received a higher score in 2013 than in 2011 and been added to the action plan. Without notes on why these changes were made, but only a score indicating differences of observed or perceived improvement in the area, there is a huge amount of information which is black-boxed (Latour, 2005). The only people who have this information are the auditors who conducted the audit and made a judgement to score the different points.

While removed points from the action plan would ideally mean an improvement from the helper-shuttle, indicated by a higher score, e.g. on point 4. Working environment that all workers are given and wearing safety gear or that on point 5.2 Quality Assurance that 100% tests are now being done by Jianco, but this is not represented in an increased score. This means that either the lead auditor, Wendy, did not compare scores from the previous audit when doing her score setting in that an improvement would amount to a higher score than in 2011, or based her judgment on her assessment of a value given to the 0,1, 2, or 3 which is possible on each question.

**ANALYSIS ROOM SEVEN**

The scores from the new audit do not clearly correspond to perceived improvements or problems. The HSAG is this way shown to be mediating (Latour, 2005) in the production of a new numerical value given to Jianco internally at Corp. For the audit process to be completed, an auditor must fill in scores on each of the areas, tally these and arrive at a final evaluative score. The audit score becomes a punctualized (Law, 1992) actor, which is enacted (Law and Mol, 2008) in creation of a value-label, 80%. This percentage is in turn enrolled (Callon, 1986a) at Corp so that sourcing engineers, all around the world, can access this new label which is attached to Jianco, and use this information as an indicator that this is a helper-shuttle they can continue sourcing from. The score legitimizes Jianco as a helper-shuttle to Corp. Jianco, has successfully been enacted (Mol, 2002) anew. According to the 2013 audit results and action plan which is the updated version of information circulated in Corp regarding this particular helper-shuttle, the issues of concern at this helper-shuttle have been to a large extent mitigated, as the scores on all areas have increased.

The changes between the action plans might be small, but they contribute towards a new idea about Jianco as a helper-shuttle (see Figure 20 below), in making present and bringing to the forefront certain aspects and removing traces of others. Different auditors using different score-cards (with differing questions) can explain the discrepancies between the scores at the two audits. But looking at the differences and similarities in the actions plans begs the question whether anything at all really happened at Jianco regarding the actions set up in 2011.
Summary of Analysis Room Seven

Results from two different audits are not comparable, as different auditors seem to be using the HSAG differently. Room seven indicates that previously powerful PiD 1 (Room 2) which was so carefully crafted and put together in Charlesburg in order for auditors all around the world to be able to conduct audits that would yield comparability, has failed. A new auditor has used the same guidelines in a different composition and arrived at very different scores.

Translations of the code in room seven, exist in the form of actions in the 2013 action plan. The actions in the 2013 action plan which correspond to previous translations of the purple booklet (the HSAGs, and the ten criteria including the prohibited and restricted list) include 3.2 Environment, previously Quality measures (Table 11 on pg.119) are here seen as measures for Jianco to improve PPM, pay for warranties, adjust their problem solving in accordance with ISO 9001 and an admonition for Jianco to continuously work on cost reductions for Corp’s cylinders.

Following are the take-aways from the analysis in room seven.
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The code:

(i) In its translated form of the Jianco action plan and score enacts Jianco in a new light (a big improvement in the score from 63 to 80%).
(ii) In its translated form of action plan deals mostly with quality concerns.
(iii) In the form of translation PiD I is not enacted the way it was intended, but rather becomes a mediator when a new auditor works with the same set of guidelines.

Associated ideas about: seem to stem primarily from a quality and control-mindset. Although we see remnants of concerns for the environment in terms of it being given space in the action plan, the corresponding action however, has to do with reviewing Corp’s demands in accordance with their prohibited and restricted list and informing Corp of the substances being used.
ROOM EIGHT

(Comparing the Action Plans, Ewing, China)

A Note on Method

Finding out whether anything had taken place at Jianco, and how the score-setting was done by Wendy at the follow-up audit was something that couldn’t be done from afar. I could compare the documents from the 2011 and the 2013 audit (room seven), but what had happened in-between needed clarification. I needed to travel back to China to meet with both Wendy and Jing who had conducted the audit in order to understand why the score had increased so much from the first audit to the follow-up, while many of the problems still showed up in the new action plan.

In June 2013, I visited Corp Ewing again and spent nine days at Corp, beginning with the sourcing department. The sourcing department was located on the second floor of a large office building in Ewing’s industrial zone. Entering the Corp premises required that I got a visitor card, sanctioned by the head of the sourcing department before I could be let into the office, but once inside, I was free to roam around in the entire building.

The first person I met with formally was Wendy. I meet with her by her office desk, which was located in an open landscape where she shared an area of about 8 square meters with three others. There are about ten other such desk-constellations, arranged back to back in the room. Only one of the other desks in Wendy’s square was occupied, so I could sit next to her while I asked her about her work and specifically about the follow up audit on Jianco. I asked her why many of the points in the action plan are the same as they were two years ago, when Jianco’s score has improved from 63% in 2011 to 80% in 2013.

Wendy tells me that she has at this point been working for Corp Ewing for nearly two years, which means that she joined right about when the first audit was done. Wendy tells me that she wasn’t involved in the audit during 2011, but started working towards Jianco right from the beginning.

Wendy: When I came to Corp my first work was to monitor and organize and work with Jianco and help them improve their performance because when I came here, Jianco’s performance was very bad, in quality issues.
Wendy and I spent some time talking about her work with Jianco from the time she joined up until recently, when the follow-up audit was conducted, in March 2013. She tells me how she works.

Wendy: We do a program, HSQDP, you know?
Maira: yes, helper-shuttle quality development process.
Wendy: Yes, to help them improve their performance for each quality issue that happens in incoming in the production line and then machine audit and the FSM that means the quality in the field, on the customer site.
Maira: Ok.
Wendy: Yes, for each quality issue I got enough information from different areas then I organize and analyze. Then I will send the plan to Jianco to work together with them to find the root cause and get to some precautions, then take the actions and monitor the actions influence.

The focus in Wendy’s talk about her work seems to revolve mostly around quality related issues. Wendy tells me about Jianco as a helper-shuttle and about the follow up audit which she conducted there. She tells me that they have improved a lot, and this is also indicated in the higher score that they received on their 2013 audit, an increase from 63% to 80%. Wendy indicates that Jianco was paying better attention to Corp’s business and that they had settled in their new production plant and management system. The fact that Corp now was buying also from a competitor, Wendy believed was one of the reasons that Jianco was now paying better attention to Corp. Although they had previously been working with other hydraulic helper-shuttles, these were located very far away from Ewing. The new competitor, Ninco was located in the same industrial zone as Jianco.

Wendy was the lead auditor at the 2013 audit, and I ask her about how she did the score setting. She brings out her documents from the audit and takes the opportunity to share with me some of the difficulties she experienced in interpreting certain questions in the HSAG’s and therefore in scoring these areas. At times she asked me if I could help her. One of these questions concerned a stopping parameter, point 10. Finance.

Wendy: About finance, I don’t understand this item. Do you know it?
Maira: Ten, ten point one [financial evaluation]?
Wendy: Where can I get this data? I don’t know this.
Maira: What does it say in the helper-shuttle assessment guidelines? I would check there. Do you have the helper-shuttle assessment guidelines? The guidelines, which go with this evaluation form?
Wendy: Yes I have the guidelines.
Maira: What is it written? Because I don’t understand this either. I don’t know what this means.
Wendy: [Laughs] so, normally I don’t [score this], I put an ‘x’ in here.

Wendy says that she would normally mark this question as ‘not applicable’ as she does not know where to find the data. It is indicated in the HSAGs that the helper-shuttle’s finances should be verified using a Dun and Bradstreet report. After our conversation I looked this up and found out that a Dun and Bradstreet is a service which companies can buy in order to analyze the financial credentials of their business partners. According to their own website, they are “the world’s leading source of commercial information and insight on businesses, enabling companies to Decide with Confidence for more than 172 years. Today, D&B's global commercial database contains more than 225 million business records. The database is enhanced by D&B's proprietary DUNSRight Quality Process, which provides our customers with quality business information. This quality information is the foundation of our global solutions that customers rely on to make critical business decisions.” (See room 3 for how the Dun and Bradstreet Report was intended to be used). The score setting on this question, however, follows a system of crediting which is indecipherable unless you have knowledge of this system of categorization.

When looking through the evaluation of Jianco made by Wendy and her team in 2013, the official record of the score that Jianco received on question 10 is a 3, that is to say, a full score. The scores for both years on point 10. Finance can be seen in Table 16 - Comparison of Jianco Scores in 2011 and 2013 on page 208. This is the same score as the helper-shuttle received during the 2011 audit. As the question is a stopping parameter, it is not possible to mark it with an ‘x’ i.e. not applicable. This particular question cannot be skipped; it must be marked with a score. If the score is zero, the helper-shuttle will fail the entire evaluation.

Back to Wendy again:

Wendy: Yeah, and another question I have is [shuffling papers]…Maybe you can see about one point three.
Maira: What is 1.3 about?
Wendy: Dependence.
Maira: Yes, dependency.
Wendy: It just says, when the business is to Corp division 2, but normally we audit the helper shuttle, it is not with the business with division 2, but for the all divisions.
Wendy: It is very difficult to give the score.

Wendy is here referring to the wording in the HSAGs which clearly states that the business and attention given to division 2 shall be scored. This is because this specific audit tool was developed by division 2. Recall that Division 1 in Charlesburg has a slightly different audit tool, but in Ewing where the entire production unit is shared by division 1 and 2 and many helper shuttles are shared, the auditors from Sweden (headed by Jakob as global sourcing engineer) have decided to work with the division 2 audit tool from Charlesburg. However, this entails difficulties for the auditors in Ewing when they are supposed to use the questions in the HSAGs to evaluate the helper-shuttles. See Table 19 below which shows the guidelines for auditors when scoring the area of dependency.

The auditor had in this case seen a problem, and wanted to score the helper-shuttle based on their entire business, not just towards division 2. A look through the scorecard revealed that the score given on this question during the 2013 audit was also a full score, a 3.

Table 19 - HSAG on 1.3 Dependency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>guideline</th>
<th>Associated score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helper shuttle's business to Corp division 2 is large enough to give attention but not that large that the helper-shuttle must rely on Corp division 2 / Independent industry.</td>
<td>3p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper shuttle's business to Corp division 2 is large enough to give attention but it also takes a larger portion of the helper-shuttles’ activities / Independent industry.</td>
<td>2p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper shuttle’s business to Corp division 2 is too small to give attention / Few big customers.</td>
<td>1p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not acceptable dependency / Monopoly.</td>
<td>0p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the 2011 and 2013 Audit with Wendy

Wendy received the 2011 action plan and documentation on the Jianco audit from Lee, when she started. Recall that Lee was one of the sourcing engineers from Ewing who accompanied Jakob and Johanna on the Jianco audit (see room 4). However, we now learn that Lee quit Corp as he received another job and therefore handed over the responsibility to follow up Jianco’s progress to Wendy.

Recall also that the action plan from 2011 did not contain any names in the column for responsible from helper-shuttle (Room 4, Table 14 on page 173). When comparing the action plans from the 2011 and 2013 audits, a total of six points, representing approximately half of the actions in the action plan, were more or less
exactly the same (See Room 7, Table 15 on page 202). The difference is now that the column for responsible people has been filled in for the 2013 audit. These names include both representatives from the helper-shuttle as well as from the Corp Ewing sourcing department. Wane, Ralph and Elly represent the helper-shuttle and Jing and Wendy are responsible from Corp’s side. It was unclear why so many of the points had remained unchanged for two years, and Wendy wasn’t able to explain this to me.

Wendy tells me that they recently had audited two other hydraulic helper-shuttles, including Ninco which is located close to Jianco and another one which is situated farther away, in an area called Xi’an. I asked to have a look at the action plans from these audits in order to get an idea of how these might look. Ninco (Jianco’s competitor) was audited on 2013-03-15 and approved with a score of 77%. The helper-shuttle in Xi’an was audited in August 2012. This helper-shuttle received a score of 68%. The action plan included 10 points which the helper-shuttle needed to work on. These include, 5.2 part quality assurance, 5.3 quality performance of deliveries, 8. Competence, 5. Problem solving, 4. Working environment, 3.2 Environment, 12. Sourcing, 2.2 Customer satisfaction, 2. Signs in working area and 9. Product development. Going through this action plan revealed that many of the points there were exactly the same as those for Jianco’s action plan. It was clear that these must have been copied directly from the Jianco audit, as the auditing team had even missed to correct the name of the helper-shuttle in the explanations of the points on the action plan meant for the supplier in Xi’an, so instead of the name of the audited helper-shuttle, it says Jianco also in their action plan.

Comparing the 2011 and 2013 Audit with Jing

The next person I met with in Ewing was Jing. Jing was a new employee at the time when the 2011 audit took place. Since then he had been involved in several audits, and now also in the follow up audit of Jianco in March 2013. I ask Jing what happened during the audit and why some of the points in the action plan were exactly the same as two years ago. He tries to explain to me, point by point why the remarks in the action plan were exactly the same, but it seems he is not certain, his explanations vary; sounding sometimes like excuses and sometimes like genuine confusion. His explanations ranged from reasons amounting to a lack of paper work, perhaps it’s because the helper-shuttle did not get the total applicable points [which is three] for the issue being inquired about, and sometimes pondering over what the remarks were doing there. I ask him specifically about the points which recur in both the 2011 and 2013 audit. Our discussion was as follows:

Maira: For example, we can start with this. 5.3.
Jing: 5.3. Quality performance of deliveries
Maira: So, in this one, the old one [from 2011]. It says quality performance of deliveries, Jianco target on 300 PPM is not achieved for Corp, and here it says, 2012 Jianco target on PPM is not achieved for Corp. So, umm, what is the difference?
Jing: Hmm.
Maira: And, the same with the environment, you remember the hexavalent chromium that they are using in the finishing of the cylinders? That is still on the action plan also.
Jing: Mhmm.
Maira: So why these points are still the same?
Jing: Uhhh, 5.3 uhh here, at that time actually we didn’t have a clear PPM level, PPM target, for the Ewing plant.
Maira: Ok.
Jing: So, this, uhhh… and at that time… actually Jianco’s quality has improved a lot further, at that time. But here, we have a clear PPM target, 3000 and 1500.
Maira: PPM means how many parts per million that are defected or how many parts per million that are not defected?
Jing: Yes. We have the Jianco PPM. I can give you later, yes, they are not achieving the target but they have agreed to improve.

There is a small difference between the two action plans and Jing explains to me that this is because Corp now has exact PPM targets, so this was added to the new action plan in order to clarify what exactly Jianco is expected to achieve.

One of the points that came up during the Jianco audit in 2011 was the use of hexavalent chrome for the chroming of the cylinders. Recall that hexavalent chrome is on Corp’s restricted list, and if it must be used there is a maximum concentration amounting to 0, 1% of the total weight of the product. However, helper-shuttles using any chemical on the restricted list must inform Corp about this and monitor their usage. This point about the use of hexavalent chrome was another issue that had not changed between the 2011 and 2013 action plans. I asked Jing about point 3.2 Environment, under which the issue of hexavalent chrome is brought up in the action plans.

Jing: Environment? I, just about this one, I talked to Edward, ehhh, he knows that because it’s… I think it’s a necessary process for the cylinders to use six chrome. Because, chrome six is hard, to make the cylinder piston load harder.
Maira: But why is it in the action plan?
Jing: You know, if this one is not achieved we have to put it here, right. So I think, this is just lack of paper work.
Maira: Lack of paper work?
Jing: Yes, something like that. I think it is, not [important] for cylinders. Maybe for other [parts] it is very important but for cylinders I think no cylinder plant can reach this one.
Maira: But I’m wondering why this point was there two years ago and it’s still there.
Jing: I don’t know. It’s strange.

It seems the reason why this action is in the action plan is to make the helper-shuttles aware that the responsibility of using a toxic chemical lies with them, hence they need to monitor the usage, safety issues, waste treatment etc. themselves.

Another example of a point that had remained unchanged in the action plans between 2011 and 2013 was point 12. Sourcing. On this point, Corp wanted to see documentation regarding Jianco’s own auditing of their helper-shuttles. Corp demanded of Jianco to audit their helper-shuttles on safety, health and environmental aspects. Jing reflects over the similarities as follows.

Jing: Actually the issue improved but why it is here?
Maira: Yes?
Jing: And the record has improved.
Jing: Number 12, I don’t know why it is here.
Maira: It says for next new cylinder, here it says for next new cylinder continuously. I mean it looks like a copy and paste.
Jing: Uhhhh. Ehh, yeah.
Jing: Let me see. Errr, I think, why we put it here. I feel, not all the item is, all the umm…it’s complicated because we find it’s not improved here.
Maira: So you mean all the columns are copied here?
Jing: No, no, no. We only copy the columns we need here.

Jing couldn’t really explain to me why some of the points were in the action plan, but the ones that could be explained provided an array of reasons, copying and pasting those that are still applicable/needed, using one audit as a template for another, clarifying new targets that Corp has set, and effectively informing the helper-shuttle that responsibilities lie with them.

**ANALYSIS ROOM EIGHT**

In room eight we find some hints which can give insights regarding the new action plan. Looking at the action plans for three different suppliers indicated that the Jianco 2011 action plan, set up by Jakob had been used as a template when auditing other helper-shuttles. Several actions on the action plan for the Xi’an competitor were copied right out of the Jianco 2011 action plan. The 2011 Jianco action plan becomes a mediator (Latour, 2005) used as a template for other audits.

However we get indications that there were also other actors, both human and non-human which had a mediating (Latour, 2005) role during the score-setting and
creation of the new action plan. We see that when it comes to scoring the audits, Wendy is not always able to make the calls. The Dun and Bradstreet report, through its absence, created problems for the lead auditor. Not knowing how to interpret this area, she tried to skip the question on Finances (See Figure 21 below). The question on Finance, however, is a stopping parameter and the pre-programmed excel-macro will not allow Wendy to skip the question. The excel-macro therefore acts as a mediator (Latour, 2005) in that Wendy must enter a score in order to complete the audit. She has a choice of 0, 1, 2, or 3. She marks it with a 3, a full score. Although she picked the number, the excel macro can here be argued to have agency (Latour, 2005) over the lead auditor, as Wendy, in order to complete her audit, must mark this question with a number. The result is that Jianco receives a full score here.

Figure 21 - The Excel Macro has Agency over the Lead Auditor

Another example where Wendy meets some resistance regarding the score-setting relates to the area of dependency. Here the HSAG would have her give a score based on business only to division 2. She however, feels that this is wrong and want to score the helper-shuttle based on their business to both division 1 and 2, acting then as the mediator (Latour, 2005) in the score setting on this point (See Figure 22 below). The result, even here, is a full score.
There are however times, when Wendy acts as a mediator (Latour, 2005), as she has agency when deciding not to use the guiding documents, particularly the HSAG. This is illustrated by her use of a previous action plan as a template for new audits and action plans (See Figure 23 below). The action plan set up by Jakob during the Jianco 2011 audit, is used as a template by Wendy. It is not the HSAG, as guiding document based on the Purple Booklet, which they was used to evaluate the helper-shuttles and make decisions, but rather the action-plan which Jakob left for Jianco that is used as a model for assessing new helper-shuttles. The Jianco action-plan from 2011 is enacted (Law and Mol, 2008) as a template for new helper-shuttle assessments.
Many points in the action plan seemed to indicate that not very much had happened in the almost two years between the audits at Jianco, neither from Corp’s side nor from Jianco’s. Perhaps the lack of responsible people in the right most column in the 2011 action plan could be an explanation. Wendy told me that one of the reasons she thought Jianco had improved their score was due to the fact that Corp now was buying also from one of Jianco’s competitors. She indicates a heightened attention from Jianco, something that Jakob was critical about (recall from room 4 that he was frustrated because Corp wasn’t getting the attention that other customers were, e.g. by not being included in the customer satisfaction survey). The action plan, however, confuses this, because although the scores have increased, many points in the action plan are still the same.

Four different sets of reasons can help explain why the action plan looks the way it does and none of these have to do with Jianco taking any action in accordance with the original action plan. This means that the increase in score from audit (a score of 63%) to follow-up audit (a score of 80%) is largely attributable to the way the auditor set the scores.

The reasons we find for the points in the action plan are (i) copying and pasting points that are still applicable/needed between the 2011 action plan and the current action plan, (ii) using one audit as a reference, suggesting that competitors are actively being compared to one another, and not ‘impartially being evaluated’ as the Purple Booklet would have it (See room zero, Figure 3 on pg. 105), (iii) clarifying new targets that Corp has set e.g. in the case of 5.3 deliveries, i.e. updating internal
information which travels straight into the action plan and (iv) vaguely informing the helper-shuttle that responsibilities lie with them for the use of a highly toxic chemical, i.e. without any clarifications on what Jianco is expected to do more than inform Corp of their use of the chemical, this point travels from action-plan 2011 to 2013 unmediated.

**Summary of Analysis Room Eight**

The inscription device so carefully crafted in room 1 has to a large extent been circumvented by the Chinese auditing crew. Instead of using the detailed guidelines, a former action plan relating to a specific audit is used as a template for new audits. When problems arise in terms of the excel-macro demanding numerical inputs, a number is entered to make the macro work. Reflection regarding stopping parameters and their purpose seems to be non-existent here. The similarities and differences in scores and action plans between 2011 and 2013 seem to a large extent be attributable to factors other than Jianco doing what they were told to do in the original action plan.

Following are the take-aways from the analysis in room eight.

**The code:**

(i) Appears only in the form of traces left in a two year old translation ‘the Jianco 2011 action plan’ which is enacted as a template for conducting new audits.

**Associated ideas:** seem to stem here from Wendy’s central role as lead auditor and her clear focus on quality and efficiency mind-sets which are prominent in her work with Jianco. Quality issues are important and data on quality related issues is gathered, organized and analyzed as a part of her daily work. Wendy acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for the quality mind-set, which is manifested, in her work with Jianco. This mind-set often appears in her framing of the action-plans and explanations of what is going on at Jianco. A lot of work seems to have been done by Wendy in terms of helping Jianco improve their quality, but the main reason for an increase in attention from Jianco towards Corp, is believed to be a new hydraulic competitor, Ninco, located very close to Jianco. This new competitor per se might not have had very much to do with the way Jianco is treating Corp, but the efficiency-mind-set which in transferred as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) though Wendy’s talk is relevant here. An efficiency mind-set often entails cutting costs, as efficiency has to do with achieving the most output with the least possible input. Competition among suppliers is a common way of trying to cut costs.
ROOM NINE

(Meeting the Supplier, 60 km outside Ewing, China)

A Note on Method

Talking to Jing and Wendy in room eight gave some insights to why the new action plan looked the way it did, and how the scores at the follow-up audit were arrived at. However, the information I received from them failed to say anything about whether Jianco had done anything in regards to the action plan from 2011 since the previous audit. In order to find out about what had happened with the action plan at Jianco, I decided to pay them a visit.

Room 9 is located in Jianco’s newly built head office, approximately 60 km East of Ewing. On June 24th 2013 Wendy and Jing had planned a visit to Jianco in order to discuss some quality related issues regarding a cylinder that had shown some problems in use. I asked to come along and booked a private meeting with Wane. Wane is one of the representatives from Jianco who has been listed as ‘responsible’ for several points on the action plan corresponding to the 2013 helper-shuttle audit (see room 7, Table 15 on page 202).

When we arrive at Jianco, I notice that it looks different to what I remember from my visit two years ago. There is a completely new building, the head office, which we approach. When we step inside there is a large hall with a reception desk at one end and a large showcase protected with glass on the other side of the room. In the showcase, miniature machinery is displayed. Jianco does not produce this machinery, but they produce pneumatic and hydraulic pumps and cylinders which are used in these machines. The showcase was displaying Jianco’s customers rather than their own products. At a closer look I could see the logos of large internationally renowned players in the industry. The logos and brands on the miniature machinery represented mostly European, Japanese, and North American companies.

I only spend a few minutes wandering around until Wane and his translator arrived to meet with me. Wane does not speak much English so he meets with me together with his own translator. The translator, Tim, speaks fluent English and is also the international sales representative for Jianco.

I am shown into a nearby meeting room with a large black oval table surrounded by about ten reclining chairs. The walls are bare. When I have presented myself, Jing
and Wendy engage in what I presume to be small talk with Wane and Tim. I do not understand what they are saying as they speak in Chinese but it is seems like the discussion is light-hearted and that they are comfortable with one another. They know each other.

In order to be able to get Jianco’s perspective without being perceived as a representative from Corp (which was difficult as I arrived there together with two Corp employees) I asked Wendy and Jing if I could conduct the interview without them being present. It was not a problem. I sat on one of the longer ends of the table and Wane and Tim sat across me.

Wane’s title according to his business card is, Marketing Manager. Since Tim also works in the sales department, he answered some of the questions himself, however most of them in consultation with Wane.

Tim tells me that Wane’s work entails expanding the market in the region, seeking for new customers and expanding the business with existing customers. Wane also deals with certain daily work regarding service issues, for example Corp. Wane works with a team of six people dealing with sales in different ways and explains that his daily work entails three parts, i) new orders, ii) delivery, and iii) new production.

The talk with Wane, through and with the translator indicates that:

1. In Jianco’s perspective, the action plan has do with a certain kind of action, i.e. communication (discourse and talk). Also audits, at large are seen as an extension of a communicative endeavor, relationship building with the customer. This is not very surprising, as it is coming from a marketing manager and sales representative. However, since these are the people who meet with Corp sourcing representatives even during audits, their stance is extremely relevant. Wane and his translator convincingly show how the management of the use of an environmentally detrimental chemical is a communicative problem rather than an environmental problem. Re-framing the problem makes the solution a rhetorical one.

2. Audits at large are seen as a potential to learn, from the big, successful companies whose logos were showcased in the entrance lobby. These audits are not, as primarily seen by Corp, seen as evaluative, but rather as an extension of the communicative process of relationship-building with their customers. In this relationship building, they see that there is a potential to learn from these higher standards (but more in theory-through association than in practice). When it comes to practice, the
differences in standards are not always practically manageable; something that Jianco as well as their customers’ seems to understand. Jianco must work hard in order to remain competitive and provide their customers with quality at prices that they are willing to pay. This tension between theoretically higher standards to aspire towards and a practical reality of being chosen as helper-shuttle due to their competitive prices serves as an explanation for:

A) the glorification of foreign standards coming from global multinationals  
B) the celebration of the applicability of Chinese standards  
C) how together with point 1. Communication, A and B are made congruent

Let me expand upon points 1 and 2. As an example for how an environmental problem is reframed as a rhetorical one as well as how different standards can co-exist without contradiction, let us have a look at a few excerpts from a dialogue between me and the sales representative, Tim, at Jianco.

The background to the following conversation is that Wane and his translator have told me that time is an issue for them, customers sometimes demand standards and changes to products on very short notice, and things brought up during the audits aren’t always possible to adhere to immediately. Also, European customers have their own standards and demands. Customers from Germany or India, they tell me, will have different demands and standards.

Tim: Yes. In China, for a Chinese company, we usually have our own certification, but they do not apply to our customers, they don’t know it and they will refuse this verification. They only believe in their standard and that certification.

This, one might imagine, may be problematic. But Jianco has made sure that they have both Chinese and international certifications to verify their production processes. But more importantly, when they do not have certificates or verifications, in instances when they cannot or do not adhere with international standards; rhetorical devices come to the rescue.

Contrary to the belief that Jianco-representatives have of their customers’ belief in only their own certifications and standards, Jianco-representatives’ own beliefs are, possibly necessarily for their very existence, wider and more flexible. At Jianco, it is not a contradiction believing in different standards. It’s a practical reality. This is illustrated when I ask about the point in the action plan corresponding to the use of hexavalent chrome which in the action plan states that the responsible person ‘Mr. Wane’ must before the end of September 2013 ‘review Corp’s prohibited and
restricted list once more and ensure that Corp receive information if substances stated in the list are used.’ I ask how they work with the action plan in general and the management of their use of hexavalent chrome in particular. Our conversation follows:

Tim: Mister Wane says, he has viewed this action plan very carefully.
Maira: Yes.
Tim: And from Jianco’s aspect, we think... Most of its points are very normal and easy for Jianco.
Maira: Okay.
Tim: Yes, but for some special points, our Chinese rules or conditions, [make it] very difficult for us.
Maira: Which one, for example?
Tim: For example, just for the environment.
Maira: Yes.
Tim: For the environment, Corp... Normally we use the chrome, chrome six.
Maira: Yes?
Tim: But Corp or other foreign customers prohibit it.
Maira: Okay.
Tim: It's very damaging to the environment.
Maira: Okay.
Tim: But nearly all of the Chinese companies or factories or plants use this element.
Maira: Okay.
Tim: Yes.
Maira: Why is that? Is it difficult to find a substitute or is it expensive?
Tim and Wane: [speak Chinese]
Tim: The chrome six is...
Wane: [speaks Chinese]
Tim: Okay, chrome, the chrome six can, makes the surface harder. Yes, and it, because Chinese government don't have rules to prohibit it. So it can be used. Also, it can be helpful and better for cylinders, so other companies use it.

The Chinese law, which allows the use of hexavalent Chrome provides an excuse for Jianco not to adhere to Corp’s demands, but using it also makes it easier for them to operate and sell high quality products since the use of this chemical, makes their products more durable and more resistant to corrosion. My question about why it isn’t substituted is not answered; rather I am given an explanation for why it is used,
which is explained with the Chinese government’s lack of prohibition and others’ use of the same chemical.

So, how do they deal with such issues? By communicating, by making two different, incongruent standards into a negotiable rhetorical exercise. Let’s have a look at how this occurs in two different examples. The first example is about the use of hexavalent chrome and the second one about working hours. Both these are examples of when the Chinese standards differ from Corp’s standards.

Maira: But how do you deal with this in, in the meetings? If they come and say to you: “You cannot use this”.
Tim and Wane: [discuss in Chinese]
Tim: Yes. Our communication, because you know… for Jianco, we have our special process for planning, yes, maybe if we change our chrome six to three, it will have a risk and maybe damage our process and our cylinders and our products, so just so far, it's not possible for Jianco to change it according to Corp's standard.
Maira: Yeah, but do they understand that?
Tim: Yes. Because we have a long discussion about this point and we are now waiting for their, Corp’s feedback.

And another example of when Chinese standards differ from Corp’s relates to ideas regarding working hours:

Tim: I know, so different countries have different rules.
Maira: Yes.
Tim: So maybe, for some situations, [certain] rules are not possible [to apply] in China. Yes, maybe for some European country, it's very normal for workers to have holiday.
Maira: Yes.
Tim: Have a long holiday, but you know our factory is very big and

---

29 This handling of the issue of hexavalent chrome is also an example of how a multibillion Euro industry contributes to the creation of reporting measures rather than replacement measures. According to a presentation from an ECHA Workshop in Brussels, 2013 “Especially for chrome metal plating, OEMs will continue to demand a zero-risk, high performing and low cost wear resistant coating – motivation is not to replace chrome coatings, but be able to control the Cr(Vi)-emission.” And “In chrome plating, the main area of concern is control of Cr (VI) – airborne emissions”. It is the airborne emissions that are deemed to be the most dangerous, meaning that those working with and in the vicinity of hexavalent chrome are the ones who bare the largest risks.

30 They know that they cannot meet Corp’s demands because the demands are vague. Corp demands them, in writing, to review their prohibited and restricted list and report their usage of hexavalent chromium. On the action plan it states that the amount of chrome cannot exceed a maximum concentration value over 0.1% of the total weight of the homogenous alloy. But in discussion with Jianco, Corp has been suggesting and discussing the possibility to phase out and look for alternatives for hexavalent chrome. Corp themselves get their directives from the European Union’s Reach (registration, evaluation, authorization and restriction of Chemicals) program. This program was started in 2007 and works with legislative frameworks for chemical usage in the European Union.
it's very busy, yes, maybe one week we only can give our workers one day off, yes….So it's very hard, it's very difficult, but I think it's not a big problem, we can [handle it] in our communication with them… I'm sure they will understand us.

However, even though the foreign standards are not always applied at Jianco, they are highly revered – not so much in what Jianco can learn from or improve based on these, but rather due to their association with large multinational companies. Supplying to these companies is a matter of pride and association with them and attention from them, is seen as positive. The daily work for the sales representatives at Jianco includes meeting customers’ demands, and Corp is not the only customer which audits Jianco from time to time. These audits, from Jianco’s perspective seem to be perceived as an opportunity for Jianco to improve, become better and the belief is that foreign standards are higher and better. Having access to these higher standards in terms of information, and association to multinationals, not necessarily adhering to these, is seen as a potential for improvement. Therefore there can exist simultaneously a belief that foreign standards, specifically Europeans standards, are higher, but this belief does not necessarily correspond with ambitions to adhere to these standards. For example, when looking at Corp’s purple booklet, Tim says:

Tim: Just for, most of these points in this book are similar to our Chinese standard… But the difference is, the European standard is higher than the Chinese standard. So of course it will give us some helpful advice, I think.

The motivation to be associated with big multinationals is also indicated in the way Jianco portrays Corp. Recall that Corp is a relatively small customer to Jianco, contributing to less than one percent of Jianco’s turnover. However, that’s not really how Jianco sees it.

Maira: [Corp] they are a very small customer for you, right?
Tim: No, very big.
Maira: They are not that big, right? Maybe one percent?
Tim: Yes, it's also very big. Corp is very important for our company.
Maira: But why?
Tim: Because you know, so far we just have a cooperative relationship with Corp.
Maira: Okay.
Tim: But you know, in global, Corp [is a] very big group, so it's strategic.
Maira: Okay, so you would like to expand the business?
Tim: Yes, of course.
Maira: In the future.
Tim: Including, I want to make a cooperation with Corp, because I also have the Corp customer in India.
The discussion above shows that Corp is seen as a strategic partner, and a good relationship could mean the possibility for more business in the future.

**ANALYSIS ROOM NINE**

In Room 9, the purple booklet exists first and foremost in the translated form of the action plan which has been left to Jianco. For Jianco representatives, finding a solution to the points in the action plan is seen as a communicative endeavor, a matter of rhetoric. Wane acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for a *sales-mind-set*, his work is about business expansion and seeking new customers. The actions in the action plan can hence be translated into an issues of communication. The result is that workers and the environment are completely silenced in this process, and with them out of the picture, Jianco’s actions are in line with what is best for them in the short run, increasing sales and thereby, profits. Interesting to note is that the person documented as responsible for most of the points in the action plan for 2013 is Wane (which is why I wanted to meet him), who is a customer manager from the sales department. It’s not very strange that he acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for marketing and sales strategies in order to tackle a problem. The action plan and the points in it are enacted (Law and Mol, 2008) by him as a rhetorical exercise.

Rhetoric and communication seem to be accepted also by Corp’s representatives as a solution to the actions in the action plan. As Tim explains, he thinks Corp understands why they continue to use hexavalent chrome and why workers only can get, ‘maybe one day off a week’. I believe Tim is right, they do understand. At least sometimes, at Corp they do, and they understand very well that their restrictions on the use of certain chemicals, demands on worker wages and working hours often are in conflict with their demands on delivery times, quality and price. Corp, however, wants to know that their helper-shuttles are aware of the demands they have. When Jianco accepts and signs Corp’s ten minimum criteria, and agree to read the action plan (rather than act on it) there is a mutual understanding of the sort where in practice, incongruent standards are resolved through discussion. However, in this rhetorical exercise what we see is a prevalence of one logic over another ‘business as usual’ or ‘business must go on’ above ‘what is best for our workers’ or ‘what is best for the environment’. In order for this mutual agreement to be possible even though the standards differ, the multinational buyers and the representatives at Jianco must share a certain common understanding. Such an understanding is made possible when quality, competitiveness and profitability come first. When incongruences in differing standards impede quality, competitiveness and profitability, then these incongruences must be rhetorically incapacitated. The incapacitation is a punctualization (Law, 1992) which occurs through an enactment (Law and Mol, 2008) of the shared understanding; i.e. resulting in a silencing of the environment and workers’ rights. The quality and sales-mind-sets in this enactment,
become mediators (Latour, 2005). The actions in the action plan as well as the actors enrolled (Callon, 1986a) therein are weak in agency (Latour, 2005) in Room 9, they have no support when being enacted (Law and Mol, 2008) through a sales-mind-set which is the dominating framework for the work and talk that Wane and Tim do. This is exaggerated further by the quality-mind-set which Corp’s representatives, Wendy and Jing share. These together manage to overpower worker’s rights, hexavalent chrome, and all the other actors associated with the action plan.

Association with Corp and the Purple Booklet, as well as other large multinational actors in the industry are seen as positive and something which Jianco representatives are proud of. The Purple Booklet is enacted as containing ‘higher standards’ which are revered because of the pride of association with global multinationals and their standards.

### Summary of Analysis Room Nine

Room nine gives us two important enactments of previous translations of the Purple Booklet (in the form of the action plan). The first enactment translates chemical usage and working hours into rhetorical issues. The second enactment translates the Purple Booklet into a set of higher standards with which association is seen as positive.

The inscription device meant for helper-shuttles to use and understand Corp’s criteria crafted in room 1 has effectively been circumvented by Jianco representatives. They see the Purple Booklet as a set of ‘higher standards’ which are not so different to the Chinese

Following are the take-aways from the analysis in room nine.

**The code:**

(i) Is translated through an enactment into ‘European standards’ which are similar to but higher than the Chinese.

(ii) Appears in the form of traces left in the action plan, which:

   a. Is translated through enactment of hexavalent chrome as a rhetorical concern.

   b. Is translated through enactment of worker’s rights as a rhetorical concern.

**Associated ideas:** seem to stem here from an understanding between Corp and Jianco representatives regarding priorities. Sales and Quality are top priorities, and everything else is secondary.
The mind-set which dominates in Wane and Tim’s talk is one of business expansion, and increasing sales. When actions and ideas are framed through this mind-set, days off for workers is negative, replacing a toxic chemical could be too risky and meeting certain customer demands (price, quality, lead time etc.) naturally take priority over others (workers’ rights and environmental protection). The sales must go on. For Wendy and Jing the actions on the action plan seem insignificant. They are here to discuss quality issues. They both act as intermediaries (Latour, 2005) for a quality-mind-set.

This prioritization means that compromises regarding the environment (use of toxic chemicals) and workers’ rights are rationalized, as the Chinese standards allow higher sales when workers are pushed to work for comparatively more hours and lower wages and simultaneously improve the quality of their products by using a toxic chemical.
A Note on Method

After meeting with the Jianco representatives in room 9, I returned back home to Umeå and worked on transcribing and analyzing the empirical material. Something that kept popping up in the material was the EU directive on chemicals and Corp’s prohibited and restricted list. Even though no signs of environmental concern or action was found, this point kept being carried forward. Also, those carrying it forward (lead auditor at follow-up audit) seemed adamant that it was important to do so but could not explain why and what they were expecting Jianco to do. I had been told that there was a Swedish expert, named Edward, working in Ewing who was in charge of the implementation of the standards in the audit tools based on the Purple Booklet. So I decided to contact Edward.

I contacted Edward in January of 2014 via Skype and asked him specifically about the point on hexavalent chrome. In the table below (See Table 20) you see the excerpt from the action plan of 2013, the same information as in action plan 2011, except for the last column, which was left empty for 2011. I ask Edward questions relating to why this point was carried through from one action plan to the next, what it means, and what Corp expects Jianco to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of problem</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Environment</td>
<td>Review Corp’s prohibited and restricted list once more to ensure that Corp receive information if substances stated in the list are used.</td>
<td>Before the end of September.</td>
<td>Wane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edward has been sent from the sourcing department in Charlesburg to Ewing, to train the auditing teams at the Ewing sourcing department and he tells me that there are differences in how audits are prioritized in Sweden and China. Edward’s explanations to my queries were often straight forward, and his message clear. The issues I was concerned about and couldn’t understand were explained by Edward as,
“a lack of competence”. I talk to Edward about the action plan in general and the issue of hexavalent chrome in particular.

I ask Edward what the point is of having such an action on the action plan, and what Corp really expects. He tells me:

Edward: I think it’s a competence issue, why they’ve written that date up there, because we are actually not sure on our own demands on what it entails regarding this 0.1 by weight. We had huge discussions on this [issue] then. I believe that [the] action should have been reformulated a bit.

I asked Edward about the practicalities in terms of responsibility on this point and he explained what Corp expects, that the helper-shuttle should be able to verify that they are not using more than 0.1% of hexavalent chrome, by weight. However, he shares with me a concern regarding the uncertainty of this issue.

Maira: so in this case it’s the helper-shuttle that needs to inform you? Is it the helper-shuttle that should have these numbers, confirming that they are using 0.1 percent and present them?
Edward: Yes.
Maira: Ok. Did you receive the numbers?
Edward: As far as I know, no.

According to Edward, Corp’s employees have not been certain about the regulations and what to demand, and resultantly not removed the activity from the action plan. Also, recall that Corp hadn’t planned their follow-ups according to the deadlines stated for the activities. I.e. end of September 2013 should have entailed a point of contact between Corp and Jianco or a re-audit. Also, it is unclear that the helper-shuttles need to verify their usage, as the activity only demands a review of the prohibited and restricted list and that Corp be informed if any of the substances are being used.

What actually happened here was not the way it’s supposed to happen, Edward explains:

Edward: well the action plan is for, if you go further down it says ‘planning of a re-audit’. And that’s the part where the end-date comes in. You’ve had a discussion with the helper-shuttle and they got 70% or 50% and after the audit, depending on how many deviations the helper-shuttle has agreed to follow up on, should be done within three months so that it’s implemented and we can book a re-audit after four months then.
And he goes on to explain,

Edward: so it’s like a software [the action plan], which you take from audit to audit. But the planned date for the re-audit should also be presented before the audit is done so actually if this would have been followed strictly, [reads from action plan] ‘end date before end of September, as soon as possible or end of June’ – then it should say on the action plan that the re-audit will take place in six months from seen the current audit date.

Edward tells me also that he thinks that a lack of knowledge regarding the regulations is the main cause for confusion. He believes the Chinese auditors are unaware and explains that they need training. This seems to be one of the reasons Edward is stationed in Ewing, to help sourcing engineers in their work with helper-shuttles.

To me, this seems strange. The restricted and prohibited list clearly states what Corp demands, and so does the description of the problem in the action plan. It’s only in the actions that are demanded of Jianco that the message becomes vague, only repeating what Jianco is expected to do for all toxic chemicals on the restricted and prohibited list.

Edward however, tells me that other things have also been happening during these two years between the audits. Much like Wendy’s explanation in room 8, Edward here tells me that they now have two cylinder helper-shuttles, Jianco and Ninco. Ninco is a direct competitor to Jianco and they are geographically located very close to each other.

Edward: Yes, we have one [helper-shuttle] that we’re trying to phase out now and put in Ninco.
Maira: Why do you want to phase them out?
Edward: Because we want to centralize our volumes to Ninco. We’ve done an audit there and we think that we’ll be getting better quality at a better price from them when we centralize our business and volumes. Also their quality assurance process is much better than the others.
Maira: Ok. Do you plan to continue sourcing from Jianco also or will you move all your business to Ninco?
Edward: No, Jianco is also categorized as a strategic helper-shuttle so our strategy is to have two helper-shuttles for cylinders. And that’s so we can take the opportunity for competitive tendering between the two.
Maira: But could that affect your relationship with Jianco in any way. What do you think will happen?
Edward: It already has.
Edward: It’s positive. They’ve reduced their price with fifteen percent already. So that’s how it is. We’ve reduced our price at Jianco well, between fifteen and twenty percent. They wanted to raise their prices which we didn’t agree to when they initiated a…they were very tough, and then we said ‘alright, we’ll move all our business to another helper-shuttle then’ and that’s how we ended up staying and they reduced their price instead of increasing it.

Edward’s talk is laden with ideas about efficiency, where cost reductions and quality increases are vital. This mind-set has been coupled with an explicit strategy from Corp’s side to phase out certain helper-shuttles and concentrate business with others. There is no discussion of audits and impartial selection of helper-shuttles. Rather, this cost-cutting strategy is used for competitive tendering (which presumably becomes easier when the helper-shuttles are in close geographical proximity to one another). The strategy has worked for Corp, and the relationship with Jianco is ‘positive’. By using competition between helper-shuttles with an explicit strategy to reduce prices, Edward legitimizes a continued silencing of the Environment and the problems related with using hexavalent chromium seem distant and unimportant.

**ANALYSIS ROOM TEN**

Edward, much like other individuals that we have gotten to know through our travels into different rooms, seems adept at making incongruences commensurable. Through his enactment (Law and Mol, 2008) of the action plan as a lack of competence, he legitimizes and justifies his own job and position in teaching the auditing crew how to do their job. There is obviously a lot of work to be done, if the auditors, as Edward indicates, are not aware of Corp’s own demands. However, this point has been the same in the action plan during 2011 and 2013, which would indicate that the same would be true for a Swedish lead auditor. In other words, this in not attributable to a lack of competence at the end of the Chinese crew per se, it’s a bigger problem. There seems to be a lack of clarity as to Corp’s own demands and priorities.

Furthermore, the choice of which helper shuttles to keep and which to phase out hasn’t had anything to do with the audits and action plans, rather it has to do with what is most strategic for Corp. having two strategic helper-shuttles for hydraulic parts allows Corp to play the competitors against one another. This has resulted in Corp getting exactly what they wanted, lower prices. Edwards acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) for an efficiency-mind-set which has been used in strategizing and making decisions. This mind-set overpowers the entire action plan and audit procedure. The point on environment really has no relevance any longer. The efficiency-mind-set brings along with it a whole set of powerful actors, perhaps
the most powerful in business settings; strategies for cost-reduction, profit maximization and competition. All actors in this game act simultaneously as mediators (Latour, 2005) and intermediaries (Latour, 2005), together building a strong alliance against the action plan and for competition, efficiency, and of course, Edward. This power-concentration game is illustrated in the figure below.

Figure 24 - Expert Legitimates Own Power, Acting as an Intermediary for an Efficiency Mind-Set which in Turn Legitimates Competition, Making the Action Plan Obsolete

Summary of Analysis Room Ten

Following are the take-aways from the analysis in room ten.

The code:
(i) Appears in the form of traces left in the action plan regarding hexavalent chrome, which:
   a. Is silenced through enactment of competitive tendering (which prioritizes cost-reduction and profit-maximization strategies over action plans and audits)
   b. Is enacted as a lack of competence of Chinese auditing crew
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Associated ideas: seem to stem here from an efficiency-mind-set which has been used in strategizing and making decisions. This mind-set overpowers the entire action plan and audit procedure. The point on environment really has no relevance any longer. The efficiency-mind-set brings along with it a whole set of powerful actors, perhaps the most powerful in business settings; strategies for cost-reduction, profit maximization and competition.

This overpowering of the audit procedure and action plan means that issues relating to the environment (use of toxic chemicals) are pushed aside and made irrelevant. Jianco did not need to do anything regarding the action plan, but when they reduced their prices, Corp representatives seem satisfied. There seems to be a disconnection between those working for audits and action plans and those working with helper-shuttles on a daily basis.
A Note on Method

The empirical material presented in this room was collected partly in June 2012, i.e. prior to the data collected for rooms seven through ten. I approached the head of investor relations and responsivity, Kate because I had been referred to her by both Jakob and Johanna concerning my questions about what happens after an audit. I wanted to know where the material traces go, and as both Johanna and Jakob indicated, their jobs involved creating reportable statistics. These statistics, I was informed, are for the sustainability report. Kate works at the headquarters and is responsible for writing this report. I therefore wanted to contact her to see if I would be able to track the Jianco audit from there. However, since my queries at the time could not be answered, this room seemed irrelevant to include until further empirical investigations linked back to the sustainability report. Breaking from the chronology of my empirical journey for this room was a matter of making the aggregated story more readable, relating to the auditing process first, and ending with the reporting process.

All audits reported by the different product companies come to group level, at Corp’s headquarters located outside Stockholm, Sweden. Therefore, although the 2011 audit at Jianco was conducted by a Swedish audit team, the reporting responsibility remained with the Ewing product company as they were officially purchasing from Jianco for their production in Ewing. But finally, all audits results are supposed to end up at the headquarters for the consolidated group reporting. Audits are reported in Corp’s sustainability report. I travelled to the Corp headquarters in June of 2012 to find out how the Jianco audit fit in to the sustainability report.

I learn here that the corporate responsibility and Marion relations manager, Kate and her assistant, sustainability coordinator, René are responsible for the sustainability report, which is a part of the annual report. 19 of a 145 pages in the annual report are dedicated to the sustainability report. I asked them if they could tell or show me where the numbers from the Jianco audit ended up. I was looking for material traces.

To my disappointment, I soon found out that this was not possible, as the numbers which the group level auditor received did not make it possible to distinguish particular audits. The auditor received numbers, and these numbers are to be reported using a specific template with numerous indicators.
Kate: On group level we don’t have the possibility to scrutinize this, we just receive a number from the units. We have no idea what lies behind the number, that’s something the units know. /.../ I write the sustainability report, so I get the numbers from our group controller and she consolidates the data and gives me the numbers and then I write this.

Kate attributes this problem to the decentralization of the company, where each unit and their divisions are doing things their own way, and just reporting numbers to the group. When I ask her how things could be done differently she indicates that audits could be handled centrally instead of the units doing their own audits.

Kate: You could have a team on group level with experts, which other corporations have, who could be situated in Sweden, or China or India or the US, depending on what you want and they would be specially trained, specifically on social or environmental issues.

Before meeting with Kate and René, I had read through Corp’s sustainability report for 2011 and it included several different aspects in relation to different stakeholders e.g. sustainable reporting, examples of Corp’s commitment to the environment and social development, an environmental declaration, examples of environmentally conscious solutions for their customers, statistics on the diversity of Corp’s crew, their commitment to the Marions and Corp’s work with business partners. I focused on the parts dealing with business partners, as this was the area relating to audits of helper-shuttles, traces of which I was looking for. I found in the sustainability report one illustration, which reported on helper-shuttles, indicating in the form of a pie chart, the percentage of helper-shuttles from different geographical regions.

Figure 25 - From Sustainability Report 2011
The rest of the information on helper-shuttles is reported in text on approximately one and a half A-4 page. The text is reported under three headings, one dealing with an introduction and referring to Corp’s ten criteria and explaining these. The next heading deals with the results from audits, and finally a paragraph discusses the restricted and prohibited list, but no information is provided on helper-shuttles use of any chemicals. Percentages occur under the second heading, dealing with results from audits. See below a paraphrasing on the reported information:

‘Corp, during the year of 2011 audited 3242 helper-shuttles, i.e. 16% of the total number of strategic helper-shuttles. The audits were done either through visiting the helper-shuttles and doing a review, or through the helper-shuttles own documentation. Of the helper-shuttles audited with an environmental perspective, 93% were approved and need no follow-up. 6% were conditionally approved and need to be followed-up. For social evaluations, including business ethics and human rights, 2835 helper-shuttles were audited and 87% were approved, and 12% approved conditionally. About 1% of the helper-shuttles were not approved. 78% of the strategic helper-shuttles who were asked, have confirmed their commitment to the Purple booklet or Corp’s ten minimum criteria. Of the not-approved, 17 were due to environmental reasons, and 16 for social, safety and health.’

The information is sparse. It is impossible for a reader to discern, if they are interested, how large a proportion of the total audited helper-shuttles have agreed to commit to the purple booklet or Corp’s ten minimum criteria. 78% of those asked, have agreed, but it does not say how many have been asked. We also don’t know how many helper-shuttles were audited with an environmental perspective. Only how many of the audited that were approved or not. For social evaluations, this number exists, 2,835; indicating that of the total audited 3242, 407 were not audited on environmental aspects. But we don’t get to know why. The report leaves an interested reader with a lot of question about the credibility of the report as well as what exactly is being reported.

The decentralization of Corp means that different divisions are doing audits differently, some explicitly asking for a signature of ten criteria but other seem not to be. This makes it difficult for Kate to write a coherent report. The result is a report which makes little sense. From room four, however, we know that Jianco is one of the helper-shuttles which has signed Corp’s ten minimum criteria in 2011. Judging from the way the reporting is done, and assuming that Ewing has reported the Jianco audit, Jianco should be represented somewhere in the numbers between “Of the helper-shuttles audited with an environmental perspective, 93% were approved and need no follow-up. 6% were conditionally approved and need to be followed-up. For social evaluations, including business ethics and human rights,
2835 helper-shuttles were audited and 87% were approved, and 12% approved conditionally.”

If Jianco has been approved despite their issues regarding the points on the action plan they should be approved in the 93%, otherwise they should be in the 6% conditionally approved and need to be followed-up. Kate, or the group controller, however, are not able to say if Jianco is part of the sustainability report, so we cannot know for sure. The discrepancies in the numbers are indicative also, of the differences in the ways audits are carried out by different divisions. Compiling these is not an easy task. I ask Kate about how these numbers are compiled, and she explains to me that it boils down to certain key performance indicators.

Maira: it says in the sustainability report that 78% of the strategic helper-shuttles that were audited have passed the evaluation or are following Corp’s purple booklet…. How do you compile that? Because division one and two in Charlesburg are using different tools to do their audits.
Kate: We have had a project group that has been discussing this. Our goal is quite vague, that we want to work with business partners that have a high ethical, social, and environmental performance. This key performance indicator is the percentage of helper-shuttles that have said that they will work according to our purple booklet, and we’ve then said that we need a confirmation on that. Other corporations sometimes include their entire code in the business contract and get [their numbers] but on these 78% Corp has received a confirmation on paper that this helper-shuttle will work according to our purple booklet.

The confirmation that a helper-shuttle will work according to the purple booklet comes in the form of e.g. for division-two audit’s, a signature of Corp’s ten minimum criteria which are attached to the audit invitation letter together with an environmental self-assessment questionnaire, which the helper-shuttle receives before an audit takes place. Recall from room 4, that this signature was vital. It is this signature which is reported in the sustainability report, as a key performance indicator.

**ANALYSIS ROOM ELEVEN**

In Room 11, helper shuttles are no longer helper-shuttles, they have been translated into aggregate numbers, percentages, and key performance indicators. The Purple Booklet and Corp’s ten minimum-criteria also has a new form, they has been translated (Latour, 2005) into a check-mark which helper-shuttles are committed or not committed to. The aggregate of these check-marks results in a percentage of committed helper-shuttles, a punctualized actor (Law, 1992) in the sustainability
report. The numbers which come to Kate, have been through a complex inscription device (Latour and Woolgar, 1986) in the form of Corp’s reporting process, which is mediated (Latour, 2005) through different actors at different divisions. Division two e.g. reports the number of helper-shuttles from whom they have received a signature of the ten criteria, making the signature an intermediary (Latour, 2005) which is passed on into the sustainability report. It seems that the group controller who gets all the figures from the different units acts as a mediator (Latour, 2005) by consolidating numbers from different units and then sending the aggregates to Kate. Kate then acts as a mediator (Latour, 2005) in order to makes sense of these in the context of the sustainability report. However, in this mediation, Kate acts also as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) though which a green-washing-mind-set is manifested (See Figure 26 - below).

Figure 26 - Numbers from Different Units come Together as a Punctualized Percentage in the Sustainability Report

The dotted box above depicts a hidden process, unknown actors and mediation. This is the process that takes place elsewhere, the results is numbers reported to the group controller.

Summary of Analysis Room Eleven

In room eleven the Code we meet has gone through several translations, however, it still appears stable and unproblematic because it has allies which allow discrepancies to be viewed as commensurable. The reporting of aggregated statistics
allows for a sustainability report to be produced and disseminated. A large amount of actors (employees and reports from all divisions, signatures from helper-shuttles around the world, controllers, and the sustainability report) and work is put down in order to make this happen.

Following are the take-aways from the analysis in room eleven.

**The code:**

1. Enacted in the form of aggregated numbers of signatures of ten minimum criteria (a previous translation of the code, seen in room 1)
2. Is enacted as a binary measure ‘committed’ or ‘not committed’

**Associated ideas:** seem to stem here from a *green-washing mind-set*. It is through such an idea, where the numbers are used in a context of presenting Corp at its best that mediation occurs. Judging from Kate’s job title, she works towards the Marions, and her job involves compiling information in a format that is readable and relevant to them. The result is numbers, percentages and key performance indicators based on numbers, which Kate receives from the group controller who in turn has received them from the different Corp units. The numbers here indicate that Corp has good control and monitoring of their helper-shuttles, since 78% of them have agreed to follow the Purple Booklet.
ROOM TWELVE

(From Audit to Sustainability Report)

A Note on Method

The figures reported in the sustainability report and the talk with Kate portrayed in room eleven left me with many questions regarding the reporting procedure. To me the transformation between audit reports from single audits and aggregated statistics in the sustainability report, were tremendous. How these changes came about therefore was of interest for me in order to explain the translation processes which lead to the final numbers in the sustainability report. I therefore tried to track the reporting before the numbers get to the headquarters to see where the aggregations of numbers take place. While in China, I asked Jing and Wendy what happened at the Ewing sourcing department after the 2013 Jianco audit had been completed, whom they send the audit reports and action plans to, and continued to follow the reporting procedure. In this process I came in contact with several managers at the sourcing department, the accounting department, and also the General Manager at Corp Ewing.

Room 12 is a space that follows the internal reporting channel at Corp Ewing. I moved from the common landscape areas of the sourcing department employees to the sourcing managers’ office, and then to Corp’s main head office in Ewing, a couple of hundred meters across the assembly plant which separated the head office from the sourcing department. The material was collected during June 2013 in Ewing, China.

Wendy (a sourcing engineer we met in previous rooms) had informed me that the documentation regarding the audit and the action plans are sent monthly to the HSQE-manager, Robert, who compiles all the audits conducted during the month and reports on a quarterly basis to the sourcing manager. Wendy sends individual reports and action plans, corresponding to each helper-shuttle to Robert. When I talk to Robert, I lean that he then compiles a power point based on all the audits and sends these numbers to the sourcing manager, Wushi. Looking through the power point, I see that it contains names of helper-shuttles, the type of audit done (chapter 1, 2 or both), the audit score, details and diagrams regarding claims-costs, a table on actual and target lead time for this year and the previous year (improvement measured in comparison to previous year), histograms showing monthly PPM levels on an aggregate of all helper-shuttles, a diagram combining PPM levels and number of claims in an aggregate to all helper-shuttles, a list of top ten worst helper-shuttles regarding PPM levels, a list of top ten helper-shuttles regarding quantity of rejected
parts, an analysis with diagrams explaining the rejections and which helper-shuttles they pertain to, and analyses of problems which need to be dealt with.

For the February 2013 – report prepared by Robert, Jianco is included in the power point. Two problems related to Jianco have been included explicitly in the analyses of problems that need to be followed up. These relate to ‘chrome plating which fell off a cylinder in the field in the Philippines’ and ‘a broken cylinder on which analysis and warranty discussions are pending’. Both issues are to be checked by Wendy and reported on further.

The power point is in total 24 slides long and combines data from various sources. It includes audit reports, field reports, claims reports, and PPM reports. Robert sends this power point to Wushi, who uses some of the data he gets from Robert in order to fill in an excel list called a business partner report. I talk to Wushi and he shows me this excel file on his computer. Wushi shows me that the list contains aggregated numbers on conducted and approved audits and tells me that he sends the report to the accounting manager, who will enter the report into Corp’s reporting system, C-Report. A business controller is responsible for checking and approving the data in C-REPORT. After this it is sent to the General Manager and with his approval, made accessible in Corp’s global reporting system.

In an informal discussion with the HSQE manager and the sourcing manager, both showed me how they compiled the information. The HSQE manager worked in power point and filled in the numbers of audits and sent these power points to the sourcing manager, Wushi. Wushi tells me about different parts of C-REPORT and that his responsibility includes the business partner report (BPR).

The excel file that Wushi shows me also includes several aspects which he reports on, on a regular basis. A quarterly report on all approved helper shuttles (approved after an audit) is entered into an internal communication system. Here all purchasers can see the list of approved helper shuttles and place orders to them.

Regarding the BPR, this excel file is compiled by Wushi and then sent to the accounting manager, Alice, who consolidates the results for all the different departments in Ewing. Wushi tells me that the details of the audit, such as questions from chapter 1 and 2 do not need to be reported. What is important, is rather, how many helper-shuttles are in compliance with the Purple booklet (checked by their signature of the ten criteria). This can be checked through a single score from the audit score-card, namely point 4.1 Business Ethics and Social Criteria. This is a stopping parameter and a score of 1 or above indicates that the helper-shuttle has
approved (read signed) ‘Corp’s business ethics and social performance criteria’.
Wushi tell me:

“C-REPORT only requests how many helper shuttles you have and how many comply. “ – Wushi

The HSAGs do not include questions on compliance per se, but rather deal with specific questions related to aspects brought up in the Purple booklet. However, recall that the helper-shuttles are sent a copy of the Purple booklet together with an audit invitation letter (containing Corp’s ten minimum criteria), which they are asked to sign. That signature, here becomes an index for compliance.

“[The] Purple booklet is sent out with a letter – Each sourcing engineer sends this letter and they [helper-shuttles] have to sign it.” – Wushi [Sourcing Manager]

The table below (Table 21) shows the reporting process showing described above, what is reported by who, the format of the reported material, and how helper shuttles are referred to in the different steps of the reporting process. The table shows how the process begins with individual helper shuttles and leads to an aggregate percentage reported in the Corp Group’s annual report.

Table 21 - From Helper-Shuttle to Committed Business Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is done by whom</th>
<th>What is reported</th>
<th>Report form</th>
<th>Reference to helper shuttles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Audit is performed by helper shuttle quality engineers and sourcing engineers.</td>
<td>Single helper shuttle audited is reported</td>
<td>Action plans in form of a ppt. Separate excel sheets for chapter 1 and 2 scores.</td>
<td>by name e.g. Jianco, Ninco, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An audit report is sent to the Helper Shuttle Quality Engineer Manager who compiles monthly KPIs</td>
<td>Aggregation of helper shuttles are reported</td>
<td>KPIs in form of a ppt</td>
<td>by name e.g. Jianco, Ninco, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The monthly KPIs are reported to the Sourcing Manager</td>
<td>Aggregation of numbers is reported</td>
<td>Numbers in a new excel file</td>
<td>Business Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. An annual report is sent to the accounting manager who enters the data into C-REPORT</td>
<td>Aggregation of numbers is reported</td>
<td>Numbers entered into C-REPORT according to Ewing reporting codes for business partners.</td>
<td>Business Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 From Helper-Shuttle Assessment Edition 7
5. A business controller approves the data in C-REPORT and Global accounting can access this data. Signature of approval is required. Number entered into C-REPORT according to Regional reporting codes. Business Partners.

6. HQ use data from 5. For consolidated sustainability report. Corp Group Annual Report is Produced. Numbers, figures, and text in annual report. % committed to Purple Booklet.

Looking closer at some of these steps allows us to dig deeper into the mediations, which occur as reports change format, and are passed between different people and levels of hierarchy. One person, with a central role is the accounting manager, Alice. When I asked how the reporting takes place, what happens to the numbers that are compiled by Wushi, he told me I should ask Alice, so I did. I meet with Alice in her office in the head office of Corp Ewing on the 25th of June, 2013. She sits alone in her office, with three walls and the fourth side of her office constructed entirely of large glass windows. Her glass-windows are parallel to even larger glass-windows on the other side of the corridor, where the business controller and General Manager sit. Alice has two computer screens and a large desk. I sit across her, and very soon into our discussion it was evident that the responsibilities in her role of accounting manager were clearly demarcated in her mind. She both explained to me, and showed me reporting guidelines which clearly stated the accounting manager’s, in this case Alice’s, responsibilities. Alice has been working with accounting at Corp for over two years, and tells me that she doesn’t find her job too hard, as she received training when she joined the company.

Alice: I think ‘The Internal Database’ is a very good tool. This tool tells us how to do work. And this is only for business partner reports and there are many, many others. I am in [the] finance department and my title is accounting manager. So for business partner reports, my responsibility is only input of data to C-REPORT.

I asked Alice about the reporting regarding business partners, regarding the aspects on which they are audited. She informs me, reading from her manual in the internal database:

Alice: Here, responsibility says that, Logistic-, purchase manager, Mister Wushi is responsible to collect quality control and analyze the reported data. Business controller is responsible for important quality check and approve business partner report in C-REPORT. Now, input the data is my responsibility.” [Alice, accounting manager]

Alice is responsible for entering all the data into the reporting system C-REPORT, but when it comes to the financial reports, she is also responsible for the content of the reports. For all other reports, including the business partner report, the
responsibility regarding the content lies with others, although Alice inputs the data into the system. The difference in responsibility is obscure to me, but for Alice, it seems very clear. So I ask her some follow-up questions and an excerpt from our discussion follows.

Maira: Okay. You said that for the reports that were, the financial reports and the sales reports, you are responsible, but for the environmental and business partners report and the charity report you are not responsible?
Alice: Actually, my responsibility is only input of data.

Alice explains to me, by reading from a flow-chart diagram which illustrates the reporting procedure.

Alice: Yes, here, perhaps you can see, here, for example, business partner, sourcing manager is responsible to correct, quality control and analyze the reporting data.
Maira: So this part, analyze the reporting data...
Alice: Yes.
Maira: What does this mean?
Alice: I don’t know. Perhaps you can ask the sourcing manager.

Alice tells me that after she has entered the data into C-REPORT, it is checked by her boss, the business controller. Alice thus, is the middle manager in regards to the reporting concerning business partners. Wushi, the sourcing manager, is supposed to collect all the data regarding helper-shuttles, conducted audits, etc. and is also responsible for the quality control and analysis of this data. Alice’s boss, who is the business controller, is responsible for the overall quality check of the data reported as well as the approval of the reports. Alice’s job, is therefore, to put the numbers into the reporting system.

Alice works with many reports, but the business partner report is an annual report and it is consolidated for the entire Ewing production unit. Although there are several different Corp divisions operating in Ewing, they all fall within the same business area, and to date have a common, shared sourcing department. Hence, only one business partner report is produced.

Alice: I only need to report one report, because the business partner report is for entity code.

I also asked Alice if there are any differences regarding the reports she works with. She tells me about the different reports that she in one way or another works with, and in total, she mentions sixteen different reports. The reports are due at different times during the year and the data comes from different departments.
Alice explains that twelve of these reports are termed financial reports and four are non-financial reports. Within the non-financial reports, there are three categories, people management, sustainability, and charity. Sustainability reporting is further divided into two different reports, business partner report (where helper-shuttle audits come in) and an environmental report. Alice however, further points out the difference in the reports in relation to responsibilities.

Alice: Yes, it is also different, because financial report, I should be responsible for it. The data is, is it correct or not, I should be responsible, but business partner report, I only should input the data. The data, is it correct or not, is not my responsibility. But I should, if there is any error and in the end of each year, I will download this document to Excel and send it to Mr. Wushi. And then he will, he will correct the data and input the data and send it to me.

Similarly, for the charity and people management report, it is the Human resource department, and for the environmental report it is the SHEQ (safety, health, environment, and quality) department that is responsible for the contents of the report.

Alice tells me about the reporting procedure, where she downloads tables from the reporting system and imports them into Excel. This excel file is sent by her to the sourcing manager, Wushi, who should fill it in and send it back to Alice. Alice will then upload the data from the excel file and put it back into the reporting system. I wondered why Wushi couldn’t just import the data into the reporting program, directly since he is responsible for the contents of the report, but this was not possible as access to the reporting system is limited to a certain few users. The input into C-REPORT must therefore be done by someone who has been granted such access.

Alice: Not every one of us can enter [data]. So only finance department, business controller and some audit employee, can enter C-REPORT.

Once Alice has filled in the data in C-REPORT and her boss, the business controller has approved it, her job is done, and the bosses higher up can access this data through the reporting software anywhere around the globe.

Alice: This system is our global system, so global accounting and the global boss can see it here, and this is our system screen, and we open business partner report. Here is our business partner report. Here, [xxx], is our company code.
Alice also explains to me that C-REPORT, the reporting system, will notify her if there are any errors in the data that she has entered.

Alice: And after I input the data to C-REPORT, here is tool, can, can tell me, which, if there is some error.
Alice: [answers the phone in Chinese] When I input the data to C-REPORT, here is also a... A check tool, which is used by global. I can check if there is some error.
Maira: What does error mean? Could you give me an example of an error?
Alice: If perhaps, let me [laughing], let me check. If there is no error here, soft validation is okay, if there is an error, soft validation is not okay, perhaps, if it is not okay, it will show "Please verify".

Alice shows me an example, as I clearly do not understand the difference between soft validation and hard validation and how the software indicates that there is an error in the numbers she has entered. She shows me how errors are indicated based on pre-programmed cells which demand e.g. a value higher than 0, similar to the pre-programmed excel cells for the helper-shuttle evaluation, not permitting auditors to skip stopping parameters and automatically creating a non-approval for the helper-shuttle if such a question is scored with a zero.

Once Alice has entered all the data into C-report she sends a copy of the report to the business controller.

Maira: Okay. But here, when he's checking and approving, what does he normally do? Does he just put like "I have checked it", like this, like a signature?
Alice: Yes.
Maira: In the system, directly?
Alice: Yes
Maira: Okay, and then after that, after he approves it, then it goes to?
Alice: GM, general manager.
Alice: When my boss, the business controller approves it, here, [the] work status will show approved.
Maira: Okay.
Alice: And finally [it] will be [a] finished report, the group will close this application and then the work status will show locked.

When the report has been approved and locked, it is available in the system for employees worldwide with access to C-REPORT, to view. The report is also visible for the General Manager, who should review the results and make decisions regarding actions for future improvements of the results.
ANALYSIS ROOM TWELVE

From Helper Shuttle to Committed Business Partner

In Room 12 we see how a meticulous reporting process associated with measuring compliance creates its own devices for creating compliance. The definition of compliance here is that a helper-shuttle, has for one reason or another, more or less knowingly or willingly, or to a certain extent coercively, (see room 4) signed Corp’s ten minimum criteria. A signature of the ten criteria inscribed into a document called ‘audit invitation letter’ entails for Corp that their helper-shuttles are in compliance with their purple booklet. This shift from a single helper-shuttle to a committed business partner occurs through the reporting process (See Table 21 on pg 249). A little signature makes the entire audit obsolete in terms of sustainability indicators for Corp. Several actors are involved in this global reporting process. The lead auditor and HSQE, Wendy takes the score from the audit and the action plan and acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) when she sends this over to her nearest boss, Robert, the HSQE-manager. The HSQE-manager puts together the scores and converts information from the action plans and audits into KPIS on all conducted audits at the end of each month. In converting the action plans and audit results into KPI’s, he acts as a mediator (Latour, 2005). He then compiles a power point on a quarterly basis, aggregating the monthly reports, acting again as a mediator (Latour, 2005) in the creation of diagrams where several helper-shuttles are combined for analyses on PPM levels, claims-costs for Corp and defected parts.

This report is sent to Wushi, the sourcing manager who takes some of the data from Roberts report (total number of audits, number approved and not approved) and then adds on information which he gets either from the audit scorecards or from elsewhere regarding the helper-shuttles approval of Corp’s ten criteria. He acts as a mediator (Latour, 2005) in accordance with the reporting procedures, as he enacts (Law and Mol, 2008) a score on the scorecard or a signature of the ten criteria and translates it into a check in a box. The checked box in his excel file indicates a committed business partner.

This excel list is then sent to Alice, the accounting manager who acts as an intermediary (Latour, 2005) simply inputting the same figures and checks that Wushi has reported to her, into C-Report. She does not have any responsibility for the accuracy of these numbers, unlike the financial reports. After she has entered the data into C-Report it goes to the business controller for a final check, and then is approved and locked. The annual locking of the system also means that the report is sent to the general manager for Ewing and made available in the global reporting system. C-Report makes sure that Jianco, and other helper-shuttles are punctualized (Law, 1992) and the group controller at Corp headquarters can access it. The entire
process shows how an enactment (Law and Mol, 2008) of a code-abiding business partner produces the reality of a code-abiding business partner (See Figure 27 on the following page).

Figure 27 - The Process of Enacting and Hence Creating a Global Code-Abiding Business Partner

Summary of Analysis Room Twelve

In room twelve we follow the reporting procedure, which results in the enactment of helper-shuttles as committed business partners. We meet the actors involved in the process and follow the reports from individual audit to a final business partner report.

Following are the take-aways from the analysis in room twelve.

The code:

(i) Exists in the translated form of Corp’s ten minimum criteria in the audit invitation letter:
   a. Which in turn is translated into a signature check
   b. A signature of which is enacted as ‘committed business partner’ through report-labeling (commitment to Corp’s Purple Booklet)

(ii) Is enacted as a binary measure ‘committed’ or ‘not committed’
Associated ideas: seem to stem here from a reporting mind-set with clear operative responsibilities regarding access to numbers and access to computer systems. These responsibilities have practical consequences, e.g. the business partner report (which is part of the sustainability report) is separated from other reports and although the accounting manager deals with the numbers for all reports, the responsibility for the content lies with the sourcing manager. The sourcing manager, however, is not eligible to carry out the operative task of entering numbers into the global reporting system.
6. Theorizing Codes as Different Kinds of Objects in Different Associations

By following traces of a code, this study posits the need for a simultaneous understanding of three dimensions of codes in different contextual settings for CCEs to be understood in geographically dispersed settings. The three dimensions are a) material translations of the code, b) enactments of these translations, and c) ideas associated with the material and enacted (sociomaterial) code. The study contributes to the literature by illuminating the actors involved in the translation processes, what the translations result in, and how associated ideas differ close to headquarters and farther away from headquarters. Below I discuss the findings in relation to proximity to headquarters in terms of sociomaterial association.

In addition, I discuss the different translations that occur in relation to where these occur, based on level of proximity to Corp’s headquarters. The three categories used for this discussion are presented under heading 4.4 Analysis IV – Empirical, Zooming out. What happens at the three different levels of proximity – Proximal (Closer to Sweden), Medial (Intertwined between Sweden and China) and Distal (Closer to China) – is also discussed below.

6.1 Proximal - (Rooms 0, 1, 2, and 11)

The rooms where the CCE is most closely intertwined with Corp headquarters gives a glimpse into certain kinds of translations. These are often both material and discursive and the material and non-material characteristics of the code are kept together. A whole lot of work is put into keeping these characteristics logically and materially interconnected. This is, for example, a case where we see the work is an effort to divide the code into the two inscription devices (in the form of the audit tool) that eventually become the main translations used once the code goes to China.

Proximal rooms are also an area where we come into contact with several punctualizations. Examples of these include the board’s ideas punctualized and translated into the purple booklet, a punctualization and translation of the purple booklet into Corp’s ten minimum criteria, and the punctualization of reported numbers into percentages, which take the form of statistics in Corp’s sustainability report.

The CCE generally appears stable, intact, and powerful. The ideas about responsibility associated with the code including ideas of compliance, control, and social responsibility are carefully woven into the inscription devices and we meet with many intermediaries who continue to enact these ideas. When we look closer,
however, there are traces of instability (e.g., in room one and two) at the Swedish sourcing department. These instabilities, however, are either rhetorically managed or managed through the creation of more documents, policies, or tools. The problems that need to be solved are not yet close enough to interfere with the HQ network because the Chinese employees, the suppliers, and potential other stakeholders have not yet entered the arena. Therefore, instability is kept under control.

The code in these rooms seems familiar when we take a look at previous studies in the field. For example, the content reinforces established ideas about internationally acceptable responsible business conduct while at the same time reinforcing differences between stakeholder groups, as noted previously by Winkler (2011). The code is also used as a management and control mechanism to enforce and legitimize its importance. This has been previously noted by several scholars (Weaver et al., 1999; Wood et al., 2004; Long & Driscoll, 2008).

This study, however, reveals the amount of work that goes into achieving the appearance of stability in the HQ network. The study also shows how associated ideas about visions of responsibility, operationalization into measureable numerics, stakeholder management, and reporting allow for drastic translations of the code, which are kept commensurable with the code through affidavits, training, sustainability reports, and complex auditing tools. The actors who are in control and contribute to the work are also highlighted. The code can be seen as a network-object (Law and Singleton, 2005) in that it holds together in its relational shape. The work put down to keep the network-object stable is shown in the translations of the code into numerous documents and policies (e.g., auditing tools, compliance statements, and ten minimum criteria) as well as the training of employees and managers and reference to international standards.

**6.2 Medial - (Rooms 3, 5, 6, 7, and 10)**

Medial rooms are interesting because they appear to be unpredictable in terms of who is in charge. Sometimes the code translations seem to be at work, but as they come in contact with new actors, it can also be a computer system or knowledge of a language that overpowers the code. This unpredictability is not so surprising as there is an increase in both number and heterogeneity of actors coming together from both Sweden and China, from both Corp and their suppliers. This is the land in-between, where most of business is done. This is where deals are made and broken. This is where prices are set and quality discussed. This is where the associated ideas inscribed into the code and translations regarding responsibility start to crackle as they must struggle against contradictory ideas regarding such issues as price, quality, reports, and time. The tools that were created in proximal spaces appear here, but not as stable inscription devices. The tools meet with new people, new
ideas about how to apply them, and new practices that refuse to fit into neat boxes. Sometimes the code translations win, but often mediators take control of the events and the CCE fades into the background.

The code generally appears in glimpses, in pieces here and there, mish-mashed with other material documents and policies, laws, and regulations, ideas about business deals, and how to leverage power between buyer and seller. The code is in flux, unstable, and as previously noted, can be defined as fluid (Jensen et al. 2015); its shape and use tend to be unpredictable in comparison to the proximal rooms. The ideas associated with code translations start to become more compliance oriented and give way to mediations and new ideas relating more to the market economy. The code can here be seen as a fluid object (de Laet and Mol, 2005) in that it can be argued to retain some stability, but at the same time there is a fluidity to the relations that constitute the CCE. Some stability can be argued to exist in the form that we see marginal or small material transformations in comparison to the proximal rooms. In terms of the enactments of these translations, however, we have numerous actors picking up the material translations and enacting them in an array of ways which have consequences far beyond what the network object in proximal rooms would have us imagine. Examples of these enactments include absent actions plans made present in different ways in different divisions, the same action plan being enacted as a template for a new audit, and the silencing of the environment as hexavalent chrome is enacted as competitive tendering. Here we also see translations of Corp’s “ten minimum” being further translated into a signature that is enacted as a “committed business partner”. The relational ties around the same material translation of the code vary, so the network can be seen as fluid.

6.3 Distal - (Rooms 4, 8, 9, and 12)

The rooms that are located farthest from Corp’s headquarters in terms of sociomaterial associations are the most prone to unexpected mediation. Although material translations can be found in the form of audit reports and action plans, this is an area where the code is often decoupled completely from the ideas about responsibility associated with it at Corp’s HQ. Here, this de-coupling allows for a free association with new ideas about how to interpret the code and the enactments and translations that we come across here are prone to associate more with the logics of market economics, marketing, and sales. Responsibility is not about following or abiding by the code, it is about rhetorically positioning the code in a different kind of hierarchy – one where the code is subordinated the principles of the market. We see the code in the form of a contract; as previously noted by Jensen et al. (2015), we see translations of the code being used as templates for new audits, we see action plans about chemical usage enacted as rhetorical problems, and we see how these
problems are solved with the help of an intricate reporting system that allows Corp to produce committed business partners for their sustainability report.

The translations of the CCE and associated ideas that have made it this far are constantly subjugated to new ideas, different ways of doing things, and interpretations that result in, e.g., hexavalent chrome becoming a rhetorical admonition rather than an environmental and health concern. Another example entails code compliance becoming a matter of merely signing off rather than actually fulfilling the criteria constructed and legitimized closer to the headquarters.

The code generally appears here to be a burden, a necessary evil, as it travels to new sites of contact. It appears vague and is clearly distorted in comparison to the version we find at Corp’s headquarters. The code is even more unstable than it is in the medial rooms and can be seen as vaporous rather than fluid. The code is a vaporous object and can be seen as similar to what Law and Singleton refer to as a “fire object” (2005). A fire object is more dynamic, more sporadic, and more energetic than a fluid object. At the same time, it is discontinuous and lives through the juxtaposition of absences and presences. A vaporous object, as suggested here, shares some of these qualities. It is discontinuous, and it is also this discontinuity that allows the CCEs to survive. Opposed to material objects that are sociomaterially translated, in terms of a CCE, it is the materiality together with the non-material ideas specifically associate with the material, and enactments of these that allow for this specific form of CCE – the vaporous CCE is different from fluidity and Latour’s ‘configurational varaince’ as noted by Jensen et al. (2015) and closer to an object realized in light of Barad’s onto-epistemology (2003). The CCE becomes fully vaporous when the material (textual/tool/action plan/percentage etc) neither refers, denotes, signifies, nor in any shape or form shows any idea or discursive association with the material. The vaporous CCE can also encompass a state when there is an instance of nonassociation between material and immaterial – but the material still holds. This is a moment in time and space before the creation of a new association, brought on e.g. though a researcher’s probing for answers. The new object which forms, together with new associations in idea-form, is again fluid as it takes on new associations.

We typically see traces of versions of the CCE in distal rooms, but fraught with inconsistency (e.g., as in environmental issues and worker’s rights being enacted as rhetorical problems). The metaphor of a vaporous object fits the CCE better in that the term vaporous is a metaphor that describes the CCE as more gaseous therefore less stable than a liquid or solid. An element that at room temperature appears in solid from is typically less stable and therefore more reactive as a liquid and even more so as a gas. As the states of matter are often illustrated, a solid is compact and retains its shape and volume, a fluid is less compact and loses its fixed shape,
assuming an amorphous shape or the shape of its container, but retains a fixed volume, and a gas loses both fixed shape and is more ready to associate with other gases. In this sense, the vaporous CCE is most like what in chemistry is defined as ‘free radicals\(^{32}\).’ At this point, the code’s material form has been translated several times and only vestiges or bits of the original material remain. These traces, in their different forms, are picked up in different contexts to mean completely different things (a contract, a score, a rhetorical exercise, a template for audits, European standards, or committed business partners).

The ideas associated with the code relate almost completely to the market economy, including parameters such as sales, quality, efficiency, and competition. Although not studied with an ANT approach, previous literature has suggested that codes look different at different levels of the organization (Preuss, 2009). Previous research suggests that a commitment from top management can encourage both decoupling and integration of processes (Weaver et al, 1999b), but this study shows that management has little influence over the spaces where the actual problems relating to labor standards and environmental hazards need to be solved.

6.4 The Network, Fluid and Vaporous CCE

The way the majority of the literature has described a CCE, it would fit neatly in the network-object category. The code either holds together relationally or is assumed to hold together in this form regardless of where it is put to work. As the empirical material in this thesis shows, however, this metaphor is only applicable close to home, in areas where employees trained at or having a connection to the headquarters are involved in the work that goes into keeping this network stable. But it is also here, within this stable network, that a lot of the material translations of the code take place. These are done in a controlled manner to control how the material translations are to be used in the production of inscription devices such as the audit tool. These inscription devices help hold together the material code with ideas associated with it. These ideas start off as visions about an appearance of responsibility coupled with some very specific internationally accepted standards for responsible business conduct, e.g., labor rights according to the ILO, UN Declaration of Human Rights, and environmental laws and directives. These ideas eventually transform into management control – operative, measurable indicators when the code is operationalized – but the material translations of and ideas about the CCE generally hold together.

---

\(^{32}\) Free radicals are atoms which have unpaired electrons which make them highly chemically reactive.
However, when the CCE and translations thereof find themselves in contact between Swedish buyers and a Chinese supplier, the realities of the Chinese business set-up collide with the agenda set up at home. More and more potential and active mediators enter the scene, creating conflicts and collisions. These collisions result in negotiations and abruptions, changes that shake the carefully crafted inscription devices, resulting in a more fluid code. The ideas associated with the CCE also start to incorporate more fluidity, as ideas of responsibility (which here have been translated into measuring the right indicators) collide with, e.g., reporting, quality, and efficiency mindsets.

As the figure below indicates, the role of mediators increases as the translations travel farther away (associations between the CCE and ideas originated) from headquarters. This means that the farther away the CCE is, the more prone it is to be decoupled from its original ideas and intent. A vaporous code, unlike a fluid code, is completely decoupled from any ideas concerning responsible business conduct, focusing only on market economics.

Figure 28 - The Role of Mediators vs. Proximity

Where the role of intermediaries played a much stronger role in being able to hold the code together in proximal areas, these intermediaries give way to mediators as well as intermediaries with respect to which ideas replace the original ideas inscribed in the code. These ideas are primarily related to market economics, including sales, efficiency, competition, and quality. Clearly, the code transforms faster and more radically the farther it travels from its source, Corps headquarters. Important to note, however, is that theoretically the potential to find a network, fluid or vaporous CCE exists in all the places where the CCE is. This means there might be situations also in a Swedish context, which are not noted here, when we might encounter a vaporous CCE.
6.5 The Multiple Code

The conclusion drawn from subsequent rooms not only affirms but also extends the fluid metaphor (Jensen et al., 2015). The code is fluid in that it changes shape and is enacted in different ways, showing “configurational variance” (Jensen et al., 2015). However, following the code even further enables us to see its vaporous phase, a condition that is encouraged with the help of new actors whose only concerns are different, based on sales and the logics of the market. The actions of the CCE and the association with the rest of the material and enacted actors shape how the CCE is done when it goes to work. The CCE is increasingly diluted the farther the translation process is followed away from headquarters, but it reconfigures to resemble its original shape with some new meanings added as it travels back to the headquarters through the reporting process.

The idea of a global code that we met in room zero is a myth. The code is not the same, not even at the sourcing department in Sweden (room 1). The code is complex and needs alibis in order to go to work for the Corp; it needs different mind-sets as we see in several of the rooms. These mind-sets such as efficiency, quality, and reporting often overpower the responsibility mind-set – i.e., what is the right thing to do or why are we doing this – and allow individuals to get the work done. The emphasis in the empirical material is on getting the work done. The closer to home (Swedish Headquarters) we are, the more distinct and clear the translations of the code are. The farther we are from home, the more vaporous the code becomes.

When a code is vaporous, it can be likened with a reactive chemical in gas form as it is ready to react with other gases and particles in the surrounding. With some chemicals the reactions are explosive, with others barely noticeable. A vaporous code is highly unpredictable and therefore its potential consequences will differ depending on its surroundings. If used in a context that allows for an emergent ethics, it could encourage moral reflection and action action. However, an unpredictable, vaporous substance, in a demoralizing context, at best might become ground for an enactment of responsibility as equal to “winning a negotiation of higher sales or a lower price”.

The largest threat to the success of CCEs as intended game changers in terms of environmental, health, and safety issues related to production in countries known for their low working standards seems to be not material or physical, but to be ideological. The CCE changed shape many times as I followed it, and so did people. Their ideas were not the same when they changed environments. However, what seems to be a universal logic regardless of proximity to Sweden or China is the basic logic of economics – high efficiency and low price optimization was the ideological bottom line in most situations.
In terms of the consequences of a multiple code noted in this thesis, there are several examples that are worth mentioning. I go through these in the following chapter. These cases discussed in chapter 7, show that an understanding of codes as (potentially) simultaneously network, fluid and vaporous objects in different contexts, can highlight effects of the code in a way that previous research has not been able to do. The implications are of relevance both in the home country of headquarters, where solutions are crafted and farther away in more distal places, where problems to which solutions are sought, abound.
7. The Consequences of a Multiple CCE in Specific Practices, Relations, and Processes

As described in the introductory chapters of the thesis, arguments were presented for approaching a CCE as a phenomenon with both material and non-material characteristics. A CCE is material in its physical document forms and virtual in its web-versions and intranet software operationalization, yet it is also inscribed with discursive elements that carry textual ideas about responsibility. At once, the phenomenon is multiple. It is with this approach to CCEs that one CCE and its subsequent translations (Latour, 2005) have been followed from country of headquarters (Sweden) on a trip to China and back to Sweden. The CCE is not a well-bounded, situated object. Rather, it is entangled in a heterogeneous materiality consisting of different kinds of actors, human and non-human. As De Laet and Mol note that “[e]ffective actors need not stand out as solid statues but may fluidly dissolve into whatever it is they help achieve” (2000: 227). This thesis has highlighted what a solid code, what a fluid code, and what a vaporous code can help achieve. Based on the translations of the code and the empirical study of these processes, there are five areas where I discuss and exemplify the role of the multiple CCE in more detail: in boundary setting practices, relations to the power dynamics of the buyer-supplier relationship, in relation to the natural environment, in the reporting culture, and in relations to organizational mindsets.

7.1 In Boundary Setting Practices

The CCE discussed in this thesis is supposed to be a code that is the same for all Corp departments. The CCE is copied and disseminated to all company departments around the globe, and translated into 26 languages. The same message, and the same code is applied to everyone. When we started tracking the material CCE at the Swedish sourcing department, however, we see how the CCE becomes involved in the reproduction of boundaries between Corp-sourcing in Sweden and Corp-sourcing elsewhere (i.e., between country of headquarters and the rest of the world). This boundary setting happens through the process of a local translation of the CCE into an operationalized supplier audits, resulting in two potential inscription devices (Latour and Woolgar, 1986) presented in room three. These inscription devices become the new sourcing code, crafted at the sourcing department in Sweden as an operationalization of working with the CCE to evaluate suppliers. The use of supplier-codes, which differ from the company’s overarching code, has been noted in the literature (e.g., Jiang, 2009 Oehmen et. al., 2010), but few empirical investigations look into what these codes entail and how they function. Notable exceptions include studies focusing particularly on labor rights and the effect of
codes in improving minimum wages, working hours, and strength of unions (e.g., Bezuidenhout and Jeppesen, 2011; Egels-Zandén, 2007; Egels-Zandén, 2014).

The sourcing code in this study is crafted in Sweden, not as a specific sourcing code, but rather as a set of documents based on the overarching CCE and then exported to the rest of the world, as are Swedish sourcing engineers, who are seen as experts. This makes the sourcing code difficult to detect, as it is intertwined with business practices in auditing suppliers and is not seen as a specific code. The sourcing code is a set of loosely related documents, manuals, criteria, international standards, and evaluation guidelines. The rest of the world, including of course China and the Chinese sourcing department, are to be coached in using this sourcing code by the Swedish experts. This finding is in line with Preuss’s (2010) study that concluded that codes form a lattice work of interlinked documents and that more coercive aspects of work with CCEs get buried at levels that are not visible when studying only the official CCE.

In the construction of boundaries between different stakeholders, particularly targeted at suppliers, the CCE discursively (Winkler, 2011) as well as materially reproduces a hierarchy regarding whose ideas of responsibility are to be valued and followed. Through the inscription devices, the Swedish sourcing engineers have the first right to interpretation of the CCE. These inscription devices are then to be used by all other sourcing engineers, and they are coached by Swedish experts in how to do this. The Swedish headquarters has the highest right to ideas of responsibility, and this right is safeguarded by emphasis on training and control of non-Swedish sourcing engineers. Hence the CCE contributes to a reiteration of an established idea, boundaries between the Western, developed country of origin and the rest of the world, particularly but not limited to developing countries.

However, this does not always work. This reproduction of the establishment of a boundary between country of headquarters and experts and the rest of the world is often interrupted when the code is no longer a network-object but rather a fluid-object, e.g., during the Jianco 2011 audit. The Swedish sourcing engineer, the expert on the Swedish operationalization of the code, had serious problems because of his lack of knowledge of the Chinese language. Furthermore, once subsequent translations of the code in the form of action plans reaches the supplier, it has been translated into ideas pertaining to market economics. Hence boundaries are being produced by Corp, and these are to some extent upheld close to home but the representatives of the supplying firm are interested in their own boundary-setting. This should not come as a surprise. If companies with CCEs are interested in self-preservation, why wouldn’t other companies (regardless if they are suppliers, retailers, producers etc.) also be?
When the CCE is vaporous, however, there is a deconstruction of the boundaries, and they become more permeable, as the supplier wants to establish associations with the buyer. The supplier happily associates with Western “higher-standards” in order to gain power in their local market. The suppliers, just like Corp, are interested in their shareholders and their own profits. This is interesting particularly because Corp is responsible for about 1% of Jianco’s turnover, and Jianco is one of several thousand suppliers worldwide that Corp uses. Suppliers are one of Corp’s five groups of stakeholders mentioned in the Purple Booklet. As noted in previous studies, the CCE at Corp discursively reproduces a power-distance between different stakeholder groups (Winkler, 2011) and uses authoritarian language (Farrell and Farrell, 1998). However, the CCE at Corp goes further than this discursive reproduction of a power-distance. The new sourcing code solidifies these boundaries in the form of an obligatory passage point (Callon, 1986): the supplier audit that suppliers must pass through in order to qualify. The sourcing code also allows for Corp to judge suppliers and choose not to source from them if they do not meet Corp’s criteria. Boundaries are also re-created between supplier and sub-supplier and suppliers of the same materials in form of pitting them against one another in order to extract the best price. However, the lack of regulations from the Chinese government and the production of a component that is relatively unique and vital to a buyer, allows the suppliers to efface these boundaries through the use of simple rhetoric.

The solidifying of boundaries between Corp and Jianco e.g. is possible through tools such as the action plan if the code were to remain a stable network-object. As a vaporous-object, this fails in an establishment of a boundary at the supplier in China. In Sweden, however, where the code is still seen as a network-object, the action plan is rhetorically punctualized (Law, 1992) as an idea of responsibility based on a partnership between Corp and their respective suppliers. What is spoken of as partnership at the Swedish sourcing department is in China a list of admonitions that are the suppliers’ problem, solved by them in a rhetorical milieu of communication, sales, and their own ideas about partnership with large multinational brands like Corp. Similar findings from legal contexts find problems with U.S. codes being in conflict with European laws on human rights and worker privacy (Pagnattaro and Peirce, 2007). Such differences in the realities in the places where codes go to work have not been sufficiently explored in the literature, allowing us to wrongfully assume that the stable network object is the one at play in all situations where the code goes to work.

Although the CCE enables the reconstruction of existing ideas about protection of a firm (Kayne, 1992; Lefebve and Singh, 1992; Singh, 2006; Stohl, Stohl and Popova, 2009), we have also learned that these ideas do not always succeed, because they meet with conflicting ideas. In this case, it is about a large supplier who is interested
in the protection of their own firm rather than satisfying a customer’s demands regarding something other than quality or price. This occurs, e.g., in the case between Corp and Jianco where actors representing both come together during the audit situation. Jianco is not only a supplier to Corp but also supplies to many other larger buyers. This means that Jianco is far from dependent on Corp in terms of turnover. Jianco’s representatives have their own agenda, and they are not interested in letting Corp dictate the terms. This means that there is not much room for dialogue; Corp representatives stick to the necessities and a quick signature of their criteria, almost coercively obtained, becomes one of the main focus points during the audit.

7.2 In the Power Dynamics of the Buyer-Supplier Relationship

The buyer-supplier relationship is interesting particularly because the literature that examines corporate codes of ethics largely assumes that management dictates the terms for their suppliers. As the empirical material in this thesis reveals, there may be cases when the contrary is true – i.e., the buyer may be dependent on the supplier. This power dynamic means assumptions about large corporations being able to demand compliance from suppliers, whether through empowerment or coercion via a CCE, is problematic (Dong and Bryn, 2012; Helin and Babri, 2015). Another ignored dimension is that large suppliers sometimes draft their own codes. Chinese, South African, and Taiwanese companies operating in South Africa in the textile industry are drafting their own CCEs (Bezuidenhout, and Jeppesen, 2011); despite these countries usually being associated with production. The findings in this thesis suggest that codes become increasingly unpredictable when they travel abroad, but they also reinforce business as usual. This potential is even larger if suppliers are drafting their own codes in order to please their shareholders.

It is important to shed light on the power-relation between buyers and suppliers, so as not to assume that the giant in the home country is also the most powerful actor in the countries where parts or products are being sourced from. The argument is in line with Lund-Thomsen (2008) who warns that codes may potentially do more harm than good due to academic as well as policy rhetoric being divorced from the realities of the developing country suppliers, workers, and communities.

Another important aspect that has largely been ignored in the CCE literature is the power dynamic created in outsourcing situations where the state typically owns 51% or more of a holding company, as a subsidiary to which multinational corporations establish themselves in foreign countries. Contrary to the problems in the retail industry, where factories in low-labor cost countries are seldom owned by the multinationals, in areas that involve long-term projects and research, including extractive industries, electronics production and assembly, factories are in
ownership of multinationals only as a minority stake. One study shedding light onto these particular dynamics in the oil and gas industry is Amaeshi and Amao (2009), who note that the codes of ethics of multinationals such as Shell, Exxon Mobil, and Statoil go to work operating as “joint venture partnerships and/or production sharing agreements with the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC) – a statutory established, government-owned corporation” (Amaeshi and Amao, 2009; 229).

Toffel, Short, and Ouellet (2015) look into the combined effects of civil society and market institutions in both domestic (where the code applies) and international (home of the code) contexts and find that in terms of supplier adherence, a higher probability of adherence to codes was found if the suppliers operating in a state that is active in the International Labor regime and possesses stringent domestic laws combined with a high level of freedom of press. These findings are interesting, but as long as outsourcing takes place in countries dominated by low labor rights standards, high levels of corruption, and low labor costs, convincing suppliers to adhere to codes may require coercive measures. Furthermore, the governance of private regulation provided by a CCE would arguably not be needed if the domestic environment provides stable and sustainable labor and environmental policies, and economic oversight.

Such power dynamics raise important questions about the role and relevance of codes of ethics. Clarkson (1995) for example discusses the issue of corporations managing relations with stakeholder groups rather than with society as a whole. This conception of taking responsibility or being ethical is prevalent also in the realm of using corporate codes of ethics, as a response to different stakeholders. As long as this is the case, a CCE risks being subject to different negotiations in different situations. Rather than holistically addressing questions concerning their particular business and its consequences on the societies where they operate, multinationals are at risk of becoming caught up in such negotiations and the CCE becomes an alibi for business as usual as it becomes meaningless in terms of solving the problems it espouses to.

7.3 In Relation to the Environment

When it comes to points in the sourcing code as it is conceived in Sweden, still a network-object, the environment is something seemingly important. It must be cared for, specifically in the case of a production focused company in terms of the chemicals that are allowed in the production process. In order to have a guiding standard, Corp relies on the European Union’s Reach Program, which conducts research into chemical compositions and their effects. In addition, Corp relies on the Reach Program to help it monitor products imported to the EU in order to update its list of restricted and prohibited chemicals. Corp also includes the environment as a point of concern in their audit tool. When the auditors found the use of a highly
toxic and restricted chemical in Jianco’s chroming procedure, this issue was transferred into a new document, the action plan. However, here neither the code nor its translations are stable network-objects.

Including this aspect in the action plan becomes a way for Corp to keep a record that they have informed the helper-shuttle about their requirements and that the responsibility lies with the helper-shuttle to find an alternative. This allows Corp to take this information of responsibility being handed over to the supplier back into the stable object-network at headquarters, where the reporting about chemical use takes place. The supplier has been informed through reference to Corp’s prohibited and restricted list with reference to the European Union’s Reach Program.

However, keeping their own records also means that they clearly show that Corp is aware of the use of hexavalent chrome, which in terms of accountability could be used by Corp to support the supplier. This could be seen as a sign of shared responsibility although the wording used in the action plan does not support such an interpretation of ‘shared responsibility’ (See point 3.2 Environment in Jianco audit 2011 and 2013; Table 6, room 7). The use of hexavalent chromium (Cr6+) compounds was not brought up by Jianco during the last review of the prohibited and restricted list. Regulations allow for a maximum concentration of Cr6+ to be 0.1% by weight. The formulation indicates instead, an admonition, and Jianco was advised to review the prohibited and restricted list once again in order to make sure that they inform Corp of their use of the chemical. Corp knows that they are using hexavalent chrome, and as Jing (a Corp representative) explains this is normal procedure in the chroming of cylinders and it is difficult to find a substitute. Keeping this point on the action plan only serves the purpose of transferring, at least rhetorically and in documentation, the responsibility to the supplier. The lack of discussion during the audit on the concentrations used and the lack of monitoring of these despite two audits over a two-year span indicate either that Jianco still is trying to hide their use of hexavalent chrome (although all hydraulic parts producers seem to be using it) or that Corp wants to make a point by keeping this issue on the action plan without explicating what really Jianco could do in terms of waste-management, protection for workers, and the safe disposal of the poisonous chemical being used.

Hexavalent chrome or is a highly toxic form of chrome, but it is commonly used in industrial processes. Because exposure to hexavalent chrome is a known health risk, the EU requires products containing this chemical be monitored, especially products that are imported to EU countries. However, not all corporations with their headquarters in EU countries sell their products on the EU market, so the use of hexavalent chrome is only a matter of concern when the products treated with it are
going to enter the EU. The highest risks regarding exposure to the chemical is borne by those working with it while hot\textsuperscript{33}, or those exposed to ground water contaminated with the chemical. However, in terms of a social audit, which builds on Corp’s CCE, which claims to follow the EU’s chemical reporting and monitoring program, this highly toxic chemical is dissolved into a rhetorical exercise. When the CCE is a vaporous-object, the use of hexavalent chrome is a matter of communication: the supplier needs Corp to understand that Chinese law does not restrict the use and everybody else is using it.

The environment is never really seen as suchas having any essential value; irrespective of whether the CCE is a network, a fluid, or vaporous-object, the environment is enacted in its absence in different ways. A genuine concern for the environment would lift it into the relations that become visible as a CCE goes to work. This, however, was not the case. The CCE was used to enact the environment in terms of chemical use restrictions and prohibitions when the CCE was a network-object. As a fluid-object, the responsibilities for the chemical used appeared to be a floating rather fluid matter of concern, as no one seemed to think this meant anything in particular. As a vaporous-object, the matter is again irrelevant. The CCE thus contributes to silencing (Callon, 1986) the environment as well as to problems such as the use of toxic chemicals being exposed to workers, people living near the chroming plant, and the environment into which the chemical is disposed. Interesting to note is that literature about CCEs has to date also ignored aspects relating to the environment and a sociomateiral approach to the study made it possible to study the translations of a particular issue in the CCE concerning the environment, showing how the environment is brought into the CCE-network, managed, and then ingored through this management.

7.4 In the Reporting Process

Interestingly, the process in which a supplier is turned into a “Committed Business Partner” says nothing about the commitment from Corp or their suppliers in terms of adhering to a code; it merely changes the label attached to a supplier who has agreed to sign the ten minimum criteria form, from supplier to committed business partner. Many mediators exist in the reporting process, and every step in the process entails a change in format and configuration of the information that is passed on to the next

\textsuperscript{33} “Cr (VI) is known to cause cancer. In addition, it targets the respiratory system, kidneys, liver, skin, and eyes. Chromium metal is added to alloy steel to make it harder and resist corrosion. A major source of worker exposure to Cr (VI) occurs during “hot work” such as welding on stainless steel and other alloy steels containing chromium metal.” Source: OSHA Website, URL: https://www.osha.gov/SLTC/hexavalentchromium/, retrieved [20160528]
step. A supplier is first re-labeled as a business partner when reporting information from an audit reaches the sourcing manager in China. This manager reports the data that which he receives as KPIs in the format of an Excel sheet called a ‘Business Partner Report’. So suppliers change names for no other reason than the name of the report they are compiled into. The individual business partners are at this point anonymous, so the sourcing manager cannot track which numbers represent which suppliers. Furthermore, a group of business partners are reported as committed business partners if they have signed Corp’s ten minimum criteria.

In Corp’s sustainability reporting procedure at headquarters, a new reality is constructed every year as the sustainability report is produced. This construction involves a very specific statistic: the number of “committed suppliers”; i.e., how many of Corp’s total suppliers have committed to following their CCE. As was shown empirically in rooms 11 and 12, this process of reporting is closely intertwined with the construction of the “committed business partners”. The suppliers who produce and supply physical raw material and employ factory workers and produce industrial waste in the process are reduced in a western enactment of responsibility – signatories of the code are equated with “committed suppliers”. As the case for Jianco would have it, this statistic bears no more proof than a signature on a piece of paper that says that Jianco is committed to following Corp’s CCE. However, the reality of the working conditions at Jianco tell another story. The material aspects of production, working conditions, and toxic chemicals are all set-aside so signed documents and statistics can speak for themselves in the sustainability report. As for the report, committed suppliers are the new, glossy reality.

The reporting process, again and again, isolates individual actions but makes possible the concept, through material changes, the management of action at a distance. These material changes are disabling for ideas of responsibility to be associated with them. This is because the process of reporting, in each of the times it comes up in the empirical material, demands that individuals change the information they have into a different form, formats, system, or label. This means that tracking information backwards is impossible, and only the one who converted it knows exactly what lies behind it. It also means that when an individual has done their work tasks, they must put them into reporting terms for the information to be useful for those higher up, thereby distorting information without knowing the consequences of that distortion.

The guiding principles for the reporting process concerning audits and the performance of suppliers is based on what needs to be reported in the Sustainability Report. The Sustainability Report is primarily aimed at shareholders. Jensen (2010) calls this ‘flexible specialization of production’ entailing that processes and products
within the firm are changed according to changes demanded by external entities such as shareholders. Shareholders demand a sustainability report and a globally spanning reporting system, where individual workers are expected to keep up to date with new reporting terms, is put in place.

The example in this thesis shows how the CCE in the reporting procedure obfuscates what adherence to the code means. In terms of reporting, code-adherence is equal to a signature on a piece of paper. The CCE in the reporting procedure therefore simplifies a complex matter to serve purposes of green-washing and marketing and simultaneously contributes to appearances of stability in the network-object at home. The report indicates that code-adherence has been measured and verified by the very reporting procedure that created this reality.

### 7.5 In Relation to Organizational Mindsets and Ideas about Responsibility

Through the course of analyzing the empirical material in this thesis, we have come across a number of logics or mind-sets that enable different enactments of the code. These mind-sets have relevance for the stability of the code-network.

The concept of mindsets relates back to ideas associated with the corporate code of ethics. We saw in room zero that a lot of work was put into constructing a code of ethics that borrowed from certain established ideas about what it entails to be a good corporation. These ideas come from different international bodies such as the UN and ILO. These ideas are universal in their nature and generally applied to all companies, reflecting a type of universalistic ethics. However, as we moved into subsequent rooms and look at material translations of the CCE, the ideas associated with the code start to take different shapes. Already in room one and carrying into rooms two and three, stemming from the Swedish sourcing department in Charlesburg, the idea of responsivity gets a very practical application. The associated mindsets are about making things measurable, and responsibility becomes calculative. These ideas, however, are neatly aligned and intertwined with the material translations of the code as inscription devices based on the code are devised in order to do just this: to measure and evaluate. The network-object is thus able to change material shape, but remains stable.

However, when the CCE travelled to China in the audit situation, the material translations were met with different approaches in terms of how to measure. The same tools, the same devices, and the same action plans were enacted in different ways, and the ideas associated with the CCE start to take different turns. The idea could be to save time and energy and increase efficiency in terms of numbers of performed audits. In such a case, it becomes a tedious task to figure out the
measurement system according to the Swedish engineers. It is much easier to use one action plan (the result of measurements and evaluations at one specific supplier for certain types of products at one point in time) as a template for other audits. The ideas that are associated with the CCE start to disassociate from the discursive contents and configuration of the material translations. This is when the CCE is a fluid-object.

At the suppliers, however, when distance is increased further from the headquarters, we find that the same action plan (material translation of the CCE), which in terms of the network-object, can be seen as made to align and intertwine with the reporting process and ideas about responsible business conduct. Here, the CCE is instead associated with completely new ideas. Disassociated from the original ideas, the CCE is associated with ideas of the power and prestige of association with a global brand. The CCE is vaporous and associates freely with ideas that are neither inscribed in or have previously been associated with the code.

The idea of organizational mindsets has to do with both professional mindsets as studied by Norberg (2009) and the formal profession or role of an individual. This could be an engineer or sales representative or green-purchaser. These titles seemingly have with them ideas about identities that individuals associate with their work; however, this was not the primary focus of this study, but the empirical material hints at these mindsets as the associations of how a job should be done. There is also another set of associations that have to do with a task-specific mindset: What do I need to do in order to get this specific task done? The ideas associated with the code therefore change and can in general be summarized in the figure on the following page (Figure 29 - The Multiple Code and Associated Ideas)

7.6 Summing up

The CCE is a network-object when it remains under the influence of the country of origin – and when it is held together, it is a fluid object, changing configurations, as it begins to travel, and it is a vaporous object when it is disassembled and disassociated from its original material form and ideas inscribed in it. As a vaporous object it is free and associates instead with new ideas that fit the realities of the given context in an uncontested manner.
When a CCE leaves its country of origin, the CCE fails to exert any kind of influence on the suppliers, finds itself in complex power-relationships where negotiations, power-dynamics, and different agendas are likely to conflict with the CCE. Moreover, the CCE contributes to silencing the environment and the fabrication of compliance of suppliers through internal reporting procedures. Ultimately, the CCE fails to export its ideas about responsibility as it negotiates with and is overpowered by ideas of economic efficiency.
8. Contributions and Discussion

The findings of this study are relevant in several ways. First, by combining existing studies from country’s where corporate codes of ethics originate with studies from developing countries, this thesis contributes to the literature in category ‘d’ (See table 1 - Five Categories of Approaches to CCEs on page 39) by methodologically increasing the geographical and processual scope in which a CCE is examined. Second, this study adds context-specific knowledge in relation to how a generic code highly correlating with UNGC works in terms of achieving the stipulated goals in an international setting. Third, this thesis theoretically adds to category ‘e’ in the previously presented literature review (See table 1 - Five Categories of Approaches to CCEs on page 39) by proposing an even more mutable and susceptible CCE, the vaporous CCE. Below I discuss these three areas of contribution in more detail.

Regarding the First Contribution

The first contribution of this thesis lies in adding to general and specific code-evidence from outside country of headquarter, specifically from China.

Previous studies have noted the specificity of the political and economic context in which codes operate need to be understood in order to enhance our knowledge regarding how these codes work (e.g., Helin and Sandström, 2007). Despite this, few studies have focused on countries outside the country of origin, where the CCE is developed and written. Of the few studies that do exist, only a handful take into account the first-hand context of the developing country (e.g., Locke and Romis, 2006; Bezuidenhout and Jeppesen, 2011; Egels-Zandén 2007; Egels-Zandén, 2014).

This thesis adds both to the general and specific knowledge of these studies in terms of providing grounded empirical insights into the workings of a code in a Chinese setting, both regarding activities carried out by members of the company in China and by members of the supplying organization. The findings suggest that code work is far from straight forward and a code’s material changes give rise to unpredictable enactments of the code. These enactments are understandable only once we shift perspective from the country of headquarter to the country where the code travels, i.e., goes to work, in this case China. The Chinese setting is specific. It has been noted that international conventions and standards are difficult to transfer into national contexts (Potobsky, 1998). The issue of right to freedom of association is a tricky area in China and hence a contested topic. Several national regulations seem
in one way or another to infringe upon the free right to associate\textsuperscript{34}. The free right to association is one of the main pillars of the UNGC under labor principles for international corporations to adhere to. As was seen in this study, adherence to these labor principles was stressed in Corp’s auditing tool, although ignored in China. This highly political problem is important to address, yet if businesses are not ready to even discuss the topic while doing business in China, there might be more significant problems that need addressing. Although this problem could be addressed by academics, it is highly relevant for increasing the amount of business being outsourced to China (Ijiri et al., 2010).

In a study of 805 factory audits from Honduras, China, and Vietnam, Anner (2012) suggested that corporate programs may be less likely to focus on worker rights in terms of democratization and independent unions since such rights actually would lessen managerial control without providing reputational value. Although this study does not go into detail about this issue, the empirical evidence is in line with Anner (2012). The issue of free association was ignored by the auditing crew because it is complicated. This means code-work is decoupled from the ideas about the code in practice, not only through complicated sociomaterial translations, but also through omission of the complicated questions.

\textbf{Regarding the Second Contribution}

The second contribution of this thesis lies in putting together knowledge from codes in various contexts (where codes are [re]developed and go to or are put to work – theoretically a global reach) and understanding codes in the milieu of many interdependent contexts.

These contexts include several sites where the code is at work in relation to the daily operations of a multinational corporation. For example, the developments of the measurement and control code at a Swedish sourcing department, the use of an audit tool in China, and the code in the corporation’s reporting chain between China and Sweden. On a broader level, the thesis touches upon the travel as well as material and immaterial transformations of one company code, based on the UNGC and the ten principles therein.

Several studies have added in different ways to the breadth of the understanding of CCEs by providing contextual insights from, e.g., different organizational levels. These include Preuss’ (2010) investigation of the interconnection between several

\textsuperscript{34} These issues are regularly taken up by activists and for example expressed in an open letter to the Chinese Head of State by the worldwide movement for human rights. URL: \url{https://www.fidh.org/en/region/asia/china/Freedom-of-association-in-China} [retrieved 2016-10-28]
different types of codes on supra- and sub-organizational levels. The study found that these documents are intermeshed and there are significant differences between the generalized, publicly visible company codes and those codes that are actually operative, i.e., put to work. The language differences suggest that the more coercive aspects of implementing codes get “buried in the lower levels of the code hierarchy” (2010:471). Therefore, studying the official codes in isolation does not give us insight into what is going on in the company. The findings in this study confirm Preuss’ (2010) findings but also extend them in that more coercive but also more unpredictable versions of the original manifest the further away the codes travel from their stable country of origin, typically North American or western European countries.

Looking closer at supplier-oriented codes, Preuss (2009) looks into the kinds of content contained in these. These codes, usually based on the overarching CCE of the company, specify issues perceived to be important in the management of supply chains. The study found that 44% of the FTSE35 (Financial Times Stock Exchange) 100 constituent companies have specific sourcing-codes, although other companies have other CSR-tools and clauses in place in relation to their suppliers. The content analysis identified three areas that were discussed in these codes: employment conditions for supplier employees, environmental protection in supplier plants, and economic issues affecting supplier firms. The analysis also suggests mimetic behavior in these codes, primarily as the sourcing codes of the FTSE companies showed a high degree of correlation with a code called the ETI Base Code (a code founded on the conventions of the International Labour Organization). The ETI has been drafted by a company called Ethical Trading Initiative:

“ETI members include global companies with thousands of suppliers, international trade union bodies, specialized labor rights organizations and development charities…Our income derives from a combination of members’ fees, a grant from the Department for International Development (DFID), individual project funding and trading income”.36

Preuss’ (2009) findings are therefore similar to earlier findings regarding the correlation between company CCEs and international standards, indicating that the same is right for specific supplier-codes. As mentioned previously, the content in a CCE is largely correlated with international standards such as the United Nations Declaration for Human Rights, the International Labor Organization’s Conventions, and International Environmental Law (Carasco and Singh, 2003). The findings in

---

35 A list of the 100 companies with the highest market capitalization on the London Stock Exchange.
this thesis are not generalizable in terms of the supplier-oriented code, because only one case is followed. However, this study does provide empirical insights in terms of the diverse and sprawling content that such a code contains in a number of different documents.

A recent study has also focused on overarching industry codes and international guidelines that guide CCEs, including the UNGC (United Nations Global Compact). Sethi and Schepers (2014) analyzed the international guidelines for corporations drafted and implemented by the United Nations in the form of the ten principles in the Global Compact Initiative (GCI), arguably the largest global corporate responsibility initiative (Hall, 2010). This is a supra-organizational code; although voluntary, it had almost 10,000 signatories in 2010. The study sets up a framework to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the principles as outlined in the GCI by analyzing perceived benefits by signatories and the duties of both signatory and sponsoring organizations. The study also evaluates the UNGC’s activities over a 12-year period to measure the progress in the enhancement of corporate conduct as stipulated in the GCI. The authors look at UNGC’s expansion policies over this period and the relevance it has had for the implementation of “principles; governance structure; sources of funding; policies, procedures, and operational practices; transparency in reporting; and measures of public accountability” (2014: 194).

The study identifies three areas of concern and finds that The UN has failed in its mission: The reasons attributed to this failure are grouped into the following three areas of concern: i) the governance structure of the UNGC failed to encourage accountability for actions and transparency in external communications; ii) the UNGC’s economic reliance on a small group of countries and companies; and iii) a failure to acknowledge the great heterogeneity of the signatory companies. Although acknowledging the unlikeliness of the event, the authors suggest that the responsible thing to do in light of the findings would be for the UNGC to “admit its failure and dissolve itself” (2014:207). They further suggest that if the UNGC umbrella would disappear, corporations would need to respond directly to public pressures for increased responsibility and better conduct. This thesis adds evidence to these findings and suggests that an association with the UNGC does not amount to higher levels of responsibility in the supply chain, yet creates legitimacy that if used to leverage against supplying nations rather than individual suppliers could be a step towards increased responsibility. However, the organizational structure and economics of the UNGC depend on members creating a political environment that is counteractive to UNGC’s mission. I agree with Sethi and Schepers (2014) and argue for more company specific codes and policies.
Regarding the Third Contribution

The third, and overarching contribution of this thesis lies in highlighting codes as different kinds of material objects and adding to the existing literature – specifically, contextualizing the code as a vaporous object.

As has previously been noted by Jensen et al. (2015), codes have previously been assumed to be what Latour (1987) calls immutable mobiles, artefacts that “do not change and the relationship between them is not altered. It holds stable wherever it goes” (Mol and Law, 1994:649). This thesis adds empirically grounded knowledge to the field suggesting the contrary. Codes change and they change in different ways, both materially and immaterially. Close to home the changes are more often of a material form, whereas the changes far from home occur in ideas and mindsets.

Jensen et al. (2015) also suggest the metaphor fluid object, arguing that codes are better understood as mutable, changeable, and showing configurational variance (Law and Mol, 2001). The mutable mobile holds together in ways different from the immutable mobile.

Viewing a code as a fluid object and allowing it to show configurational variance means that it cannot be assumed to be only a text, a symbolic artefact or a management tool when it travels through organized networks. For it to perform, to work and continue to work, there cannot be hybrid versions of these three definitions. As the code travels and it enacted upon, it must, it seems, sometimes also be a fluid object. (Jensen et al., 2015:264)

This thesis confirms the fluidity of codes, but places this fluidity in the context of when the code is in negotiation between home country associations (e.g., individuals trained in Sweden and in contact with the headquarters, software designed to track and monitor code-work, models and ideas related to the idea of a responsible business stemming from the UN and EU) and receiving country associations (e.g., individuals working and living in China and the politico-legal system in China). This placement offers an extension to the findings provided by Jensen et al. (2015) where the managers followed are exactly in this kind of negotiation situation; they are employees in Sweden but sent to Rio, Ottawa, Delhi, or trade fairs. This context creates incoherencies and the code is simultaneously perceived as good for business and bad for business. In a pre-study where a Swedish subsidiary is the receiver of a code, employees enacted it as relating to common sense and not related to the company’s core operations. The enactments of the code related instead to use of office phones for private calls or inviting a business partner for lunch. (Helin and Sandström, 2010). When the same code goes to Rio, New Delhi, and Ottawa, however, it comes much closer to the company’s core operations (Jensen et al.,
Whereas the code in Sweden was enacted as remote, the code in Rio and Delhi became more intrusive. These results are also confirmed by this study as the code becomes more intrusive in the medial rooms when translations of the code are most actively in negotiation. In distal rooms, however, the enactment of the code is better described as indifferent but also practical in terms of fitting within the local context.

This thesis extends this metaphor further to suggest that codes may also be seen as a vaporous object, one that does not hold together materially and in idea form. The variance is no longer configurational, but replacemental – this happens when one set of ideas that hold together are replaced with a different set of ideas that are incongruent with the first. The text and meanings inscribed in the material code cannot logically be linked to the ideas associated with it. This means that the change is more abrupt rather than continual. The change is in the form of a new association. Evidence for the vaporous code is found only when the code is with the suppliers and free for them to interpret without any associations with Corp. These findings further suggest that studies of codes of suppliers, taking the supplying organization’s perspective, can add to our understanding of how codes work and are put to work. This means, however, that beginning studies that focus on the supplier end could be beneficial. These studies would not take the perspective of code dissemination but rather focus on reception by supplier organizations. Several studies look at reception by employees in western contexts, e.g., Norbergs (2009) and Helin and Sandström (2010). In a similar manner, there is a further need for studies to focus on supplying organizations as receivers of codes in different contexts.
9. Suggested Future Research

Translations of a CCE in more and different corporate contexts need to be studied to understand the potential effects that CCEs have both in the western world and in less developed countries. These contexts include but are not limited to supplying organizations. Furthermore, the interconnection between the versions of a CCE that travels through global business practices are relevant. More studies are needed that follow a CCE over longer periods and in interaction with a wider range of different actors. A focus on both material translations and associated ideas can further enhance the knowledge regarding the consequences that code-work has in different settings.

Furthermore, studies of CCEs in more material-intensive sites are needed to understand how CCEs influence the way business is conducted. This means more contact with production, assembly, and raw material excavation sites. If we are interested in truly attempting to solve the problems related with global production and consumption, we must understand the local spaces where these problems are, the environments where they are fostered, and the local spaces where solutions to these problems are tailored, advocated, and put to work.

Future research is also needed regarding how corporations can tailor their work regarding social, environmental, and economic responsibility in ways that are more specifically related to the effects of the actions related to their work rather than copying other corporations and relying merely on umbrella organizations to set generic standards.
10. Managerial Implications for CCE-Work

The implications of the findings in this thesis can be of relevance to both practitioners and academics. While the thesis mostly discusses academic relevance, this section is aimed at practitioners, primarily those working with development, implementation, and operative work with codes of ethics in a global business setting. The practical or managerial implications are more of “food for thought” rather than practical tools. However, I do provide some ideas relating to the focus in practical code-work.

This thesis provides evidence for the complexity associated with code work, something that I believe many practitioners in the field already recognize. This complexity, which entails a process of drawing together distant places, actors, and ideas, is to a large part attributable to factors which code-work comes in contact with. My advice to practitioners is to stay true to this complexity, because it is through the work and a heightened engagement and interest in production sites far away that the problems with global business can be brought to light. Rather than seeing codes as a necessary evil, if these are seen as eye-openers and discussion-triggers, we might be able to highlight the problems that need solutions rather than inadvertently designing programs that contribute to the creation of an illusion that these problems do not exist.

The theoretical concepts of a code as multiple object-network, fluid, and vaporous can be of high relevance in managerial work since these theoretical concepts also carry with them a high level of metaphorical value. The code is more stable at home, where you have put down the work to retain this stability, but it becomes less so when it travels outbound, where the problems it espouses to solve are really occurring. This means codes cannot be seen as a problem-solver farther away just because they have been intricately designed and disseminated in the organization. The code becomes less stable as it travels, becoming more fluid and finally vaporous. This means that parts and morsels of the code are retained, while others disappear or become less relevant. Seeing this, however, can help organizations acknowledge the complexity of the global business environment where they operate and also help them focus on the areas that are most pertinent to the specific industry or company. The importance of firm specific solutions is paramount.

In terms of humble practical suggestions, my advice to practitioners in large corporations working with CCEs would be to be cautious when tempted to want to solve all problems with environmental degradation and labor standards. Rather, start with a focus on something that truly emanates from the core operations of the corporation. Clearly, this is difficult to do since many large corporations are
diversified and operate over various industries; however, there is still arguably something that every corporation would be most adept at focusing on. For example, in the textile industry the focus might be on labor rights, which are a huge problem, for the extraction industry environmental degradation is a consequence, for production industries it is the use of hazardous materials, for the food industry it is the use of pesticides, for electronics it might be waste that is produced by fast technological advancements and over-consumption. Focusing more time and energy on a core area would allow for a thorough analysis of and workable solutions for the most pertinent problems in the industry.

In addition, my advice to higher-level managers working primarily in headquarters would be to listen to their co-workers who have operative knowledge of the business outside the legal, social, political and cultural environment where company-spanning decisions are usually made. Let their knowledge of the complexity of the operations be valued and encourage them to make suggestions tailored for the specific problems at hand rather than opting for the “one-size fits all” solution where one code is meant to guide all of the work organized under the corporation. Invite such knowledgeable co-workers to join discussions and take their knowledge seriously. It can help you find those very specific issues that your specific company can help solve.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Fictitious Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Collected by</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2010-04-06</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>Henrik</td>
<td>Head of sourcing department Charlesburg</td>
<td>Sven and Johan</td>
<td>Initiating discussion on project group</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2010-10-07</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>Viktor</td>
<td>strategic purchaser</td>
<td>Sven and Johan</td>
<td>On audits and the IMS portal</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2010-10-27</td>
<td>HQ Stockholm</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>CSR manager</td>
<td>Sven and Johan</td>
<td>About the code, stakeholder management, CSR, sustainability reporting</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2010-11-21</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Strategic purchasing</td>
<td>Sven</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 2010-12-07</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Strategic purchasing</td>
<td>Sven and Johan</td>
<td>CSR and audits</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2011-06-14</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>Johanna, Viktor, Jakob, Henrik</td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2</td>
<td>Maira and Sven</td>
<td>Going through the auditing tools</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 2011-09-05</td>
<td>Sofitel Hotel, Ewing</td>
<td>Johanna, Jakob</td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2</td>
<td>Maira and Sven</td>
<td>Discussion regarding the process of an audit</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 2011-09-06</td>
<td>Jianco, Johanna, Jakob, Lee, Jing and suppliers (Jianco)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2 + supplier</td>
<td>Maira and Sven</td>
<td>Field notes from audit</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 2011-09-06</td>
<td>Jianco, Johanna, Jakob, Lee, Jing and suppliers (Jianco)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2 + supplier</td>
<td>Maira and Sven</td>
<td>Field notes from factory tour</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>field notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 2011-09-06</td>
<td>Jianco, Johanna, Jakob, Lee, Jing and suppliers (Jianco)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2 + supplier</td>
<td>Maira and Sven</td>
<td>Reflections from the day</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 2011-09-07</td>
<td>Jianco, Johanna, Jakob, Lee, Jing and suppliers (Jianco)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2 + supplier</td>
<td>Maira and Sven</td>
<td>Field notes from audit (morning)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2011-09-07</td>
<td>Jianco, Johanna, Jakob, Lee, and Jing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2</td>
<td>Maira and Sven</td>
<td>Internal score-setting, day 2 of audit</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name(s)</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Topic/Notes</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2011-09-07</td>
<td>Jianco</td>
<td>Johanna, Jakob, Lee, Jing and suppliers (Jianco)</td>
<td>Purchasing division 1 and 2 + supplier</td>
<td>Maira and Sven Field notes from audit/afternoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2011-09-08</td>
<td>Corp Ewing</td>
<td>Viktor, Johanna</td>
<td>project manager purchasing, strategic purchaser</td>
<td>Maira and Sven About background to Corp Ewing, sourcing in China</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2011-09-08</td>
<td>Corp Ewing</td>
<td>Lee, Jakob</td>
<td>Purchasing Ewing, division 2</td>
<td>Maira and Sven Following up the audit</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2011-09-08</td>
<td>Sofitel Hotel, Ewing</td>
<td>Jakob</td>
<td>Purchasing division 2</td>
<td>Maira and Sven After-audit discussion regarding score-setting</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2011-09-09</td>
<td>Corp Ewing</td>
<td>Vinny, Lucy</td>
<td>Production and SHEQ manager</td>
<td>Maira and Sven SHEQ at Corp in China</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2011-10-18</td>
<td>Charlesburg University</td>
<td>Jakob</td>
<td>Global Supplier Development Engineer</td>
<td>Reconnecting and following up on the audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2012-04-18</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Strategic Purchasing, division 1</td>
<td>Maira and Sven discussion regarding work with suppliers in China</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2012-04-18</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Strategic purchasing</td>
<td>Maira</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2012-04-20</td>
<td>Corp Charlesburg</td>
<td>Lars and Adam</td>
<td>Strategic Purchasing, division 1</td>
<td>Maira</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2012-04-24</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Jakob</td>
<td>Global Supplier Development Engineer - strategic purchasing, division 2</td>
<td>Maira Supplier Collaboration Portal and sustainability reporting</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2012-04-27</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Lars</td>
<td>Strategic Purchasing, division 1</td>
<td>Maira</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2012-06-11</td>
<td>HQ Stockholm</td>
<td>Kate, René</td>
<td>Corporate Responsibility and Relations Manager and Sustainability coordinator, corporate communications</td>
<td>Maira About the code and sustainability reporting</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2012-06-11</td>
<td>HQ Stockholm</td>
<td>René</td>
<td>Sustainability coordinator, corporate communications</td>
<td>Maira About sustainability reporting and audits</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four interviews, nr. 4, 23, 26, and 32 were not transcribed because the content of the interviews was deemed not adding to the purpose of the thesis.
### Appendix 1b - List of empirical material, documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>What is it</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Acronym/Alias</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Reference nr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The Code</td>
<td>Corp's code of ethics (English, Swedish, and Chinese versions)</td>
<td>pamphlet</td>
<td>The Purple book</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Supplier Quality Process</td>
<td>A policy and process manual</td>
<td>PowerPoint (19 slides)</td>
<td>TSQP</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Audit Invitation Letter</td>
<td>Letter sent to suppliers before audit</td>
<td>6 page word document</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Supplier Assessment, supplier process evaluation and supplier evaluation checklist</td>
<td>the complete tool for assessing suppliers during an audit</td>
<td>Excel document</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Supplier Assessment Guidelines</td>
<td>Written guidelines for guidance on score setting of an audit</td>
<td>39 page word document</td>
<td>SAGs</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Organizational Chart</td>
<td>Illustration of how Corp is organized</td>
<td>1 page document</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Group Compliance Statement</td>
<td>A document asking Managers to confirm they have read and 'are in full agreement with' the Code</td>
<td>1 page document</td>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Business code discussion points</td>
<td>An internal pdd-file at Corp used for training purposes</td>
<td>8 page document</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Business Code for Business Partners</td>
<td>An internal Corp document for business partners including suppliers</td>
<td>4 page document</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Business Ethics, Social and Environmental Performance Criteria for Corp Business Partners</td>
<td>Internal summary of criteria for business partners</td>
<td>3 page document</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Prerequisite Strategic Purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 page document</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
<td>Document 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Supplier Qualification Process (division1)</td>
<td>A tool used by Corp to evaluate suppliers</td>
<td>excel document</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Introduction 1.3.5 Audit</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Evaluation of suppliers from safety, health and environment I</td>
<td>Training Document</td>
<td>32 slide PowerPoint</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Evaluation of suppliers from safety, health and environment II</td>
<td>Training Document</td>
<td>38 slide PowerPoint</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Safety, Health and Environment Manual</td>
<td>Training manual for Corp employees and to be used also for suppliers in the</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dun and Bradstreet Report of Jianco</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Corp's prohibited and restricted list</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Corp Book</td>
<td>A training book introducing Corps way of working and values</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Audit results Jianco 2011</td>
<td>document containing results for the audit, and action plan set up for the</td>
<td>9 slide PowerPoint</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Audit results Jianco 2013</td>
<td>document containing results for the audit, and action plan set up for the</td>
<td>7 slide PowerPoint</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Monthly Supplier Quality Report, Feb 2013, Ewing</td>
<td>Report sent by SQE manager to the Sourcing Manager monthly, including key</td>
<td>24 slide PowerPoint</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>figures on all conducted audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Document ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>GRI implementation manual</td>
<td>Global Reporting Initiatives description of how to implement GRI based reporting in a company</td>
<td>206 page pdf file</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Global Reporting Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>GRI sustainability reporting guidelines</td>
<td>Global Reporting Initiatives description of how to implement GRI based sustainability reporting in a company</td>
<td>94 page pdf file</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Global Reporting Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights</td>
<td>8 page pdf file</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Document 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Global Compact's Ten Principles</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>Document 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>ILO The Four Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>Document 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 a Interview guide – Examples of Questions asked during Round 1 of data collection

- When did you first come in contact with the code?
- How did that happen?
- What were your reactions/associations?
- What do you think about the code?
- Has there been a code or something similar before?
- Have you read the code?
- Do you know what it contains?
- Is there anything in particular that you have reacted to (good/bad)?
- Do you talk about the code?
- Is it relevant to what you do?
- How has it been received in the organization?
- Can you think of any episodes, examples or stories related to the code?
- Is the code really necessary?
Appendix 2 b Interview guide - Questions- Examples of Questions asked during Round 2 of data collection

Questions for Jakob and Johanna (sourcing engineers, Charlesburg) before the Jianco supplier audit 2011

- Why are supplier audits done? What is the purpose?
- Has this supplier been evaluated previously? What happened then?
- Are there any specific challenges with doing audits in China? Can you compare it to other places?
- How do you go about the audits? What is the division of tasks from Corp’s side. How do you decide on that? Who does what at an audit? Who is responsible for which parts?
- What do you do as preparation for the audit?

Questions for Jakob and Johanna (sourcing engineers, Charlesburg) after the Jianco supplier audit 2011

- What are your general reflections from the audit?
- What do you think about Lee’s role during the audit?
- Are you satisfied with the answers you got to the questions you posed? Why or why not?
  - Language barriers
  - Genuine ambiguities
  - Wrong people
- Could we have a look at each of the points in the HSAG and go through the score-setting?
- What does the communication between Corp and the supplier look like outside the audit scenario?
  - When you send them technical specifications does the supplier dare to criticize or ask questions?
  - Is there a forum for a dialogue?
- Why do you at Corp want suppliers to share your ethical and social values?
- Why is it important that the invitation letter gets signed?
- Who fills in the self-assessments given to suppliers? Who signs the contracts such as the ‘invitation letter’ in order to assure that “we have read and approved the above2?
- How is the CCE relevant in this process?
- Was there anything that was peculiar about this specific audit (or anything relating specifically to China) which you would say differs from audits elsewhere?
- Is there a difference in how the audit depending on the size of the supplier?
- What does the communication look like between management back home in Sweden when you’ve been working on this audit here?
Regarding the results of the audit, what does it entail that no stopping parameter was marked with a zero?

What happens next? What’s the next step in the process?

Questions for Lee and Jing (sourcing engineers Ewing) after the Jianco Supplier Audit 2011

- What do you work with on a daily basis? Can you tell me a bit about what you do?
- Have you heard about the purple booklet?
- Do you know what it is about?
- Do you have a location for the code? Does it exist in any physical sense? Do you know where?
- How did you get to know about the code? Do you get new information about it? How do you get that information?
- What is the code for?
- How do you use the code? Does it relate to your work in any way? How?

Questions for Sourcing Engineers connected to Sourcing Department in Sweden

- Can you tell me a little about yourself and your daily work
- What did you do when you were in China?
- Do you remember the first time you came in contact with the code?
  - Could you tell me about that
- In your daily work, in what ways is the code relevant? And in China?
  - Could you give me some examples
  - Could you show me
  - Who else is involved in decision-making
- Is there a point to having a code?
- Would you say the code is a topic of conversation?
  - Can you give me any examples
- Who is the person in-charge of the code?
- Could you suggest anyone else I should talk to considering my interest in the code?
- Specific questions (complemented with observations) regarding how, why and when the supplier portal and Sustainability reporting, have been implemented.
Questions for Kate (corporate responsibility and investor relations manager, HQ)

- Could you tell me about what you work with?
- When did Corp draft its first code of ethics?
  - Ask about previous version and differences compared to the new one
  - Why did you choose to change it?
- How has the code been implemented?
  - What activities (training etc.) are connected to this?
  - Who is responsible for this at different departments and units?
  - In different parts of the world, what has this implementation looked like?
- Why do you have a Code of ethics?
  - What is the purpose? What is it meant for?
  - Is it a good idea to have a code?
- How do you think others in the organization perceive the code and your work with it?
- How is the code relevant for your daily work?
  - Can you give me some examples?
  - Have you ever needed to look something up?
- Why do you think supplier audits?
  - For whom are these important?
  - Why is it important to do them as you do?
- What is the responsibility of supplier’s to Corp?
- Have you been involved in supplier audits?
- What are the different steps in the audit results that are reported in the sustainability report?
  - Are all the audits form different departments comparable? Do they need to be?
  - How do differences in the used tools at different departments affect your work with reporting?
  - Who else is involved in the reporting?
- Could I have a look at the templates you use for reporting?
- Would you recommend someone else I could speak with regarding these issues?
- Specific questions regarding the Jianco audit and tracking it in the reporting process.
Appendix 2 c Interview guide – Examples of Questions asked during Round 3 of data collection

Interview Questions for Jing – Charlesburg 20120705

- Can you tell me about what you work with these days?
- How long will you be staying in Sweden and what will you be doing during this time?
  - In relation to suppliers?
    - How many suppliers do you work with?
    - In what way do you work with them?
    - What is your main responsibility?
- Have you had ongoing contact with Jianco after the audit in September last year?
  - Could you tell me about this contact
- Jianco supplies to different divisions of Corp, are there any problems with this?
  - How is the communication handled by the two divisions? Is it autonomous or overlapping? Do you see any difficulties in this in your job?
- Have you been performing audits yourself?
- Do you know how the audits are stored, to be reported to the group?
- What are the major challenges with working with suppliers?
- In what way does the code, the blue book come in to play?
  - Do you ever refer to it in your daily work?
  - If so, how, can you give me an example?
- Do you think there is any point of having a corporate code of business?
  - Why or why not/ in what way?

Questions relating to follow-up audit Jianco (Wendy and Jing)

- In September an audit was done at Jianco and they received 63%. An action list was set up, consisting of a list of actions that Jianco needed to take in relation to quality, delivery precision, working environment, customer satisfaction etc.
- Could you tell me what has been done in the negotiation with Jianco in relation to this action plan?
- Who was involved in the supplier relations during this time? And what were their responsibilities?
- Is Jianco still the only supplier of cylinders to Corp?
- A follow-up audit was conducted in March 2013, where they received 80% on chapter 1 and 83% on Chapter 2. Can you tell me a bit about how this audit was conducted?
  - How long did it take?
  - Which areas did you focus most on?
Was there any reason for doing both a chapter 1 and chapter 2 audit?
What is the reason they scored so much higher than the last audit?
If we compare the two action plans and results (I have the documents) what has happened during this time?
  - Some things are still on the action plan e.g. use of hexavalent chromium
  - It seems there are still problems with quality and delivery, has it been this way the entire time?
  - Point 12 on sourcing is exactly the same. What is the reason for that?
What happens next, who is the action plan reported to? Where is the information about the suppliers and audits stored?
  - Do you also have the results from the previous audit (the version I have does not have people responsible in the action plan, were these set up afterwards?)
  - How was the information about the previous audit communicated to you, was it just the audit result and action plan?
    - When did you get it, in that case?
  - On the action plan, I see that the environmental and social issues only have a responsible from the suppliers side whereas many of the other points have representatives from both Jianco and Corp responsible, why is this?

Questions relating to the action plan for Supplier (Wane)

- Could you tell me what you work with?
- What kind of contact do you have with Corp?
  - Are there any challenges? How do you deal with these?
- Is it common that your customers make visits and do audits similar to Corp?
  - What do these audits entail for Jianco?
  - Is it good/bad/a lot of extra work/ a necessary evil?
- You have been put up as responsible for some points on the action plan after their follow up audit, e.g. the environmental and sourcing issues [point 3.2 and 12]. What does this mean?
  - What will you be doing in the near future?
  - How much contact do you have with Corp?
  - These points were there during the last audit as well, why do you think that is?
- Does Corp’s Code come in use in any way in your work at Jianco?
  - In what way?
(Focus group with 4 people working with suppliers in different ways, Ewing)

- What does working with suppliers entail?
- Does the work with suppliers involve certain responsibilities on your part?
- What is the importance of supplier audits?
  - Why are they done
  - Why is the documentation important
  - Do the audits affect the work with suppliers on a daily basis?
- Are there other forms of work that you do with suppliers that could relate to aspects of responsibility?
- What are the challenges in working with suppliers?
  - Ask for examples
  - How are they dealt with?
  - What terms of guidance do you have if you are faced with a dilemma? Or a situation which you cannot directly solve? You see that the supplier is not using
- What responsibilities do you think Corp have in relation to suppliers?
- What responsibilities do you think suppliers have in relation to Corp?
- Could you exemplify this responsibility in terms of how you work with suppliers?
I skriftserien Studier i företagsekonomi Serie B utges löpande rapporter från den företagsekonomiska forskningsgruppens verksamhet vid Umeå universitet.

Hittills föreligger följande skrifter:

Lars-Peter Holmlund
Hur man tillämpar teorier om planering.

Göran Carstedt och Birgitta Isaksson Peréz
Företag i strukturomvandlingen, del I-V.
Umeå 1974.

Lennart Orkan
Personalomsättning - orsaker, konsekvenser och regional struktur.
Umeå 1974.

Dezsö Horváth
Situationsanpassade organisationer - teori och tillämpning.
Umeå 1976.

Claes-Göran Larsson
Datorbaserad kassaplanering.
Umeå 1976.

Carl Fredriksson och Leif Lindmark
Nationella och lokala produktionssystem. En strukturstudie av svenskt näringsliv.
Umeå 1976.

Carin Holmaquist
Styrning av organisationer - ett systemperspektiv tillämpat på statliga företag.
Umeå 1980.

Runo Axelsson och Lennart Rosenberg
Applications of organization theory. On problems of the Swedish system of higher education.
Umeå 1976.

25. Elisabeth Sundin
Företag i perifera regioner. Fallstudier av företagartradition, företagsmiljö och företags framväxt i Norrbottnens inland.
Umeå 1980.

26. Per Månsson och Kaj Sköldberg
Symboliska organisationsmönster - Sju typer av planeringskultur under osäkerhet och stress i ett metamorfosperspektiv.
Umeå 1983.

27. Christer Strandberg
Glesbygdsbutiker. En studie av tillkomst, köpandrohet och socialt samspel.
Umeå 1984.

28. Häkan Bohman och Häkan Boter
Planering i mindre och medelstora företag. Den strategiska planeringens utmaningar och faktiska villkor.
Umeå 1984.

29. Christer Peterson
Familjeföretag i omvandling. En studie av fusionsförlopp och utvecklingsmönster.
Umeå 1985.

30. Maj-Britt Johansson Lindfors
Organisationers ideologiska ansikten. Om grundläggande föreställningar i mindre företag.
Umeå 1989.

31. Anders Söderholm
Organiseringens logik. En studie av kommunal näringslivspolitik.

32. Kerstin Nilsson och Per Nilsson
Småföretag i flerpartssamverkan. En studie av aktörer, bygstenar och fogmassa vid nätverksbyggnade.

33. Maria Bengtsson
Konkurrensklimat och dynamik. En studie av interaktion mellan konkurrenter.
Umeå 1994.

34. Nils Wåhlin
Näringslivsledares arbete i nätverk. Identitetsskapandets dynamik.
Umeå 1994.

35. Tomas Müllern och Katarina Östergren
Larande kultur. En studie av organisatoriskt lärande under olika institutionella betingelser.
Umeå 1995.

36. Monica Lindgren
Möjligheter till kompetensutveckling. Ett individperspektiv på relationen människa-organisation.
Umeå 1996.

37. Ulrica Nylén
Gott och ont inom affärslivet. Utveckling av ett etiskt perspektiv på företags relationer med aktörer.
Umeå 1996.

38. Jan-Erik Jaensson
Marknadsorientering i tjänsteföretag. En studie av försäkringsbolag.
Umeå 1997.
39. Sven Junghagen
Strategiska förhållningssätt till informationsteknik i små företag.
Umeå 1998.

40. Tomas Blomquist och Johann Packendorff
Ekonomisk styrning för förändring: En studie av ekonomiska styrintitiv i hälso- och sjukvården.
Umeå 1998.

41. Agneta Marell Molander
Umeå 1998.

42. Karl Bonnedahl
En företagstrategisk analys av ekonomisk integration. Konsekvenser av Europas inre marknad för svenska mindre tillverkande företag.
Umeå 1999.

43. Jan Bodin
Perpetual Product Development. A study of small technology-driven firms.
Umeå 2000.

44. Henrik Linderoth
Från Vision till Integration. Infusion av telemedicin, en översättningsprocess.
Umeå 2000.

45. Gert-Olof Boström
CAD Adoption in the Swedish Architectural Industry. IT and the Professional Service Sector.

46. Peter Hultén
Managing a Cross-Institutional Setting: A Case Study of a Western Firm’s Subsidiary in the Ukraine.
Umeå 2002.

47. Johan Sandström
Organizational Approaches to Greening: Technocentrism and Beyond.
Umeå 2002.

48. Elisabet C. Ljunggren
Entreprenörskap och kjänns. En kunskapsreise mellan to perspektiver: fra individ til relasjon.
Umeå 2002.

49. Olof Wahlberg
A Paradigm Questioned. A study of how the cultural relativity of modern management knowledge confines its transferability to non-industrialised Third World countries.
Umeå 2002.

50. Henrik Nilsson
Essays on the value relevance of financial statement information.
Umeå 2003.

51. Lars Lindbergh

52. Jessica Eriksson
Branschinteraktion och institutionell förändring. Omvandling i två livsmedelsbranscher.
Umeå 2004.

53. Simone Wenisch
The Diffusion of a Balanced Scorecard in a divisionalized firm - Adoption and Implementation in a practical context.
Umeå 2004.

54. Tommy Jensen
Översättningar av konkurrens i ekonomiska laboratorier om ekonomiska teoriers förenkling, komplexitet och fördunkling i hälso- och sjukvården.
Umeå 2004.

55. Åke Gabrielsson och Margareta Paulsson
Individ och agentskap i strategiska processer. En syntetisk och handlingslogisk ansats.
Umeå 2004.

56. Rickard Olsson
Portfolio Management under Transaction Costs. Model Development and Swedish Evidence.
Umeå 2005.

57. Håkan Andersson
Svenska småföretags användning av reserveringar för resulvatutjämning och intern finansiering.
Umeå 2006.

58. Sofia Isberg
Den mångfacetterade marknadsorienteringsprocessen.
Umeå 2006.

59. Anders Isaksson
Studies on the venture capital process.
Umeå 2006.

60. Patrik Nilsson
Attention to Advertising.
Umeå 2006.

61. Lars-Anders Byberg
Framgångsrika exportörer.
Umeå 2006.

62. Peter Zackariasson
World-Builders: A Study on the Development of a Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Game.

63. Andreas Nilsson
Projektledning i praktiken. Observationer av arbete i korta projekt.
Umeå 2008.
64. Tobias Svanström
Revision och rådgivning. Efterfrågan, kvalitet och obe-roende.
Umeå 2008.

65. Kittipong Sophonthummapharn
A Comprehensive Framework for the Adoption of Techno-Relationship Innovations: Empirical Evidence from eCRM in Manufacturing SMEs.
Umeå 2008.

66. Jens Graff
Umeå 2008.

67. Jaana Kurvinen
Imitation och omtolkning – entreprenörers identifie-ringssprocesser ur ett genusperspektiv.
Umeå 2009.

68. Markus Hälgren
Avvikelsens mekanismer: Observationer av projekt i praktiken.
Umeå 2009.

69. Lars Erik Lauritz
Spirande polisidentiteter, en studie av polisstudenters och nya polisers professionella identitet.
Umeå 2009.

70. Pontus Bergh
Learning Among Entrepreneurs in Formal Networks: Outcomes, Processes and Beyond.
Umeå 2009.

71. Johan Jansson
Car(ing) for our environment? Consumer eco-innovation adoption and curtailment behaviors: The case of the alternative fuel vehicle.
Umeå 2009.

72. Thommie Burström
Organizing boundaries in early phases of product development. The case of an interorganizational vehicle platform project setting.
Umeå 2010.

73. Jonas Nilsson
Umeå 2010.

74. Malin H. Näsholm
Global careercists’ identity construction. A narrative study of repeat expatriates and international itinerants.
Umeå 2011.

75. Erik Lindberg
Umeå 2011.

76. Helena Lindahl
Sociala identiteter i seriösa fritidsaktiviteter - om samspelet mellan seriösa fritidsaktiviteter, platser, sociala världar och konsumtionsföremål i downhillcykling.
Umeå 2011.

77. Mattias Jacobsson
Samordningens dynamik.
Umeå 2011.

78. Vladimir Vanyushyn
Innovative Behavior of Small Firms: Essays on Small Firms’ Internationalization and Use of Online Channels.
Umeå 2011.

79. Erika Knutsson
Bundling for consumers? Understanding complementarity and its effect on consumers’ preferences and satisfaction.
Umeå 2011.

80. Thomas Biedenbach
Capabilities for frequent innovation: Managing the early project phases in the pharmaceutical R&D process.
Umeå 2011.

81. Marlene Johansson
The Balancing Act - Cooperating with Competitors.
Umeå 2012.

82. Galina Biedenbach
Umeå 2012.

83. Therese Hedlund
Tourists’ vacation choice structure: Influence of values and implications for green tourism.
Umeå 2013.

84. Christopher Nicol
Change in the cage. Examining an Organisational Field’s Formation, Development and Change – Sweden’s Biofuel Region.
Umeå 2013.

85. Suranai Ch挝airuang
Umeå 2013.

86. Herman Stål
Umeå 2014.

87. Philip Roth
Umeå 2015.

88. Rustam Vosliov
Essay on Art Markets: Insight from the international sculpture auction market.
Umeå 2015.

89. Giulia Giunti
The impact of increased standard flexibility on disclosure practices.
Umeå 2015.

90. Annika Andersson
Affärssystemsprojekt: Konsekvenser av att vara sluten eller öppen för förändringar.
Umeå 2016.

91. Elin Nilsson
Where to shop? - Understanding consumers choices of grocery stores.
Umeå 2016.

92. Jan Tony Abrahamsson
Umeå 2016.

93. Maira Babri
The Corporate Code of Ethics, at Home, Far Away, and in Between: Sociomaterial Translations of a Traveling Code.
Umeå 2016.