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Abstract

Dis-identification has become a key research area in organization studies, demonstrating how employees subjectively distance themselves from managerial domination by protecting/constructing their more ‘authentic’ identities. But how should we understand situations where even these ‘real’ selves are experienced as alien and foreign? We revise the theory of self-alienation to explain cases beyond dis-identification, where even back-stage identities (‘who we really are’) are considered something polluted, objectified and foreign. Drawing on an illustrative empirical vignette of a consultant, we demonstrate how a revised version of self-alienation might usefully capture experiences of work where the back-stage/front-stage boundary breaks down. We tentatively posit three causes of this self-alienation in relation to contemporary organizations, and discuss their significance in the context of organizational dis-identification.

Key words: authenticity, culture management, dis-identification, imaginary, narrative, power, self-alienation
Introduction

As organizational domination seemingly becomes increasingly geared towards constituting the identities of employees, a growing body of research has focused on workplace dis-identification as a tactical response among the workforce. Studies have shown that dis-identification may take multiple forms, including cynicism, humour skepticism and irony, and has been explained in a number of different ways. In the context of culture management, for example, dis-identification might allow employees to overcome tensions between ‘who they really are’ and ‘who they have to be at work’ in order to maintain a sense of authenticity (Kunda, 1992; Sturdy, 1998; Whittle, 2005). By protecting or constructing a back-stage preserve of ‘authentic’ selfhood, actors establish a boundary between what is genuine and what is counterfeit, performed and mere pragmatic pretense. Research also indicates that employees derive psychic satisfaction and relief from the knowledge that they can protect ‘who they really are’ from the corrosive clutch of the corporate power (Van Maanen, 1991; Kosmala and Herrbach, 2006) – an outcome that may ironically integrate them into the rhythms of work more effectively given the impression of autonomy it allows (Fleming and Spicer, 2003; Brown and Humphrey, 2006).

In this paper, we suggest research now needs to explain situations beyond dis-identification, where even these separate and nominal ‘authentic’ selves are experienced as something alien and inhuman. While the cynical worker can get on with their job secure in the knowledge that they possess a non-colonized reserve of selfhood, others are tormented by the realization that even this inner preserve is contaminated. In such a milieu, dis-identification partially fails since what actors consider to be most truthful about themselves is experienced as alien, lifeless and a derivative of corporate power. As indicated by Sennett (1998) and Leidner (1993), such an encroachment of corporate objectification into the realm of self falls painfully short of complete co-optation since employees acknowledge with a sense of malaise and loss that ‘who they really are’ is someone they ought not to be. In order to explain scenarios where employees confront their ‘real’ selves as an alien phenomenon, we revive the concept of self-alienation. This is a potentially risky move given the essentialist connotations of the phrase. Alienation has a long history in social and organizational theory stemming from Marx’s influential earlier writings (Marx, 1978). Alienation is said to occur when capitalism estranges selfhood from community, nature and ultimately the self itself. The concept has not weathered postmodern criticisms of essentialism and economic determinism well. However, we maintain a revised version may reveal the complex interplay between control, dis-identification and authenticity in contemporary organizations. In particular, we use the idea to conceptualize experiences of work that lie beyond dis-identification, where even the private sanctuary of a ‘real’ self is considered polluted, alien and inhuman.

In order to make our argument the paper is structured as follows. First, we explore the architecture of dis-identification and demonstrate how actors construct an ‘imaginary’ narrative of authenticity to distinguish themselves from corporate designer identities. Second, after presenting a brief history of the concept of self-alienation and post-modern criticisms, we develop our revised version to explain those instances where the narrative of authenticity (‘who I really am’ behind the faux displays) is experienced as somehow unreal and alien. Third, we demonstrate the utility of this concept by presenting an illustrative empirical vignette of a management consultant we call ‘Paul’. This vignette is drawn from a broader ongoing study of employee dis-identification in a London consultancy called ‘Robos International’. In the discussion section we posit three possible causes of self-alienation. These are the
failure to generate a plausible narrative of authenticity outside of the firm given the long work hours, the increasing number of ‘Generation Y’ employees interested in anti-corporate ideas which simultaneously present their own work identities in an unfavorable light, and the rising importance of managerial attempts to harness authenticity to increase productiveness (thus rendering it an instrumental and calculated experience). We conclude by discussing the broader significance of self-alienation in relation to contemporary organizational forms, authenticity and dis-identification.

The Architecture of Workplace Dis-identification

The significance of dis-identification as a contemporary mode of workplace experience has been underlined in a growing number of studies. It is difficult to establish for sure whether there is anything new about this phenomenon – perhaps employees have always dis-identified with work given the economic and cultural contradictions in capitalism (Bendix, 1956; Edwards, 1979). The importance of dis-identification today, however, is best explained by shifting relations of managerial domination that appear to target employee selves as a strategic resource. The so-called ‘last frontier of control’, as Ray (1986) famously called the extension of control systems into the realm of identity, is not only met with unquestioning acquiescence or subjectification. Some may distance or protect certain aspects of their personhood from the regulatory reach and membership roles associated with the culture, empowerment and commitment programmes en vogue today (e.g. Collinson, 1988; Trethewey, 1997; Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999). The idea of dis-identification reveals the negative side of identification. An ‘unpopular culture’ (Weeks, 2004) may lead some to distinguish what is considered as more genuine and ‘real’ about themselves vis-à-vis the patently bogus identities exhorted by management. This is how the widespread observations of employee ambivalence, irony, humour, scepticism and cynicism have generally been explained. Let’s now unpack the architecture of dis-identification in order to better position our revised theory of self-alienation.

The Spatially Divided Self

When employees are said to dis-identify with a management discourse associated with culture management, empowerment or commitment rituals, the terms ‘protect’ and ‘defend’ are often evoked. Such terminology implies the spatial metaphor of a boundary that divides the real from impression management and outward displays of self. Kunda’s (1992) much cited ethnographic study of a high-commitment culture at ‘Tech’ is germane here. Employing Goffman’s (1959) classic demarcation, Kunda noted how engineers not only engaged in ‘role embracing’ (identification) but also ‘role distancing’ (cynicism, skepticism, etc.) – this is where front-stage selves are detached from back-stage feelings, thoughts and attitudes. As the dramaturgical language implies, employees may simply ‘act the part’ in order to get by unharassed by significant authority figures, while inside they enjoy genuine feelings of resentment, cynicism and so-forth (also see Willmott, 1993). Such an architecture of selfhood has been elaborated and developed in subsequent studies of dis-identification. Casey (1995), for example, terms those employees who express various forms of resistance and discomfort when confronted with the company’s colonizing discourses as ‘defensive selves’. Their anti-management discourse represents a “wish of employees to withdraw and to hold back something” of the self (Casey, 1995: 147). Sturdy (1998) too argued that when employees suspect they are being forced to become someone they are not, attitudes of cynicism, irony and
humour provide relief by opening up a space of self-determination and sincerity within tightly controlled environments. Subsequent investigations have analyzed more closely the division between ‘authentic’ back-stage selves and faux front-stage presentations in order to understand how dis-identification constructs identity. This research moves beyond the terminology of ‘protection’, ‘defense’ and ‘boundary patrolling’ since it implies that the back-stage self is pre-given and a priori. Fleming’s (2005) study of a communications firm demonstrated how employees’ cynical dis-identification with a paternalistic culture (that cast them as children in a school setting) actually constituted the ‘real’ back-stage selves. As employees participated in the puerile team building exercises, the cynical act of protecting their dignified and rational adult identities simultaneously constructed them. This performative feature of back-stage selves highlights how dis-identification is instrumental in creating alternative narratives of personhood that are considered ‘better’ and ‘above’ the ones encouraged by the labour process (Whittle, 2005; Hodgson, 2005).

**Authenticity and the Real**

The acknowledgment that back-stage identities and the boundary dividing them from front-stage presentations are constructed in the tumult of contradiction, tension and dissonance inevitably leads us to question what exactly we mean by authenticity. The idea of authenticity in relation to self and identity has a long philosophical history borne in European romantic thought (Berman, 1970). As Guigon (2004) points out, authenticity has come to mean the ‘truth of oneself’, or that which is sincere and genuine (as opposed to fake and untruthful). It thus imputes a moral connotation of goodness to the subject who retains their authenticity. Modern humanism in particular utilizes this approach, as the philosophy of Heidegger and Sartre demonstrates. According to Hochschild (1983), authenticity is that inner domain of integrity that employees keep to themselves as they act through the organizational roles assigned to them. Lasch (1979) employs a similar liberalist theory of authenticity when mapping its demise in the modern corporation. It is that part of the person privately chosen, which identifies them most truthfully within the forest of illusions, facades and designer subject positions.

More recent research on dis-identification and the constructed nature of ‘real’ selves shows how authenticity emerges from the collage of discourses that subjects existentially feel best describes them (Tracy and Threthewey, 2005). Importantly, it is only when workers are forced to distinguish themselves from an obviously cheap corporate identity that the construction process ensues. We concur with Roberts’ (2005) Lacanian reading that authenticity is a kind of crafted ‘imaginary’ that allows one to know ‘who they really are’ in the past, present and future (also see Deetz, 1992; Alvesson and Willmott, 2002). This ‘imaginary’ structure of authenticity gathers form through a process of narrative as when one is asked, ‘who do you think you really are?’ (Taylor, 1989). It thus provides people with a fictitious yet ‘real’ sense of identity (Kuhn, 2006).

The discursive building materials for weaving this imaginary narrative of the real are of varied sources. Following Collinson (1994), some workers might evoke a broader working class discourse to define the truth of themselves, involving images of masculinity and machismo (the strong male, the bread winner, etc.). Llewellyn and Harrison similarly show how employees dis-identify with corporate communication texts (considered “glossies, buzzwords and fads, waffle, wordy and ‘civil services style’ writing, corporate bullshit” [Llewellyn and Harrison, 2006: 588]) and fix themselves by using class-based anti-management discourses. Perhaps the most
prominent source of this imaginary is found in extra-employment identities and values. Ezzamel (2001) note how false compliance in an organization implementing ‘new wave’ management techniques was structured around an identity derived from non-work images of self (family, friends, relationships, etc.). As Meyerson (2003) elucidates, such an evocation is shot through with wider ‘social identity’ markers relating to ethnicity, race, sexual orientation and religion, as well as ethical differences apropos socialized values and beliefs (also see Meyerson and Scully, 1995).

The Polluted Imaginary?

Much of the literature exploring the dynamics of dis-identification demonstrates how this imaginary narrative of authenticity protects employees from internalizing corporate dogma. As the term authenticity implies, such an imaginary exudes purity, sanctity, felicity and integrity. The assumption is that a space of realness can be forged and then enjoyed – as epitomized by the laconic cynic who manages to weave a subversive trail through the most oppressive organizational environments. This assumption does not hold in all cases. This paper is interested in those more pessimistic and painful experiences of work where the imaginary narrative of authenticity becomes too thin and contaminated to support the process of dis-identification. In light of the experiences relayed by Sennett (1998), Leidner (1993) among others, we suggest that research needs to explain situations beyond dis-identification where even these separate and so-called ‘authentic’ selves are experienced as alien, inhuman and even lifeless. For those involved, this is an unhappy predicament – subjects cannot enjoy the ignorant bliss of full co-optation (since they still maintain a partial critical distance) nor does the revealed truth of themselves reflect anything amenable or dignified. One only finds ‘iron in the soul’.

Several studies have given empirical accounts of such experiences, without placing them on a firm theoretical foundation. Sennett (1998), for example, discusses Rico (a management consultant) who suffers a powerful estrangement, since he constantly fears that “the ways he has to live […] in the modern economy have set his emotional, inner life adrift” (Sennett, 1998: 20). His traditional family values of loyalty, commitment and trust become difficult to sustain, and he slowly realizes that the truth of himself is alien to others and himself. Rico appears incapable of sheltering himself behind a dis-identifying self and lives what we would call his ‘imaginary’ authenticity as a foreign place. Leidner’s (1993) case studies of an insurance company and McDonald’s outlet also demonstrate how her routinized interactive service workers “have to be, while at work, someone they did not want to be” (Leidner, 1993: 184). The effects of this forced adoption of an alien self are described in Hochschild’s (1983) study of Delta Airlines flight attendants. After many months of deep acting, it becomes difficult to ascertain where ‘real’ selves end and company selves begin. Over time, employees cannot distance themselves from what they perceive to be ‘inauthentic’ attributes even off the job (also see Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993). It is the self-awareness involved here that gives these cases a tenor of malaise and loss. Indeed, parallels can be drawn with O’Connell Davidson’s (1998) study of prostitution, where the prostitutes experience themselves as ‘socially dead’ and ‘invisible’, a ‘fantasy’ and ‘unreal’. In the context of contemporary organizations, how can we explain this space beyond dis-identification, when even the imaginary narrative of authenticity becomes something alien?

Enter Self-Alienation
We aim to revise the concept of self-alienation to theoretically account for instances where the truth of oneself cannot be enjoyed as an 'authentic' preserve (unlike the cynic) since it appears alien. Self-alienation is defined as an experience where dis-identification partially fails since the boundary between false and real is disrupted. Before we unpack this organizational predicament and propose some causes, we give a brief history of self-alienation in Marxist thought in order to revise a more contemporary version.

The Rise and Fall of Self-Alienation in Marxist Theory

Inspired by Hegel and Feuerbach, Marx develops the concept of alienation in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 to critique the workings of capitalism (Marx, 1978). According to Marx, labour under capitalism is alienating in four ways. First, the object produced by labour ceases to belong to the worker because it is owned by another. Second, the universal personal life-activity of the worker similarly becomes an alien practice since work is now a forced activity. Third and most importantly for our purposes, Marx refers to alienation of the self from the self, as the species being becomes estranged. The self is alienated not only because the object, which is a universal part of man’s subjective connection with the world is externalized (entäußert), but also because the characteristics of the species being – the spontaneously, freely, consciously conduct of “life-activity” for intrinsic purposes – are lost. Thus, “estranged labor estranges the species from man” (Marx, 1978: 75; italics original) and thereby leading to the dehumanization of the worker (Schacht, 1970: 100). Fourth, as a consequence of the other forms of alienation, an “estrangement of man from man” (Marx, 1978: 77) occurs as we are pitted against others in the labour market. For Marx, in order to overcome this alienation, he believed that private property would have to be transcended. This would signal the “complete return of man to himself as a social being […]; the genuine resolution of the conflict between man and nature, between man and man – the true result of the strife between existence and essence” (Marx, 1978: 85; italics original).

Lukács (1922/1971) developed the idea of self-alienation in relation to objectification and commodification, and its effects on self-awareness within the labour process. Self becomes an object to be traded on the market as skill, expertise and experience are commodified and packaged as a productive resource. It was the rationalized nature of this marketization that the Frankfurt School critical theorists were particularly interested in. According to Adorno and Horkheimer (1944/1997), the abstracted nature of calculative rationality within a mass society of commodification leads to the ‘thingification’ of self, something the later Sartre (1976) also recognized. Similar conclusions about the alienating nature of contemporary work were also made in industrial sociology (e.g. Blauner, 1964; Marcson, 1970; Greene, 1978) and organization theory (Prasad and Prasad, 1993).

The concept of self-alienation was largely jettisoned with the arrival of post-modern theory, although even hardened Marxists like Althusser (1965/2005) also found it problematic. Especially in light of Foucault’s analyses that eschewed essentialist understandings of human nature and economic determinism, interest in self-alienation all but dried up in social theory. For sure, if there is no human essence that makes us authentic beings, how can we be self-alienated? (Knights and Willmott, 1989).
Towards a Revised Theory of Self-alienation

As will be noted in the aforementioned discussion of dis-identification, we approach self-alienation in a manner that bypasses debates about human nature, essence, immutable selves and so-forth. Instead, we gain inspiration from a more Lukácsian angle. Accordingly, self-alienation is considered a product of reification whereby identity is objectified and confronts its host as alien and inhuman. Indeed, this aspect of the Marxist tradition remains relevant in an era of emotional and aesthetic labour, ‘designer identities’ (Casey, 1995) and ‘crafted selves’ (Kondo, 1990). More specifically, our revised version of self-alienation aims to fit these broad insights into the discussion around dis-identification. We can recall that dis-identification relies upon the construction of an alternative self that is considered more real, authentic and existentially aligned with ‘who we really are’ – this self may be multiple and fragmented, but nevertheless ‘real’ in a lived biographical sense. Following Roberts (2005), we also suggested that this authenticity relies upon an ‘imaginary’ narrative, allowing one to construct ‘who they really are’ in contradistinction to the fake face-work demanded by customer service roles, engineered commitment programmes and the like. Self-alienation occurs when such distancing reveals not a domain of felicitous genuineness, but an alien space that is simultaneously owned by their hosts.

We propose that the self-alienated consciousness finds it difficult to forge boundaries the cynic would enjoy since what is real is perceived as foreign and a source of nausea. Indeed, and resonating with Jaeggi (2005), while the successful dis-identifier manages themselves through playful role distancing via cynicism, irony and humour, the self-alienated employee is decidedly ‘unplayful’ since they are unsure about what counts as authentic and inauthentic. There is nothing inside to hold onto. Yet painfully, a vague and unsatisfying boundary remains, since otherwise no tension or unhappiness would be involved. In the next section, we present a vignette of a management consultant to illustrate this revised theory of self-alienation. In the discussion that follows, some possible causes of self-alienation will be posited and situated within the context of contemporary employment practices.

Self-Alienation at ‘Robos International’

A vignette of the twenty-five year old consultant ‘Paul’ will illustrate what we propose is an experience of self-alienation. In a similar vein to Thomas and Davies (2005), the vignette style of data presentation is primarily a tool of exploratory theory building. We by no means attempt to generalize from a single case in relation to the company or patterns of employment more generally. The case illustrates what self-alienation might look like in the context of contemporary organizations, and provides a tentative framework for future analysis regarding self-alienation in organizations where identity is strategically managed. Moreover, while our case focuses on an individual (for the purpose of analytical depth), we approach self-alienation as a social phenomenon, a point we will return to in the conclusion. Methodologically, the study is based on participant observation in a human resource project team (involving participation and attendance of workshops with staff from HR and the business) and tape-recorded, semi-structured face-to-face interviews. Three hours of interview data was collected from Paul. Robos International is one of the top four worldwide operating consultancies and it attracts and recruits graduates with various university backgrounds. The formal culture emphasizes themes of ‘diversity’, ‘difference’ and ‘inclusion’, but employees describe it as one that consists of ‘long hours, just long hours’ (Rachel, consultant, 27 years old), ‘slave-driven’ (Rocky, 28 years old,
consultant), ‘robotic’ (Nathalie, analyst, 24 years old), ‘very aggressive’ (Jason, project manager, 34 years old) with a ‘no matter we can do’ attitude (Tom, consultant 28 years old).

Paul has worked as a consultant in the public sector division of Robos International in London for three years. Before joining the company he completed a humanities undergraduate degree at one of the most prestigious universities in the UK. Without a clear career direction in mind, he applied for various jobs in consultancy, media, advertisement businesses and ‘ended up at Robos’ because he ‘just needed somewhere to start’. Paul comes across as a liberal minded young professional who is interested in music (plays guitar), leftist intellectual ideas and popular culture, independent movies and other ‘cultural things’ such as theatre and exhibitions. When asked to describe himself, Paul replied:

“Well, I think I’d liked to consider myself of more sort of a creative. I think it is more in terms of appreciation of what I find stimulating. That doesn’t mean that I am as a person particularly creative. […] I guess if you wanted a description of me, I am very much a daydreamer.

Regarding Robos’ corporate culture, Paul said at various occasions that he experiences a ‘clash’ between ‘who he is’, that is the ‘creative’, ‘artistic’, ‘nebulous’ and ‘intellectual’ Paul and ‘who he has to be’ at work, that is the sterile, ‘cold’, ‘driven’ and ‘aggressive’ type of employee that Robos is reputed to attract in the business community:

I guess because you can be so much an individual at work and being yourself at work. There is a line where you have to realize that there are certain responsibilities in a professional environment and the actual nature of work it is very dry material and you actually have to approach it in a clinical, professional mindset, you can’t be necessarily creative and artistic and philosophical about it. That is very much a clinical process in some way. And that is where I find is the clash.

Importantly, Paul does not come across as a cynical person. For example, a couple of months ago he voluntarily supported the Robos corporate responsibility team in order to ‘give back’ to the company, make it a more ‘ethical’ place to work and to do ‘something that that would make him feel more integrated within’. Generally, Paul’s description of his working life at Robos is critical, yet ambivalent:

I find the work quite frustrating and boring. I mean I can say that I don’t love the work I do here. I don’t think it is a bad place to work, I think it is a good place to work but I think that it is very difficult for me the more I work here to find something interesting, something I enjoy within the company. I don’t think the company does anything wrong necessarily but I know more about who I am and what I would like to do and that it doesn’t fit in with the culture at Robos.

Because of the long hours and strong emphasis on work in Paul’s life, he admits:

I have very few friends that I stay in contact with for a very long time. There is no one from university that I would say that I see on a regular basis.
The long hours also means that he finds it difficult to hold onto a narrative of his ‘real’ self as an intellectual, musician and creative type who is attracted to countercultural issues. In this respect, Paul feels that his job is ‘draining’ him of his personhood:

I find the overall work here quite limiting and quite constricting, but if you push it I would say that I find the work quite asphyxiating. That basically means ‘strangling’. The sort of feeling that it constricts you. I often find myself to be getting stupider. [...] Those things [i.e., reading; learning new languages] are still very important to me and I just can’t, I just don’t have that room in my personal life to keep it up while working for Robos. [...] I describe it as being brain-rotten.

The imagery of ‘strangulation’ captures Paul’s feeling that his life is being drained, as he becomes someone foreign and almost ghostly. That is to say, unlike the cynic who has a kernel of enjoyable authenticity behind the facade, Paul is fearful that he has become that facade. In this sense, he seems to be fighting with himself to preserve an ‘imaginary’ narrative of the intellectual, literate and articulate person. This struggle goes beyond the boundaries of work. He purchases critical theory books that remain unread, but at least provide him with something to hold onto in terms of his previous identity as a radical intellectual. He explains:

I bought a year ago this book and I still haven’t read it. I used to read the LRB, the London review of books journals and it makes book reviews and the first six months I have got a subscription of it and I was reading it every week. I thought I wouldn’t be reading newspapers as much but this on the way to work. I found it very interesting. The past 4-5 months they are at home still in the plastic and I haven’t gotten around reading any of them and it seems such a waste. And I went to the bookshop to buy this book, which was by one of the authors who studied, it was a critical theory author and I used to study that.

But, his work intervenes:

I feel like I don’t have enough time to read, I feel stupid, I feel that I am engaging less and less intellectually. I feel like I am getting less articulate [...] I only realized that about 2 years along the line when I was working for Robos and even more recently so the past 6-8 months [...] It seems to be getting worse and worse and that is why I am trying to study [languages] and I want to hold on to it and it kind of feels very desperate and I don’t feel it should. It feels a bit defeated. It should not feel desperate or defeated to retain something but it should feel like something you want to do in your free time.

Having realized that his voluntary work has not made him feel more included since it also functions like a business within a ‘large corporation’, Paul struggles to find a way to deal with his failed attempt to genuinely fit in. This is especially the case as he experiences difficulties to maintain the person he thinks ‘he really is’. Referring to another consultant, Paul notes:

He was a very good consultant, probably very intelligent and he seemed to be an interesting person as well with lots of interests outside of that. But I think
there is a point in consultancy when your work person becomes more of who you are even outside of work and those original things that kept, all that made you as a person interesting, become secondary to who you are.

When asked how Paul feels about all this, he responds that ‘it stresses him out quite a lot’ and makes him feel ‘pretty low, pretty miserable’.

**After Dis-identification and the Alien Self**

The vignette of Paul provides an interesting example of what we call a self-alienated consciousness. We argue that this mode of workplace experience is quite different to the dis-identifier who is able to construct a boundary between the authentic and fake within themselves. As is evident from the interview transcript, Paul is unhappy, yet he chooses to remain rather than exit (a point we will discuss later on in this section). His despondency is of a different register to that of the resigned cynic or the full-blooded subscriber. Paul cannot find a kernel of authenticity to redeem himself in the context of his work environment – the line between ‘who he is’ and the company is precarious, and Paul is disappointed by what he sees when he reflects on himself. We propose that he is self-alienated because what he considers ‘real’ about his identity confronts him as foreign and devoid of life. He describes himself as ‘stupid’, ‘brain-rotten’ and ‘strangled’ by his work environment. Much like Lukács’ understanding of the fetishized self, Paul perceives ‘who he really is’ not as a safe and dignified sanctuary, but a husk that is largely unrecognizable. In this way, he fails to generate a plausible and practical imaginary narrative apropos an ‘authentic’ identity beyond the firm. We want to posit three causes that might explain the self-alienation that has befallen Paul at Robos International. We will suggest that these causes also raise significant issues regarding the experience of modern employment in the professional sector and perhaps elsewhere.

**Extension of the Working Day**

The first cause relates to time and over-work. Paul is required to work extremely long hours and as a result his life narrative and existential experience is largely determined by Robos International. The extension of the working day and its benefits to the capital accumulation process has been well documented in the Marxist literature (see Marx, 1867/1976). More recent theory, in particular Deleuze’s (1992) notion of ‘societies of control’ and Hardt and Negri’s (1994) theory of the social factory, also point out how the logic of work has hegemonized the spatial and temporal experiences of many in advanced economies. Paul has little life outside Robos International, something he himself is very self-conscious of. As Paul attempts to create an imaginary narrative of personhood that might afford a sense of authenticity outside the rhythms of Robos (and a boundary to protect himself), he clutches onto his prestigious university education, interest in radicalism, art and theatre. But these sources of self are overwhelmed by the sheer hours Paul works. There is little credibility or legitimacy in these extra-employment narratives since he knows full well that they are quickly fading vestiges of his former self. The books sit unread on the shelf and copies of the London Review of Books pile up in their mocking plastic wrappers. From the interview data, Paul seems to sadly understand that ‘who he really is’ is not the promising university scholar or art connoisseur (which are now but flimsy and broken dreams), but a Robos man.

**The Malaise of the Corporate Bohemian**
The second cause of Paul’s self-alienation derives from the kind of extra-employment narratives he is attracted to in an attempt to define himself. Being of the artistic and creative type, Paul has a keen interest in counter-culture and similar lifestyle domains usually associated with anti-corporate cool (including bands like Radio Head, etc.). Ross (2004) has demonstrated that many firms are now tapping the creative energies of the ‘subversive’ bohemian ethos in order to enhance creativity, innovation and flexibility in organizations (also see Florida, 2004). Indeed, as Boltanski and Chiapello (2005) also point out, the ‘new spirit of capitalism’ has absorbed a good deal of the humanist critique characterizing the 1970s and 1980s, utilizing various forms of ‘designer resistance’ in order to enhance the cultural legitimacy of the work environment. In the case of Paul, this leads to an interesting tension – he is drawn to discourses that fail as an imaginary narrative of self (given the long hours he works), but which nevertheless highlight the ‘sold out’ nature of his life as a consultant. In other words, the counter-culture he looks to cannot provide him with what he needs given the material dynamics of the labour process discussed earlier, but is illuminating enough to reveal that he has become a lifeless corporate ‘robot’. The contradiction is clear – Paul’s search for authenticity (in extra-employment narratives) leads to a sense of inauthenticity. This is exacerbated by the fact that Paul chooses to remain at Robos rather than exit (cf. Hirschman, 1970). He is not a cynic for he wants a career, even though he cannot believe in it; he wants to succeed, even though he knows ‘success’ is an ideological illusion. As with Jermier’s (1985) fictitious anti-hero Mike Armstrong, when the ‘sleeper wakes’ and discovers they are the agents of their own oppression, a profound listlessness and forlornness ensues. According to a senior human resource management interviewed at Robos International, this is one of the great challenges when managing so-called ‘Generation-Y’ employees – they are media savvy, critical and interested in underground slacker cool, yet find themselves choosing to work in extremely commercial environments.

**Corporate Colonization of Authenticity**

A third possible cause of Paul’s experience of self-alienation relates to recent trends in managerial discourse and practices that Fleming and Sturdy (2007) term neo-normative control. They argue that identity controls have evolved from those of the 1980s and 1990s where uniform commitment to a singular identity was required. Managerial pundits now encourage expressions of difference, authenticity and even subversion since it is the ‘real’ selves behind the cynicism that organizations now target as a resource (also see Ross, 2004; Boltanski and Chiapello, 2005). The nature of this development is complex, and cannot be described in full detail here (see Fleming and Sturdy, 2007). Suffice to say that such neo-normative control defines authenticity in a very individualist and controlled manner; employees are invited to display ‘who they really are’ by evoking certain extra-employment themes associated with sexuality, consumption, alternative lifestyles, ethical values and so-forth. As we mentioned earlier, Robos engages in CSR initiatives and prominently displays ‘fair-trade’ branding in the cafeteria in order to signal to ‘Generation Y’ employees that working here does not represent a complete ‘sell out’. We propose that for willing yet pessimistic employees, participation in such ‘authenticity schemes’ may lead them to view ‘who they really are’ in a skeptical manner. This is because the boundary between a self-defined authenticity and that orchestrated by the company is blurred. We can note this with Paul when he is ambivalent about the company’s interest in diversity and difference, and his own participation in Robos’ CSR initiatives. For
Paul, such activities are important for remaining true to himself and he likes this facet of the Robos environment. Yet his participation does not result in satisfaction or alignment between himself and the company. He accesses his back-stage self via the firm in a ‘sterile and clinical’ environment. This appears to suck something from him since ‘who he really is’ after the euphoric high of a philanthropic gesture is ‘stupid’, ‘drained’ and lifeless. Unlike the cynical dis-identifier who might retain an imaginary narrative about their authentic selves as they participate in the bogus CSR rituals, the self-alienated worker genuinely believes in the rituals and wants to find themselves in them, but simultaneously knows that they are staged, instrumental and bereft of self-determination.

Concluding Remarks

We have drawn on the growing discussion around dis-identification and identity politics in order to describe a mode of experience that we have called self-alienation. Our paper suggests that the typical architecture of dis-identification is somewhat scrambled when attempted by the alienated consciousness. Authenticity and the division between front-stage and back-stage selves are fundamentally reconfigured. While the dis-identifying subject can retain a plausible ‘imaginary’ in order to narrate an authentic self (Roberts, 2005), those who are self-alienated view even their nominal ‘true’ selves as foreign and lifeless – an external object that fails to afford relief from the ‘psychological siege and assault’ (Casey, 1995) of contemporary work relations. We have posited possible causes of this self-alienation in the context of modern organizations. In approaching self-alienation in this manner, we do not want to place it too firmly within an historical frame. Given the data available, we are unsure if such self-alienation is new or not, we simply use the term to describe a peculiar mode of experience that is beyond the dis-identifying subject (who has received so much attention in organizations studies). We would like to speculate that the self-alienation described is indicative of the damaging dimensions of the modern organizational form, but more research would be required to justify such a claim.

We have approached self-alienation as a mode of experience – a kind of unhappy consciousness. This might be quite different to more strident Marxist interpretations that view it in terms of a blissful false consciousness. In other words, from a classic Frankfurt School approach, for example, self-alienation is epitomized by a subject so immersed in commodity culture, they experience their formal domination with little tension or antagonism (Marcuse, 1968). It is a falsely happy experience. We approach self-alienation in a different manner, resonating more with Lukacs’ notion of reification and self-fetishization. Paul is conscious of the fact that what is authentic about him is paradoxically inauthentic and foreign. Such an analysis, therefore, follows Latour’s (2004) plea regarding a revived humanism in the social sciences. Rather than simply interpreting experience from an outside vantage point, we need to get closer to it, recount it faithfully as we attempt to interpret it. Getting inside Paul’s experience took time and effort, and we hope that the painful and sad nature of his experience at work is fairly represented here. Indeed, the term ‘self-alienation’ is hardly neutral, as it carries critical and political connotations about the effects contemporary work arrangements have on those who participate in them.

Accordingly, the paper has studied self-alienation by digging deep into the experiences of an individual, but we do not theorize it as an individual phenomenon. Self-alienation can only occur through the social processes that we have mapped in the context of contemporary forms of management and employment. Having said that,
it is interesting to note that the self-alienated consciousness appears chained to a very individualistic experience of self at work. Paul was detached and pre-occupied with the deformed nature of his identity. In addition to the isolation fostered by overwork, perhaps this is a corollary to the management of authenticity now pervading cutting-edge firms, defined as it is by individual difference, diversity and lifestyle. It is possible then that authenticity might emerge as a significant contested terrain in organizations. One can envisage it being redefined by employees in a more collective manner, perhaps reflecting the uniform and standardized nature of work tasks themselves as opposed to the private diversity of particular individuals.

The character type we suggest is self-alienated remains unexplored and untheorized in organization studies. We now know much about the cynical dis-identifier who can still enjoy a sense of ‘authentic’ self, however constructed and ‘imaginary’ it may be. The cynic is notoriously supple – they are ‘tempered radicals’ (Meyerson, 2003) who can hold strong anti-corporate views while participating in the organization as an ardent member. Unlike the cynic who is quietly tolerated given their superior work performance, the self-alienated worker represents something of a problem to management. They are tempted by anti-corporate popular culture yet still choose to remain employed, and they want to believe in the ideology of work but find it difficult to do so and thus are restless, crestfallen and unmotivated. These workers cannot gain a positive sense of identity to cope with the injuries of contemporary employment since it renders them drained, foreign and alien to themselves. It will be therefore interesting to observe in the future whether self-alienation changes the political climate of contemporary organizations, perhaps becoming a catalyst and platform for a progressive workplace politics.
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Alienation, Sociology of. Rather than present an overly strict definition of this rather vague umbrella concept which many would not agree with, the italics in the following five points sum up the elements that should bring the concept in sharper focus. 

(b) With the obvious exception of self-estrangement, alienation always points to a relationship between a subject and some real or imaginary, concrete or abstract aspect of his environment: nature, God, work, the products of work or the means of production, other people, different social structures, processes, institutions, etc.