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ABSTRACT

SAMANTHA L. SZCZUR: Office Space: Governmentality, the Corporate Campus, and Subject Position
(Under the direction of Steven May)

This dissertation is a study of one corporate campus environment and the potential impact it has on employee subject position. I use Foucault’s concept of governmentality as an analytical framework and examine how the corporate campus exercises mechanisms of control. I focus on DanTech, a highly regarded software company with a reputed corporate campus headquarters. The research examines what type of material and ideological environment is constructed among DanTech’s campus. Additionally, I address how campus and its affiliated services impact employee understandings of the organization, their jobs, and themselves. Finally, I analyze the integration of “work” and “life” and problematize modernist tendencies to dichotomize these life-realms. I draw upon interviews with 14 current employees and six former employees, campus observations, and academic literature to expound upon my research questions and attempt to situate the popularity of corporate campuses. I address both overt and subtle measures of control and employee navigations and renegotiations of power. DanTech’s corporate campus provides vehicles for power and control but also opportunities for employees to manage their lives. Overall, employees on DanTech’s campus value the amenities offered to them. The material and ideological facets of campus shape employee lives and perceptions but also provide a means for them to navigate their own subjectivities.
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Chapter One

An Introduction

Work is Cultural

Whether we like it or not, most of us work. Forms of work have varied from agrarian, industrial, to creative or knowledge work. While forms of work have greatly varied, what remains constant is the need for most people to engage in forms of paid labor outside of the home. What’s more, the labor we perform is not for ourselves, but for other people and other organizations.

The foundation of my research begins with the simple premise that not only do we work, but we must work. Certainly, work is far from a recent phenomenon. Humans have always acted in ways and performed duties that ensured survival. However, this was not “work” as much as it was “life.” The contemporary meanings we contribute to work are social and cultural. “Work,” largely, encompasses paid labor performed outside of the home usually for one’s employing organization. Work is defined through cultural negotiations as it develops specific cultural connotations. In other words, meanings of work are not intrinsic or inherent. Rather, cultural formations ascribe meaning to various forms and practices of work; what we do, how we do it, and whom we do it for supposedly suggests something about which we are, how we understand ourselves, and further, how we are positioned in relation to work.

This project examines the facets of work in one particular context. Specifically, I am interested in using Foucault’s concept of governmentality to analyze processes of work and subject formation as they relate to a highly regarded corporate campus. While I recognize the specificity of the context, the project ultimately addresses larger social questions regarding the
type of environment created by and through corporate campuses and amenities, how this influences people’s notions of their jobs as well as their opinions of the organization for which they work, and lastly, what corporate campuses suggest about our traditional conceptualizations of work/life distinctions and notions of community.

**Defining Corporate Campuses**

As with any term, defining exactly what constitutes a corporate campus can be contentious. For the purposes of this project, I define corporate campuses as demarcated plots of land that house one or more organizational entities with the intention of providing services and amenities to campus employees within close proximity to where they work (essentially upon campus grounds). In addition, an essential characteristic of corporate campuses is the intentional blurring of “work” and “life.” For example, the city of Noblesville, Indiana is in the process of constructing a 3600 acre campus that embraces the “whole-life” concept. As stated on the city’s website:

>The Noblesville Corporate Campus, an intelligent plan four years in the making, brings the sweet rhythm of comfortable living side by side with the cadence of corporate America in a well-orchestrated community. Here city planners are bringing to life a successful mix of office, industrial, commercial, and residential uses, weaving it effortlessly into the existing character and heritage of Noblesville. ([http://www.cityofnoblesville.org/cc/index.asp](http://www.cityofnoblesville.org/cc/index.asp))

Thus, the corporate campus is ultimately a workspace designed to mesh with the necessities of the everyday (such as eating and going to the doctor) as well as other aspects of social life (such as recreation and education). It is almost a misnomer to refer to the campus as solely a “workspace” since much of what happens here is not necessarily work. As Chan (2009) notes in a Seattle Times article, “Microsoft workers should never have to leave campus again to buy a beer, replace a bike tire or heal their spiritual energy through Reiki.” In fact, the article
discusses The Commons found on Microsoft’s West Campus which is essentially a shopping mall for campus employees. The Commons houses restaurants, shops, a pub, and a spinoff of Pike Place Market. However, since corporate campuses are the property of profit-generating entities and exist primarily for this purpose, falling back on the comfortable vernacular of “workspace” is convenient. One area of inquiry of this project is to examine this notion more closely. Regardless of what takes place on campus grounds, corporate campuses are recognizable in that they clearly draw boundaries indicating what is inside and outside of campus bounds. Many campuses are gated and require identification to enter the premises. Some are surrounded by fences or wooded areas. Campuses may be, and most certainly are, near other facilities such as schools, restaurants, and businesses. However, the dynamics and balance of inclusivity and exclusivity are apparent.

I recall my first experience viewing a corporate campus. “Viewing” is an appropriate word choice since curious onlookers are not welcome to browse around. Working in Beaverton, Oregon, I passed Nike’s world headquarters and corporate campus driving to and from work each day. Young, somewhat naïve, and a former athlete, to me the space looked like a dream come true. The soccer pitches were beautiful, the grounds pristine, the people bounding around the running trails for an early morning run vibrant. Nike and I had a relationship, albeit unbeknownst to Nike, and it was most certainly one of unrequited love. The campus was definitely an invitation, but not an open one. While my morning and early evening ritual consisted of melancholic gaze, my coworker and commuting partner had one of her own. It was her custom to hum the Darth Vader theme from “Star Wars.” I wouldn’t understand why until many years later.
I, however, was not the only person enthralled with the prospect of working within the bounds of a corporate campus. A quick glance at *Fortune Magazine*’s list of the “100 Best Companies to Work For” demonstrates high regard for corporate campuses (money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune). In the top 10, three companies are featured that have well-known campuses. They include SAS, who is number one on the list for the second straight year, Google (number four), and Dreamworks (tenth on the list). In each company snapshot, *Fortune* asks, “What makes it so great?” For each of these three organizations, discussion immediately centers on “perks” associated with campus. They state in regards to SAS, “Its perks are epic: on-site healthcare, high quality childcare at $410 per month, summer camp for kids, car cleaning, a beauty salon, and more—it’s all enough to make a state-of-the-are, 66,000-square-foot gym seem like nothing special by comparison.” Similarly, the discussion of Google highlights similar advantages. The website states, “The search giant is famous for its laundry list of perks including free food at any of its cafeteria, a climbing wall, and well, free laundry.” *Fortune* recognizes Dreamworks for “lavish[ing] [employees] with free breakfast and lunch, movie screenings, afternoon yoga, on-campus art classes and monthly parties.”

A visit to each of these organizations’ websites quickly reveals their own descriptions of their respective campuses. For example, Dreamworks offers the following description:

The gates to our studio in Glendale, Calif., welcome over 1,400 employees and guests daily. Beyond lie six acres of landscaped grounds with fountains, a river, a lagoon, walking paths and courtyards, along with 325,000 square feet of office space, and another 135,000 square feet due to open in 2010. The architecture and style of the studio take their inspiration from the Mediterranean, with arches and towers finished in warm shades of ochre, russet and stone, silvery olive trees, lush bougainvillea and flowing water. (dreamworksanimation.com)

Their own description highlights the aesthetics of campus. They continue and describe some on-campus services and programs:
Throughout the year, DreamWorks Animation employees have many on-campus events and activities to participate in. For example, there are on-campus art shows and craft fairs, weekly movie screenings, artistic development classes and lectures - open to any and all employees - and family days, when friends and family are invited to join us for lunch. (dreamworksanimation.com)

Here, they further outline amenities offered to employees. On-campus fitness facilities, educational opportunities, cafés, and laundry facilities are common corporate campus offerings.

Informal conversations with my own 30-something white-collar-professional friends reveal an overwhelming desire to work at such a place. I often get the same reaction from my 20-something students who are rapidly approaching entry into corporate America. Ultimately, my research questions revolve around the simple question, why? Why do people want to work in these types of environments? Additionally, what do these spaces do? It is my view that corporate campuses are a relevant and important social and cultural phenomenon because they continually appear as desirable places to work. However, they also contribute to the subject positions of employees, shaping their realms of possibility. They have real and material consequences for the lives of employees. What does this suggest about how we live our lives or how we ideally want to live our lives? One thing is for certain; corporate campuses are not accidental. They are contrived, carefully planned, and meticulously arranged areas of space, configurations of place, amenities and services, and organizational ideologies.

Brant Bernet (http://www.naiop.org/) of the Commercial Real Estate Development Association examines the primary reasons organizations construct corporate campuses. He notes of several justifications, “… the most significant of which is their [the organization’s] ability to exercise better control over the real estate holdings in the long term.” In addition, he states, “They [the organization] also recognize the potential benefits of designing facilities that meet their specific requirements in support of their corporate missions, cultures and operations.” The
physical and material space is one vehicle through which an organization navigates its real estate holdings, but campus is also a means to craft the space in particular ways that orient employees, customers, and the public writ large in terms of organizational image and culture.

Of course, there are many types and forms of corporate campuses. Many organizations have well-popularized corporate campuses. Among the most well-known are Google, Microsoft, Apple and, of course, Nike. While many campuses house one specific organization, some campuses such as Campus El Segundo in California, the Eisenhower Corporate Campus in New Jersey, and Research Triangle Park in the Raleigh/Durham area of North Carolina provide space for lease to an array of organizations. Campuses range in size, location, and types of amenities offered. Much of this has to do with the location of the organization and the amount of financial capital organizations posses for corporate real estate.

**Lineage of Corporate Campuses**

Upon first glance, it may seem that corporate campuses are a recent phenomenon dating back a few decades. While it is true that the way we understand corporate campuses now is relatively recent, organizations have constructed company towns and an array of welfare service offerings for employees for hundreds of years. I am not arguing that company towns, welfare services, and corporate campuses are *the same*. However, many similarities among them emerge.

For hundreds of years, Marchand (1998) suggests since the 1600s, organizations recognized the value in constructing company towns striving toward the integration of work and life. The typical situation for the construction of a company town began with an organization owning a significant plot of land on which they built both working facilities (factories and the
like) and living facilities within close proximity. Traditionally, company towns have been justified in many ways. The stabilization of a burgeoning industrial workforce was a common effort. Company towns also served as a vehicle for disciplining morality and social behavior, keeping workers’ wages local so they could spend their money on or near the property of the company. Since the company town’s inception, there has been difficulty in balancing the tension of “good business” and “philanthropic” practices. Creating a stable workforce that ultimately spends money where they work clearly contributes to the economic success of an organization. However, providing desirable housing, education programs, and recreation facilities may also contribute to the overall happiness and well-being of employees. Efforts concerned with employee well-being, whether social, psychological, financial, or otherwise, are often referred to as employee welfare services. Welfare, in this sense, is not in reference to aiding people in times of financial need. Rather, welfare services are those amenities and programs that seek, at least in some capacity, to improve the lives of employees.

Organizations often justified construction of company towns as a means of providing various forms of welfare for employees. Within an American context, this exemplified a form of welfare capitalism that emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Crawford, 1995; Marchand 1998). Again, the focus here was upon offering non-financial services such as housing and social clubs, health-care, and pensions. However, after World War II, the tenor of welfare services gravitated toward the more pragmatic and practical. Facets such as housing were in much less demand by employees. Workers now wanted quality health-care, retirement funds, pensions, and the like. Arguments abound in regards to this shift in employee welfare programs and services. Post World War II, pursuit of the American Dream was evident in the mass exodus from city-centers and urban settings. As architectural historian Gwendolyn Wright
(1983) suggests, much of the post-war public sought forms of privacy and space unavailable in city dwellings. Thus, workers moved from cities to surrounding peripheries bringing the birth of the suburbs and new, different, and perhaps more dispersed forms of community. If one could construct their own living space precisely how and where s/he wanted, there is little need or desire for corporate-sponsored housing.

Both employees and organizations recognized the demand for more pragmatic services. While wages have always been important to workers for immediate subsistence, in this era workers became equally concerned with maintaining security for the future in the form of pensions. I argue that this existed in relation to a rapidly burgeoning American materialism and a desire for financial security more than a means of “just getting by.” Here, there is an ideological shift toward stability and certainty for the future. While wages remained important, projected financial security became the foreground for corporations’ employee welfare services. However, this is not to suggest that physical space and location were no longer an issue for corporations. Workers may very well have moved to urban peripheries, but organizations still needed to concentrate labor in a particular space. Thus, the design of factories, office parks, and office space in general remained a significant organizational concern.

I argue that the contemporary corporate campus is an extension of, and related concept to, that of company towns and employee welfare services. Corporate campuses are similar to company towns in that they intentionally bring together and blur the lines between what is traditionally conceptualized as “work” and that of one’s “private life.” We can see this evidenced in today’s corporate campuses which include on-site childcare, healthcare, and recreation facilities. Listing examples of potential campus amenities is an exhaustive task. The following are found in one or more campuses: restaurants; pubs; shops; shopping centers; markets;
financial seminars, parenting seminars; continuing education programs; banking centers; dry-
cleaning; tailoring; spas; hair and nail salons; sporting fields; post offices; bike shops; and cell
phone vendors. While academics have proven slow in studying the corporate campus
phenomenon, with a few exceptions such as Massey et al.’s (1992) work on research parks, much
of the writing on corporate campuses originates from popular press. For example, Microsoft is a
significant presence in the Seattle area. Thus, The Seattle Times regularly reports on
developments regarding the campus.

Campuses and their amenities are constructed as spaces of flexibility. Time savings is a
common justification for corporate campuses. The struggle over time has long-since been a
located the struggle over time as a primary tension between the worker and the capitalist. E. P.
Thompson (1967) similarly addressed the economization of time and many contemporary
academics analyze conflicts regarding time (Gini, 2003; Hochschild, 1997; Hunnicutt, 1988;
Kunda, 2006). However, within a campus environment, employees can structure their time in
such a way that enables them to work efficiently and minimize time spent on campus. This
clearly has organizational benefits as well since efficient employees yield high productivity and
financial results. By including recreation facilities on campus, employees engage in sport,
fitness, and play and, in doing so, participate in social and communal formations (Zoller, 2003;
Zoller, 2004).

To summarize, or perhaps state more concisely, three key functions of corporate
campuses are the intentional blurring (if not integration) of work and life, governing capacities of
campus, potential benefits to employees, and ultimately, the impact that these both have upon
subject positions of employees. In the following chapter, I will elaborate upon corporate
campuses, their history and intentions, and their capacity to contribute to the subject positioning of employees. What is important at this point is to establish a working definition of corporate campuses and a general outline of their history within an American context.

**Rationale for Study**

In my project, I use Foucault’s concept of governmentality to examine how particular aspects of the corporate campus (work, play, community) impact subject position within a specific corporate campus working environment. Work, articulated within networks of global capitalism, ideology, power and control, serves as a fundamental component of identity and self-realization. Heelas (2002), for example, states, “Work, in other words, is meaningful, serves as a ‘source of significance,’ because (among other things) it provides opportunities for ‘inner’ or psychological identity exploration and cultivation” (p. 83). Work, thus, does not merely encompass a detached means to etch out a living. Rather, work is one of the primary means by which people evaluate themselves through their own reflection. In addition, it is through the vehicle of work that social values are cultivated on behalf of employees. This can be good, bad, or both. Rose (1990) states in regards to the implications of work as a social and cultural practice:

> In the psychologies of self-actualization, work is no longer necessarily a constraint upon the freedom of the individual to fulfill his or her potential through the strivings of the psychic economy for autonomy, creativity and responsibility. Work is an essential element in the path of self-fulfillment. There is no longer any barrier between the economic, the psychological, and the social. (p.119)

> Work is no longer simply the means to an end—the end filling the role of the consumptive citizen. Rather, the work, in many cases, is the end. The work itself provides the platform for responsible, self-actualized, fulfilled, productive/consumptive citizen subjects. This is not merely a matter of what one does for eight (or 10, or 12, or 14) hours a day. As Aronowitz
(2004) states, “As an end, labor tends to dominate our entire existence; it’s not all about money, it is equally about what and who we have become” (p. 7). And Americans work a lot. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (bls.gov), in 2008, the average employed American worked 1,792 hours per year. Compared with the 1,542 hours of the average French worker, 1,432 of the average German worker, or 1,389 of the average Dutch worker, Americans work several hundred more hours per year than many industrialized countries. The work, on many levels, defines us. Work is thus understood as a powerful force contributing to subject positionings with which the individual engages. Work, as both social and cultural, also provides an opportunity for belonging or creating and navigating community ties and relations.

Thus, if we take these arguments to heart, work is a crucial site of identity and subject formation. However, work is never merely about productive labor. Meanings of and from work exist dialectically in relation to the environment, both materially and ideologically, in which it is performed. If this is so, we must consider the workspace/place and its association with organizational culture, employee ideas about their jobs and employer, and how this transforms communal ties. Massey et al. (1992) refer to workspace/place constructions as “socio-spatial,” asserting that spaces and places are social, cultural, and generative and reflective of ideological formations. Ross (2003) recognizes the importance of space in a less abstract way when he writes:

Next to business casual, the reorganization of office space was most often portrayed as a sign of radical change. It was hailed as a revolt against the prison house of mental toil lampooned in the Dilbert strips . . . The constancy of this rigid office design and its formulaic expression of hierarchy had come to typify the failure of imagination attributed to the large corporation. (p.110)

While corporate complexes and service offerings are not new, corporate campuses and their organization of space do in fact reflect a differently imagined, if not reimagined,
articulation of work and life. Further, cultivating an understanding of what this articulation is and what it means within the contemporary cultural context is important because it allows further comprehension of the relationships between work, space/place, life, and subject positioning. Studying corporate campuses, what they do, and what they reflect is important because working in these contexts consistently emerges as an enviable position on behalf of the popular. What is it that makes these working environments desirable?

Lastly, it is my hope that this project expands upon existing knowledge and theory in regards to governmentality, work, and subject position. If it is clear that work impacts people in significant ways, I want to argue that the ways in which people work (the how and where) are equally significant. Examining working environments, specifically corporate campuses in this case, enables us to further interrogate the material consequences of work while also assessing the construction of corporate campuses in social, cultural, and economic terms.

Research Questions

To explore the aforementioned phenomenon in relation to corporate campuses, my project focuses specifically on one corporate campus in the southern United States. I will use the pseudonym “DanTech” to refer to this organization. I am fully aware that specific context is of utmost importance and all corporate campuses are by no means the same. However, I hope to use one organizational site as a vehicle to examine the micro implications of the campus and also explore the macro notions of what they reflect and generate in terms of employee subject position and sociality. My specific research questions and their thematic components are outlined below.
RQ 1: **The corporate campus environment.** What type of environment does the corporate campus create? What are the physical and material attributes of the campus? What are the array of employee amenities and service offerings? How do these interact to create an organizational setting?

In addressing research question one, I examine the actual space in terms of its bricks and mortar and bucolic surroundings. I examine how this plays into popular tropes romanticizing natural settings as well as how this has influenced the construction of suburbs as attractive settings. I also describe the array of employee benefits, programs, and amenities available to organizational members and their families.

RQ 2: **Campus impact upon employees’ understandings of their jobs and employer.** How does the corporate campus impact, if at all, how employees feel about their jobs? How does the corporate campus impact, if at all, how employees feel about their employer?

In addressing research question two, I explore the relationship between the corporate campus, employee happiness, and (un)willingness to perform job function, and (un)willingness to leave the organization. I also examine how people think of and assess the campus and service offerings on their own, and how this impacts conceptualizations of the organization.

RQ 3: **Blurring of boundaries.** How, if at all, does the corporate campus blur the traditional boundaries between work and life? What does this suggest about traditional notions of community? How does this enable us to reconceptualize community?
In research question three, I examine the interplay of work and life evidenced in the organizational setting since this is an explicit intention of campus settings and they are quite adept at it. I also explore how this alters modernist tendencies to polarize these areas of life and what it means to rethink these areas as integrated.

**Outline of the Dissertation**

The remainder of this dissertation includes five additional chapters. They include a review of the literature, an explanation of my methodological choices, analysis and discussion of empirical data, an assertion of implications and contributions, and a concluding chapter including final thoughts and directions for future research.

Chapter Two presents review of relevant literature and also serves as an exploration of my theoretical orientations and assumptions. I begin this chapter with a theoretical discussion of governmentality as an analytical framework. I then analyze how one’s work is crucial to subject position since work plays many important roles in our lives. Then, I discuss what corporate campuses specifically do to working environment and how this relates to work as a subjectifying entity. Lastly, I consider contemporary notions of work and life boundaries and what this suggests about social and cultural communities.

Chapter Three outlines my methodological selections and demonstrates the framework of how I actually conducted the research project. I address methods of data collection and why they are appropriate strategies for the research at hand. Any research project has limitations methodologically and this one is no exception. I highlight those potential limitations as a fair area of future critique but also assert that my methodological selections were deliberate solutions.
for practical problems. Lastly, this chapter presents my primary organizational site. This chapter will also include a discussion of participants in the study and method of data analysis.

Chapter Four, the analysis and discussion of empirical data, explores my research questions using interview data and academic literature. I position this data in relation to the literature presented in Chapter Two to flesh out my arguments and discuss the implications of interview responses. This chapter, in essence, provides responses to each of my three primary areas of inquiry.

Chapter Five offers discussion in regards to the significance of the research and what it means theoretically and practically. This chapter situates the contributions of the project in relation to existing literatures and areas of study. In particular, I examine my project’s contributions to existing areas of literature and how this can introduce new strains of research.

Lastly, Chapter Six offers a reiteration of the project, methodology, and basic arguments. I also address the potential directions for my future research as it relates to the project. I offer brief concluding remarks and conclude the analysis.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Introduction

In this chapter, I review literature relevant to the project. I begin with a discussion on governmentality, including Foucault’s preliminary outline of the concept and subsequent intellectual work elaborating upon Foucault and employing governmentality as an analytical framework. I follow that with an examination of how processes of work relate to identity and subject formation. Then, I address the notion that specific conditions in which one works are important in regards to processes of governance. Elaborating on this point, I discuss the integration of work and life and describe some specifics in regards to corporate campuses. At the conclusion of this chapter, readers should have a grasp on my theoretical assumptions and how I position myself within the literature.

Governmentality

The primary analytical lens I employ throughout my analysis is informed by Foucault’s concept of governmentality. Governmentality is an ideal lens for this project for many reasons. First, it considers an assemblage of techniques that contribute to subject formation. In other words, subjects are shaped by a multitude of cultural and material facets. Second, governmentality recognizes the significance of macro and micro techniques. Third, an analytical framework of governmentality assumes the diffusion of power and how that comes to bear upon subjects. My project is ultimately a study of subject formation as it exists in relation to DanTech and its corporate campus. In this analysis, I interrogate the macro and micro practices that
position employees, their thoughts, and their behaviors. Used as an analytic in this way, governmentality provides the ideal framework to address my research questions.

While Foucault’s theorizing on governmentality is generally regarded as incomplete, subsequent intellectual work elaborates upon his outline and use of the concept. At the most basic level, governmentality is an analytical framework that considers a broad range of elaborate assemblages that shape identities, mold political subjects, and generate regimes of knowledge and truth (King, 2003). Persistently dubbed “the conduct of conduct,” studies of governmentality highlight the complex ways in which subjects manage components of self including their habits, activities, behaviors, and psychologies (Rose et al., 2006).

The theoretical foundations of governmentality are scattered throughout Foucault’s writing. However, in his later lectures at the College de France, Foucault attempts to outline the history and contemporary conditions of governmentality. In *Security, Territory, Population* (2007), he offers this description worth quoting at length:

> By this word ‘governmentality,’ I mean three things. First, by ‘governmentality’ I understand the ensemble formed by institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, calculations, and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific, albeit very complex, power that has the population as its target, political economy as its major form of knowledge, and apparatuses of security as its essential technical instrument. Second, by ‘governmentality’ I understand the tendency, the line of force, that for a long time, and throughout the West, has constantly led towards the pre-eminence over all other types of power—sovereignty, discipline, and so on—of the type of power that we can call ‘government’ and which has led to the development of a series of specific governmental apparatuses on the one hand, [and on the other] to the development of a series of knowledges. Finally, by ‘governmentality’ I think we should understand the process, or rather, the result of the process by which the state of justice of the Middle Ages became the administrative state in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and was gradually ‘governmentalized.’ (pp.108-109)

In this description, Foucault outlines the structure of governmentality by recognizing the diverse and diffuse means and vehicles through which governance operates. The term “ensemble” is crucial here since governmentality has no linear, clear structure, but rather
employs fluid groupings of material and ideological facets. The creation and circulation of
“knowledges” is also pivotal since these truth-regimes act upon variously defined populations.
Lastly, Foucault suggests that contemporary forms of governmentality are rooted in centuries-old
practices.

Governing is a means of exercising power and control, and consequently, influences
subject formation. Governmentality shapes the possibilities of thoughts and actions. The type of
power exercised through governmentality is neither forceful nor coercive. The following quote
further elaborates upon Foucault’s conceptualization of governmentality:

The exercise of power consists in guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order
the possible outcome. Basically power is less a confrontation between two adversaries or
the linking of one to the other than a question of government. This word must be allowed
the very broad meaning which it had in the sixteenth century. ‘Government’ did not refer
only to political structures or to the management of states; rather it designated the way in
which the conduct of individuals or of groups might be directed: the government of
children, of souls, of communities, of families, of the sick. It did not only cover the
legitimately constituted forms of political or economic subjection, but also modes of
action, more or less considered and calculated, which were destined to act upon the
possibilities of action of other people. To govern, in this sense, is to structure the
possible field of action of others. The relationship proper to power would not therefore
be sought on the side of violence or of struggle, nor on that of voluntary linking (all of
which can, at best, only be the instruments of power), but rather in the area of the singular
mode of action, neither warlike nor juridical, which is government. (Foucault, 1982, p.
221)

This quote, similar to the quote which preceded it, directs attention to a series of key
themes of governmentality. Governmentality is a complex exercise of power that targets
populations. The individuals that compose such populations operate under the assumption that
they are free to act. Thus, power need not be forceful or violent. Struggle is unnecessary when
individuals believe they act as free agents. In this way, governance is a willful submission.
Many contemporary intellectuals build upon Foucault’s preliminary thoughts on governmentality. For example, Bratich et al. (2003) offer the following explanation of governmentality:

In simplest terms, governmentality refers to the arts and rationalities of governing, where the conduct of conduct is the key activity. It is an attempt to reformulate the governor-governed relationship, one that does not make the relation dependent upon administrative machines, juridical institutions, or other apparatuses that usually get grouped under the rubric of the State. Rather…the conduct of conduct takes place at innumerable sites, through an array of techniques and programs that are usually defined as cultural. (p. 4)

As Bratich et al. (2003) suggest, governmentality operates through diffuse assemblages that position power as a series of relationships. The concept characterizes power as a series of negotiated relationships while complicating the object/subject dialectic. Further, conducting conduct, or governing, is not implemented from the top-down. Rather, governing is culturally created, navigated, embraced, and/or resisted (Barnett et al., 2008).

According to the framework of governmentality, attaining governance, or the capacity to influence management of the self, requires a few crucial components. These vital elements include the creation of populations, emphasis on the individual as free agent, and the production and circulation of knowledges as truth regimes (Rose et al., 2006). I will discuss each of these in turn.

The advent of populations is akin to the development of a manageable social body for attaining particular goals. Foucault addresses this phenomenon extensively in both The History of Sexuality (1990) and Security, Territory, Population (2007). He locates the concern with populations as an important technique of exercising power. He states:

One of the great innovations in the techniques of power in the eighteenth century was the emergence of ‘population’ as an economic and political problem: population as wealth, population as manpower or labor capacity, population balanced between its own growth and the recourses it commanded. Governments perceived that they were not dealing
simply with subjects, or even with a ‘people,’ but with a ‘population,’ with its specific phenomena and its peculiar variables... (1990, p. 25)

Thus, populations are definable groups of individuals. Denominations of populations are numerous, sometimes overlapping and sometimes contradicting. For example, populations include those of citizen, employee, homosexual, and outlaw. Creating categories of subjects in terms of populations provides a discursive and/or material vehicle to exert influence upon the individuals which comprise the population. At DanTech, “healthy employee,” “happy employee,” and “productive employee” emerge as examples of populations. For example, a “healthy employee” is considered one who is fit, who eats certain (“healthy”) foods, and who maintains a balance between their work and life. While populations are largely defined through the managerial elite, employees’ actions reproduce and reinforce the norms of population as articulated by the organization.

In addition to the creation of populations, the individuals which comprise those groups must be positioned as free agents. Conceptualizing the self as an agent requires a construction of freedom and the idea that as subjects we are unbounded. In other words, humans are capable of any transformation to which they commit. What’s more, governance not only positions subjects as capable of transformation, governance absolutely relies on this notion that humans are free to act as agents. In other words, we must be free, or at least accept the idea that we are, in order for processes of governmentality to function. Foucault states, “Power is exercised only over free subjects, and only insofar as they are free. By this we mean individual or collective subjects who are faced with a field of possibilities in which several ways of behaving, several reactions and diverse comportments may be realized (1982, p. 221).” Thus, governing in this sense is not a matter of producing submissive subjects. Rather, subjects are positioned as active in their freedom to pursue betterment. As Rose et al. note, “The subject so created would produce the
ends of government by fulfilling themselves rather than being merely obedient...[and] would be obliged to be free in specific ways” (2006, p. 89). Paradoxically, individuals govern themselves as they exercise their freedom. Subjects embrace their perceived autonomy yet their freedom binds them to larger social structures of control and governance. Actions perceived as free are complex means of population management. In turn, pursuit of the idealized self actually produces less autonomy for subjects, not more. At DanTech, one way employees experience this sense of freedom is through campus and the amenities it provides. As I will discuss in further detail in Chapter Four, employees feel as if they can freely structure their time, movements, and actions on campus. Thus, they freely remain on campus. However, in exercising their free will and choosing to spend time on campus, they are subjected to the will of the organization at every turn.

Populations are comprised of individuals. Processes of governmentality simultaneously position subjects as both members of population(s) or social bodies and as individuals. Persistent emphasis on the self as an individual is fundamental to governance in contexts where liberalism dominates social formations, such as in the United States (Clarke, 2007). Additionally, the individual is poised as a perpetual agent always capable of altering one’s circumstances, particularly when dealing with issues of self-improvement. Rose et al. (2006) describe acting upon the individual as technologies of the self as “…ways in which human beings come to understand and act upon themselves within certain regimes of authority and knowledge, and by means of certain techniques directed to self-improvement” (p. 90). The self is conceptualized as a canvas of sorts in that, if acted upon correctly, the self is easily malleable and more importantly, improvable. Theoretically, the individual is easily divorced from social formations that surround her/him since the self is ultimately the responsibility of the individual.
Thus, in a liberal and humanist sense, one is always capable of transformation and if one does not transform or adequately conform to characteristics of populations, one can only blame her- or himself. Essentially, DanTech and similar corporate campuses are spaces of self-help where employees are given the means and expertise to improve their lives. Employees need only make the effort to use the resources available to them. Consequently, if employees are unfit, depressed, in debt, or having marital trouble, they are not adequately managing themselves.

Within a framework of governmentality, populations and the individual as agent exist in relation to knowledge creation and truth regimes. Within formations of populations, certain signs, symbols, and ideas emerge as taken-for-granted truths. In fact, as Rimke (2000), Rose et al. (2006), and Bennett et al. (2007) note, “regimes of truth” with emphasis on knowledge and authority greatly inform both how subjects understand themselves and the behaviors they enact. As Foucault states, “…truth isn’t outside power, or lacking in power…” (1980, p. 131). In other words, truth is far from neutral. Rather, truth is socially created and negotiated. Foucault continues:

Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (1980, p. 131)

Thus, we socially mold ideas of truth and falsity. Further, processes of defining truth are steeped in power relations. Lastly, the power of expertise accompanies those who articulate truth.

Rose (1990) offers an extensive exploration of a multitude of truth regimes including the field of psychology which claims to offer the truth of the mind as well as the cultural
naturalization of the productive worker experienced by much of the world. Rose (1990) also suggests that truth and knowledge claims require the construction of forms of expertise. Expertise enables social valuing of perspectives from those with certain credentials and/or experiences while devaluing the perspectives of others without similar credentials or experiences. Governmentality as a theoretical framework encourages exploration of the relationships between populations, individual agency, truth, and knowledge. As Bratich et al. (2003) discuss, governmentality is a diffuse and dynamic assemblage of technologies of power. Thus, truth, individuals, and population creation and managed are engaged in constant negotiation. On DanTech’s campus, truth regimes define populations such as the healthy and productive employee. For example, many managerial messages circulate throughout DanTech that define a particular notion of health. This definition is reinforced by campus health services and doctors who serve not only as medical professionals, but also as experts in the field. As experts, their perspectives are to be internalized and accepted as truth. A similar phenomenon occurs with campus nutritionists and personal trainers. As experts in their respective areas, they perpetuate both managerial and popular notions of health.

A closer analysis of Rimke’s (2000) work enables concrete exploration of preceding concepts. She asserts, using governmentality, that self-help writings demonstrate the complexities of governance. She states:

The arguments presented here will demonstrate how the appropriation and application of self-help psychological discourses holds a key position in advanced liberal democratic society, and how these discourses and technologies contribute to the invention and scripting of selves—citizens who are psychologically ‘healthy’ inasmuch as they are governable, predictable, calculable, classifiable, self-conscious, responsible, self-regulating and self-determined. Constructed and acted upon as such, individuals are rendered entirely responsible for their failures as well as their successes, their despair as well as their happiness. Indeed, this is the social subject of a liberal governance. (Rimke, 2000, p. 63)
Thus the social subject that Rimke identifies is one comprised of a particular citizenry or population. Rimke argues, using governmentality as an analytical framework, that self-help literature constructs the ideal person as one who is well-adjusted and psychologically stable. Consequently, the individual should make a concerted effort to articulate her/himself into the population. Clearly, self-help literature relies on scientific knowledges as truth regimes, and more specifically the constructed expertise associated with the field of psychology. Subjects are positioned as free agents capable of any change to which they commit. If we consider corporate campuses as spaces of self-help, we see similar phenomena emerge. DanTech services and amenities offer resources for employees to realize their well-adjusted selves. They are subjected to truth regimes that, when accepted, articulate them into populations that are ultimately beneficial for the organization and capitalist production. In addition, coercion is unnecessary since employees are positioned as free to act and free to take advantage of whatever resources they choose.

Employing governmentality as an analytical framework, I consider how DanTech’s corporate campus impacts employee subject positions and identities. My analysis suggests that campus is clearly a vehicle for governing the thoughts and actions of employees. This is accomplished through overt and subtle means, but overall, campus molds employees into political subjects in multiple ways.

Subject Formation and Identity

As an analytical framework, governmentality aims to identify the ways in which assemblages of power impact subject formation and individual identities. Ultimately, this is the driving force behind Foucault’s oeuvre as he articulates, “Thus it is not power, but the subject, which is the general theme of my research” (1982, p. 209). Conceptualizations of identity and
subject formation, thanks to Foucault and many others, have largely broken free from the modernist tendency to classify the individual and her/his identity as a static set of characteristics. More recent philosophical thought renounces modernist orientations about identity. Many theorists reposition identity in light of postmodernism and poststructuralism as a series of processual, fragmented, tense, and sometimes conflicting relationships (Collinson, 2003; du Gay, 2007; Grossberg, 1996; Hall, 1996). The notion of the self shifted from a single and solitary set of traits to collections of multiple and disjointed characteristics. Imbricated within a series of constant intertextual negotiations, the individual and the self transitioned from the concrete to the indefinite. The linguistic turn within intellectual thought dismantled subject/object dualism and challenged human subjectivity and identity as the origin of perspective (Deetz, 2003a). Thus, identity was not found through a simple retreat into the self. Rather, the linguistic turn positioned identity as communicatively and discursively constructed on individual, social, and structural levels. Identity also shapes and is shaped by what one “does” in the world lending significance to the material practices of the everyday (Collinson, 2003; Gini, 2000).

Foucault was very clear in his assertion that identities and subject positions exist in relation to complex power structures. He addresses both identity and subject formation in the following quote:

This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorizes the individual, marks him [sic] by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize and which others have to recognize in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word subject: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to. (1982, p. 212)

Thus, all aspects of selves, identities, and subject positions are mediated through social and cultural institutions of power. Rose (1990) echoes this notion when he states, “Our
personalities, subjectivities, and ‘relationships’ are not private matters, if this implies that they are not the objects of power. On the contrary, they are intensively governed” (p. 1). Building on Rose’s assertion that selves are mediated and formed by relations of power, the material practice of work is then no exception. I address this notion in the following section.

**Work, Identity, and Subject Formation**

If all social institutions are mediated through structures of power and come down upon the minds and bodies of individuals, analyses of workplaces and employees must consider the nuanced ways power shapes identities and subject positions. People spend much of their lives engaged in elements of work and these processes, like all other social processes, are created and perpetuated within systems of power. As Deetz and Hegbloom (2007) suggest, “Worker identity and experience are not universal and ahistorical but constructed within the work environment, which then becomes a cultural resource” (p. 325). In this passage, Deetz and Hegbloom move away from essentializing effects of work and toward the notion that the ways we understand work are socially and culturally positioned. We can then consider the importance of context, including spatial and material facets, since environment is constructed within social and cultural formations. This dissertation makes an attempt to seriously consider work and the context in which it occurs, DanTech’s corporate campus, with the lens of governmentality to analyze how this work(place) contributes to identity and subject formation.

Over the past several hundred years, as processes of labor and types of work have changed, there has been a critical shift in human consciousness regarding the nature of, and processes related to, work. For a long time, many people have essentialized work as a fundamental component of the human condition. This is clear in the work of Marx as he
discusses the alienating aspects of labor that strips an individual of what s/he envisioned as the inherent joy in work found in the control of the labor process from beginning to end (Marx, 1992; Marx, 1993). In his ideological analysis and examination of historical materialism, he does not address the discursive formation of things like “labor,” “work,” or the “employee” (du Gay, 2007; Jacques, 1996). However, “work” or “labor” is not a human inevitability. Certainly, human beings have always done things. We would not survive if we did not eat. Likewise, we would not survive harsh winters without shelter. This requires finding food and constructing shelters, but these activities are not “work” or “labor” as we understand them today. In the contemporary moment, work takes on specific formations which exist in relation to a global capitalist economy with the primary goal of the production of wealth. This is very different from simply doing things. Like all other aspects of human society, work is a discursively created and negotiated idea and its meanings are parsed out via discourse over time and space. Definitions, practices, and attitudes regarding work are processual and socially and individually navigated. Weber (2008) situates the cultural specificity of work in his analysis of the articulation of work and religious ideology. His claims address the relationships between Protestant religious ideology and the growth of capitalist systems. Although greed and the possession of wealth for wealth’s sake contrast much religious ideology, the Protestant ethic, emphasizing rationality and attributing moral value to cultural practices like work, helped enable specific economic formations. Similarly, but in a more recent context, Heelas (2002) notes that through discourse and discursive social and cultural practices, we cultivate “work ethics.” He conceptualizes work ethics as the cultural and social ascription of value to work. Heelas’ move de-essentializes the relationship between work and humanity and emphasizes the communicative construction of work and the value we attach to work (Heelas, 2002). To summarize, work, how it is
understood, and its implications on identity and subject formation are cultural processes. Thus, DanTech and the jobs people hold there are not stand alone phenomena. Rather, the organization, campus, and employee subjectivities are mediated through communicative, social, and cultural means.

Jeremy Rifkin (1996) addresses the value placed upon contemporary modes of work. He contemplates social anxieties surrounding the mechanization of industry, replacing human workers with machinery. He poses the question, “What will we do if there are no more jobs,” as one the most perplexing and problematic questions of our time. Rifkin describes the anxiety as such:

The idea of a society not based on work is so utterly alien to any notion we have about how to organize large numbers of people into a social whole, that we are faced with the prospect of having to rethink the very basis of the social contract. (p.12)

I believe this comment suggests that work has become so naturalized within much of modern consciousness that many of us cannot conceive of organizing reality and social collectives around anything else. With an incredible amount of social and cultural emphasis placed upon work, it is clear that processes of work are not merely about production of goods, services, and capital. Rather, work has a significant impact on how we understand ourselves, our identities, and how we are positioned (Bauman, 2000; Braverman, 1974; Casey, 1995; Collinson, 2003; du Gay, 2007; Gini, 2000; Rose, 1990).

An incredibly important facet of the context that surrounds processes of work is the emergence of globalization and its implications for global capital and work. Globalization demands a postmodern labor market requiring flexibility, adaptability, and a sense of impermanence. This is evident across many sectors of labor markets. Collinson (2003) notes the flexible and contract-based labor that characterizes many organizations and recognizes labor that
is casualized and nomadic. He suggests that this shift is largely responsible for a sense of general anxiety and insecurity regarding work within (post)modernity. Against the notion that globalization happens “out there,” not “in here,” it is clear that this seems to be happening everywhere. Bauman (2000) offers a similar sentiment when he states, “Work can no longer offer the secure axis around which to wrap and fix self-definitions, identities, and life-projects” (p. 139). Where perhaps, once upon a time, lifetime employment offered a solid sense of identity and stability, the reassurance that you can pay your bills, with the current impending threat of layoffs and/or one’s job moving elsewhere, such security is far removed. Or to take a slightly different but related angle like Thrift (2005), the “fast economy” of the contemporary moment requires “fast subjects.” Fast subjects must exhibit creativity and innovation, demonstrating the ability to keep up with fast-paced economies. This transformation has significant consequences for human beings. Casey (1995) examines the impact on the “self” in such circumstances, pointing to Deleuze and Guattari’s analysis of the “… psycho-physical effects of capitalism on the psyche and the body” as they “describe the schizoid personality of late capitalism” (p. 72).

I argue because we must work, and because we spend so much time doing it, that we must take work seriously in considering processes of identity and subject formation. As Deetz and Hegbloom (2007) note, “… identity and consumption are important not simply in the area of culture, but within the workplace, at the site of production” (p.325). In this article, Deetz and Hegbloom discuss political economy, cultural studies, and processes of living and working. They are clear proponents of analyzing the cultural implications of workplaces. They continue, “This perspective works to problematize an understanding of culture, consumption, meaning, and identity as a realm separate from material production and the economy” (2007, p. 325). Rather, culture, consumption, meaning, identity, material production, and economies are interrelated and
ingrained in the systems of power which situate subjectivities. This will be evident in the case of DanTech where the integration of the aforementioned cultural formations come together in overt ways through engagements with labor, play, leisure, food, family management, and capitalist production.

Ross (2003) asserts a similar sentiment in regards to Deetz and Hegbloom's (2007) argument. He recognizes the importance of processes of work, but more specifically, he points to the novelty of when people actually enjoy their work (and/or the organization for which they're working). He states:

In order to earn a livelihood, we are compelled to work hard at things that are beyond ourselves. If the effort and the product of that effort make us more human, if we feel like the owners psychologically, if not materially, of the product, and if enough of our coworkers feel the same way, then we are on to something quite rare, at least in a for-profit economy—so rare, in fact, that we can ill afford to dismiss any encouraging evidence that comes down the pike. (p. 2)

Ross claims that pleasure in work is an absolute rarity in contemporary capitalism. Thus, when people suggest that they like their jobs and companies, researchers should take note and try to figure out why. As I will argue later, corporate campus environments are often enviable workspaces that seem to “improve” the lives of employees. People like working in/at them. However, corporate campuses and employee reactions to them are also riddled with contradiction and overt and subtle mechanisms of control. An analytical framework of governmentality helps us field these difficult questions. As a framework of analysis, governmentality enables an intricate examination of corporate campuses and their impact on identity and subject formation,

In short, people’s working circumstances have material consequences upon human lives, subject formation, and subject position. In fact, managers rely on this reality in attempts to
create corporate cultures and identity. Kunda’s (2006) study of an engineering firm makes this precise claim:

The ideal employees are those who have internalized the organization’s goals and values—its culture—into their cognitive and affective make-up, and therefore no longer require strict and rigid external control. Instead, productive work is the result of a combination of self-direction, initiative, and emotional attachment, and ultimately combines the organizational interest in productivity with the employees’ personal interest in growth and maturity. (p. 10)

In this passage, Kunda describes the creation of the idealized employee as one who has integrated the corporate image into who employees are and how they understand themselves. This operates ideologically and affectively. The process is effective, at least in part, due to the articulation of work and personal growth. In fact, the organization capitalizes on the understanding that processes of work hold significant social and cultural meanings and that these can be molded to meet the needs and desires of the organization.

To summarize, work is an important component in our subject formation and positioning. Work is cultural in its creation and has material implications for individuals and societies. To take this one step further, how and where individuals work is equally significant. The conditions of one’s work are also cultural and contribute to the specific context in which people engage in paid labor and this project seeks to examine how this comes into play in the context of DanTech’s corporate campus.

Conditions of Work

Since the dawning of industrial economies, workplaces have been replete with a set of standard tensions. First, tension often surrounds differential organizational and individual goals (Kunda, 2006). At times, organizational and individual goals can be in stark contrast or seemingly unrelated. Secondly, we’ve seen a persistent struggle over time within production
oriented organizations (Hochschild, 1997; Stevens & Lavin, 2007; Thompson, 1967). Third, conflicts regarding a managerial view of culture as “implemented” and culture as “emergent” reflects the potential of two (or many more) entirely different views of an organization’s culture(s) (Smith & Eisenberg, 1987). Just as we socially create meanings of work, we also create ideals of working contexts. These too, are not natural or essentialized sets of behaviors or organizations of environments. Rather, they depend upon and are governed structures of discourse that shape their meanings (and vice-versa).

A phenomenon that interests me and informs my project is the persistent negotiation of the (de)polarization of labor and leisure. Corporate campuses in general, and DanTech specifically, demonstrate significant transgressions of traditionally conceptualized binaries of work and play or labor and leisure. The histories of such polarizations are varied as they have emerged from many different theoretical angles. Perhaps most famously were Frederick Taylor’s (1995) writings in regards to maximizing productivity and efficiency within industrial contexts. Much of his writing addressed “systematic soldiering,” which he defined as the systematic restriction of output. With adequate extrinsic monetary reward, Taylor theorized, he could extract maximum effort and output. Taylor exemplifies an early Fordist emergence of neoliberal mentality as he suggests that only “work” should happen at work.

I agree with Thompson (1967) and argue that much of organizational/individual and labor/leisure conflict exists in relation to the construction of “clock-time” as an attempted orientation of individuals to the rhythms of work. Hochschild (1997) writes extensively on the issue of work and time. She addresses the pre-industrial age when she writes, “Time was life. Much of life was work, but neither work nor time was so precisely measured in units of money”
Time, both within and outside of work, became economized in that it was a currency to be bought, sold, traded, wasted, and spent.

Organizations and workers alike are concerned with the issue of time. A more recent example of the fight over time is the emergence and punishment of organizational “time theft.” Stevens and Lavin (2007) define time theft as “. . . the identification by management of non-productive activities by employees at work . . .” (p.42). Their article examines the creation of the concept of time theft as a vehicle for neoliberal managerialism that operates to discipline workers and extract the maximum output of labor from their working hours. In addition, the authors suggest that time theft is framed as a criminal activity. The moral and ethical dimensions here are clear. Stealing is wrong; therefore, time theft is wrong. Here, the victim of the crime is none other than capitalist production. However, corporate campus contexts value the incorporation of non-work activities upon campus grounds. The blurring of work and non-work and the temporal spaces in which they occur is part of the intent of campus dynamics.

Workers, for a very long time, have resisted managerial control of and over their time by interjecting elements of their “private” lives and “leisure” into their working lives. Even under the microscope of managerial scrutiny, people engaging in various forms of labor seem to find ways to resist managerial persistence for maximum productivity by engaging in activities unrelated to their work. Stevens and Lavin (2007) recognize this in their article that analyzes call center workers laboring in an organizational setting that evidences many forms of direct and technological surveillance. The call center workers, however, reconfigured technological tools to build informal break times into their regular schedules. Decades earlier, Burawoy (1979) wrote of the games created by workers in order to “make out.” Though he ultimately argues that the games created by workers serve as a vehicle of hegemonic reproduction, Burawoy suggests that
more than simple production happens at work. Roy (1959) also writes of the tendency of people to engage in sociality and personal pursuits to tolerate the severe boredom which accompanied the work in his ethnographic context. Similarly, Rosenzweig (1983) offers a historical account of work and leisure in an American industrial city in the late 1800s to early 1900s. One of his foci is on the role of the tavern or pub as a social nexus for industrial workers. Oftentimes, people worked together and then drank together. In addition, he notes that for some time alcohol served as an amenity that employers offered potential employees. Thus, personal leisure-time activities (in this case, drinking), were actually built into managerial tactics for effective workplace practices.

Working contexts and conditions are important contributing factors in any analysis of worker identity and subject formation. For example, a rigid 8 to 6 o’clock Monday through Friday industrial schedule has different implications for people than a flexible 24/7/365 variability. Such flexibilities enable labor in the “social factory” that is deterritorialized, decentralized, and dispersed (Gill & Pratt, 2008). Clearly, working contexts and conditions are cultural and are constantly negotiated and changing. Humans have often navigated “work” and “life” and it was a modernist, industrial creation to separate these realms of living. Since then, the intersections and divisions of work and life as realms of existence have been variously conceptualized. Taylor, clearly, would think of the separation of these realms as entirely necessary. However, an important set of power dynamics emerge within corporate campus settings because they provide a means to articulate “nonwork” into realms of capitalist production. Fleming (2009) makes a similar argument when he addresses the ways in which “fun” is incorporated into corporate forms. Fleming examines the popular management trend that encourages employees to “just be yourself” and “have fun” (2009). He argues that this
managerial push ultimately harnesses ideas traditionally associated with nonwork only to incorporate them into the organizational setting. He states, “Rather than hide, suppress, or deny those unique elements of self that make up the individual person at work, they ought to be communicated” (2009, p. 23). Thus, the whole of identity may potentially be co-opted by the organization. Fleming continues, “Here, the plurality of strange and vibrant identities and tastes found in the marketplace are invited into work” (2009, pp. 23-24). DanTech’s corporate campus, as I will examine in detail, go even further in this direction by inviting all of life into the workplace. This integration not only molds identities and subject formation, but also articulates all of life into capitalist production.

**Work/Life Integration and Community**

DanTech’s corporate campus illustrates the permeability of “work” and “life.” DanTech and similar campuses demonstrate the ways in which people (seemingly seamlessly) integrate realms of life. The work/life or labor/leisure binary is a modernist construction that we can falsify by discussing social tendencies of the “personal” overflowing into the workplace and by discussing laborious tendencies in our leisure and “private” lives. This is the theme of Aron’s (1999) book in which she provides a history of vacations in the United States. She notes that Americans have often embarked on vacations that require some degree of work on behalf of the vacationer. She draws particular attention to vacationing in pursuit of health, self-improvement, and camping trips that often require a significant amount of work. Warhurst et al. (2008) address how labor and leisure have traditionally been juxtaposed. They state, “Leisure . . . is conceived to be an end in itself, an activity free from any mixture of obligation and utility, whereas work is thought to be purely instrumental, necessary to obtain income and leisure” (p. 13). However, as Warhurst et al. (2008) note, the bifurcation of labor/leisure is not only a cultural construction of
patterns between laboring and leisuring, but one that relies on the other for its own definition and import. Labor and work are often equated as a time for productivity and efficiency, but if those so-called boundaries are porous, then the ethical dimensions of productivity and efficiency must have some bearing upon the “non-work.” Thus, we encounter arguments similar to Aron’s (1999) that leisure is never entirely divorced from the ideological elements that surround work and labor. Warhurst et al. (2008) note that ideally and in many respects, “. . . leisure time should be managed as efficiently as working-time” (p. 15). Andrew (1999) makes similar claims as he suggests that principles of scientific management have fulfilled Weber’s grim prophecy that the overwhelming components of bureaucracy have colonized “leisure time.” As my interview responses and analysis indicate, the DanTech campus creates an environment in which employees work and play within close proximity. Additionally, the emphasis on time-management, efficiency, and productivity are persistent themes that run throughout multiple realms of employees’ lives.

Once upon a time, it may have made sense to view one’s working life and one’s non-work life as separate entities. The rise of industrialization and labor occurring in factory settings contributed to this focus. Industry, conventionally understood, references a specific form of production that occurs in a plant or factory. Fordist processes of production required rote forms of labor performed in calculated environments. Positioned outside of consumptive purview, processes of production, traditionally thought of as “work,” and consumption, traditionally thought of as “leisure,” remained categorically and spatially separate.

However, within globalization, processes of work have drastically changed. While industrial and manufacturing forms of labor still exist, processes of globalization have dramatically altered the ways people experience the world as well as intellectual
conceptualizations of the boundaries and borders between them. This has many implications, not
the least of which is a material and theoretical breakdown of the polarization of work/life. As
Kunda (2006) notes, “… the boundary between work and play is vague: the definitions of
organizational time are flexible; there are many attempts to annex and colonize members’ time;
and work and play are often combined” (p. 149). Questions of where life begins and work ends,
or vice-versa, are difficult to field because they inform one another and sometimes, as corporate
campuses suggest, they occur in the same physical space. Often, questions regarding the
delineation of life-realms quickly lead to discussions of the (de)polarization of
community/corporation, or community/workplace, and the implications of such dissolution.

There’s an extensive body of literature examining the work/life relationship (Golden et
al., 2006). This literature originates from multiple perspectives and attends to various facets of
work and life. For example, a popular area of analysis examines relationships between family
and work (Golden, 2000; Golden, 2001; Jorgenson, 1995; Kirby, 2000). Many analyses focus
specifically on gender (Liu & Buzzanell, 2006; Martin, 1990; Medved & Kirby, 2005) while
others interrogate the idea of borders and boundaries (May, 2004; Mirchandani, 1998). All of
this literature is written from particular theoretical perspectives; however, they share a desire to
understand the nuanced set of relationships between work, life, and various issues of identities.

Some work/life literature is written from an entirely managerial perspective. This
research largely analyzes work/life benefits and their impact upon employee productivity and
loyalty. Here, the intent is to gauge the impact of work/life programs and use them to further
organizational interests. For example, Konrad and Mangel (2000) analyzed work/life programs
and noted that such programs raise employee productivity, especially among working women.
Valentine and Fleischman (2008) address work/life programs from an ethical perspective and
claim that a significant correlation exists between employee loyalty and the perceived ethics of their employers. In other words, offering work/life programs is interpreted as ethical behavior, hence, employees will do more for the organization. As such, organizations should use work/life programs so they “might better manage employees’ ethical perceptions” and increase organizational productivity (2008, p. 159). Lambert (2000) similarly notes, “…work-family benefits may promote employee participation and initiative; workers may feel obligated to exert ‘extra’ effort in return for ‘extra’ benefits” (2000, p. 801). The dominant thought in this paradigm of literature is that work/life programs can be used means to insure reciprocity. If we, the organization, give certain benefits to employees, they will give even more in return.

Much of the most recent work/life literature is critically oriented and seriously considers the construction of the work/life binary. In fact, Cheney and Nadesan (2008) encourage scholars who study work to interrogate their own ideas of what “work” actually is. They prompt researchers to consider the ideological and cultural facets of work, claiming work’s contingency and contextuality. The notion of boundaries between work and life, or employees as border crossers, is being reconsidered and retheorized. As Broadfoot et al. (2008) suggest, “… the contemporary context of work compels us to move beyond formal organizational boundaries and study the diverse ways in which people communicatively create and organize meaning about, through, and for their work and working lives” (p. 153). Compartmentalizing work and life oversimplifies these life realms and interferes with our ability to analyze subject formation.

Another main contribution of critical work/life scholarship is a critique of how work/life are intentionally integrated within organizational contexts as mechanisms of power and control. For example, Lair et al. write:
preferential meanings of work often marginalize alternative meanings derived from more “private” realms of life by exploring how the introduction of meanings associated with private bodies (gendered, pregnant, or familial) are sanctioned, managed, or erased to re-establish work-based meanings as the privileged and primary source of organizational meaning. (2008, p. 175)

Thus, the private is no longer ignored in organizational contexts. Rather, the private is very closely integrated into everyday organizational life. Work/life programs and corporate campuses are tools used by organizations to ease this integration and generate the appearance of happy, productive, and balanced employees. Kuhn et al. similarly state, “…that finding meaning in work increasingly requires that people blur distinctions between private and professional lives, become free agents who identify with their career over any given organization, and display continual flexibility, self-control, and creativity (2008, p. 162).” Here, Kuhn et al. suggest that employees must learn to blur their work and lives and adjust their identities to craft themselves into subjects that fit organizational norms.

Additionally, critical work/life scholars also analyze the communicative construction of work and life. For example, Hoffman and Cowan (2008) studied the websites of Fortune’s “100 Best Places to Work” and found four main themes relating to corporate ideologies of work/life balance. They argue that implicitly, corporate constructions of work/life balance privilege work as the most important realm of life. Secondly, they note that “life” means “family,” thus certain activities and lifestyles outside work were more respectable and credible than others. Third, individuals are ultimately responsible for managing the balance between work and life. Lastly, organizations are the creators and controllers of work/life programs. In their article, Hoffman and Cowan (2008) elaborate extensively on the managerial bias of these four facets and the problems they pose for employees.

Deetz, while not specifically a work/life theorist, critically examines the power dynamics in work/life relationships in his text, Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization, (1992)
where he outlines the infiltration of the corporation into all aspects of daily life. Drawing on a Habermasian framework, Deetz points to the overlap between what has traditionally been conceptualized as the private and public spheres. For example, he discusses the proliferation of corporate interests within academic settings. He also points to specific ways corporate settings begin to appear more and more “community-like” with amenities like child-care.

Similarly, Cowan and Hoffman (2007) examine the breakdown in the work/life binary throughout their article on flexible organizations noting that many theorists write about organizations and workplaces in terms of the work/life border theory. They define the work/life border theory as a theory that “. . . seeks to predict and explain how ‘border-crossers’ manage work and life domains in order to obtain balance” (p. 38). Here, Cowan and Hoffman examine the expectation placed upon workers to seamlessly and persistently cross borders or, further, forget that there were ever any lines to begin with and entirely blur “work” and “life.” Further, they suggest, “Community does not have a physical location. It is within relationships and interactions with others that community is located” (p. 559). While this may or may not be entirely accurate, it is interesting to consider the development of community in relation to space, place, and working lives. Perhaps it makes sense, in light of the vast amount of time people spend at work with their co-workers, to analyze how one’s workplace and co-workers potentially create the primary community with which one engages. This may not be bound to or by location, but this arrangement of space certainly enters the equation.

What happens when people conceptualize their workplace as a primary location of community? Or, what are the implications of individuals conceptualizing membership and belonging in multiple communal sites, the workplace just being one of them? Traditional notions of community revolve around sentimental notions of the neighborhood as the place one lived and
interacted with others outside of work. However, Ross (2003) examines a view of community in contrast to the nostalgic community. He writes:

By contrast, what I found quite widespread among employees was the belief that some kind of improved, if not ideal, society could be pursued within a company. In the 1990s, this goal of creating a reconstructed, politically correct company became a fervent substitute for aspirations to social change outside of the workplace. (p. 17)

Thus, while the ideal seemed impossible or untenable, the corporation presented the possibility for fairness and even democracy within the boundaries of the organization itself. If we have inequitable access to resources outside of organizational bounds, can we possibly acquire fairness and equality inside of the corporation? The rhetoric and literature regarding Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) would have us believe so. Regardless, as Arnott (2002) notes, “American corporations have taken over the meaning-making process for individuals that was once supplied by family and community” (p. 62). While this claim may be exaggerated, the workplace organization (including the circulating social and cultural meanings of work) certainly contributes to the ideological configuration of workers and “citizens.”

Corporate Campus Settings

Since the evolution of corporate campuses is vague at best, it’s difficult to pinpoint exactly where they came from and who could claim to be the “first” in constructing such an environment. However, authors such as Ross (2003) and Arnott (2000) view the technology company Hewlett Packard as a forerunner in this area. Specifically, Ross states, “The HP Way and its imitators fostered a corporate version of the never-never land of the eternal graduate student” (p. 37). He continues, “The easing of formality—first-name communication, open-door management, egalitarian parking, dogs in the workplace, and no private offices, was aimed at softening traditional forms of conflict with management” (p. 37). This type of informality is what Ross refers to as “no-collar.” The premise behind a no-collar workplace simply consists of
providing a desirable working environment taking a more relaxed approach to “business as usual.” Ross pays particular attention to social and cultural facets of the workplace. His analysis does this at the expense of the spatial as he largely ignores the physical and material components of a workspace that have very real implications for how people understand and experience their day to day, their jobs, and how they conceptualize who they work for. If we consider his examples of open-door policies, arrangement of parking lots and spaces, and an open floor plan, it is clear that these are certainly social and cultural facets of workspace. However, in privileging the social and cultural aspects of the workspace, oddly, he offers little description of the “space.”

Massey et al. (1992) consider a broader spectrum of contextual facets in their socio-spatial analysis of research parks in England. They examine the organization of research parks and their relationships, both geographic and inter-organizational, with university settings. A consistently occurring characteristic of research parks is their emphasis on science and technology. While Massey et al.’s work here is somewhat dated, within a contemporary American context research parks remain oriented around these areas. To paraphrase their work, ultimately, they seek to wade through articulations of social, spatial, and scientific/technological elements. This work serves as an excellent model for my own since it considers issues of sociality and space, both of which are cultural entities, as well as the particular industries with which organizations (or complexes of organizations) are associated. Overwhelming regard for science and technology speaks volumes in terms of what Americans value in the current social context. Since the Enlightenment’s focus on reason and rationality, admiration surrounded scientific endeavors. With science quickly leading to technological fields, specifically computer technology, similar discourses of progress surround the computing industry. Massey et al. argue that privileging science and technology results in more than a set of discursive manifestations
and that geography and space relate to and reflect notions of rationality, cutting-edge industry, and progress. Thus, technologically oriented organizations not only reflect and inform popular discourse, but also influence cultural, social, and spatial formations. This notion is reflected in Massey et al.’s work as they examine research parks as social and spatial institutions.

Organizations are communicative entities in that they both define and are defined through social means. Thus, their very existence is entirely communicative. However, many organizations also carefully monitor the construction and distribution of messages regarding their practices. As such, organizations create, negotiate, and relay messages to employees, clients, the public, and so forth. Marchand (1998) makes this point, albeit indirectly, in his analysis of the rise of public relations in the United States. He traces corporations’ struggles against being seen as “soulless” in the eyes of the public. Those running corporations recognized the potential of renegotiating their image and pursued advertising campaigns, relationships with newsletters and other publications as avenues for public relations, and began touring fairs and tradeshow circuits. Each of these campaigns highlighted the quality of the organization and the welfare services and amenities they offered to employees. Marchand (1998) writes:

One way for a large corporation to prove it possessed human feeling was to demonstrate compassionate concern for its employees. A paternalistic display of kindness might so alter public and employee perceptions that the abstract corporation would seem more like a big family. (p. 29)

Publicizing service offerings presented the nurturing, caring side of corporations. The amenities indicated the organization’s concern for employee health and well-being. Additionally, public relations campaigns also focused on the physical spaces of corporations. As Marchand (1998, p. 29) notes, organizations portrayed “…the factory as the palpable personification of the corporation” and positioned the organization as stable, logical, practical, and often calculated,
hierarchical, and paternalistic. One of Marchand’s examples includes an advertisement from JELL-O that depicted their factory in a gelatin mold. He argues that the advertisement connoted a sense of stability and an organization in control of its practices. Thus, evidenced through the early days of corporate public relations, employee service offerings and organizational space established a convenient alliance. This relationship persists today in corporate campuses as they intimately and intentionally bind workplace/space and employee amenities.

In general, campuses are found near metropolitan areas but not in metropolitan areas. If we trace the lineage of the corporate campus back to the company town, they share the tendency to situate their environs in semi-rural areas. For example, this was an explicit goal of Ford who sought the construction of workspaces, factories, and company towns with “one foot in industry, one foot on the land” (Marchand, 1998, p. 209). Ford wasn’t alone in this venture as many other organizations similarly moved to escape the “undesirable” facets of city life. Crawford (1995) notes:

> Searching for scientific solutions to the urgent problems of the slum and the factory, both movements drew the same conclusion: away from the bad influences of the city, a socially engineered environment could offer a tabula rasa on which capital and labor could renegotiate their differences. (p. 60)

Several facets of this quote are poignant. One, movement away from city centers set the stage for the future development of the suburbs. Many believed the fresh air and natural surroundings would temper morally undesirable behaviors such as drunkenness and absenteeism. Second, but closely related to the first, is a romanticization of nature that suggests there is something inherently “better” about rural and pastoral (essentially, the “nonurban”) settings. Lastly, the fact that urban exodus provided a means to “socially engineer” place is significant. In terms of the company town, moving workers out of urban contexts reduced their mobility and
isolated employees in and around the company town. While this is not necessarily the case with corporate campuses, they most certainly glorify “natural settings,” boasting manicured lawns, walking trails, trees, and lakes. In addition, corporate campuses are often shrouded in a suburban context that caters to white-collar professionals. In fact, Ross (2003) recognizes areas abounding with corporate campuses such as Santa Clara, California and Raleigh/Durham, North Carolina as examples of “high-end suburban peripher[ies].” In contrast to the company towns of old, employees of corporate campuses are less likely to be dependent upon the organization for actual living space. However, employees may easily become dependent upon the amenities offered in a corporate campus setting.

While all workplaces are relational, campuses construct a particular form of alterity through their organization of space. As Massey et al. (1992) note in their study of research parks, they help provide meaning for those who work on park grounds because they materially inhabit a space that is clearly demarcated from others. In other words, employees understand what it means to work on the park because they understand the “not-park.” As with other forms of identity and subject formation, our understandings are always relational to the “other,” or “that which we are not.” Again, with corporate campus settings surrounded by barriers and gates, the spatial arrangement of environment communicates what “belongs” to the organization and what does not.

Corporate campuses are obviously comprised through material aspects such as plots of land, buildings, and parking lots. But equally important in considering a campus workspace are the types of employee service offerings and amenities available to organizational members (and often times their families). These vary by organization, of course, but a few popular amenities include on-site childcare, healthcare, employee assistance programs, and cafes. Fitness centers
are also remarkably common on such sites, as are education programs. While these appear as standard, some campuses offer increasingly unique amenities such on-site tailoring, dry cleaning, hair salons, spas, and libraries. Again, considering the intention of blurring work and life, at least to some extent, many campus amenities are those services and elements of community that traditionally occurred outside of the workspace.

Campus settings and employee service offerings meet an array of organizational goals. Early company towns recognized the value in providing services on or near company grounds. However, there was some tension in how these efforts were portrayed through public relations (Crawford, 1995; Marchand, 1998). Crawford (1995) notes:

Hospitals, health insurance, and better housing were portrayed as essentially self-serving measures designed to increase productivity. Descriptions of these programs underlined the employer’s concern with the workers’ productivity rather than their comfort. Healthy workers translated directly into less absenteeism from sickness. (p. 32)

Here, it is suggested that organizations publicized their efforts as primarily business-oriented. However, as Marchand (1998) indicates, this was not necessarily always the case. In fact, he argues, presenting employee services and amenities was a means by which corporations improved their public image. What is interesting here are the gendered dynamics surrounding the question of what employee services are for. The masculinized “business nexus” approach, while rational and financially direct, also comes across as callous and uncaring. But, the feminized ethic of care and community seems to undermine the business of making reasoned decisions for the generation of profit. Marchand (1998) elaborates:

To carry welfare programs to the point of philanthropy, or even to accept the notion that paternalistic practices might give their employee-children the right to make claims on their benevolence, violated the precepts of good business practice. A man [sic] who seriously attended to his business could not confuse the sphere of business with that of philanthropy or allow sentiment to interfere with rational business decisions. (p. 15)
This tension persists today. Reading justifications for corporate campuses, the see-saw of business nexus/ethic of care is apparent. Some organizations assert that their campuses and employee services are solely motivated by business and profit. Not surprisingly, some of these same organizations are listed on *Fortune’s* Best Places to Work list, recognized largely because of their campus offerings. It is hard to imagine how they made this list without the mechanism of public relations projecting the campus and services as desirable and appreciated. One often hears the argument that campuses and amenities are the result of sound business decisions resulting in the by-product of happy employees. Here we see the age-old capitalist notion reminiscent of Milton Friedman that it is businesses’ responsibility to make money and generate profit and that social good and progress will result. One will rarely, if ever, hear an organization claim that they provide campus services solely because they feel it is the right thing to do. These efforts are always bracketed to and grounded within business justifications and principles.

Regardless of why organizations construct such environments, they undeniably reap benefits from campus constructions. The overall discourse of “health” on corporate campuses is a powerful one. For example, recreation centers and facilities provide a space where employees can pursue fitness and healthfulness. Organizationally sanctioned and encouraged “play” and “recreation” is not free from ideological undertones. The fact the “health” is a prominent discourse on campuses does not necessarily indicate so much of an organizational concern for employees, but rather, the overwhelming understanding that healthy people feel better, perform better, and miss less work. The idea is, in short, the healthier the worker, the more productive the worker. Hunnicutt (1988) examines the cultural engineering involved with recreation as it pertained to community centers and the like. Again, play is not exempt from dynamics of social and cultural power, especially when play occurs on organizational grounds. He suggests:
Through public recreation facilities, adults could have access to their community’s culture and not lose their individuality. Through hobbies, they could have the opportunity to express themselves, an opportunity denied them by standard and routine jobs. Public recreation could allow the individual to be actively involved in sports and games, thereby improving his well-being and health. (p.111)

As Hunnicutt’s quote suggests, providing provisions for play and recreation can be a means of exerting power and control. Through recreation in a corporate campus context, employees are provided yet another avenue for establishing and maintaining relationships with other employees and identifying with the ideologies of the corporate culture. Additionally, recreation, fitness, and play encourage an idealized healthful lifestyle that ultimately produces employees who get sick less and cost the company less money in healthcare fees. Thus, the organization benefits financially as well as ideologically since recreation can be a vehicle for cultivating strong identification and ties to corporate culture as well as strong bodies.

Additionally, Gini (2003) examines the duality of play when he recognizes both its restorative and regressive powers. He states, “Unfortunately, for too many of us our various forms of recreation and play are really about rehabilitation, recuperation, and recovery rather than rapture and the possibility of the rediscovery of self” (p. 32). Clearly, in the context of a corporate campus, recreation is conceptualized as a means for creating and maintaining healthy populations. He continues that play and diversions are “… designed to overcome fatigue, numb awareness, or appease a particular appetite—all for the purpose of reinvigorating and restoring us to the work task at hand” (p. 32). It seems clear that organizations have similarly recognized the restorative and disciplinary elements of play and fitness. Recreation is a consistent theme for organizations with corporate campuses as evidenced by on-site workout and recreation facilities.

Campuses, amenities, and employee service offerings, since they are unnecessary to the operation of the organization, can be viewed as gifts. However, as Crawford notes regarding
company towns, “These ‘gifts’ often brought a measure of control with them” (1995, p. 36). Indeed, campuses are calculated environments. Fitness centers exist, at least in part, for the production of a healthy employee population. Onsite cafes not only present healthful meal options but also exist as means of minimizing employee time traveling off campus to eat. Employee assistance programs and educational seminars teach you how to deal with your teenager at home to eliminate, to an extent, the distractions of workers’ personal lives so they focus on their tasks at hand while at work. Thus, onsite childcare is great, especially for working mothers who remain largely responsible for domestic labor. But, as Deetz notes (1992), a consequence of such service is that one’s children are being raised by one’s employer where, literally, employees are paid to give children hugs and show them affection. While each of these facets helps employees, a notion to which I will return shortly, they most certainly benefit the organization. As Kunda (2006) notes:

The company . . . harnesses the efforts and initiative of its employees in the service of high-quality collective performance and at the same time provides them with ‘the good life’: a benign and supportive work environment that offers the opportunity for individual self-actualization. (p. 10)

Packaged as an innocuous workplace, corporate campuses do, in fact, offer employees elements of “the good life.” Amenities are presented as optional services that can improve the lives of employees. Conversely, amenities are not presented as mandatory programs in which employees must participate. However, once one has “the good life” at work, why would s/he want to leave? Perhaps employees may stay even if they are unhappy with their actual jobs, their salaries, or the management of the organization. Unique and seemingly humane workplaces, of which I would consider corporate campuses, appeal to workers because they present the image and notion of exceptional workspace that is difficult if not impossible to replicate. As Ross (2003) notes, “. . . I found it was the social and cultural design of the workplace that stole the
affection of employees because it promised to deliver some of that human self-recognition that Marx had written about” (p. 15). Thus, the social and cultural, and I would add spatial, model of the workplace offered value, meaning, and belonging for employees. Fulfilling attributes of work, then, have less to do with the actual work than Marx and others originally anticipated. Perhaps the meaning and value of work lies not only in gaining a means of subsistence, but also in developing communal and social ties with other organizational members. Ross (2003) also states, “. . . more common was nostalgia for an irresistible work environment, one that they feared they may never enjoy again in their professional lives” (p. 15). Thus, once an employee is surrounded by the good life that is the corporate campus, will the embrace of the campus life/workstyle stifle discontent? What are the implications of this?

While we don’t have to search very hard to find problematic elements of corporate campuses and the organizations that construct them, my purpose in this project is not merely criticism of campuses. With my ultimate interest being in the analysis of the relationships between work and subject formation, campuses also offer different ways to reimagine work, society, and community. In contemporary academic circles, this possibility is referred to as “precarity.” Gill and Pratt (2008) define the “precariat” as “. . . a neologism that brings together the meanings of precariousness and proletariat to signify both an experience of exploitation and a (potential) new political subjectivity” (p. 3). Foucault also briefly addressed the issue of “counter-conduct” as those behaviors in resistance to dominant forms of power (2007). In the most vulgar of Marxist interpretations, workers are “exploited” in the sense that they sell their labor-capacity to the capitalist, they are deskillled through their high degree of job specialization, and rely on the organization for a wage or salary. In these ways, among many others, corporate campus workers are subject to and positioned by forces that are largely out of their control.
However, they have sophisticated understandings and critical reflections of how they are positioned. What’s more, they negotiate these positionings by putting these forces to work for them and thereby improving their lives. Whether it is the intent of the organization and corporate campus to do so is somewhat irrelevant. If we’ve learned anything from Taylor, it is that culture cannot be merely wrangled and manipulated. Rather, culture is comprised of emergent patterns that constantly negotiate the dynamics of subject to and subject of. Humans always-already exist in webs of ideologies and power. Humans are subject to these forces in this instance. We also understand ourselves in relation to systems of power and ideologies. Additionally, individual and collective subject positions critically reflect upon and shape those forces.

The purpose of the remainder of this dissertation is to carefully address the aforementioned questions using Foucault’s governmentality as an analytical framework. In addressing my research questions, I discuss elements of power exercised among DanTech’s campus, how the campus contributes to employee identities and subject formations, and the various modes of control. In the following chapter I provide a description of DanTech’s campus as well as my research methods.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter, I outline my research context and methodology. I begin by describing the organizational site, including some general information about DanTech and more specifics of their corporate campus. Then, I situate my project in line with critical research methodologies and explore how they relate to my theoretical assumptions and research practices. From there, I expound upon modes of data collection and describe the participants of the study. Lastly, I discuss methods and justifications for data analysis.

Organizational Site

As a rule, I try to not envision first impressions of people or places. I have learned that my imagined impressions are never anything like the “real thing,” and this always leads to a sense of disappointment. However, driving to the corporate campus for the first time, it was difficult to keep my imagination in line. Having read so much in popular press about DanTech and other corporate campuses, I expected Disneyland. In fact, that’s how I arrived at this project in the first place. Corporate campuses, as they’re described, often sound like a dream come true. Originally interested in tourism and how campuses create a touristic space, I envisioned, perhaps foolishly, a resort-like setting. Free food! Places to work out! They wash your car!

Conditioned by such descriptions, I half expected the campus to be more like a vacation spot than a workplace.

The exit off the freeway is much like every other exit off the freeway in this area. Strip malls and plazas, coffee shops, gas stations, and fast food places. However, the exit isn’t exactly
like every other. There is a different presence there, not necessarily a looming one, just different.
I’m not sure what I saw first—the sign with the corporate logo at the entrance of campus or the massive sculpture which is also company property. Maybe I saw them in tandem and maybe that’s the point.

My first visit to campus was also my first interview. I would have gone sooner to look around but one must have an appointment to be granted entrance onto campus grounds. About a quarter of a mile in, yet still on the periphery of campus, I reached the guardhouse and gate. During business hours the gates are up. However, campus visitors must stop, give their name to the security guard, and receive the go-ahead to continue through to campus. The guards are welcoming if not downright chipper. In fact, most days I traveled to campus to conduct interviews, the guard on duty stood outside the gate and waved at employees driving in and out. I frequently interacted with one particular woman at the gate. She was bright and bubbly and began to recognize me after a couple of visits. The interactions followed a similar script.

“Hi. My name is Samantha Szczur and I have a meeting with so-and-so.”

She would smile and go in the gatehouse to check her registry.

“Do you know what building?” she would ask.

I would fumble around in my planner while she waited patiently. Inevitably she would tell me where I was going as she already had that information. “Down this road, the second building on the right,” she would say. Or, “Continue on here until you pass a building under construction. Then, take a left.”
While there are no high fences topped with barbed wire, there is a clear distinction between “on-campus” and “off-campus.” No, there is no mote, but there is a barrier of trees. Carefully planned roads follow the contoured hills. Between these two facets, campus remains cleverly hidden from the main drag off the exit.

Campus is, in a word, nice. The buildings are well-maintained and designed. The lawns are neatly trimmed. There is an array of plants and flowers everywhere you look. And I don’t mean lazily placed plants and flowers, dried up, without water, and knocking on death’s door. I mean healthy, colorful, oxygen-producing foliage. Walking trails snake through surrounding trees and circle the campus lake. Sports fields and tennis courts dot open spaces. There’s art everywhere; huge sculptures on the lawns, pieces all over inside the buildings, and paintings on nearly every wall. While campus did not live up to my vision of theme-park-workplace, it was certainly a far cry from the standard cement office-park with trees and every other living thing razed to the ground.

This is the campus of one of the world’s most profitable software companies that I will refer to as DanTech. They are relatively unknown and chances are, even if I revealed the actual company name, most readers have probably never heard of them. Despite their virtual anonymity, they generate yearly revenues in the billions. For instance, in 2008, DanTech’s worldwide revenue topped $2 billion. They have experienced persistent financial growth since their incarnation. Globally, DanTech employs over 10,000 people, around 4,000 of those at their world headquarters and corporate campus. DanTech is repeatedly featured on Fortune Magazine’s list of the 100 best companies to work for. A persistent justification for their yearly appearance there includes a reverence of the campus and its offerings such as healthcare, childcare, and positive work-life balance.
From DanTech’s inception, management labored to create a culture and environment that evoked positive responses from employees. This wasn’t necessarily philanthropic. Ultimately, these efforts served DanTech’s goals for productivity and efficiency. Ted, a former member of top-level management explained this to me in very simple terms by describing the technology industry in the late 1970s and early 1980s. In searching for talent, all of the organization’s major decision makers recognized the same thing—that women were crucially underemployed when it came to technology industries. Ted explained to me that women in fields like math, science, computer technology, etc., were traditionally relegated to the feminized realm of teaching. They were not valued in the public sector. Ted and others recognized the pool of female talent in these areas as an untapped goldmine. So what did the leaders of DanTech do? They recruited and hired women trained in science, math, and computer science graduating from one of the area’s prominent universities.

It seemed like a win-win situation. DanTech recruited the talent, and the women they employed filled highly-valued positions at a burgeoning company. But a few years down the road, they all encountered a problem. As Ted noted, many of these women who entered DanTech at 22 years old and single were, five years later, now 27 years old, married, and pregnant. DanTech was troubled by the prospect of these valuable employees leaving the company. Similarly, women were hesitant to leave and take time off work since the technology industry progresses so quickly. Re-entering the workforce after an absence of several years would essentially mean starting from scratch. Since this was not an ideal situation for DanTech or career-minded women, a viable solution appeared as an onsite daycare center. As a result, DanTech kept its valued employees and avoided recruiting or retraining new people for various positions. Additionally, women retained their jobs and positions, eliminating the need for them
to “start from scratch” after re-entering the workforce after an absence of several years. While Ted was the first to explain this evolution to me, he was far from the last. Many other DanTech employees recounted the same tale making sure to point out the necessity (and nicety) of the decision.

The campus is often described as country-club like. Campus grounds consist of about 300 acres of well-groomed and welcoming environs. Buildings on campus, about 20 of them, are also well-constructed and maintained. The attractive physical nature of the campus is merely one part of the equation. The list of campus benefits and onsite amenities is exhaustive. The original small childcare center that began with four or five kids is now a network that cares for over 500 children. Childcare, onsite healthcare, gourmet cafés, private offices, and unlimited employee sick days are merely the beginning. They offer an employee assistance program through which employees can access counseling, as well as legal and financial consultation. Recreation and fitness is another key amenity. DanTech offers workout facilities, wellness programs, massage therapy, and organized sports. DanTech also offers incentive programs to quit smoking and engage in more leisure time. There is an array of seminars employees may attend. A short sampling of upcoming events includes: “Your Weight Management Plan,” “The Wonder Years: Parenting Your Toddler and Young Child,” “Social Security Overview,” “How to Stay Happily Married,” and “Managing Anxiety Levels in Anxious Times.” In addition, on DanTech grounds, you can also have your clothes altered and dry-cleaned, pick up a book from the campus book exchange, and get a haircut.

The organized environment and list of services provided to employees is far from accidental. Management learned a lesson early on when dealing with departing female workers with newborns; namely, that turnover is expensive. By minimizing turnover, the company
arguably saves tens of millions per year. In fact, DanTech’s retention rate is almost startling, losing only about 130 employees (between 3-5%) a year. A typical software company of DanTech’s size loses around 1,000 employees. The cost savings of retaining employees are essentially monumental. Saved revenue is cycled back through the company in many ways. Clearly, the campus and various programs offered to employees are manifestations of how funds are appropriated.

As a privately held organization, stockholders are unable to frown upon constructing a campus and service offerings that some might find wasteful and frivolous. However, simply put, the ownership believes that people feel better in nice places and that the better they feel, the better they’ll perform. DanTech’s primary owners simply articulate what Communication Studies and Cultural Studies scholars, Geographers, and Anthropologists discuss ad nauseam. Basically, the materiality of space and objects has considerable impact as do other resources within the organization (what I’ve referred to as “amenities” up to this point). This materiality certainly exists in combination with the affective, the ideological, and the psychological.

Many high-caliber decision makers are acutely aware of this reality. Ted, the former member of upper level management at DanTech states that the campus and employee service offerings are part of a soundly designed business strategy. On campus, he suggests, it’s almost impossible to not do your job. It’s a little hard to combat this notion. With essentially every need met somewhere on or near the campus, there’s little excuse for a lack of productivity. DanTech offers a form of support for almost everything. If you have an ailing parent 1,000 miles away, there’s someone to help you arrange care for them. No time to cook dinner? Pick it up from the café to take home and eat with your family. Feeling ill? Head over to the campus
healthcare facility. Wondering what your kids are up to? Pick them up from the campus daycare and have lunch with them in the café.

Many skeptical critics evaluate the ostensible utopia as a grating, too-perfect, “Stepford Corporation” with a “sophisticated plantation mentality.” It’s easy to see how one comes to this judgment. DanTech’s corporate campus, low turnover, and general employee satisfaction easily sound too good to be true. DanTech pays below industry average salaries, not exorbitant amounts of money to their employees. Thus, extrinsic monetary rewards are not the primary motivator to stay. Why then do they stay? This is the point where one must seriously consider the gravity of DanTech’s campus, programs, and employee offerings. The campus makes it easy for employees to accomplish what they need in many realms of life. Within the space of the campus, one can manage health, family, finances, illness, fitness, and so on. DanTech accomplishes this through management of physical space, their organizational offerings, and a particular construction of community that both builds upon ideological positioning and material facets.

In addition to DanTech’s own campus, they are located incredibly close to Research Triangle Park (RTP), the largest research park in the United States (rtp.org). According to the Association of University Research Parks (AURP), research parks are collections of high-tech and research firms located near local research universities to facilitate interaction between public enterprise and education. Their web site states (aurrp.org):

Research parks formed near the universities, but independent from them, on the one hand ensure the commercialization of scientific developments, and provide additional income for teachers and students. On the other hand, creating structure of commercial activities, prevent over-commercialization of the universities themselves.
Such parks enable relationships between private enterprise and major educational institutions. Research parks are often viewed as centers of technological and economic advancement. The first of such parks, the Stanford Park, brought together university scientists and companies such as Hewlett-Packard (aurlp.org). RTP, created in 1959, intended to build a high-tech complex touting innovation and cutting-edge technology while improving the regional economy. Their web site outlines the original goal (rtp.org):

The Research Triangle Park was founded in January 1959 by a committee of government, university, and business leaders as a model for research, innovation, and economic development. By establishing a place where educators, researchers, and businesses come together as collaborative partners, the founders of the Park hoped to change the economic composition of the region and state, thereby increasing the opportunities for the citizens of North Carolina. The vision was to provide a ready physical infrastructure that would attract research oriented companies. The advantage of locating in RTP would be that companies could employ the highly-educated local work force and be proximate to the research being conducted by the state’s research universities.

By many measurements, RTP is a success. Currently, it is the oldest and largest research park in the United States. Over the past 50 years, RTP has grown tremendously. RTP now occupies a 7,000-acre development, employing around 42,000 people within over 150 organizations (rtp.org).

DanTech, not while formally part of RTP’s complex, certainly operates using similar principles. DanTech’s founder and his initial team of workers were students at a nearby research university. When they outgrew their space by campus, they migrated and settled near RTP. Initially, DanTech’s campus was one building on a huge parcel of land. Over the years, DanTech constructed buildings as needed to house employees and the service offerings that began with onsite childcare.

While DanTech is unique, it is not alone in its construction of a corporate campus. In fact, such campuses are becoming increasingly popular. For example, the Googleplex has been
written about extensively for its ostensibly novel working environment with such amenities as
gourmet, organic, locally produced meals. Pixar is yet another example. From images depicted
in popular press, one gets the impression that walking as a mode of transportation has been
entirely uprooted by Segway transportation within Pixar’s campus. These organizations are
unique and different from one another in many ways, but they seem to embody a current trend
within workplace construction that emphasizes an air of play that is markedly absent from the
stale images of workplaces of the past.

One of my assumptions within this project is that we could locate the campus as the
contemporary incarnation of the “company town.” DanTech is a business. People work for
them, often times on the grounds of the corporate campus. But that’s not all they do. They also
engage in leisure. They get massages, eat food, meet spouses and partners, and play sports. In
addition, they seemingly have a great deal of allegiance to those that provide this context in
which they work and play. This is the crux of my project—understanding how blurring spaces of
labor/leisure and corporation/community impacts the governance and subject positions of those
employed by the organization. While critically oriented, the project does not dismiss DanTech
employees as manipulated drones. Many elements of what’s happening in and around DanTech
are problematic. However, we should also understand the potential benefits of such a context
and recognize the potential for new subject positions.

**Critical Research Methodology**

As a critically oriented project, my research methodology followed four basic
components of critical research as defined by Alvesson and Deetz (2000). They describe these
four facets as challenging assumptions, recognizing histories and cultures in context, imagining
alternatives, and a general skepticism in regards to truth claims. I situated my work within these tenets with the intention of understanding nuanced dynamics of micro practices of the everyday. As such, I positioned work as a social and cultural practice positioned specifically within the context of DanTech.

Taking these four facets of critically oriented research in turn demonstrates the framework of the project. First, in challenging assumptions, my project primarily questioned conceptualizations of the divisions and/or boundaries (however porous) of “work” and “life.” As Warhurst et al. (2008) recognize, ideas of what constitutes the realms of work and life exist in relation to types of economy and industry. For example, in agrarian societies the integration of work and life was commonplace. However, in industrial settings it became easier to think of work and life as separate realms since work largely occurred in specific, factory-like spaces. Within the contemporary age of flexible capitalism and the labor and technology that enable it, we see much more of an interpenetration of work and life. My point here is that neither work nor life is given terms with inherent meanings. My project begins by challenging traditional conceptualizations regarding the separation of work and life and how this impacts modern worker subject positions and governance.

Secondly, in recognizing histories and cultures in context, I traced the evolution of corporate campuses in an American context in relation to a longstanding tradition of corporate welfare programs and offerings. For various reasons such as stabilizing a workforce, disciplining morality, and monitoring health, organizations offered programs, services, and housing (etc.) to employees. This evolved into the American company town in which organizations created spaces where work informed play and vice-versa. In many ways, corporate campuses and company towns share many similarities that one cannot ignore. Thus, noting the historical,
cultural, and economic trends which produce them is vital in cultivating an understanding of where corporate campuses come from and what they suggest about cultural formations in which they are currently situated.

Building on Alvesson and Deetz’s (2000) characteristics of critical research, the third facet they identify is that of imagining alternatives. For my project, this took many forms. First, I interrogated and reimagined work, life, and their interpenetration. Also, I examined the potential benefits in the integration of work and life that occurs on corporate campuses and how that potentially benefits employees, an alternative to the assumed degradation of work. Additionally, in regards to my third research question, I also asked how corporate campuses present new or different forms of community and the benefits and downfalls of those formations.

Lastly, Alvesson and Deetz (2000) suggest a general skepticism in regards to truth claims as a crucial component of critical research. This facet is important in two ways. First, questioning truth claims resists privileging one grand narrative that highlights one particular experience or perspective. As theories of governmentality suggest, notions of truth must be questioned just as definitive terms must be questioned. Secondly, skepticism in regards to truth claims must fall back upon a researcher and the claims s/he makes. In terms of my project, this meant that I did not make ultimate claims of “this is what’s going on.” Rather, my analysis suggested that my perspective is one approach situated in regards to particular theoretical perspectives. No research is neutral. Many methodological writings recognize the notion of researcher subject position (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Madison, 2005). Additionally, Denzin and Lincoln (2003) and Madison (2005) note that writing is not an innocent process. Clearly establishing my own theoretical position throughout the dissertation lends transparency to the assumptions I make regarding the context under study.
Alvesson and Deetz (2000) suggest that critical research emphasizing the context of work should pay particular attention to the subject position of employees. Hopefully, I have made clear that this is a major component of my project. My research highlights the everyday realities of those who work for the organization. Thus, I’m not concerned with managerial efficacy, efficiency, or productivity. The critical orientation of the project focused on how work exists in relation to various facets of people’s lives. More specifically, I examine how working in a corporate campus context governs how people understand themselves as well as how they are positioned.

**Data Collection**

When people embark on pursuits of research, they identify a text (or set of texts) to be interpreted and analyzed. The text may take multiple and varied forms. As Alvesson and Skoldberg (2000) note, “The text can be literal, consisting of written or spoken words. It can also be figurative, in that social acts are regarded as meaningful symbols, taking the text as model” (p. 61). The primary texts I analyzed throughout my project include academic literature, interview transcripts, as well as the materiality of the corporate campus. In my understanding, data, or “research material” to use Gray’s (2003) preferred and less clinical term, serves as some empirical “evidence” of a phenomenon (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). Thus, in order to read and interpret a text, sets of data or materials are required to examine specific research questions. For each of my research questions, I examined particular forms of data that appear most helpful for examining my three primary areas of inquiry.

My first area of inquiry explored the type of environment created by the corporate campus. I conceptualized environment as interpersonal, organizational, temporal, spatial, and
the interrelationships amongst them. As Denzin and Lincoln suggest (2003), part of a researcher’s job is simply “…going into a social situation and looking” (p. 48). Thus, observation is pivotal in the research process and the materiality of organizational space has a dramatic impact on the type of environment created. Angrosino and de Perez (2003) similarly note, “Social scientists are observers both of human activities and of the physical settings in which such activities take place” (p. 107). In this way, impressions of the corporate campus exist as a data set in conversational interviews, theoretical literature, as well as my own observations.

Not only did I consider the materiality of the corporate campus, but I also considered programs and service offerings available for employees. Data collected addressing this research question also considered corporate literature describing the campus, and program and service offerings. On DanTech’s website alone there is an abundance of information regarding the “benefits” of working there. These benefits include the amenities of the campus as well as “extras” such as adoption assistance, on-site summer camp for school aged children, and on-site clothing alterations. While much information about DanTech is documented in the area’s largest newspaper in addition to magazine publications such as *Fast Company* and *Fortune*, I do not include direct references to these articles. I realize that such articles can compose a valuable data set. However, in order to retain the anonymity of the organization, I do not include specific citations and quotes from these publications.

My second research question probed into how the campus and service and program offerings influence the ways employees feel about work and their jobs. In order to gauge employees’ sentiments, I conducted in-depth interviews with current and past DanTech employees. These participants are professional “white-collar” employees who perform job functions that we would associate with knowledge workers. I recognize that based on position,
employees may have remarkably different opinions and experiences with the organization. For example, a white-collar professional may assess her/his experience with a different lens than that of a non-knowledge worker. For the sake of this project, I concentrated on those knowledge workers who work for the organization presently or who have worked for DanTech in the past.

Finally, research question three sought to understand how DanTech employees experience the blurring of the boundaries between labor/leisure and corporation/community. Essentially, this research question brings together research questions one and two. What I explored with this question was how the organizational context at DanTech—and employees’ use of it— influence the divisions or confluences of labor/leisure and corporation/community. In addressing this question, I put my data sets in conversation with one another and look for similarities and differences. Thus, I read texts such as interview data, my own observations of campus, and academic literature and look closely for areas of overlap and tension.

**Process and Participants**

The issue of access is one that plagues critical researchers studying organizations. In their text which explores conducting critical management research, Alvesson and Deetz (2000) note the hesitancy of many organizations, particularly corporate forms, to open their doors to academics whose research and publications they cannot necessarily control. During the time I conducted my research, which was one of economic turmoil both globally and in the United States, I believe it was even more difficult to gain access since many organizations were hyper-protective of their corporate image. Because of access problems, I was not able to conduct my ideal research project. The ideal methodology for the project would include an ethnographic component, specifically a critical ethnography following the tenets outlined by Madison (2005).
I attempted to secure a part-time job at my organizational site and also explored other avenues for spending time on campus. However, due to an array of reasons, I could not secure access to perform an ethnographic project.

I felt that, in light of my denied access, the best way to address my research questions was through conducting interviews with former and current employees of the organization. Instead of interviews consisting of part of an ethnographic project, a primary focus of the project was in collecting and analyzing interviews. While I could not spend extended amounts of time at the organizational site, interview respondents have extensive experience working in the context of DanTech’s campus. Additionally, they have taken time to reflect upon campus and the implications it has upon their lives. Further, after each interview I conducted on-campus I spent time driving around and observing on my own. During this time I recorded my thoughts and observations.

Interviews provide an opportunity to explore research questions while simultaneously encouraging people to make sense of their everyday lives. Lindlof and Taylor (2002) recognize the narrative capacity of interviews when they state, “Qualitative interviews are a storytelling zone par excellence in which people are given complete license to craft their selves in language” (p. 173). Interview participants can comment on their perspectives, tell stories about their experiences, and comment on data taken from other sources as well (such as reactions to my own observations). Participant comments, reactions, and stories, offer insights for qualitative researchers. In addition, as Fontana and Frey (2003) note, interviews are negotiated texts. This means that while I may direct the interview in certain ways, interview participants also direct the conversation as well. This produces valuable information as interview participants introduce new themes and perspectives to the research.
The interviews were semi-structured. I entered each interview with a clear sense of the questions I wanted to ask. The interviews began with some general questions regarding duration of employment, first impressions of the company, and so forth. I asked participants how long they worked at DanTech, to describe a typical day, and what general changes they had experienced at DanTech. Remaining questions centered on research questions one, two, and three. In regards to research question one, I asked participants how DanTech differed from other places they had worked. I also asked them their impressions of DanTech’s campus and service offerings and to describe which programs they participated in. For research question two, I inquired about how, if at all, campus and service amenities impacted employee views on their jobs and DanTech as an organization. Lastly, to address research question three, I asked how DanTech’s campus influenced their ideas of community and how, if at all, they experienced blurring of “work” and “life.”

My list of primary questions served as starting points to establish rapport with interview participants. The list of interview questions primarily served as a guideline since all interviews contained a certain degree of nonlinearity. The fluidity of the interview process enabled a natural conversation-like experience where, hopefully, participants were most comfortable sharing information with me. Allowing, if not encouraging, conversations to ebb and flow produced a comfortable environment while allowing participants to elaborate on their feelings, opinions, and experiences.

My sample included interviews with 20 participants, 14 of which were current employees. People currently working for the organization are beneficial interviewees since they have the most up-to-date notion of everyday occurrences of the organization. The downfall here lies in their willingness and openness about potential aspects of the organization and/or
organizational leadership that they do not like. I tried to minimize their hesitation by stating in the consent form and assuring them several additional times that their names, any identifying information, and the actual name of the organization would not be revealed in any stage of the dissertation process or publications thereafter.

Out of the 20 informants, six were former employees of DanTech. I included them in the project for several reasons. First, since they are no longer accountable to the company, interviewees were potentially more candid in their responses and opinions of the organization and its practices. In fact, Alvesson and Deetz (2000) note the value of interviewing former employees when they state:

Interviewing should not be restricted to the people currently working at a company. People who have left . . . are often better informants, as they may have some distance from the company and, therefore, a clearer perspective on it, and they probably feel much freer in terms of what they can and will say. (p. 196)

I did, in fact, find this to be true throughout the interview process. While I believe all interview participants were honest and forthcoming in their responses, former employees of DanTech offered a level of critique and criticism that went beyond superficial description. Former employees were markedly more willing to critique or disparage DanTech.

All participants work(ed) in white-collar, professional jobs at DanTech. While I did not formally question them about levels of education, as highly technical jobs, most participants had a minimum of a Bachelor’s degree and indicated so at some point in the interview. Those who did not hold a Bachelor’s degree were long-time employees of the organization and received specialized training over the years. This project focuses specifically on the perspectives of these “knowledge-workers” since they comprise a vast majority of campus employees. However, the organization is unique in the fact that it employs some service-oriented workers such as food
preparation and service employees, an entire landscaping department, security, and janitorial staff. Many organizations outsource these functions. DanTech, alternatively, keeps all of these services in-house, offering full-time employment and benefits to people who fill these roles. For many reasons, I could not access this population. Thus, my sample of DanTech employees consists of those performing what is generally referred to as knowledge-work.

While some might suggest that the narrowness of the sample is a limitation of the project, I believe that the specificity of job function enables crucial insight into the potential dissatisfaction of contemporary knowledge-workers. It has been argued that knowledge-workers are often disenchanted with their work because the promise of fulfilling employment often remains unrealized. Thus, knowledge or white-collar workers are infamously more dissatisfied with their work than other types of workers. If we consider the processes and ways in which social and cultural value is inscribed in particular forms of labor, knowledge-work is supposed to offer employees a sense of accomplishment and challenge. Most often, we do not see a similar discourse surrounding other types of labor such as service work. This is, then, an interesting population to study because of the intersections of knowledge-work, a corporate campus setting, and employee subject position.

Participants ranged in age, job-function, and duration with the company. Of the 20 participants, 13 were women. Some interviewees had been with the company for merely a few months while others worked at DanTech for more than 20 years. The average time worked for DanTech was 15 years. Some worked for several other organizations before their employment at DanTech and others had worked there their entire adult life. Some had an amiable separation from the organization while others did not. Though the sample shared similar demographics, they still offered an array of experiences and perspectives.
Of the interviews I conducted, seven occurred on campus. Many of these were held in the respective offices of participants. However, I conducted one interview in a building’s common area and one interview sitting outside. I used on-campus interviews as opportunities to drive around campus in order to augment interviews with at least some degree of campus observation. I often recorded field notes in my car just outside of campus buildings and would take a significant amount of time simply “being” on campus. I held nine interviews off-campus, primarily in coffee shops. Interviews with former employees were conducted primarily at local coffee shops and one occurred in the home of a participant. Four of the interviews occurred over the phone. Each participant chose the interview location based on their preference, schedule, and comfort level. Interviews ranged anywhere from 20 minutes to slightly over an hour. However, the average interview time was 46 minutes. All interview participants consented to have the conversation recorded. I personally transcribed each interview. Overall, interview transcripts offered well over 100 pages of data.

Data Analysis

In their work on reflexive methodology, Alvesson and Skoldberg (2007) state, “Research can be seen as a fundamentally interpretive activity . . .” (p.7). As such, a researcher examines a text and engages in processes of translation and pattern recognition (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). When sorting through and coding data, ideally, scholars should revisit their theoretical frameworks to put new information in conversation with earlier assumptions. However, one should not simply lay the theoretical framework on top of the text and data. Rather, as Alvesson and Skoldberg note, “The trick, then, is to control theories (interpretive possibilities), without letting them control you” (p. 251).
I situated all of my data within material documents. I wrote my observations into field notes and transcribed each interview I conducted. I constructed themes in relation to my research questions and focused on developing and recognizing patterns while reading data. Working with my research questions close at hand, I analyzed data for persistent themes in regards to each research question. I employed processes of triangulation throughout all phases of analysis. Triangulation, as described by many authors (Burgess, 1984; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003; Henn et al., 2009) is defined as combining methods and data sets in order to enrich analysis. Specifically, Burgess (1984) states that researches employ “…[triangulation] in order to overcome the problems that stem from studies relying upon a single theory, single method, single set of data and single investigator” (p. 144). Gray (2003) similarly suggests that forms of data and texts can reinforce and/or contradict one another and these areas of dissonance and overlap are instrumental in building a critique. As such, for my project, interview responses were not the last (or only) word in answering research questions. I constantly compared and contrasted data sets, theoretical perspectives, interview responses, and my own observations.

As I proceeded with analysis, I engaged with my theoretical framework. As Gray (2003) states, all knowledge is created socially and is rooted in a set of assumptions. Clearly, I have my assumptions about the organizational context of DanTech and these assumptions are theoretically based. For example, as a critically oriented scholar, I believe power is inscribed within everything. As such, materiality, sociality, and culture are arenas to negotiate power. Additionally, I believe work is a social construct and not an inherent inevitability. However, this is not to suggest that my assertions and readings are “right.” To reference Alvesson and Skoldberg, researcher reflection is critical in seeing how data both support and depart from theoretical assumptions. They note, “Reflection means thinking about the conditions for what
one is doing, investigating the way in which the theoretical, cultural and political context of individual and intellectual involvement affects interaction with whatever is being researched . . .” (2000, p. 245). Questioning where my own reading of data comes from is important not only to keep my own assumptions in check, but also because this is what provides the platform for the most nuanced and rich analysis of the text. In addition, Alvesson and Deetz (2000) outline a reflexive methodology that is an “…interpretive, open, language-sensitive, identity-conscious, historical, political, local, non-authoritative and textually aware understanding of social research” (p. 136). The interpretive process, thus, is one that is cognizant of historical formations, relations of power, and intertextuality. In my research, I have made every attempt to revisit these characteristics to produce rich, culturally and socially context analyses. I have been transparent in stating my theoretical assumptions beginning in the introductory chapter and literature review and continue that transparency throughout. I have been reflexive and revealing about my thoughts of DanTech’s corporate campus and my sentiments regarding the general phenomenon of corporate campuses. Additionally, I have continually highlighted the potential problematics and benefits of DanTech’s campus. I have consciously made each of these efforts to retain a sense of open-mindedness and awareness of how my biases influence the work produced throughout the project.

Once a researcher collects her/his data, there is the question of what s/he actually does with it. With quantitative research, this process is relatively straight forward. However, with qualitative research, issues of analysis and interpretation arise in markedly different ways. Lindlof and Taylor (2002) suggest analysis and interpretation are crucial to processes of qualitative research. They identify analysis as “…the process of labeling and breaking down (or decontextualizing) raw data and reconstituting them into patterns, themes, concepts, and
propositions” (p. 210). Thus, analysis includes close readings of data sets and an organization of data into categorized schemes. Categorization, according to Lindlof and Taylor (2002), is the process of locating generic properties and bracketing unit of data in accordance with these themes. More specifically, categories are defined as “…array[s] of general phenomena: concepts, constructs, themes, and other types of ‘bins’ in which to put items that are similar” (2002, p. 214). Similarly, Ryan and Bernard (2003) suggest that finding themes in this (or a similar) manner is fundamental to qualitative data management and analysis. It follows that coding is an important tool for analysis that links specifics of data sets to categories. Lindlof and Taylor (2002) assert, “The core purpose of coding is to mark the units of text as they relate meaningfully to categories (concepts, themes, constructs)” (p. 216).

For this project, I analyzed data sets and developed categories and themes as they related to my primary research questions. I analyzed data sets closely and read them closely in relation to research questions. As large categories emerged, I divided those into subcategories that served as a complement to the larger theme. For example, the three primary categories I identified closely followed my research questions as “Environment,” “Impact,” and “Boundaries.” Taking each in turn, environment led to more specific themes such as material environment, physical environment, and organizational culture. The category of impact included themes such as generating loyalty, time savings, desire to remain employed at DanTech, and (un)willingness to leave. The theme of boundaries focused more specifically on work/life, labor/leisure, and corporation/community subthemes.

My primary means of coding consisted of physically mapping out themes and subthemes and constantly (re)visiting data sets for associated information. As I read interview transcripts, academic literature, and field notes, I cultivated major themes and subthemes. I created a
separate electronic document for each research question and compiled relevant quotes and citations as well as my thoughts and initial analyses. From here, I clumped together information that emerged in particular subthemes. I created new electronic documents for each subtheme and arranged the information (interview quotes, literary quotes, my notes) to serve as the outline for writing. As I progressed further into researching other themes I persistently revisited and reconfigured prior themes and organizational schemes. This revisitation and reorganization was constant even throughout the writing phase.

I began writing based on these initial outlines. As I fleshed out each area, I read my preliminary analysis and compared thematics to other research areas and subquestions. I kept a list of areas of tension, overlap, and contradictions between themes and research questions. I incorporated this information throughout all areas of discussion in order to enrich my analyses and offer readers counterpoints to dominant themes. Progressing through the writing process I reread transcripts and continued reading academic literature I had previously reviewed and introduced new literature as well. Sometimes this prompted reconfigurations of themes or analyses. Ultimately, this operated to improve my overall critiques.

**Conclusion**

This chapter outlined my methodological assumptions and practices. I employed critically-oriented research methodologies to explore my research questions in regards to DanTech’s corporate campus and worker subject position. Through 20 in-depth interviews, I garnered responses to a set of detailed questions about employees’ impressions and experiences. I analyzed interview transcripts and academic literature as my primary data sets and put these in conversation with my observations of campus. Lastly, I employed methods of triangulation and thematic analysis to construct the discussion presented in the Chapter Four. In the next chapter, I
analyze and discuss the project’s research questions. I incorporate each of my data sets or texts and offer various perspectives addressing each research question. I put this analysis in conversation with academic literature and address phenomena associated with, though not directly posed by, my primary research questions.
Chapter Four

Analysis and Discussion

Introduction

This chapter analyzes my research questions in turn. I incorporate employee comments and academic literature to situate their responses. I largely draw upon the concept of governmentality as an analytical framework focusing on the nuances of organizational control, hegemonic self-governance on behalf of employees, and the ways in which DanTech employees negotiate their corporate campus environment. I also provide my own insights delving into employee responses. I address directly the specifics of each research question and also introduce associated ideas and questions. Aside from Foucault and other writing that elaborates upon his concept of governmentality, I also employ critical organizational scholarship and work/life literature to ground my claims and analyses.

Research Question One

When I graduated with my Bachelor’s degree, I took my first (and only) “professional” job at a small marketing company. The organization employed between 20 and 25 people. In a run-down industrial park, our office space, while clean and freshly painted, lacked luster. I recall discussions regarding the installation of a “gym” so employees could exercise before or after work, or even during their lunch break. I was horrified at the prospect. My shared office space was right around the corner from the proposed fitness area. The gym, if approved, would be fitted into a windowless room no bigger than 10 feet by 20 feet. Talk of a stair-stepper and a universal weightlifting machine surrounded the proposition. Some had the vision of a nice, company-supported fitness area. I had images of partially defunct gym equipment, squawking
loudly with every step taken or weight lifted and sweating people, laboring profusely in a room that at one time must have been a closet.

Little wonder, then, that I reacted the way I did a couple months later upon first seeing Nike’s corporate campus. My exposure to workplaces and spaces, to that point suggested discomfort and ugliness. My own office space was small and describing it as mediocre is an act of generosity. Literally down the street from where I grew up was General Electric Aircraft Engine’s behemoth headquarters, shrouded in fences and barbed wire, building after building connected by parking lots. Not Nike, though. Their campus was pretty. It looked like a park, not a jail. Amid sprawling Beaverton, Oregon, Nike constructed a visible green space. How nice it must be to go to work there, right? Surely, green space is more comfortable than a grey parking lot.

This project begins with the assumption that the physical space in which one works matters. As the above narrative illustrates, my own inclination is toward the park-like setting of Nike and away from the industrial complex of GE. The physical space in which work occurs is a significant factor in the formation of working subjects. Additionally, workspace intersects with the type of work employees perform as well as services offered to employees that contribute to processes of subject formation. As such, campus, amenities, types of work, and play are interdependent facets in a complex of governance. To examine the intersections of campus and governance, my initial area of inquiry poses this series of questions: What type of environment does the corporate campus create? What are the physical and material attributes of the campus? What are the array of employee amenities and service offerings? How do these interact to create an organizational setting? As Massey (2007) notes, all places “stand for” something (p. 10). Further, places are maps of power which reflect, (re)produce, and transform political formations.
Thus, my first area of inquiry is essentially, considering the socio-spatiality of DanTech, what does their campus stand for? In part one of this chapter, I discuss my first research question and address the aforementioned questions.

**The Physicality of DanTech’s Corporate Campus**

The land surrounding DanTech was, once upon a time, in the middle of nowhere. The founder of the company purchased a massive parcel of land in a rural area. The land was inexpensive due to the fact that nothing was there. But he had plans for the land. As a former DanTech executive stated, the founder’s idea was not simply to put a building on the land. Rather, from the beginning, he intended to build a campus. The former executive, Ted, explained that “…instead of one huge building, he built a small building, then another small building, and he built this campus where people were required to get out of their offices and walk from one building to another” (emphasis spoken in original quote). Spacing buildings out necessitated the incorporation of the “outside” into day-to-day operations of the organization. As Ted’s quote indicates, decisions surrounding the construction of a campus were far from arbitrary. They were conscious, calculated, intentional decisions based on the founder’s assumptions regarding space, place, work, and productivity. Ted continued, “It became a natural perspective that people would be up and around. They’d be out in the air in a virtual park-like setting.”

DanTech’s founder was not the first person to recognize the significance of space and its arrangement. However, his intuitions regarding the image of a contemporary workspace were progressive for the time. In the 1970s, when DanTech was founded and construction began, “corporate architecture” was not a clearly defined field or phenomenon. Today, this is far from
the case. Major architectural firms include divisions dedicated to the design of business space while other firms deal solely with corporate architecture. Space Syntax is one such firm. Their web site offers their pivotal assumption and justification for their business at the top of the webpage that simply reads “Space matters” (spacesyntax.com). They describe the importance of space in the following manner:

We show how value can be created through the analysis, understanding and skillful manipulation of space. Through over 20 years of research-informed consulting, we have developed a powerful technology that demonstrates the key role of spatial layout in shaping patterns of human behavior. (spacesyntax.com)

In this passage, Space Syntax describes the governing capacity of space. In their view, organizations can capitalize upon the arrangement of space by creating environments that mold employee behavior. Their description highlights important intersections between profit, management of physical environment, and actual behaviors. Using the frame of governmentality, this confluence of factors provides a range of technologies that contribute to the positionality of employees.

Similarly, DEGW, a self-identified “strategic business consultancy,” focuses on the intersections of people, place, and performance. Their web site states, “Our people help clients to capitalize on a vital dynamic; the relationship between people and the design of physical place to enhance organizational performance” (degw.com). The Albert Kahn “family of companies” is yet another example of a contemporary firm dedicated to the design of workplaces. They concentrate on the elements of architecture, engineering, planning, design, and management and their interrelationships (albertkahn.com).

As the above examples indicate, many members of the business world recognize the capacity of physical surroundings to shape employee attitudes and behaviors. DanTech’s
founder, fully aware of the significance of space, designed the campus for sociality and aesthetics. There is a clear emphasis on the physical beauty of the campus. In fact, adjectives used by employees to describe campus grounds indicate as much: beautiful, gorgeous, awesome, nice, and pretty top the list of such adjectives. When asked of their impressions of the physicality of campus, all of the interviewed employees stated that they found the grounds attractive. Mike, a Social Media Manager for DanTech, described his first impressions of campus, “The first week you really are overwhelmed by how pretty the campus is, by how nice everything is, by the fact that the people here seem very calm and relaxed, very nice.” Evidently, Mike values both the attractiveness of the physical space and the effort that DanTech puts forth to construct such a space. In addition, he indicates some relationship between the environs and ostensible “calm” and “relaxed” employees. Many people made similar connections. Mike stated, “For me, I really appreciate the fact that aesthetics and beauty are important to them.” From this perspective, he suggests that physical appearance indicates organizational values writ large. If they care about the grass, then they care about the employees. If they care about the employees, then they care about the client. If they care about the client, then they care about the product . . . . Neatness, cleanliness, and orderly surroundings suggest an ethic of care, not merely an ethic of profiteering. For many, the allure of campus is immediate. Rick, who works with the distribution of marketing materials, described his first impressions, “It was like, ‘This is beautiful. I could work here the rest of my life.’” While I understand the impossibility of divorcing the physical from the social, as do employees I interviewed, I did push them to bracket and comment upon primarily the physical space. The responses were overwhelmingly positive, inevitably describing desirable green space, ponds and lakes, and wooded areas.
As Halford and Leonard (2006) note in their article examining the spatial and temporal complexities of organizations, the context in which work occurs is crucial when assessing both organizational control as well as employee subject formation. They state, “Organizations are themselves configurations of multiple, distinctive and differentiated spaces offering different potentials for subjectivities” (2005, p. 661). Various facets of organizational space hold the potential to govern employee understandings and formation of subject-positions. The cultivation of DanTech as a green space positively impacts employee ideas regarding work environment, demonstrating how physicality and presentation of a natural setting molds employee attitudes regarding the materiality of their workspace.

The discourse surrounding what a campus is and should be is far from absent in employee descriptions of the space. There is an apparent assumption that the physical space creates a collegial environment of creativity and collaboration into everyday aspects of work and the organization. As Lance articulated, “I think the term ‘campus,’ I always associate it with universities.” He continued, “I think of these buildings and common spaces and being able to walk between them and relax.” Brown (2009) recognizes the organizational effect of such spaces when she notes, “Office space itself becomes part of the quest for constant communication; open meeting areas replace cubicles, optimizing possibilities for contact between coworkers and their supervisors” (p. 78). Thus, the collegial design enables communicative interactions between and among employees that organizations tend to deem productive. Thus, the space is managed to attain organizational ends through the governance of everyday employee interactions. However, employees largely appreciate this attribute. For some, an emphasis on campus mobility is among their favorite characteristics. Rick, who has
been with DanTech for 18 years, stated that mobility was (and continues to be) what he likes best about the campus. He stated:

I mean, they call it a campus and it’s just like a college campus. I remember I loved to walk around. Part of my job when I was working in the file room was delivering files to different people in different buildings. [My favorite] part was grabbing a couple files, having to go to different buildings, and walking through the paths and across the green grass and under the pine trees… It just fills you with this sense of peace. You know, it’s like, “This is a really nice place to work.”

Here, Rick suggested that the physical surroundings potentially mitigate the pressures that are standard in many workplaces. Encouragement to get out and walk around serves multiple ends: it eases stress, it promotes interaction with other employees, and it provides a healthful outlet. Yet such a framing of mobility also projects the image of freedom and agency upon which governmentality so strongly relies. At DanTech, as Rick indicates, mobility is taken as freedom. Overall, employees express gratitude for this freedom of mobility. However, while employees do have the ability to move around, employee mobility is closely tied to organizational efforts to maximize employees’ time and productivity on campus. Thus, an aspect of campus which employees overwhelmingly like and appreciate is also a technology of governance that contributes to their positionality as docile yet productive workers.

The park-like attributes of DanTech’s campus are oddities in many ways. Many people do not engage with the physical surroundings of their work context in the manner of DanTech’s employees. What’s more, employees overwhelmingly value the physical attributes of campus. Lance, the only employee interviewed who previously worked on another corporate campus indicated as much in his description of that space. He explained that his previous employer termed their work environment a campus. However, by many standards, the environment he described is a glorified office complex, void of bucolic surroundings. When asked to compare the campuses, Lance stated, “…I don’t think there’s any comparison. Their campus was a bunch
of buildings and it’s all paved. It looked like an office complex you’d see anywhere.” Lance
described not only the importance of particular physical forms and surroundings, but also that a
campus without park-like surroundings seems to fall short of the idealized corporate campus. He
stated that DanTech’s campus made it easier to come to work and enjoy his time there. Anna
likewise commented:

The previous job I had was just in one of these office parks. A lot of these software
places are in these crummy places. And you have nowhere to go for lunch and it’s all
kind of ugly. DanTech has these gorgeous grounds and you can go for long walks. I go
for a lunch walk for three or four miles just through the woods and fields around
DanTech. I think that ambiance just adds to your comfort level. You get sort of used to
not having to pay for a gym membership and also having it very easy to go to and having
decent food at the cafeteria that’s not very expensive. Often times in the working world
you have to go out to eat or you bring your brown bag lunch and that’s kind of
depressing. I think those things do make a difference.

Anna’s right. Those things do make a difference. In the case of this project, the details
Anna outlines are part of a complex of technologies that position DanTech employees. For
example, the creation of DanTech’s campus in the image of a park and/or campus is consistent
with a long history of the design of recreational spaces that focus on aesthetic and moral visions.
For example, as Rosenzweig (1983) describes, public parks and recreational spaces were touted
as the antidote to working class indigence. Campus similarly works to discipline both thought
and behavior. Additionally, freedom of mobility emerges once again as Anna describes her
lunchtime walks. Lastly, “getting used to” certain amenities is reflective of an intentional
dependence on organizational resources on behalf of DanTech employees. The interplay
between freedom and dependence evidences the contradictory nature of corporate campuses.
Employees make decisions regarding what amenities to use, yet become reliant upon what they
have freely chosen.
As Ross (2003) notes, those living and working in “high-end suburban peripher[ies]” are sensitive to matters of place. That is, they are particular about the types of places they “consume.” In accordance with suburban propensities, and as the term suburban itself suggests, members of the so-called professional classes expect the incorporation of natural environs with industrial pursuits, especially as it relates to the context of corporate campuses. As Anna and Lance indicated, the type of place DanTech creates is valued and pleasurable for employees to “consume.”

An advantage of the physicality of DanTech’s campus (and other campuses as well), is that many facets don’t feel like a workplace. Logically, many employees indicate that it feels like something else, something closely akin to a collegial environment. Cheryl described this as such, “I think he deliberately made this campus like a college campus because it fosters communication, it fosters learning.” Janelle experiences this to such an extent that she claimed she sometimes forgets where she’s going. She stated, “I still catch myself saying, ‘I’m going to school’ instead of ‘I’m going to work.’ Because, it just seems like a campus environment.” It is significant to note here that Lisa is far-removed from her own days of schooling. She’s been with the organization for 25 years, all of which she’s spent working on campus.

Even for those who don’t make the verbal slip-up of referring to their work as school, campus aesthetics still provide a welcoming environment. Cheryl, a Technical Writer with 11-years at DanTech stated, “It’s really pleasant coming in because it’s like you’re not coming to work. It really does feel like a college campus.” And she’s right. Many aspects of DanTech’s campus feel and look like universities. There is no dress code, so campus is speckled with shorts, blue jeans, sneakers, and sandals. There are common areas both out and indoors. Upon one occasion visiting campus for an interview, I noticed the main entrance of the building littered
with bicycles that employees used for transportation and/or recreation. During that same visit, I saw a DanTech employee cross the atrium to exit the building. Slung over his hand were soccer cleats.

One can conclude that the materiality of DanTech’s campus has the potential to greatly impact employee understandings of their work, their organization, and themselves. Campus is a significant force in terms of employee governance. Scholars from an array of disciplines theorize the disciplining interrelationships between space, place, ideologies, “things,” and discursive formations. As Cooren (2004) states, “…an organization is a hybrid of human and nonhuman contributions” (p. 388). Thus, while an organizational context is comprised of human sociality, this sociality exists in relation to a series of material conditions. In the context of DanTech, the physical attributes of campus as well as human interactions compose the organization. Dale and Burell (2008) comment on this inter-subjectivity:

Materiality communicates and shapes. It consists not only of physical structures but is part of the inter-subjective and subjective realms that make up our social relations. And in turn, the physical world made social comes to constitute people through its very materiality. The spaces and places around us construct us as we construct them. (p. 1)

Thus, in a word, materiality governs. Further, the social and material cannot be divorced from one another. Rather, these realms are co-constitutive as things shape humans and humans shape things. Authors such as Fox (2000) and Geisler (2001) argue this line of thought by elaborating upon actor-network theory as outlined by Latour. Specifically, they turn to “the agency of things,” suggesting that objects play significant roles in social and discursive networks. Similarly, Dale (2005) states:

Materiality is imbued with culture, language, imagination, memory; it cannot be reduced to mere object or objectivity. And, even further, it is not just that materiality has taken on social meanings, but that humans enact social agency through a materiality which simultaneously shapes the nature of that social agency. (p. 652)
As Dale (2005) and these other authors suggest, materiality is not innocent, excused from relations of power, nor removed from human interaction. Rather, it is more productive to examine how materiality shapes and is shaped by and through human sociality, ideology, and everyday practices. DanTech’s campus is an excellent example of such interrelationships. The physicality and materiality of campus communicate various messages to multiple audiences including employees, managers, clients, visitors, and the targets of public relations efforts. In other words, campus helps govern employees by influencing attitudes and behaviors. For example, campus green space makes people feel better about coming to work. In fact, it very well may prompt them to work harder.

**Intersections of Campus Physicality with Employee Amenities**

For all the ways DanTech is *not like* a workplace, there is something important to remember: *it is* a workplace. If it weren’t for the jobs, it very well might seem like something else. Thus, dominant discourses at DanTech include collaboration, creativity, and interaction, just like many college campuses. However, just as many universities are centers of innovation and knowledge production, campus is concerned with productivity, efficiency, and even competition. DanTech is a business. It is an entity that creates and sells product to make money. Throughout my interviews, there was no shortage of employee understanding of this fact. Quite the contrary, popular business phrases such as “At the end of the day…” and “There’s always the bottom line…” peppered interview responses. Everyone articulated the understanding that, ultimately, they were there to make money. DanTech employees, as a population, reflect social truths about business and the necessity to generate profit to survive.
DanTech is a workplace. However, DanTech is not only a workplace. DanTech is not alone in this as many have noted that a lot more than “work” happens at work (Deetz, 1992; Kunda, 2006; Stevens & Lavin, 2007). Time at work, on campus, is spent working, playing, gossiping, surfing the internet, taking children to the doctor, eating, socializing, and so on. What’s particular about a corporate campus setting is that tending to various non-work facets of life is intentionally built into the design of the space. DanTech recognizes and wants employees to do more than simply perform their job functions while on campus. More than work is supposed to happen there. Incorporating day-to-day activities into DanTech’s campus is built in, quite literally, to the design of the space.

Everyone seemed to agree that the physical surroundings are nice. In fact, many described them as beautiful. On the whole, this makes a difference to employees because it suggests that the organization cares about more than profit margin. It suggests that they care about appearances and self-presentation. Many state that this notion of care also reflects how the organization views and treats employees. As Mike noted:

All the spaces on campus are equally attractive. The ones that are made specifically for the customers are really nice, but all the spaces are really nice. It really does show that they value creating a positive work environment. In other places I worked that meant you had a nice chair and a cordless headset. Which was cool, but they really didn’t spend any time thinking about the aesthetics or the higher aspirations.

Mike’s statement indicates an assumed interdependence among physical environment and organizational attitude toward employees. While he spoke about DanTech’s creation of a positive work environment, he fails to mention the ways in which DanTech can use the environment to exert power and control. Additionally, while there is not inherently a connection between caring about organizational space and caring about employees, several interviewees expressed this precise notion.
Beyond the physicality of campus, organizational benefits and amenities are vastly important and inform the assemblage of governing technologies. In speaking with DanTech employees, there’s no shortage of admiration of organizational benefits and employee amenities. The most commonly used and commented upon amenities were healthcare, childcare, food service, and gym facilities. DanTech’s onsite healthcare facility is free to staff members and their families. The medical professionals working on campus, including several doctors and nurse practitioners, are DanTech employees as well. Childcare, while using a seniority-based admission system, is drastically subsidized. Cost per month ranged based on who gave the estimate, but full-time daycare is provided for around $300-$400 a month. Many daycare facilities in the area easily charge $300-$400 per week. Campus is spotted with cafés that offer a constantly rotating menu. The food here is also subsidized, making meals both easily accessible and inexpensive. A typical lunch, such as a crab-cake sandwich, vegetable, and frozen-yogurt, costs around $4. One of my interviewees actually took me to lunch in one of DanTech’s cafés. Relatively empty when we first arrived, five minutes later, streams of employees trickled in. Soon, employees filled rows of lunch tables and boisterous conversation erupted.

In addition to healthcare and food services, most of the interviewed employees utilize some component of the gym and fitness offerings. Again, all of these services are free. The main workout area includes standard gym features such as cardio machines, nautilus equipment, and weights. The fitness center offers a litany of classes including yoga, pilates, and self-defense. DanTech employees have access to free personal trainers. The fitness facilities also include an aquatic center with a lap pool and sports leagues for an array of activities.

While healthcare, childcare, food service, and fitness facilities are what I recognize as the major employee amenities, DanTech offers numerous more subtle benefits. Several interviewed
employees use DanTech’s onsite salon for haircuts and associated services. The prices here also appear remarkably low. For example, Jackie has her hair cut and colored for a total of $40. Elsewhere, these services could easily run $150. Educational seminars are well-regarded and attended. Among the most popular are financial planning, parenting, and health and wellness seminars. For some, the dry-cleaning service is invaluable since all one has to do is leave laundry for pick-up and it reappears three days later clean and pressed. A few people use the car-detailing service simply dropping their car off earlier in the day and picking it up, spotless, later in the afternoon. A handful of interviewees referenced the ergonomics lab which outfits your office, chair, and desk arrangement to provide the most comfortable and posture-supporting working environment. There are so many amenities available for employees that several people commented on how they continually discovered new programs, offerings, and benefits. It is logical that this would be the case for new employees. As Michelle stated, “I remember the first day I started work. I called my husband every hour and said, ‘You won’t believe what I found now!’” However, people who have worked for the organization for tens of years report discovering new organizational benefits and service offerings that had been unfamiliar to them.

While the major amenities are obviously important, more subtle campus offerings point toward “…the mundane, little governmental techniques and tools” that Rose et al. (2006) recognize as significant facets of governmental structures.

DanTech seems to have everything employees need. In fact, when asked what service, benefit, or amenity they would add to campus, essentially all interviewees paused and seriously considered the question. Some could not think of anything, not one thing, they would add to campus offerings. Campus, in a sense, offers employees the environment of a “corporate city” in the words of one employee. Or, as Ted, the former executive states, “Now you have the campus,
the buildings, people moving back and forth, high levels of camaraderie, a business nexus in doing this and all of a sudden, this campus becomes a community.”

So the question becomes, if campus is in fact a corporate city and/or a community, what type of community is it? As Massey (2007) asserts, the politics of place are far from neutral. “Work,” as a Western and modern invention, has long since been a means to exercise power and control. In eras of coloniality, Europeans imposed processes of work to limit mobility and stabilize colonized populations in order to “civilize” them (Magubane, 2004). It follows that workspaces, as matrices of various forms of socio-economic-political power, are not merely composed of innocent structures and gestures. Employees persistently suggest that campus eases their lives in many ways. Employees repeatedly described the time and financial savings that campus and its amenities provide (I revisit this notion more closely in the third section of my analysis). However, with a “business nexus,” to use Ted’s term, underlying the construction and arrangement of campus and amenities, we must question the ways in which the profit motivations of the organization impact facets of campus work and life. Additionally, with so much focus on health, one must also examine the ways in which DanTech benefits, financially and otherwise, from such amenities.

Throughout my research, health consistently emerged as a primary theme. Employee interviews, organizational organs, and popular press covering DanTech persistently highlighted the ways in which campus and amenities contribute to the overall health and well-being of employees and their families. Free onsite healthcare is perhaps the most obvious example. The story behind this facility suggests that onsite, free healthcare was a way to avoid expensive insurance premiums. It was cheaper for DanTech to gain independence from its insurance provider, build a clinic, and staff it with medical professionals. While DanTech offers employees
the option of using the onsite facility as their primary provider, most of my interview participants did, in fact, employ the facility as their primary provider. All interview participants except one, at one time or another, used onsite healthcare. When asked what this meant for their healthcare records and, more specifically, who had access to them, not one of the interview participants had a concrete answer. Most interviewees gave some iteration of “Well, they’re supposed to be private . . .” while others stated that it was an interesting question they had not considered. Many people consider health matters an issue of privacy and it is interesting that the vast majority of interviewed employees did not know for certain whether or not DanTech can or would access their health information. Anna, a technical writer, was an anomaly and stated outright that she was uncomfortable using onsite healthcare because she feared organizational access to her medical records. She stated that using DanTech healthcare was too “Big Brotherish.” Anna stated, “I actually don’t use the healthcare center. I’m actually a little uncomfortable with having my health records maintained by my company.” She continued, “I just find it hard to believe if [DanTech’s founder] says, ‘Let me see that record,’ I don’t know, they work for him. There was just a line that was crossed that I didn’t feel comfortable with.” Anna elaborated and claimed that she would feel uncomfortable if she had to discuss an issue like depression that could be perceived as a potential interference in her job performance. She described a relatively clear unease with DanTech’s maintenance of health records and their degree of privacy. Anna seems aware that there’s a certain governance at play here. She is among the few who leveraged critique or skepticism in regards to campus healthcare, recognizing that using DanTech’s resources could be a means to control or discipline her. In this case, if one did not fit the described population of “healthy employee,” s/he could potentially be dismissed.
One way or another, whether through an insurance provider or a self-funded facility, DanTech is at least somewhat financially responsible for the health of employees and their families. Financially, it is in DanTech’s best interest to keep its employees healthy to cut down on healthcare costs and lost productivity due to illness-related absences. Thus, DanTech not only provides numerous ways for one to live a (very specifically defined) “healthy lifestyle,” but actively encourages employees and their families to do so. In this way, DanTech creates the population of “healthy employees” by constructing and circulating their own definitions of health. One way they accomplish this is through incentive programs for working out where employees receive credits for the amount of exercise they perform. They can then redeem these credits on campus for items like clothing. The cafés provide another example of DanTech’s gentle push toward good health. The food offered to employees on the whole, while not exclusively, is lower-calorie and lower-fat. Not only do DanTech cafes provide these sensible food options, but they list the fat and caloric content on placards throughout the café. Additionally, the spatial arrangement of some food indicates its nutritional value. Janelle discussed this with me and noted:

[They] at least try to offer some healthy menus items. So they have the salad bar and they have it split up. If you go down this end you’re going to be getting to the full-fat dressing and all the stuff that makes a salad fattening… And if you go down here, then you’re going to be making healthier choices.

If micro practices are just as important to processes of governmentality, then small details such as the arrangement of dressings based on fat content cannot be ignored. Rather, such details provide valuable insight into managerially driven notions of health and how they impact the behaviors of employees. Thus, in order to meet expectations of the healthy employee, food consumption is governed both in presentation and employee “choice.” A seemingly innocuous practice, the presentation of food on a salad bar, actually indicates the complexity of processes of
governmentality. Definitions of health created by management come to bear upon discourses of the healthy employee population and material practices such as food presentation. Employee actions are influenced by ideological and material practices. They act, behave, and make decisions informed by DanTech’s definition of health thereby demonstrating one of the myriad ways employees are governed as political subjects.

The salad bar arrangement isn’t the only micro-practice of conspicuously marking (non)healthy foods. On the placards detailing fat and caloric content are small graphic descriptors of some foods. The food, and its healthful content, is clearly marked. Janelle described:

Everything’s marked. Like if it’s heart healthy it has a red heart. And if it’s vegetarian then it has a green V. They mark those things so that you know. And then they also tell you how many calories are in them and how many fat grams are in them. It kind of helps you make a decision of what you’re going to get.

Janelle’s emphasis on eating as a decision is important. As many authors clearly state, governmentality relies on popularly accepted notions of freedom and agency (Bennett et al., 2007; Foucault, 2007; Rimke, 2000; Rose et al., 2006). Foucault describes the necessity of freedom in the following quote:

Henceforth, a condition of governing well is that freedom, or certain forms of freedom, are really respected. Failing to respect freedom is not only an abuse of rights with regard to the law, it is above all ignorance of how to govern properly. (2007, p. 353)

If subjects believe they are free to act, that they are unrestrained by organizations and other institutions, then they certainly don’t feel as if they are being governed. In order to produce effective vehicles of governance people must feel free and cultures must socially value freedom as an ideal. However, this ultimately inserts employees further into processes of governmentality as they “choose” to act in ways that benefit and reinforce the assemblages of
governmentality. Janelle positioned her food decisions as a matter of personal choice. However, that choice is not her own. Her choice is influenced by food presentation, DanTech’s defining of health and the healthy employee, and an entire series of practices and thoughts. While Janelle and other DanTech members decide what to eat, that decision is always mediated.

Changing food trends on campus are indicative of DanTech’s capacity to alter both conceptualizations of health and employee behaviors. Cheryl described changing food trends on campus over the years. While soda and donuts used to be a campus staple, they’ve been replaced by juice and bagels. She described this change in terms of heightened sense of awareness in regards to food and health. Cheryl stated:

We’re getting more health conscious on campus. We have a nutritionist on staff and even the menus, they give the caloric content, the fat content so that you can watch kind of what you’re eating so you know what it is you’re eating.

According to Janelle and Cheryl, this information helps DanTech employees make informed decisions regarding the food they eat. Again, the emphasis being on their decisions in regards to what to eat suggesting they ultimately are “free” to make any decision they’d like. Janelle described reading the nutritional content of a serving of french fries, then opting against them because she didn’t want to “mess up” her day of “good” eating. While the information may be valuable to employees and help them make informed decisions, DanTech’s cafés work to tailor those decisions toward managerial interests. Additionally, the types of food one chooses to consume is a conspicuous act. In this way, DanTech employees can perform professionalism and success as Nadesan and Trethewey (2000) and Trethewey (1999) describe through the body and one’s choices in how it is fed.

Having employees who stay in shape, maintain a healthy weight, and eat well benefits DanTech since it reduces health problems and mitigates absenteeism. However, interviewed
employees persistently noted that these emphases on health also benefit the employee. Many interviewed used the phrase “win-win” to describe a simultaneous organizational and employee benefit. When asked who benefits more from campus and amenities, Jackie responded:

That’s a hard question because [employees and DanTech] both benefit. More? Depends on what day you ask me that. It is pretty mutual. I don’t know if there’s much of a cost to the organization as much as it is a benefit. So I think they benefit and there’s probably not much of a cost.

Here, Jackie suggested campus and amenities are mutually beneficial. However, Jackie also pointed toward the fact that DanTech certainly benefits while not incurring much overhead cost. As a for-profit organization, DanTech is ultimately concerned about profit and DanTech’s founder and executives are quick to state that campus and amenities are not gestures of goodwill. Rather, they are business decisions that generate profit for the organization. Critically speaking, while both DanTech and employees may benefit in some ways, the ways in which they benefit are not the same. The convenience of a lunchtime workout is of vastly different consequence than the generation of millions of dollars of profit.

Lance responded similarly when asked about employee and organizational benefits. He stated:

They feed on each other. I don’t know that one does more than the other. The organization benefits from having employees that are happy and content and can get their work done. And employees in turn can benefit from having these great amenities and campus and they’re taken care of. So I think they feed on each other.

Lance, like Jackie, outlined a sense of reciprocity in regards to campus and amenities. Many employees described the cyclical nature of campus. Lance described this give and take:

I think this campus is really a calming place. The flowers are beautiful, the grass is green year-round, it’s like immaculate. You know if they’re going to take that kind of care of the grounds, they’re going to take care of you. When you come in and you see the people
working with the pride to make the place look nice, so you can come in and get your work done, you just have to feel good about that.

Thus, if employees feel cared for and cared about, they will put more into the organization. Clearly, as employees suggest, campus and amenities indicate a degree of care on behalf of DanTech, even though they exist in tandem to make money for the organization.

Lance continued by describing the benefits on DanTech’s end:

I think some of it’s, you know, these are the top concerns for our employees, is there something we can do. Then you start looking at, well this would actually help them be more productive if they have healthcare onsite and didn’t have to schedule appointments to go to the doctors. Some of the things, like the wellness people we have, our nutritionists, if we can help our people learn how to make better food choices for their particular bodies, well they’ll not be out as much sick. And the company wins both ways.

Lance’s response illustrates how employee decisions and choices are informed by DanTech. Thus, employees are “taught” to make “better” food choices for themselves.

Additionally, it is interesting that Lance frames campus and amenities as a means to meet the top concerns for employees. DanTech seeks to minimize non-work matters in order to maximize employee productivity and time spent on-campus. While there is no on-campus enforcer driving employees to work-out or eat healthy meals, the discourse in and around the organization certainly emphasizes what is popularly portrayed as a healthy lifestyle. Managerial interests and ideologies are pervasive in such discourse as Zoller (2003, 2004) indicates in her analyses of the managerial creation, dissemination, and perpetuation of very specific definitions of health. Similarly, Trethewey (1999) and Nadesan and Trethewey (2000) examine notions of the idealized professional body as a fit body. While they concentrate specifically on the gendered dynamics of the fit, professional body, it is worth noting that discourses of health, fitness, and success have consequences for all professional workers. Brown (2009) also examines the corporate focus on employee health and how this translates into increased productivity for
organizations. Both the employees and the organization may benefit, but that is perhaps beside
the point. What is at issue is: who gets to decide? Definitions of health are not universal even
though they are mediated through processes of reification that may make them appear as if they
are. Further, there need not be an on-campus enforcer. Governing does not require such a figure
because subjects “willingly” act in ways that discipline themselves. As Rose et al. (2006) note,
“The subjects so created would produce the ends of government by fulfilling themselves rather
than being merely obedient…” (p. 89). In other words, subjects are instruments of self-
governance.

DanTech’s focus on health, fitness, diet, etc., is emblematic of popular notions of success
and reflective of an American “professional” population. A successful, professional person is
one that is committed, loyal, and disciplined. Such characteristics should be easily read on the
bodies of professionals. Nadesan and Trethewey (2000) describe this notion:

The popular success literature appropriates enterprise as a prescriptive framework for
contemporary organizational life where the body is a surface to be marked by, and a site
for performing, the codes of consumption and those of formal organizational sign
systems. Accordingly, readers are admonished to conduct their bodies accordingly, to
become entrepreneurs of their very selves, shaping their bodies and lives through
performative displays. The popular success literature suggests that the body can be
successfully managed by cultivating bodily regimes such as image management, style,
comportment, dress, diet, and exercise. (pp. 234-235)

As this passage suggests, the pursuit of fitness occurs not only for lowering cholesterol
and losing weight. Fitness is a means to attain the embodied image of success. In this way,
bodies are managed. Obviously, this is a means of disciplining employees by controlling the
operation of bodies. Clearly, discourses of health impact employee thoughts regarding health
and actual behaviors. This is in accordance with DanTech’s larger social prescriptions for the
healthful, professional, employee.
The New Company Town?

While corporate campuses are a relatively new phenomenon within the American landscape, numerous similarities emerge when comparing contemporary corporate campuses to company towns of days past. Company towns were quite popular from the 1600s to the late 1800s and early 1900s (Crawford, 1995). As Crawford (1995) and Marchand (1998) note, organizational concern for employee welfare has a lengthy history. Existing in relation to social, political, and economic circumstances, the types of offerings set forth for employee welfare varied. When company towns were most popular, they served the need or desire for reasonable working and living conditions for the industrial working class. For what may be the first time, American employees were became concerned with more practical welfare offerings such as healthcare, pensions, insurance, and the like (Crawford, 1995).

As far as location, both entities sought spaces on urban peripheries, close to the city but not too close. The move away from city centers distanced an organization and its worker from the dirtiness, crime, and overcrowding of urban settings. Natural locales, romanticized as clean, serene, and peaceful emerged as more wholesome places to live and work. Thus, the tendency for both company towns and campuses to retreat into somewhat rural spaces is apparent. In reading interview responses, we can clearly see the value placed in natural, non-urban settings. Typically, not many people describe their working environment as beautiful, gorgeous, or pretty. What’s more, they are not describing parking lots as such. DanTech employees use such adjectives to reflect upon and describe the natural attributes of campus. Michelle clearly articulates the difference between “pretty” and “ugly” (and the corresponding “nature” and “human constructed”) when she explains that she likes to periodically look out her window during the day. Bridget also described:
[Campus is] a very natural setting. I’m a real outdoorsy person anyway and so having an environment that’s not concrete and nothing else has been really nice. It certainly makes being able to look out the window a very pleasant experience. Not, I’m going to see traffic going down the highway, or something like that.

Stacey echoes a similar sentiment when she notes that she values looking out the window to see natural surroundings and not the hideous sight of cars zooming down the freeway. It is comforting for employees to see the trees and green space. Natural landscapes, including woods and lakes, emerge as far more desirable than concrete office parks. Serene, natural settings are themselves part of the apparatus of governmentality. DanTech’s campus is effective in spurring self-governance because its use of dominant perceptions of cleanliness and beauty. Employees enjoy the space, making them far more likely to spend significant amounts of time there.

Without prompting, some DanTech employees explicitly made the connection between company towns and corporate campuses. Glenda stated, “It’s almost like a mill working community. You know, cradle to grave [DanTech]. In fact, I wouldn’t be at all surprised if [they] have a cemetery lined up for you.” This same employee goes on to suggest that “[DanTech] is just the modern day version of a mill town.” In many ways, this and other employees are accurate in such descriptions. Many parallels exist between campuses and company towns in terms of their locations, integration of work and other aspects of life, and cultivation of specific social ethics.

A few key similarities emerge when comparing company towns to corporate campuses. First, both contexts demonstrate the blurring of boundaries between work and life. Secondly, through this blurring, measures of discipline and governance could be easily exacted. Third, both contexts operate to concentrate subjects and resources within a particular space. Employing
the analytical framework of governmentality, these characteristics exemplify how the tentacles of
governance create self-disciplining political subjects and populations.

Obviously, an overwhelming similarity between corporate campuses and company towns
is the intentional construction of spaces that integrate “work” and “life.” In Crawford’s (1995)
history of American company towns, she notes the propensity to build a space in which living
and working occurred side by side, or more, as indistinguishable. Thus, early builders of
company towns incorporated areas for education, recreation, shopping, health, as well as living
quarters. Looking at the campus and amenities offered to employees, there seems little
difference between the two. DanTech’s campus provides the prescribed norms for the company
towns of 200 years ago. Up to this point, I have not mentioned the parcels of land available to
DanTech employees at reduced rates for construction of housing. Thus, even living quarters are
incorporated in some contemporary corporate campus settings. In both the case of company
towns and corporate campuses, as a self-contained entity of sorts, each context provides
mechanisms that keep workers on the premises. As Rick described:

I always said if I were single I’d be spending twice as much time here at DanTech
because it’s such a comfortable place to live [sic]. You know, with the computers, the
recreation and fitness center, and the cafes. You could pretty much live here 24/7.

In Rick’s description, he addresses the potential willingness to occupy himself upon
campus grounds. Obviously, Rick works on campus. Yet, what’s notable is his readiness to
spend time playing on campus. Further, Rick was not the only interviewee to misspeak and
substitute “live” for the word “work.” Of course, employees don’t actually live on campus.
However, as this quote and other descriptions of campus indicate, you rarely have to leave.
DanTech fosters an environment where employees need not leave campus to manage various
facets of their day-to-day lives. Thus, employees minimize time away from work since most
workers leave campus very little during a typical work day. Minimized time running errands for the employee translates into maximized time performing work duties for DanTech. In addition to the time savings, employees comment on how the campus, benefits, and amenities work to allay the fears and anxieties of everyday life. If your child is sick, it is much easier to take her to the doctor when both her daycare and doctor are within a 100 yard radius. Integration of work and life eases the capacity for employee-subjects to self-govern, thereby further articulating them into processes of governmentality.

In addition to the integration of work and life realms, company towns and corporate campuses also share the governing tendency to discipline morality and notions of ethical behaviors. For example, in the case of company towns, drinking alcohol threatened the stability of the workforce since a hung over employee was often unproductive or absent. Thus, drinking and the operation of pubs were policed by the company town’s primary organization (Rosenzweig, 1983). Marx, while not a proponent of the drinking working class, argued that restricting or eliminating alcohol consumption stripped leisure and pleasure from workers, often the only leisure and pleasure they were able to pursue. Ultimately, this was yet another way the capitalist class controlled the working class. Disciplining employees in various ways subject them to managerial ideologies regarding an ideal sense of personhood, conditioning them to specific notions of model behaviors. At DanTech, notions of the ideal employee population heavily revolve around managerially created notions regarding health and productivity.

In both company town and corporate campus contexts, organizational emphasis on family serves as a means of disciplining behavior. The emphasis stems from larger social-political ideas about the importance of family, yet organizations have much to gain by perpetuating dominant narratives regarding the value of familial ties. At DanTech, managerial interests shape the
valuing of family life while harnessing the organizational benefits that accompany this ideological formation. For example, DanTech employees and their families have access to free onsite healthcare. DanTech employees and their domestic partners and kids above the age of 18 can work out at the fitness facilities. Many of the educational seminars revolve around family issues—dealing with your child in teenage years, classes for new parents, etc. Of course, to have a family means one must take care of that family. Structured into “family” is responsibility; structured into that responsibility is financial well-being, more particularly, one that is tied to performing well at work and keeping one’s job. As Schor (1991) notes, family responsibility tempers employee inclinations to challenge management and organizational expectations because often the employee is reliant on the organization for a wage or salary to support her/his family. The employee is in essence dependent upon the organization. As Schor (1991) states, “Dependency translates into control and, ultimately, profitability” (p. 64). Thus, social, cultural, and organizational configurations of family can serve as a vehicle for exercising organizational hegemony and authority. As Sotirin, Buzzanell, and Turner (2007) similarly state, “Framing family as a management enterprise promotes not just more efficient households but conceptions of the ‘good’ family that cast love, intimacy, and care as means in the ongoing work of fashioning family members into successful entrepreneurial subjects” (p. 249). Thus, articulating the enterprising and familial subjects provides an instrument of governance.

Lastly, company towns and corporate campuses characteristically concentrate money, resources, and employees in a particular space. This is a space that ultimately serves an organization’s financial interest by building everyday life into organizational space. For example, company towns produced stable workforces by limiting mobility. Company towns in rural contexts in a sense isolated workers from urban mobility. In addition, in company towns
workers became dependent upon organizational housing. Corporate campuses produce many of the same phenomena. For example, suburbanization similarly restricts workers’ mobility, binding them to both work and living spaces.

If corporate campuses are a contemporary form of the company town, the workforce to whom they cater in the economies in which they exist are drastically different. Corporate campuses like DanTech largely employ members of what Florida (2002) terms the “creative class,” comprising a hefty portion of the post-industrial workforce. They are knowledge workers, many of whom have specific talents and education. DanTech employees embody Florida’s notion of the creative class. A vast majority of DanTech employees are highly educated, many having post-Baccalaureate degrees. The few who have two-year degrees have been with the company for tens of years and have undergone extensive in-house technological training. DanTech employees have nuanced understandings of the industry in which they’re situated. A majority of DanTech employees are technological engineers responsible for creating, generating, and perfecting highly analytical computer software. What’s more, they love the work and take it incredibly seriously. As highly educated, highly trained, and highly motivated, they are valuable as employees, either at DanTech or elsewhere. DanTech employees understand their position as knowledge workers and members of the creative class. Ellen indicated as much when she stated, “[People] in our field are highly specialized and many of us have gotten patents which are now DanTech’s material. [This] has made a lot of money for DanTech.”

Thus, corporate campus environments cater to and attract (mostly) knowledge workers. Organizations who employ them understand the pace at which workers live their lives. These are precisely the fast subjects existing in a fast economy to which Thrift (2005) refers. Considering the creative, knowledge workers that compose the bulk of corporate campus workers,
organizations like DanTech that build campuses create environments that assuage the demands of the contemporary American knowledge worker by enabling employees to pace and manage their lives. In addition to practical offerings such as retirement plans and healthcare, corporate campuses can be read as a response in relation to late-capitalism’s demands for spatial, temporal, financial, and psychological flexibility. This is of particular importance to the knowledge workers of the creative class because flexibility of life-realms is expected of them in far different ways than that of types of workers. Take for example service workers. While service workers certainly encounter demands for flexibility, some of the boundaries between work/life persist. For example, a man working in a fast-food restaurant still experiences many of the spatial differentiations of “work” and “non-work.” Even though he demonstrates psychological flexibility as he contemplates his work and job, the food production line does not follow him home. With the increase of mobile technologies and a 24/7/365 availability of knowledge workers, the knowledge worker does not experience a similar separation.

Summary

In this section of Chapter Four I have examined my first research question and affiliated subquestions. Employing the analytical framework of governmentality, I have described the physical space of DanTech as well as the service offerings and amenities available to employees and their families and how these contribute to processes of willing self-government. I have examined both the benefits and potential problematics of DanTech’s campus and employee engagement with the context. In the next section of Chapter Four, I address my second set of research questions which explore how campus and service offerings impact employee understandings of their jobs and DanTech as an employing organization.
Research Question Two

Introduction

In the early stages of my project, I found it hard to describe my work to others, especially those outside of the academy. When people asked about my dissertation topic, I usually gave them some generic answer that I was “studying corporate campuses.” This was mostly followed by expressions of confusion. “What’s that?” a good friend of mine asked. I described to her what I knew of DanTech, its campus, and its amenities. I described to her the technology company, the beautiful plot of land, healthcare, childcare, and cafes. All the while I gave these descriptions, I was thinking of the problematic aspects of this type of environment. But my friend interrupted me before I could launch into my critique. “That sounds awesome.” She was referring to campus and not my project.

As a critically oriented scholar, this was one of the hardest facets of my work to metabolize. I could easily locate many critiques. But what about the people who liked it there? Many employees in my study really and truly wanted to work for the organization until they retired. Many of them also loved the atmosphere. Thus, my second research question explores the impact of DanTech’s campus and amenities upon how employees feel about their jobs and the company. In other words, I explore how campus and employees’ work contribute to employee identities and how DanTech’s campus crafts governed political subjects. Specifically, I ask, how does the corporate campus impact how employees feel about their jobs? Secondly, how does the corporate campus impact how employees feel about their employer? I then situate how the questions relate to processes of governmentality and disciplining employees.
Governmentality operates through various mechanisms, both material and ideological. As I have stated several times, processes of governance require vast assemblages in order to bear upon identities and subjects. At DanTech, campus and amenities, job functions, and the organization itself exist in complex interrelations that contribute to processes of governmentality. Additionally, DanTech’s campus, the work that occurs there, and employees’ work and lives exist in relation to broader social discourses that frame the technology industry as a creative, innovative, and desirable field in which to work. In the following section of this chapter, I consider my second research question while I analyze how these material and ideological nuances interrelate and, in turn, how they function as forms of governance.

The Impact of Industry

The specific nature of work, and the industry in which it occurs, impacts how employees feel about their work and their employer. Employees respond to both the physical environment that surrounds them as well as cultural assumptions regarding specific types of workplaces. Organizations operating within the technology industry are notoriously constructed and viewed as cutting-edge, often times in both material and ideological realms. In other words, spaces of work are less traditional in the sense that they incorporate many elements of life, including not only amenities for employees, but also ideas like “fun” and “community.” Ross (2003), in his ethnographic work at two new media companies, describes the connections between creative knowledge work, environment, employee identity and subject positioning. He addresses how employees engaged in knowledge work tend to be highly committed, embrace discourses of creativity, and demonstrate a willingness to work long hours. Likewise, Kunda (2006) discusses a similar phenomenon at a high-tech engineering firm. In Kunda’s study, he observed that working as a “high-tech engineer” connoted intelligence, creativity, and innovation. Workers at
the organization personalized popular notions of what it meant to be involved in their industry and their particular jobs as they inscribed these meanings into and on themselves. At DanTech, where many of those employed are software engineers, a comparable trend occurs. Ellen, a veteran Software Engineer, illustrated this notion when she stated:

Well, I think there’s a commitment first and foremost to the work. It’s an intellectual place. You’re never bored and there’s always something new you’re learning and people who are there thrive on curiosity and the intellectual challenge. So I think part of it is that first.

Ellen provides valuable insight into social understandings about work, and more specifically, work that occurs in high-tech settings. She suggests that employee commitment to the organization is present. However, in her purview, software engineers are ultimately dedicated to the challenges associated with the work they perform in relation to their jobs. Her emphasis on learning, curiosity, and intellectual challenge parallels conceptualizations of technology “outside” of the organization. In other words, there is a clear relationship between a social and cultural valuing of technology in society at large and at DanTech specifically. As Collier (2009) suggests, similarities between dominant discourse and specific populations indicate the dispersion and efficacy of governance. Collier states that governmentality is valuable “…for understanding what is general to diverse governmental forms in disparate sites” (2009, p. 99). At DanTech, for example, dominant discourses of knowledge work demonstrate the complexity of processes of governance as well as how governmentality does not operate via top-down power structures. Rather, DanTech and its campus exist within an assemblage that molds potential thought and action. Thus, associations of concepts like “innovation” and “intelligence” with the field of technology are governed in our society writ large and on DanTech’s campus specifically. My interviews revealed a few key themes in regards to dominant discourses within the technology industry, specifically, and knowledge work, more
generally. My interviews suggest that themes such as creativity, intellectual challenge, and technological savvy simultaneously exist in social discourse and are embraced by DanTech employees. DanTech is regarded as a creative environment and was designed to harness creativity to increase productivity. As Ted stated, “[The founder] felt, intuitively, I think, that that type [of environment] would enhance the creativity and he would get higher productivity.” Later in this same interview, Ted reiterated the importance of creativity when he stated, “[The founder] wanted to build is so people would be comfortable, so people would be quote ‘happy,’ so people would have their creative juices tweaked.” Ellen commented specifically on how campus enables creativity when she stated, “The amenities allow me to not stress about little things so I can maintain that level of thought and ability to plan and analyze and think outside the box. And I get paid to think outside the box.” Here, Ellen frames her discussion of creativity by employing the popular business phrase, “think outside of the box.” Ellen’s statement is not only indicative of how creativity is valued at DanTech, but also demonstrates the permeability of the social valuing of creativity in workplace environments and how they are internalized in specific contexts.

In addition to discourses of creativity, employees continually reference the importance of intellectual challenge, another theme closely related to knowledge work. In fact, for Ellen, intellectual challenge is a necessary component of her work and her job. She stated, “If I had a not very intellectually challenging job, I would not stay there.” She further elaborated:

I don’t have to worry about little things getting done. Or I don’t have to interrupt my day going to get lunch or getting my kids to A, B, and C halfway across town. That allows me more time to think and process and meet and collaborate with other people. But if I didn’t have that part of it, that intellectual side, I wouldn’t stay there.
Ellen’s statement indicates the degree to which she values the intellectual challenge associated with her work. Without the intellectual challenge she currently enjoys, Ellen claims she would seek employment elsewhere. What’s more, from Ellen’s perspective, DanTech’s campus enables her to engage in intellectual labor more efficiently.

Finally, technological savvy emerges as an important element of social discourse surrounding the technology industry that has also been internalized at DanTech. In fact, Rick feels as if the technology alone is enough to sustain the organization, even if campus were not part of the organizational environment. He stated, “I think DanTech as an overall organization would be successful with the software that they do even if they had a bare bones kind of attitude. They would still get workers.” Thus, the innovation and complexity of the products they create is enough to attain and retain employees. Katherine bluntly echoed a similar sentiment when she stated, “Technical skills and brilliance are [seen as important.]” She made this statement definitively and suggested that these characteristics ranked among the most important for DanTech employees. However, the design of campus, with both private and open spaces for collaboration and discussion, largely facilitates innovative work (Turner, 2009).

Massey et al. (1992) similarly recognize that broader social discourses surrounding technology and science have significant implications for work(ers) in research parks. Terms like “innovation,” “creativity,” and “cutting-edge” swirl around the arenas of technology and science. As Ross (2003) notes, “In the business world, creativity is viewed as a wonderstuff for transforming workplaces into powerhouses of value” (p. 32). Thus, discourses of creativity translate to efficiency and productivity. We see evidence of this in popular press, television shows, advertisements, and so on. For example, typing the phrase “business creativity” into Amazon.com's search engine yields pages of results including the titles *Creativity in Business*
(Ray & Myers, 1986), *Jamming: The Art and Discipline of Business Creativity* (Kao, 1997), and *Business Creativity: Breaking the Invisible Barriers* (Gogatz & Mondejar, 2005). On the whole, the DanTech employees I interviewed indicated that freedom to be creative was important in keeping them happy. In addition, several DanTech employees commented that the emphasis on creativity intersected with their job function. Further, these facets combine with DanTech’s on-campus offerings to create an entire organizational complex that contributes to the governing of employee subject positions. For example, Lance stated:

> Is there enough work here within your field to keep you challenged? Is it constantly growing? Is there enough stuff to keep you happy technically? And then you look and see what the company does for you to make you happy otherwise, and it’s like, “Why would I go somewhere else?” Nobody’s really offering the combination of those two things.

Lance noted the importance of the relationships between campus, amenities, and his actual work. While DanTech provides a nice physical working environment with many employee services, this in and of itself is not enough to retain employees. Employees, on the whole, expressed desires to perform engaging and intriguing work that constantly challenges their intellectual capacities. I believe this attitude reflects the contemporary notion of the “good citizen” as one that contributes to society in meaningful and productive ways (Ouelette & Hay, 2008; Rimke, 2000). If DanTech were merely a playground where employees lazed the day away, working for DanTech would lose much credibility. As Lance and Ellen both suggest, employees must, foremost, fulfill the social expectation to intellectually and creatively produce. In other words, employees must identify with their work and jobs to meet both personal and social expectations. Clearly, this is not only a matter of identification, but also an issue of subject formation since the drive for productivity is created socially yet realized personally. As Lance questions, if employees’ desires for intellectual challenge and a desirable workplace are met, why would they go anywhere else?
The fact that challenging work is balanced by a desirable workplace is powerful in retaining highly trained, educated, and proficient employees. Ellen, the Software Engineer quoted above, described the intersections of industry, job function, organization, and working environment. She stated, “I think part of it is the side of …. When a company provides that many benefits, you feel a commitment from them to you. And I think that does engender further commitment. It’s sort of cyclical.” Work within technology industries is deemed cutting-edge and fast-paced. In a society that highly values such characteristics, employees most certainly exhibit a sense of pride that they are involved in such pursuits. Additionally, since DanTech provides many campus amenities and services, the combination of a desirable job in a nice working environment is irresistible for many.

Thus, using a lens of governmentality, it is no surprise that the type of work and its context relate to the particular industry in which they are imbricated. As Ladner (2008) notes in his research on mobile technologies and flexible work, “Work in the gaming industry is constructed as ‘fun,’ where long hours are intermingled with episodes of play while in the office” (p. 460). This is politically and economically significant because if work is framed as “fun,” who wouldn’t want to work (read: “have fun”) all the time? Yet, while employees may benefit from a workplace that emphasizes fun, the organization benefits by using the emphasis on fun to extract more productive labor from employees. Ross (2003) notes that for workers and workplaces within knowledge and creative industries, job satisfaction, “…still comes at a heavy sacrificial cost—longer hours in pursuit of the satisfying finish, price discounts in return for aesthetic recognition, self-exploitation in response to the gift of autonomy, and dispensability in exchange for flexibility” (p. 34). Of all the interviewed employees, Katherine was the most forthcoming about this paradoxical tension. She described the reality beneath the surface of
campus life when she stated, “Below the surface of all these niceties, there’s incredible job stress and pressure. That’s just the way it was.” She also described the trend toward overwork when she stated, “It’s a high-tech company and workaholism is prevalent.” Katherine recognizes the price employees pay for the campus working environment and suggests that such “niceties” come at a cost. At the end of her interview, she spoke for some time and concluded:

On a closing note, one of the things we always laughed about was people acted like, the line is that we’re this Disneyland kind of a place to work. And actually, it’s a high-tech environment, it’s very stressful, at some times more than others, but there’s a level of stress and there’s a real expectation that you’ll work and work hard. DanTech will let you be a workaholic and kind of wear you out. You’re kind of responsible as an adult to not let the company wear you out and wring everything from you. But the environment supports that kind of workaholic attitude. It looks family friendly in that there are all these services there, but the amount of overtime some people put in... It was not Disneyland.

As Katherine indicates, while corporate campuses—with an emphasis on fun, creativity, and being-yourself—potentially loosen the constraints of traditional working lives, they carry negative and far-reaching consequences such as increased time working, increased stress while working, and a greater emphasis on productivity in all realms of life. What’s more, many of the negative implications of Dan Tech’s campus and the associated discourses of creativity and innovation are entirely self-imposed. As employees embrace the innovation and challenge associated with their work, while also using campus resources, they are the purveyors of their own governing.

Fleming (2009) problematizes the ways in which “fun” and the idea that each employee should “be yourself” have been integrated into corporate settings. Following Hardt and Negri’s (2001, 2004) descriptions of the commercialization of the commons, Fleming argues that the integration of “authentic selves” into corporate settings is yet another way to commodify daily life. He prefaces his project by explaining that “The analysis that follows is particularly
interested in the corporate characterization of authenticity that calls upon the apparent freedoms of *non-work* to enter the office, the factory, the call centre, etc.” (2009, p. ix). His primary argument is that managerial ideologies now intentionally incorporate aspects of non-work into organizational life. Encouraging employees to bring their non-work identities into the office is considered a means to increase employee satisfaction and productivity. A consequence of this co-optation and integration is that those traditional elements of non-work become implicated in the means of capitalist production. With DanTech’s campus, the incorporation of family, leisure, health, education and so forth insert many life realms directly into the space of capitalist production. Ultimately, subject positions and identities of workers exist in relation to the myriad of factors that comprise structures of governmentality. One cannot make assertions regarding employee subject positions by taking into account only the organization for which one works, or the particular job function s/he performs, or the type of industry in which one works, or one’s working environment, and so on. Rather, analyzing how employees understand themselves and how they are positioned must consider a range of components including the social, cultural, economic, temporal, and spatial. Comprehending all elements of a contextual milieu is difficult due to their complexities and areas of overlap. In the pages that follow, I try to explore the ways in which DanTech’s campus and amenities contribute (or not) to the ways employees identify with their jobs and DanTech and how this molds political subjects. However, I also attempt to put these facets in conversation with other components of the cultural context, further addressing the diffuse processes of governmentality.

**On the Job**

What should be clear by now is that space, place, and environment are important. In several foundational texts of governmentality, Foucault describes the significance of architecture
Discipline and Punish (1977) famously addresses the panoptic prison structure. Additionally, Security, Territory, Population (2007) describes the creation of (un)healthful populations and their spatial distribution. For Foucault and the analytical framework of governmentality, architectural practices relate to structures of power as they become “...a question of using the disposition of space for economic-political ends” (1980, p. 148). I agree with the assertion that space matters. My own assumption is that any workplace and space is a significant component of governing assemblages and impacts employee perceptions and subject formation. Thus, the question becomes, in what ways does DanTech’s campus govern employees?

In response to questions about the physical campus, employees noted that it had tremendous impact on how they felt about their day-to-day working lives. Anna stated, “I think it definitely influences it. I think if I was in some cruddy little office building, in a cube farm, it would definitely affect my opinion.” The bucolic surroundings and well-maintained landscape and buildings, several stated, simply make coming to work feel better. Stacey explained:

I love looking at the flowers when I drive in and I know that a lot of time and effort are put in to just the landscaping. So it makes me feel like, “Oh, I love driving in to DanTech.” And I love how it feels and I love all the extra things that other companies don’t have.

Of course, Stacey was just one among many who commented on the details of DanTech’s landscaping. In fact, she was one among many to comment on the flowers lining the entrance to campus. Upon first glance, landscaping and flowers may seem insignificant to this analysis. However, I believe such examples show how micro practices that constitute a corporate campus like DanTech’s contribute to governance. Werry’s (2008) work on tourism in New Zealand makes a similar argument. She builds upon the framework of governmentality and analyzes the
constructions of space that rely upon specific notions of natural beauty. While DanTech exists in an entirely different context, the physical landscape and flora have a real impact upon how employees experience the space. As Stacey indicates, the flowers and physical surroundings influence how she feels about DanTech, but also how she feels about coming in to work. She appreciates DanTech’s efforts to create an environment consistent with popular notions of natural beauty, thereby molding her view of the organization. Further, there’s a significant degree of power exercised through an environment that makes it easier for one to come to work. Increased willingness to be in one’s workspace ultimately positions an employee to be in the space for longer, with “better” attitudes, and the capacity to increase productivity.

When describing what it’s like to work at DanTech, employee accounts almost always included commentary on physical space and the niceties of campus amenities. For example, Lance stated, “The place is manicured like a golf course. It’s beautiful.” Ellen similarly commented, “Campus is gorgeous. I mean it absolutely is gorgeous.” Not only is campus visibly appealing for employees, but several interviewees noted that campus altered their perceptions regarding work and DanTech as an organization. Cheryl stated:

I just think that the campus is really pretty and I think that’s a stress reliever for me. It makes me feel good when I come into work and even when I leave work, it makes me feel good. So, I’m a happier person.

Cheryl appreciates the appearance of campus and her description indicates deeper consequences of the space. Cheryl illustrated the affective impact campus has upon her. She clearly describes how campus alleviates stress and alters her mood, making her feel happy.

Similarly, Kevin described campus grounds at length. He considers campus one of the key selling points for DanTech, going so far as to suggest that campus is manicured to impress clients. Yet, he too addresses the affective influence of campus upon employees. Kevin stated:
Having the grounds maintained the way they are at DanTech is more for a customer coming in and seeing, “Well, if they can spend money on this they’re definitely well off. They’re spending money on their technology first and foremost and then they have money on top of that to take care of the grounds.” I think it’s a source of pride for some employees.

In addition to the selling potential of campus, Kevin describes employees’ response to the space. They experience feelings of pride because of the care and thought DanTech puts into the organizational environment. Again, Kevin demonstrates how campus has affective and psychological implications for DanTech employees.

As the above quotes indicate, a working environment greatly impacts worker perception and experience. Further, Deetz and Hegbloom (2007) note that working environments have a multitude of cultural dimensions. Thus, as we see at DanTech, campus and its amenities are woven into the cultural fabric of the organization and its context writ large. This is not divorced from employees; rather, it operates as a vehicle of governance with the capacity of molding and influencing behaviors that are deeply entrenched in relations of power. Thus, employees work long hours, accept substandard industry wages, and stifle critique of the organization because they feel spoiled when they voice discontent. Further, regimes of power have the potential to influence major and minute campus details. Health care services, the Employee Assistance Program, and the like are obvious vehicles to enact governance. However, more subtle details such as flowers lining campus entrances and the art hanging on the walls also have the capacity to shape fields of possibility. As such, an organization's arrangement of physical space and the company amenities carry the ability to operate as vehicles for power, control, and domination. At DanTech, the cafés, gym, health care center, and even the flowers lining the entrance are imbricated in political matrices. The gym, health care center, and cafes condition employee notions of health, thereby shaping their behaviors so they may attain optimum (and managerial)
ideals of health. Yet, the flowers and the golf-course-like grounds also shape subjects because, as Cheryl and Kevin suggested, smaller facets such as these contribute to employee happiness and a sense of pride. As such, vehicles of control can be overt and obvious or covert and subtle. However, both the overt and covert operate to structure employee subject position and identity.

Many employees addressed the ways in which their (working) lives would change in accordance with changes in DanTech’s campus and offerings. When I asked Cheryl about how she would perceive DanTech if the campus and its amenities were eliminated she replied, “It would be a job and this is more of a lifestyle. I consider it a lifestyle rather than a job.” Cheryl’s comment indicates the extent to which work impacts other realms of her life. She views campus and her activities there as more than simply “work,” although she certainly wouldn’t suggest that her campus activities constituted her entire “life.” She seems to compromise between these two notions by settling on “lifestyle.” I believe this quote indicates how important work is in shaping how we understand ourselves, and how we are positioned. Many authors (Bauman, 2000; Casey, 1995; Collinson, 2003; du Gay, 2007) recognize the extreme degree to which people can identify with and become largely defined by their work. As Cheryl indicates, working at DanTech enables employees to reconceptualize the “work/life balance” to the extent that this becomes an integration of the two. In fact, Hoffman and Cowan (2008) problematize organizational treatments of “work/life balance.” They state, “…framing the ideal relationship between paid work and the rest of life as ‘balance’ obviously privileges paid work, and maintains organizational control of work/life expectations” (2008, p. 235). Thus, notions of work/life balance are organizationally defined knowledges that employees willingly adopt, furthering assemblages of governmentality.
At DanTech, the materiality of campus works with service offerings to create an impression of distinction and difference for both the organization and employees. Massey et al. (1992) propose that establishing spatial alterity is important in defining a place as “different.” Halford and Leonard (2006) similarly state, “Organizational spaces are often themselves appropriated in the process of change, as architecture and decor are used to communicate messages about status or service” (p. 661). Here, Halford and Leonard (2006) refer to changes in subject formation and the capacity of organizational spaces to contribute to such processes. Yet, campus amenities are also important in establishing DanTech's alterity. Ultimately, without the exterior of campus and the array of employee amenities, DanTech loses an edge in their construction of difference as an organization. DanTech would not only lose much of its appeal for employees, but much would change about how employees understand work and life. Janelle, when asked how her opinions would change without all the organizational “extras,” stated:

Just taking out one of those things [campus and/or amenities] would not be a break or make deal. But I think if you took them all away, it wouldn’t seem like a special place to work and it would probably lose some of its appeal. It would just feel like you were like everybody else and right now I feel special. If you take away all those things then it wouldn’t be DanTech. You might as well call it something else.

As Janelle recognized, DanTech intentionally others itself through campus and amenities, thereby creating a sense of uniqueness and exclusivity. Right now, Janelle feels special in a way that she would not in the absence of campus and amenities. In this way, work becomes as much about identification and subject formation as it is developing a product (Collinson, 2003; du Gay, 2007) since it is in this organizational space that processes of production, both of product and of person, largely occur. The relationship between subject formation and economies is significant for Werry’s (2008) definition of governmentality as “…an operation of regulation that aimed to transform individual habitus and dispositions, and through them, social and economic life itself” (p. 395). Thus, regulating the behaviors and habits of others has economic and organizational
implications. Along these lines, Halford and Leonard (2006) recommend conceptualizing organizations and organizational power as multimodal. They state, “[This] encourages a move away from fixed representations of subjectivity and response in relation to discourses of change to appreciate the ways in which these may be renegotiated through the dynamic relationship between identity, time and space” (p. 661). In accordance with Halford and Leonard, and as Janelle indicates, subject formation of employees exists in relation to the temporality and spatiality of the organization. What’s more, subject positions are fluid and changing in relation to the organizational context which surrounds employees, and perhaps more importantly, are closely aligned with processes of production.

Throughout our conversation, Stacey articulated the importance of organizational surroundings and service offerings at DanTech. She indicated that working at DanTech would simply not be the same without the specific organizational amenities. She stated:

If you took away everything and just looked at, “what do I do for my job,” it wouldn’t be as much fun if that was the only thing. If you took away all of the special services, my office, put me in a cubicle, I couldn’t get free coffee if I wanted it … then it would just be another job. And I probably wouldn’t be as loyal and I probably wouldn’t go that extra mile like I do now because it wouldn’t be as valuable. It would be just money but it wouldn’t be anything more than that. It would lose value and importance. But of course I would still do what I needed to do to make money. But I don’t know if I would necessarily, I don’t know if I would stay somewhere 17 years without all the extra amenities because it really does make a difference.

This quote is interesting for several reasons. Her emphasis on value and importance is significant when we consider the social and cultural inscription of worth onto practices of work. This is what Heelas (2002) refers to as “work ethics,” or what Kuhn et al. (2008) describe as “meaningful work,” referring to the social processes through which we place value on forms of work. Not only does work contribute to processes of subject formation, as Stacey suggested, but the environment in which one works is also consequential. If DanTech were not what it is, her
job, her work, and even herself would not be the same. Additionally, campus and employee amenities are similarly inscribed with value and importance. DanTech is rewarded for providing a pleasing environment, both aesthetically and through service offerings, by being listed as one of *Fortune’s* Best Places to Work, indicating that organizations with elaborate campuses and service offerings are often celebrated for this of treatment of, and provisions for, employees. Taking Heelas’ (2002) assertions regarding work ethics and framing work as a valuable pursuit in and of itself, both the work and the workplace of DanTech are similarly inscribed with value.

Alterting the organizational context would reconfigure the value of the work and the organization itself for Stacey. As Massey et al. (1992) clearly note, space creates dimensions of alterity. The sense of difference, both physical and socio-cultural, is vital to DanTech and its campus. It helps people feel a part of something unique and different, especially in terms of contemporary corporate America. This has much to do with DanTech’s campus and employee service offerings.

**The Tradeoffs**

While benefits of campus and employee amenities are numerous, employees also recognize that these come at a cost or, at the least, a compromise. As Anna articulated, “Sometimes I think it’s also true that we’re being bought off a little bit with this lavish exterior.” When asked about these compromises, employees addressed DanTech’s practice of paying substandard industry salaries, performing jobs they don’t necessarily like, taking advantage of campus and services, and tolerating discontent. Thus, while employees may be unhappy in certain ways, they remain at DanTech.
One of the ways campus molds employees’ reactions to their jobs and DanTech is by providing workers with such a desirable working environment that they make concessions to remain employed on campus. To use Anna’s phrase, one of the ways in which employees are “bought off” is in the exchange for below industry average salaries. In fact, as DanTech’s employees indicated, salary is their primary source of discontent. As Mike indicated, salary would become much more of an issue in the absence of campus amenities and benefits. He stated, “What I’ve heard from a lot of people and what I’ve experienced myself, you might be making 10% less here than you would be somewhere else but everything else makes up for it.” Employees then become involved in a balancing act in which they perform a cost/benefit analysis of sorts. When asked about lower salaries, Kevin stated:

That’s definitely true [that DanTech has lower salaries] but I think their benefits more than make up for it. When I was trying to weigh out leaving DanTech, and when I did finally leave DanTech, and this is just my pros and cons estimation, even though I was taking close to a $25,000 increase in salary, it ended up being a wash because of what I had to pay out of pocket for my own benefits, own gym, own doctor and things like that… It ended up being a wash. So it’s very difficult to leave from that aspect because even though the salary is lower, the amenities are much higher.

While campus and amenities provide incredible benefits to employees, it is also possible that employees find it difficult to leave, even when they want to. As Miller and Rose (2008) discuss subject formation as “the making of people,” the above quotes indicate that the working environment at DanTech also has a significant role in “making a working environment.” This constructed environment, in turn, has direct implications for making workers. Thus, campus and amenities contribute to how workers understand themselves, their lives, and their work. Sometimes, amenities and benefits provided within the campus can emerge as overwhelming positive facets of one’s job and/or working life. However, positive facets trump other less desirable facets such as lower salaries, ultimately undermining the best interest of employees.
Another example of potential employee sacrifice is found within DanTech employee reactions to campus childcare services. Subsidized daycare emerged as one of the premier amenities that saved employees time, money, and some of the anxieties of parenthood. By most estimates, DanTech’s childcare saves employees around $1,000 per month, per child. There are many positive aspects of this type of subsidized child care. Tara, who has been with DanTech for eight years, stated:

Daycare in general is one of the best benefits for me. As a working mother, I want to feel like my kids are well taken care of and that I can see them and get progress reports throughout the day if I need to. Or just go over and see them. I have a weekly standing lunch date with my four year old. I go to her pre-school, pick her up, walk to the cafeteria, sit with her and have lunch with her and take her back in time for a nap. And it’s just such a highlight of my week to be able to connect with her in the middle of my day like that. And it makes me feel like I’m not sacrificing time with my family to have a job, if that makes sense. I feel like I’m balancing it really well at this company. It makes me feel like I can be a full-time employee and be a mom at the same time. And be a wife at the same time. And those are things, I think especially for women, I think we struggle with because if you work a 60 hour a week job and you have to tote your kids to daycare half an hour away from your home, you spend a lot of time going places and at work and you don’t have a lot of quality time.

How hard would it be for Tara to walk away from DanTech? Judging from this quote, it would be extremely difficult. Subsidized campus childcare mitigates the guilt involved with being a working-mother while allowing Tara to fulfill popular prescriptions of motherhood. Additionally, Tara enjoys the comfort and ease of having her daughter nearby, within walking distance, for a couple of hundred dollars per month. This type of arrangement is incredibly difficult to find elsewhere. The reciprocal nature of amenities like childcare is well understood by employees. They recognize the benefit they garner as well as how they bind an employee to DanTech. As Sandra bluntly noted, “If you do get a child in daycare, you’d be an idiot to leave.” Thus, while subsidized childcare services ease many aspects of workers lives, it is possible that access to this and other campus services can damper one’s desire or likelihood to leave the
organization even if one is unhappy with her/his job. In the preceding quote from Tara, she
describes how campus child care enables her to simultaneously fulfill two dominant subject
positions; that of mother and that of productive worker. Her desire to fulfill these roles speaks to
her wish to be articulated into these positions. The campus and its amenities allows her to meet
these expectations while also connecting her ever-closer to the organization in the process.

One worker, Kevin, who did in fact leave DanTech, struggled with his decision to leave
the company. He ultimately left because he felt stagnant in his position. He felt as if the
organization offered much in terms of amenities and benefits, but little in terms of career
advancement and challenge. However, leaving DanTech was not an easy decision for Kevin. He
described becoming increasingly cynical during his time at DanTech. He stated, “It was when I
was looking at other jobs outside of DanTech that I started questioning, ‘It’d be kind of hard to
leave some of these things behind.’” Many of his reasons revolved around finances and
convenience of campus amenities. He elaborated, “The benefits and amenities draw in
employees and keep them happy but [then you] start thinking about if it keeps you too connected
with the campus.” (emphasis in original quote) Deetz (1998) examines a similar phenomenon
and notes how organizations contribute to employee tendencies toward self-subordination. Deetz
offers a case study of highly-educated technical workers and their relationship with and to their
organization. He describes employees and the compromises they make, “They seem to have
struck a Faustian bargain with the company to accept conditions of subordination for the sake of
pay-offs in term of identity, financial standing, and job security” (1998, p. 169). DanTech’s
campus can easily influence employees’ self-subordination and governance. Employees enjoy
the cultural capital associated with DanTech’s stellar reputation and the ease of campus-life, yet
their acceptance of such a form implicates other realms of their lives within capitalist production
and, in many cases, works against their own best interest. Thus, DanTech employees earn a lower salary than those in comparable positions, many of them have their health records maintained by the organization, and much of the traditional “nonwork” areas of life now exist within the bounds of the organization.

A clear pitfall to DanTech’s campus and amenities, or further, to the concept of corporate campuses in general, is that people may perform jobs they do not enjoy for managers they do not like. However, when one’s “life” is so closely integrated with his/her workplace and space, it becomes increasingly difficult to extract oneself from a less than ideal working situation. Ross (2003) notes as much in his analyses of two New York new media companies where employees were so identified with the organization and their work that they kept incredibly long hours and demonstrated an eager willingness to work. Ellen recognized this phenomenon when she stated, “[Campus] certainly helps retain and acquire talented people. Even at times when you’re not necessarily happy with your job, you’re so happy with everything else.”

In this sense, working at DanTech is seen by some employees as an exchange. DanTech’s campus and employee amenities are designed to reduce turnover and retain employees. This is effective, maybe even too effective. Again, Jackie referenced the potential “cost” of the environment when she said, “The price to pay I think is staying somewhere longer than you want to or putting up with things that you wouldn’t normally put up with because you’ve got such a sweet deal.” She goes on to describe a friend of hers who becomes “numb” at work. The friend does not like working at DanTech but “blocks it out” because her kids are enrolled in the campus daycare. The sweet deal of subsidized daycare isn’t free. For this particular employee, the cost is unhappiness in her working life. Jackie continued, “I think there are a lot of people who are not living the life that they really want to live. We always compromise but there’s a limit. I
think some people don’t have a limit. There’s a huge cost.” What Jackie describes here is the basis of Marx’s critique of capitalist labor exchange (1992, 1993). The DanTech employee sells her labor for a means of subsistence and is alienated in and through the “numbing” process. However, because of the ways in which life is economized, the DanTech employee participates in the exchange even though she is dissatisfied.

Here, an important contradiction emerges. One of the ways in which governmentality operates is through the constitution of “free” subjects. As Foucault (2007) notes:

This explains, finally, the insertion of freedom within governmentality, not only as the right of individuals legitimately opposed to the power, usurpations, and abuses of the sovereign or the government, but as an element that has become indispensible to governmentality itself. (p. 353)

The DanTech employees I interviewed were quick to describe the “freedom,” flexibility, and mobility campus provides. However, as the preceding quotes indicate, employees are often bound to DanTech in problematic ways. Theoretically, they are “free” to participate in the organization as they see fit. However, DanTech and its campus certainly help shape the fields of possibility for employees. Thus, even if one is unhappy, underpaid, or dissatisfied in any way, employees operate under the assumption that they are free agents, capable of changing their circumstance. However, as the above examples indicate, employees are far less free than they often realize. They are free to leave the organization at any point, but they have economic realities they must face that tie them to DanTech. They are free to use the fitness center or not, but they cannot filter managerial messages regarding health which, in turn, influence employee notions of health. They are free to balance their work and their lives, but they cannot undo their interpenetration upon campus grounds. What’s more, critical scholars recognize the governing characteristics of seemingly more flexible, humane, and democratic work environments. For
example, Kuhn et al. (2008) note how discursive formations defining “meaningful work” ironically mask organizational disciplinary power. Similarly, Donzelot (1991) states:

Flexible hours, job enrichment, self-managed work-teams, continued retraining (formation permanente): none of these innovations can be regarded as serious attempts to modify the capitalist regime. And in fact their ambition is not to transform the organization of production, but to change the relation of individuals to their productive work. (p. 251)

Here, Donzelot addresses the disciplinary measures that certain organizational forms produce. While small-group work and flexibility may be touted as significant organizational changes, ultimately, they operate to further reinscribe capitalist tendencies. At DanTech, the entire campus is targeted toward this end. Employees are being positioned as productive subjects at work by enabling them to be productive subjects in the other realms of their lives which are increasingly integrated into campus space. Examples include on-campus family and health maintenance, educational seminars, and financial planning advice. Thus, all realms of life are targeted toward productive ends.

Another key consequence of the campus and amenities offered to employees is that criticism is shut down or muted. Many employees feel as if complaining or critiquing the organization is in poor form. Repeatedly, interviewees described feeling spoiled by their working environment. Many echoed the sentiment of “We’re spoiled here...” or “It’s easy to become spoiled with everything we have.” For example, Lance stated, “You just kind of have to put it back in perspective and say, you know, it’s amazing that DanTech offers this, to find complaint or fault in it is amazing.” Lance further described how his wife kept him in check in regards to his criticisms. “It’s real hard to come home and complain about your day at work,” he said, sort of chuckling. “Oh, that was terrible. I walked to the gym today at lunch and played an hour of tennis, picked up a sandwich pre-made for me on the way home, or the way back to the
office,” he stated sarcastically, full-out laughing at this point. Creating an environment where employees demonstrate an unwillingness to express discontent can be an effective way to silence discourse regarding organizational conflict. Deetz (2003b) identifies such processes as discursive closure. He recognizes that managerial forces among organizational forms enjoy the luxury of shaping discursive realities of the organization. For example, management is largely responsible for developing the vocabulary of what the organization “is.” In this way, management operates to constrain how employees conceptualize and discuss the organization. Deetz (2003b) states:

Organizational life could be an explicit site of political struggle as different groups openly develop and try to realize their own interests but the conflicts there are often routinized, evoke standard mechanisms for resolution, and reproduce presumed natural tensions (e.g., between workers and management). The essential politics thus becomes invisible. (p. 26)

As Deetz suggests, potential political struggle is mitigated by limiting and obscuring communicative conflict. DanTech employees note that it’s hard to complain about certain facets of their jobs and the organization because they are ultimately given so much by the organization. In a sense, the company, via its campus, services, and amenities, trivializes and mutes potential grievances. To further the discussion on employee agency, one would assume that DanTech employees would be free to express discontent, voice issues of conflict, and make suggestions for organizational change. However, employees are uncomfortable doing any of these. Thus, DanTech employees privilege their freedoms in terms of campus flexibility and benefits, yet seemingly overlook their freedom to engage in democratic forms of organizing.

In a similar vein, Anna described at length how employees had to carefully frame problems or requests for additional services. Her most vivid example was one from about 10 or so years ago when a group of employees approached upper-level management with a proposal
for domestic partner benefits. She explained, “There is a corporate culture where you really have to be careful about how you complain and who you complain to. If you’re really trying to get something done you have to really kind of be politically astute.” She continued and stated that you did not want to come across as criticizing DanTech’s generosity and feeling as if DanTech is good to you, “don’t ask for any more.” However, as in the case of domestic partnership, problems and issues arise through some form of conflict that needs debate and consideration. She illustrated this tension:

With DanTech’s reputation, there’s kind of the pressure to always be happy and grateful. But it’s a normal workplace and there are certainly conflicts and not everything is perfect all the time. There’s unfairness, or things might be inefficient. It’s pretty good but it’s not like there’s nothing bad about it. There’s sort of this pressure, like you should be happy and grateful because you work at DanTech. You get a little cynical about that I guess.

On the whole, DanTech employees expressed a willingness to tolerate substandard industry salaries and limited opportunities for advancement. Many of them recognized the risk of becoming overly dependent on campus benefits and services. Further, because of campus and service offerings, many employees felt that they could not wage criticisms or address areas of conflict. Each of these facets can be viewed as part of the assemblages of governmentality that operate upon employees to shape the material conditions of their lives as well as their perceptions of DanTech and the jobs they perform there.

Additional Measures of Control

DanTech’s campus impacts employee perceptions of their jobs and of the organization. This is possible due, at least in part, to the ways the organization localizes employees on campus. Similar to company towns, DanTech’s campus is designed to keep employees around albeit the ways in which they intend to keep employees around are a bit different. Company towns, as the
saying goes, largely took a “cradle to grave” approach. They wanted workers and their families living, quite literally, in the place where they worked. DanTech knows that people do not live on campus, nor does DanTech want them to. However, DanTech creates their campus environment to minimize movement off campus during employee workdays. This keeps employees in close proximity, physically and mentally, to their work. What’s more, as Cowan and Hoffman (2007) note, employees desire this proximity and a working environment that enables what I refer to as “contained flexibility.” In their article on work/life borders in contemporary and flexible organizations, Cowan and Hoffman (2007) note that “…contemporary employees desire four distinct but interdependent types of flexibility: time, space, evaluation, and compensation” (p. 37). While this study does not address evaluative flexibility, we certainly see DanTech employees’ desires for flexibility in time, space, and compensation even if they have significant hegemonic implications. This is interesting because DanTech’s campus and amenities simultaneously enable flexibility while also disciplining and monitoring mobility. On the whole, DanTech employees appear to both desire and appreciate contained flexibility. For example, they like having their children close, even if that means their employer is responsible for the raising of those children. Or, employees like having cafés stocked with good food, even if that means the placard indicating fat and caloric content dissuades them from ordering a plate of french fries. The disciplinary and governing trade-offs emerge as “worth it” to employees. Perhaps the trade-offs are so readily accepted because campus does project an air of freedom upon which processes of governmentality rely (Bennett et al., 2007; Foucault, 1982; Rose et al., 2006). Employee flexibility, especially in regards to time and space, can be read as examples of employee freedom. While employees may feel free, in terms of mobility and otherwise, they are
operating within a precisely calculated environment. Thus, the air of freedom is a crucial
cOMPONENT TO EMPLOYEE (SELF)-GOVERNANCE.

Additionally, DanTech tries to create an environment, spatially and culturally, that retains
employees for long durations. This is of particular importance for companies and workers in the
technology arena where it takes several years for one to catch his/her stride, so to speak. Ted
acknowledged as much, “You don’t reach your peak of productivity, typically, for years. And
how sad it would be if somebody got to their peak of productivity and decided it wasn’t the best
place in the whole world to work?” DanTech is remarkably effective in both of these efforts.
Interviewed employees rarely leave campus during their workday. Additionally, as Appendix A
indicates, DanTech employees work for the organization for many years. In fact, DanTech is
Proud of their employee retention, touting a mere 3-5% yearly turnover rate.

Again, the decisions on behalf of DanTech’s founder were intentional. He wanted to
create an environment that maximized productivity. He determined that making employees
happy and easing the anxieties of their everyday lives were some of the easiest ways to
accomplish this goal. Ted noted:

That was his plan from the beginning. He wanted to emulate a campus collegial
environment. He felt, intuitively, I think, that that type [of environment] would enhance
the creativity and he would get higher productivity. So there was a business nexus in all
that. It wasn’t like he wanted to build a park so people could wander around and look at
the flora and fauna. He wanted to build it so people would be comfortable, so people
would be quote “happy,” so people would have their creative juices tweaked. Because he
knew if that happened, he would get greater productivity. He also felt if employees were
comfortable and “happy,” again, “happy” in quotation marks, they’re not going to leave.

As the above quote indicates, DanTech’s campus and employee service offerings came
about through a series of reasoned, logical business decisions. The founder was not building a
park and he was not offering cheap childcare and healthcare for the sake of generosity. Rather,
he was creating an environment that made it easy for people to do their work. If you’re not worried about your kids, it’s easier to work. If you have a doctor’s appointment on campus that takes 30 minutes (opposed to the three hours it would take if it were off campus), it’s easier to work. If you don’t have to worry about lunch, it’s easier to work. DanTech not only makes it easy to do your work, the campus and its amenities make it almost impossible not to.

Discussions of work/life balance circulate around campus and service amenities. However, the concept of work/life balance is problematic in itself. Hoffman and Cowan (2008) describe organizational discourse regarding work/life balance in their study examining 96 of Fortune’s Best Places to Work list of 2008. Their primary assertion is that organizational messages regarding work/life increase the degree of influence the organization has on one’s “non-work” life. This seems to be true for many DanTech employees in many areas of their lives. Hoffman and Cowan (2008) spend a significant amount of time describing how organizations “…obscure their own interests by presenting them as in the best interest of workers, when in fact they may serve primarily organizational ends” (p. 235). They continue along this line of thought and state, “…by framing balance as in the best interest of employees, organizations hide their own interests in gaining maximum effort from employees” (2008, p. 235). Ultimately, DanTech’s campus provides a setting in which employees perform this balancing act. Employees govern themselves by working and participating in organizational life, but the benefits to the organizational, while significant, are often obscured. This is interesting because, while DanTech frames balance as important for employee well-being, they are upfront and transparent in describing their efforts as business decisions. This departs from Hoffman and Cowan’s argument since the organization suggests that employee well-being is secondary to DanTech’s efforts to make sound business decisions.
Further, Ted’s emphasis on happy employees reflects the language and assumptions of Human Resource Management (HRM) which focuses on the psychological aspects of the worker. Townley (1998) describes the Human Relations movement which was a clear forerunner of HRM. She discusses the move away from Taylorism and states:

Human Relations represents a radical departure because of the way it constructs the individual, changing from a mechanical model of the employee, to a socio-emotional one, a shift from the body, ‘hands,’ to the intervening variable of ‘attitudes’ between working conditions and work activity. (1998, p. 195)

Thus, managerial interests recognized that where employees work and what they are doing contribute to their affective perspectives. As Ted notes, DanTech’s founder was acutely aware of this idea and created a company founded upon it. Similarly, Miller and Rose (2008) address the Human Relations movement and the creation of employees as “psycho-physiological entities” (p. 176). Human Relations and contemporary HRM formations recognize the worker as a delicate and responsive psychological being capable of affective and bodily shaping. Deetz (2003b) similarly states, “Modern human resource management is clearly in the culture and meaning business, its focus is on the production of a specific kind of human being with specific self-conceptions and feelings” (p. 24). In other words, managerial discourse crafts particular forms of human beings targeted toward specific behaviors and thoughts. Employing the language of governmentality, populations are constructed and individuals insert themselves into those populations, exercising various forms of control and discipline. At DanTech, we see constructions of healthy workers, productive citizens, and well-adjusted subjects and employees clearly put much effort into becoming these populations. Again, thinking of DanTech, we must question what role campus and amenities play in this production of subjects.
DanTech’s economic and “business nexus” justifications for campus and employee amenities influences conceptualizations of “work,” “play,” their relationships, and so forth. Hoffman and Cowan (2008) recognize this when they argue, “…the idea that work/life programs exist for the economic benefit of the organization allows organizations to maintain symbolic and material control over the meaning and practice of the relationship between paid work and the rest of life” (p. 239). I would argue that this is even more prevalent in corporate campuses since the environment intentionally tries to blur these boundaries. In fact, what is potentially most problematic about DanTech and similar corporate campuses is the intentional integration of work and life as a means to capitalize upon what is traditionally viewed as the “private.” Having the power to define work, life, and how they do or should interact is an incredible component of cultural capital. When an organization has this power, it seems obvious that they would define and position such facets of life in ways that primarily benefit the organization.

**Benevolence or Profit: Does it Matter?**

The DanTech employees I interviewed are fully aware that the campus and its amenities aren’t charity. They know that money is the underlying motivation of DanTech’s decision-making. As Jordan stated, “It’s not just because he likes us. Everything has its purpose.” They understand that the purpose is streamlining the organization, campus, and even employee lives so they may be productive, efficient and, as Ted suggested, “happy.” Overall, the rationale for DanTech’s decisions were not important to employees. Essentially all interviewed employees stated that they felt campus and employee services were provided to meet financial objectives and to meet quality of life objectives. Without question, DanTech does meet these objectives. Ted addressed the relationship between the two dimensions:
We weren’t just setting up a healthcare center so people would say we were wonderful or Saint Francis of Assisi. That was not it. There was a business nexus. Does it denigrate the value or the social consciousness aspect of it? In some people’s eyes, yes. But why should it? It’s still there; it’s still valuable [for employees].

Ted posed a very interesting question: Does a business justification for DanTech’s campus denigrate the value for employees? Perhaps not, but campus amenities and services are clearly means of governance and control. However, as my interviews indicate, campus and employee amenities are deemed very valuable to employees. I asked each of them the simple question, “Does (or did) DanTech’s campus and the services available to you make your life better?” Everyone answered with a resounding “yes.” In fact, I often felt foolish asking this question because of the strange looks I received from participants. Many of them answered yes, but looked at me with quizzical expressions. It was as though this was a foregone conclusion. How could it not make your life better? For some, it seemed, this was well beyond the realm of possibility. Glen even went so far as to state, “If other companies were run the way we are, the world, our country would be a better place. I really think that… I’ve really enjoyed my time here.” As Glen suggested, beyond making individual employee’s lives better, DanTech offers a model of what life, work, and business should (and could) be. Absent from Glen’s comment is a critical reflection upon the potential problems and downfalls of campus. In general, employees seem either unaware or uncritical of the control and discipline DanTech’s campus exercises. I believe this is the case for several reasons. First, employees primarily see campus as a means to save themselves time and money. Further, employees do not question the power differentials in regards to how employees benefit and how DanTech benefits. Secondly, employees overwhelmingly embrace social discourse that values the enterprising subject who is productive at every turn. As Ouelette and Hay (2008) describe, “The capacity to make enterprising lifestyle choices in matters of health, security, consumption, family and household takes on more urgency
in a political climate where individuals are expected to maximize their interests as a condition of self-rule” (p. 476). Thus, campus makes it easy for employees to fulfill prescriptions of productive citizens in all realms of their lives. Third, even if employees did recognize some degree of governance and their own self-discipline, I fear that they would simply dismiss the critiques, accepting certain measures of governance as taken-for-granted realities of organizational life. Again, employee admiration and appreciation of the organization was common throughout the interviews. Critically oriented readers will likely recognize immediately the potential for this admiration and appreciation to create highly-motivated and overly-enthusiastic working subjects. However, as Gill and Pratt (2008) note, “…the new moment of capitalism that engenders precariousness is seen as not only oppressive but also as offering the potential for new subjectivities, new socialities and new kinds of politics” (p. 3). While elements of DanTech’s campus and benefits may be incredibly problematic, employees defend the idea that what the organization provides is valuable and beneficial to their lives. This is important and should not be ignored. Campus and amenities certainly position employees—disciplining health, promoting one particular form of family, and limiting mobility for example. However, employees find ways to use what DanTech offers to their own benefit. In this sense, they can be the primary beneficiaries, not necessarily the organization. With so much emphasis on democratic and humane workplaces (Deetz, 1992; Ross, 2003), academics should take seriously claims of employees who are at least satisfied, if not idealistically fulfilled, in their jobs and work. While we may have an important discussion regarding the theoretical and material consequences of integrating “life,” “the commons,” or “the private” into spaces of production, we should also pay attention to how people use campus and their own reflections on that use.
However, one gets the sense that employees respond to the seeming goodwill of the organization through cultivating a distinct loyalty and almost thankfulness. When asked about his impressions regarding why DanTech provides what they do, Rick stated:

My belief in upper management is that they’re trying to do things the right way. Whether it’s for business reasons or they’re good people who want to do the right thing just to do the right thing. But it makes me love working for DanTech. It makes me not consider looking around or going anywhere else. It makes me think this is the place I’m going to stay until I retire. So that definitely is 90% of the reason why I’m working at DanTech is because of all those “great place to work” kind of things.

As Rick indicates, he doesn’t really care why DanTech provides campus services. Regardless of why, he expressed how the provisions of campus services impact his view of the organization as well as his plans to stay at DanTech until he retires. It seems, in many cases, both the employee and the organization benefit in such an arrangement although they do not benefit in the same way. Many other interviewed employees expressed similar notions. I asked Lance how campus and service offerings impacted his view of DanTech and he responded:

I think it is real positive. If they’re doing all this stuff for me then they must care. Not just that I’m here every day, but they care about my well-being, that I’m a happy employee outside of work… They’ve helped provide information so I can be happy outside of work so when I’m here, I can do my best work. If they’re going to put that much effort into me having a comfortable place to work, then I should put that much more effort in to doing the best work I can.

While services and amenities may suggest that leaders of DanTech do care about the well-being of their employees, this is not necessarily the case. They certainly may care, but they may also recognize the financial benefit of integrating “life” into the campus workspace. Campus keeps people close, happy, and content enough to remain with the company for many years. In this sense, DanTech and campus work to govern employee actions, thoughts, emotions, and behaviors.
Many employees articulated the tendency to “respond in kind.” That is, since the employer gives to you and provides you with a working atmosphere that is far “better” than most, you both owe it to the organization and are motivated to perform your best work. Jason noted:

At this company, I see a lot of people, myself included, really believing in what you’re doing, really believing it’s important, really going the extra mile. And that’s why it is good business not to treat your employees like crap… A lot of the times, I’ll be walking the dogs and I’ll be thinking about my next project, or “I’m going to test this” and all that because I know I’m going to be here down the road and that’s a big motivating factor to want to do a good job. And that was sort of the president’s philosophy. If you treat them well, they’re going to respond in kind.

I asked interviewed employees what they thought of critiques of corporate campuses. The primary critiques I discussed with them were the potential of becoming overly reliant on campus and services and that DanTech, through campus and amenities, could create overly enthusiastic and uncritical employees. Many employees felt as if these critiques were both far from their own experiences and not at all accurate. Employees expressed that they make a choice to be a part of the organization. The campus and amenities may influence that choice, but ultimately, no one forces people to be a part of the organization. Further, if one chooses to be a part of DanTech, they are not forced to participate in campus activities, healthcare, childcare, educational seminars, and so forth. Yet, governmentality does not require forceful intervention because subjects engage in these behaviors willingly. As Foucault (1991) states, “…with government it is a question not of imposing law on men, but of disposing things…” (p. 95). Many employees appeared surprised at the notion that these types of critiques existed and almost insulted at the insinuation that they were being covertly manipulated. Mike stated, “There are people who will pick holes in anything that looks good. I think the idea of saying, ‘Well, you’re just controlling me by making this such a wonderful place that I don’t want to leave’ is
absolutely absurd.” This sort of defensive stance was typical of employee responses. Many interviewees suggested that people who make such assertions were merely jealous. The critics were probably people who tried to get a job at DanTech but couldn’t. Mike continued, “The idea that you could be in that frame of mind in a good situation, that you are being trapped by a good situation just strikes me as absurd.” Another common reaction amongst employees was that DanTech’s campus and services simply work to meet the needs and demands of employees and their lives. For example, DanTech did not create what Hochschild (1997) labels the “time-bind,” or, the overwhelming sense many Americans feel that they do not have adequate time to tend to various facets of their lives. The context DanTech provides essentially enables employees to manage these functions of the day-to-day. DanTech realizes that employees struggle with issues of time both professionally and personally so they provide, as best they can, an atmosphere to mitigate some of those struggles. Again, no one is forced to be there. As Stacey indicated, “I could just decide, ‘No, I don’t want to work at DanTech because it’s not what it used to be.’ That’s very possible. But until that happens, the Kool-Aid tastes good. I don’t mind the Kool-Aid.” Stacey, snickering a bit at the end of this statement, reinforced the idea that people are at DanTech willingly. Using the metaphor of the “grape Kool-Aid,” she suggested that this kind of gentle persuasion might not be a bad thing. In fact, it might be a good thing. To elaborate on Stacey’s metaphor, what falls out of her analysis is the result of drinking the “grape Kool-aid.” Its consumption is harmful. If campus is like a poisonous drink, then its negative consequences should not strike employees, or anyone, as so surprising.

I heard many accounts from DanTech employees about the dynamics of the organization, campus and amenities, and the type of environment experienced on the day to day. Obviously a complex set of interrelationships, DanTech provides a unique working environment that
simultaneously benefits employees and the organization, but also disciplines employees in particular ways. Katherine, who worked at DanTech for almost 26 years eloquently outlined these associations:

It’s very much a sense of a community. It’s not just a place you go to work. People create incredible loyalties. It’s the kind of place very few people leave. There’s a positive side to that and a downside to that. The positive side is people create loyalty. They stick around and there’s this incredible reservoir of corporate knowledge in all these people and it stays there, and people know something about what happened five years ago because they were there and involved in it. And that keeps people from having to redo work. It’s an incredible advantage to a corporation to have that knowledge stick around. The downside is, people felt like they were there under golden handcuffs and didn’t want to leave the company even if their individual situation with a particular manager or a particular job was not good. People would stick around and not leave when probably it would have been better if they did leave.

The benefits to DanTech are clear. If employees feel taken care of, if the annoying and anxiety-inducing facets of one’s life are easily dealt with, they will be more productive and will stay at the company for a long time. High retention eliminates the need to recruit, replace, and retrain employees, thus saving the organization money. Employees also cultivate loyalties to the organization because they feel cared for and appreciated. They often have the same co-workers for many years with which they cultivate personal and professional ties, and hence, loyalties and senses of community. However, while no one forces an employee to stay, they are disciplined in the Foucauldian sense in that various technologies define and/or restrict their mobility. It is hard to walk away from a job at an organization that has a good reputation, an organization that is persistently ranked among the nation’s best places to work. I can only imagine the feeling of distress one must go through if s/he hates working at DanTech. It must be an overwhelming sensation of, what now? If I can’t work here, or, if I don’t like it here, can I be happy anywhere? Certainly the campus and amenities offered to employees are significant to this process of disciplining. Your eating habits, exercise routines, family relationships, childcare, and so on are
in part corporatized (Deetz, 1992). However, employees state that they garner benefits from this type of working situation. What is disconcerting is the potential (lack of) willingness to critique the organization and the implications of the campus and services upon employees’ lives. Simply because they save you time and money or make you “healthier,” is that reason enough to dismiss your employer’s influence on aspects of your life that for a long time have been perceived as “personal?” For some, perhaps.

Summary

In this section, I addressed my second research question and analyzed the impact of DanTech's campus and amenities upon employee perceptions of DanTech and the jobs they perform there. I examined how campus and its amenities intersect with discourses of technology since that is the industry in which DanTech is situated. I examined an array of potential control mechanisms present throughout campus and organizational structures. Lastly, I addressed how campus, amenities, and industry intersect to enable employees’ self government.

Research Question Three

Introduction

About a year into my job at a marketing communications organization, something odd happened to me. It was the evening and I was at home. I picked up the phone to call someone. However, I did not directly dial the number. I took an extra step. I dialed nine.

Ten years later, I can look back on this instance with a critical eye. I know I felt strange when it happened but there was no way I could articulate why. Now, I understand that what I confronted when I dialed nine to get an outside line (in the comfort of my own home), was the
blurring of the boundaries between organizational and non-organizational life. Embodied and psychological, the sensation was awkward yet telling. What counts as work? What counts as life?

The third area of my research examines intersections between “work” and “life.” I ask, how, if at all, does the corporate campus blur the traditional boundaries between work and life? What does this suggest about traditional notions of community? And, how does this enable us to reconceptualize community?

I examine how DanTech’s campus intentionally facilitates blurring boundaries between work and life. Additionally, I analyze how employees apply business principles to their everyday lives. Lastly, I address the functions of community on campus. I address how these integrations influences employee subject positions and contribute to processes of governmentality.

**Borders and Boundaries**

As Hoffman and Cowan (2007) note, much of the literature regarding work/life balance focuses on the borders surrounding them. They explore Clark’s (2000) notion of border-crossers, which positions employees as negotiators of work and life domains in an effort to create a manageable sense of balance. Using Clark’s definition of borders, Hoffman and Cowan suggest that, “Borders can be physical, temporal, and/or psychological. Two important components that serve to determine a border’s strength are flexibility and permeability” (2007, p. 38). Thus, Hoffman and Cowan identify three types of borders in terms of time, space, and modes of thought. Additionally, effective borders are fluid. On a basic level, we can see several elements of flexibility in terms of DanTech’s physical, spatial, and psychological borders and how employees experience them. In the case of DanTech, campus is the most obvious marker of a
physical boundary. DanTech is spatially demarcated by staffed gates which monitor who enters and exits campus. Moreover, the design of the space, including trees, bushes, and winding roads prohibit onlookers from peering too far down the campus drive. Thus, what constitutes “campus” and “not campus” is apparent. However, DanTech’s campus is neither surrounded by a shark-filled moat nor towering fences topped with barbed wire. Employees are free to leave campus as they see fit, appealing once again to perceived freedom and agency required for processes of governmentality. Although Deetz (2003b) suggests that discourses of agency and freedom obscure the fact that employees are subject to regimes of power, DanTech employees maintain that they have a significant amount of latitude regarding how they structure their days. I experienced this mobility first-hand. Many of my interviews occurred on campus. While I did not “belong” to or at DanTech, I was able to navigate campus grounds with ease. While the physical boundaries of campus are marked, there is persistent movement across them.

Temporal boundaries are similarly flexible at DanTech. DanTech operates on standard Western business hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday-Friday), but the organization does not require employees to be on campus at precisely those hours. Several employees noted that they kept nonstandard business hours due to personal preference or other obligations. Likewise, employee time is not micro-managed. Employees are free to run errands, go to the doctor, go to the gym, and tend to whatever they need. However, temporal boundaries are not so permeable that employees feel as if they can do whatever they want, whenever they want. Employees are expected to been seen around the office and engage with their colleagues. Thus, both employees and DanTech work to balance permeable temporal boundaries.

Lastly, psychological boundaries reflect similar flexibilities. Psychological borders, as conceptualized by Clark (2000) and Cowan and Hoffman (2007), address specifically the realm
of thought. Thought, while existing in relation to physical and temporal structures, is not bound by them. While at work or “working,” other facets of life do not simply fall away. Similarly, thoughts of and about work intersperse “non-work” times and places. Psychological flexibility describes the tendency for subjects to integrate, rather than divide and relegate, mental energy regarding various realms of their lives.

As Clark (2000) and Cowan and Hoffman (2007) recognize, part of the power of borders is their capacity to shift and move. Effective borders are necessarily flexible and permeable. Borders, then, are easily transgressed. Additionally, the realms of physicality, temporality, and psychology fold into one another. In essence, DanTech workers are examples of contemporary capitalist subjects, including willed and willful positions that operate in a late capitalism characterized by fragmentation and diffusion. Before I further examine this line of argument, I will examine the integration of these realms of work and life at DanTech.

**The Integration of Life-Realms**

DanTech’s campus demonstrates the presence of multiple life realms within an organizational context. Conversely, one’s homespace and personal life are to greater or lesser degrees peppered with facets of work. Examples include at-home computer tie-ins, mobile technologies, and the simple act of thinking about work outside of its physical and temporal barriers. Clearly articulated with physical space are temporal expectations. While DanTech allows flexible working hours, most employees are on campus for at least seven hours a day, Monday-Friday. During this time, an employee works, but may also workout, eat lunch, go to the doctor, or create a living will. Jordan discussed the interplay between work and non-work or play:
You know how you get that break in school, recess, where it’s like, “Okay, I can do whatever I want now within reason.” Well you still have that concept at DanTech where you have your lunch and you can do whatever you want. It’s almost like, “Okay, well, I’m off work but I’m still at work but it doesn’t feel like I’m at work. I don’t know. That’s a weird way to say it I guess.

While Jordon might feel awkward about the latter portion of his description, his depiction perfectly describes the permeability of campus and what happens when one works, plays, and tends to other aspects of life while still technically at work. The integration is designed to easily access “life” or the “private” while in the spatial and temporal realm of work. Jordan falters at the conclusion of his portrayal because making the work/life distinction is difficult, especially when one spends any significant amount of time on campus where the porous environment creates what becomes a work/life space. The integration can even penetrate into DanTech employee’s romantic relationships as Stacey noted, “My husband works at DanTech. I met [him] in the gym at DanTech. So there is this idea that you can’t really separate, ‘You go to your job, you have your life.’ You can’t really separate the two.” Thus, even romantic relationships are integrated into the fabric of DanTech’s campus life. Both Jordan and Stacey’s comments reflect the current trend in academic literature that persistently problematizes the modernist split between work and life (Brown, 2009). It’s becoming increasingly difficult to compartmentalize work and life, especially in a workspace such as DanTech’s where the integration of work and life is fundamental to the design of the space.

DanTech’s founder also identified the porous tendencies of individual thought. One of the primary reasons he developed DanTech’s corporate campus was to capitalize on the fluidity of employee thought processes. By providing outlets for play, recreation, eating, and so forth, he also provided opportunities for freedom and exchange of ideas. Ted described how working relationships and friendships are forged on campus when he stated, “What happens is, your
friends are the people you work with. Forty percent of the time you’re talking about last night’s
game. Thirty percent of the time you’re talking about some business thing. So, when they’re not
working, they’re working.” He continued to illustrate his point by describing an exchange while
engaged in sport. He stated, “Here we are playing softball and you and I are sitting in the dug-
out waiting to bat. And you know how things go off in your head? ‘Hey, that thing we were
talking about?’ That’s the way it works.” Playing softball, one’s mind isn’t entirely on softball.
However, when one’s teammates are also coworkers, it becomes incredibly easy to talk about
work. While the above anecdote certainly illustrates how campus enables the exchange of ideas,
the narrative also demonstrates how the integration of leisure into campus space actually
facilitates more work. Thus, even during times of recreation, DanTech’s campus foregrounds
work as the primary, and most important, human activity.

Off campus, as well as on, physical, temporal, and psychological spheres coalesce.
Mobile technologies are an excellent example of their integration. In Ladner’s (2008) study
about the use of mobile technologies, he notes that items such as cell phones, laptops, wireless
internet, and portable email devices diffuse where work occurs. As such, lines of work/life are
blurred as these realms collapse into one another. One can be outside of the physical realm of
work, DanTech’s campus, yet temporally and psychologically engage with work related tasks.
Additionally, mobile technologies have particular significance for white-collar, knowledge-based
service workers who are granted liberal degrees of autonomy with their work. Ladner (2008)
states, “…professionals with a great deal of work-time autonomy find their private-time
autonomy compromised by expectations of continuous availability to work” (p. 466). DanTech
clearly provides an environment where employees exercise significant levels of autonomy.
However, following Ladner’s argument, one contradictory consequence of increased autonomy
at work is decreased autonomy outside of work. Cheryl indicates as much when she spoke of checking her email from home. Further, as Cheryl noted, she did not consider this work. Rather, the action was simply another element of her day. Thus, outside of the physical boundary of DanTech, employees such as Cheryl devote time and mental energy to their work.

Aside from the blurring of physical, spatial, and psychological boundaries, DanTech’s campus exhibits many instances of the integration of work and life. On campus, certainly a large amount of work takes place. However, people also spend significant amounts of time performing other duties and fulfilling non-work related responsibilities. A campus environment is designed to ease the anxieties of employees and the easiest way to do this is to create an environment at work where one can also manage the details of her/his non-work life. No time (or desire) to cook? That’s not a problem. As Stacey explains, “The café also has leftovers where you can order online leftovers if they have any. You can take them home and you don’t have to make dinner which is really nice if you’re really really busy.” Food preparation, typically the domain of the “home” and domestic work is, in a sense, outsourced to DanTech.

DanTech’s corporate campus enables employees to manage realms of life by providing an environment that intentionally blurs “work” and “life.” Childcare and seminars on successful marriage are among the ways people manage family at work. Low-calorie food, personal training, and crock-pot recipe cook-offs are among the ways people manage their health. The list of opportunities to pursue non-work interests is seemingly endless (dry-cleaning, haircuts, Employee Assistance Program, etc.). As several employees noted, one could essentially live on campus. Rick, whom I quoted earlier, suggested as much when he described DanTech as “such a nice place to live.” Clearly, he mistakenly substituted “live” where he meant “work.” Interestingly, Glenda made this slip as well when she stated, “The one thing is, back when I was
living [at DanTech], er, when I was at DanTech…” As Glenda and Rick’s speaking errors indicate, DanTech successfully creates an environment where realms of life coalesce. Not only is DanTech a nice place to work, but it’s a nice place to live. Glenda and Rick’s comments illustrate the messiness of late capitalism and its impact on subject position. There are no clear lines between work and life. Further, the subjects of late capitalism become what Mitchell et al. (2003) term “life workers.” They state, “What we are signaling is the interpellation of subjects as life workers—the rendering of permanently mobilized bodies in new technologies of power. The new flexible subjects of late capitalism ‘are the office’; their spheres of domesticity ‘are the factory….’” (2003, p. 417). Mitchell et al. phrase “life workers” is appropriate because it defines subject who are constantly “working,” yet constantly “living” as well. In other words, life-workers continually negotiate life realms.

DanTech recognizes and embraces the notion that employees desire this type of working context and they create an environment in which it is easy to perform both work and life functions. To make the lives of employees easier and give them access to tools to ease their non-work lives, corporate campuses like DanTech must integrate those realms of life that were traditionally thought of as outside of work. In describing Google’s Mountain View campus, CEO Eric Schmidt stated:

The goal is to strip away everything that gets in our employees’ way. We provide a standard package of fringe benefits, but on top of that are first-class dining facilities, gyms, laundry rooms, massage rooms, haircuts, car washes, dry cleaning and commuting buses. Let’s face it: programmers want to program, they don’t want to do their laundry. So we make it easy for them to do both. (google.com)

Schmidt, though specifically speaking of Google, illustrates both the standard amenities of corporate campuses and why they exist. Productivity is the primary objective of a campus and it is far easier for an employee to be productive and efficient when s/he can manage life chores in
close proximity to work. While Schmidt does not use the language of “work/life balance,” he certainly echoes the primary tenets associated with the concept. While work/life balance is often celebrated, the concept is problematic on multiple levels as Brown (2009) describes:

We cannot ‘balance’ work and life as if these were two entirely separate, unrelated elements, forever locked in conflict; for doing so only inserts work into life even more deeply. When such conflicts do surface in corporate policy or rhetoric, work is configured as the central, inevitable factor, while personal or family concerns must somehow be altered to accommodate work. (p. 62)

Reading Schmidt and Brown’s statements side by side, it is abundantly clear that paid, “productive” labor is socially valued. Meanwhile, domestic, unpaid labor is relegated to secondary status at best and, at worst, is conceptualized as a hassle or impediment of life (which is actually just “work”). Google’s campus, according to Schmidt, helps mitigate all facets of life that “get in the way” of employees. They want to program, says Schmidt, not tend to domestic, familial, and communal matters. In essence, corporate campuses like Google, Microsoft, and DanTech integrate realms of life but in doing so, delegitimize and devalue those realms not directly related to paid production. As Mescher et al. (2010) describe, the ideal conceptions of “a worker” are managerially prescribed and exemplify a specific set of work-related characteristics. They state, “The characteristics of this abstract worker are full-time availability, mobility, high qualifications, a strong work orientation and no responsibilities in life other than the ones required by the organization” (Mescher, Benschop, & Doorewaard, 2010, p. 24). In essence, corporate campuses such as DanTech mold the population of ideal workers by building other life realms into the context of work. The discourse that circulates regarding this integration is a bit paradoxical. On the one hand, you find organizations with corporate campuses circulating ideas about work/life balance that fundamentally privilege work (Hoffman & Cowan, 2008; Hoffman & Cowan 2010; Kossek, Lewis, and Hammer, 2010). Yet, the power dimensions of
this privileging are obscured by organizational rhetoric that suggests that work/life balance, or even integration, benefit the employee. However, employing the lens of governmentality, it becomes obvious that these working contexts are designed to maximize employees’ time at work and exercise further degrees of control, not freedom. Campus is designed to facilitate work-related discussions in spaces of play and leisure. Campus is designed to maximize employee productivity by minimizing time spent on non-work obligations. As employees “take advantage” of campus services and amenities, they intimately tie themselves to DanTech’s organizational interests. Serving these organization interests, not individual interests, is a function of governing the population of DanTech employees. Foucault states:

> Interest at the level of consciousness of each individual who goes to make up the population, and interest considered as the interest of the population regardless of what the particular interests and aspirations may be of the individuals who compose it, this is the new target and the fundamental instrument of the government of population... (1991, p. 100)

DanTech’s campus enables employees to act in the primary interest of the organization, not the self. As such, maintenance of the population takes precedence over individual interests.

In short, campus and its amenities certainly blur boundaries of work and life. In addition, this blurring exists in relation to realms of physicality, spatiality, and psychology. Thus, one’s off-campus life is not divorced from his/her work (and vice-versa, of course). I argue that this has three implications. First, the folding of these realms into one another suggests an integration of work, life, physicality, spatiality, and psychology. As such, these areas cannot be studied in isolation as they are woven into matrices of governmentality. Secondly, this integration is both reflective and constitutive of late-capitalist subject positions in relation to postindustrial settings. Thus, “the factory,” either as metaphor or materiality, is neither stable nor centralized. Lastly, DanTech and other corporate campuses reflect the tendency of organizations to incorporate
various life realms into the working context, thereby implicating them in spaces of capitalist production. The impacts of these decentralizations are discussed in the following sections.

Decentralization and Subject Position

Reconceptualizing work/life borders means moving away from the modernist tendency to dichotomize these realms of life. As Hochschild (1997) notes, in pre-capitalist society, the actions performed on the day to day, whatever they may be, were simply “life.” People spent much time working but did not position work and life in alterity. In this way, pre-capitalist formations reflect an integration of work and life, formations that did not position work and life as polarities. As the market system introduced “life as hard labor” (Gini, 2003, p. 67), workers alienated from their labor sought gratification in more fulfilling realms of “life.” In Marx’s purview, loss of fulfillment in work led to pursuit of pleasure elsewhere, namely, in the acts of eating, drinking, and fornication (Eker, 1991). Because of the nature of the industrial work Marx describes, perhaps people intentionally binarized “work” and “life” as a way to escape the drudgery of the factory. In this sense, within these types of industrial settings, separating realms of work and life appears beneficial to employees in the sense that one could leave her/his labor at the factory and seek amusement and pleasure in other aspects of “life,” which were not rote and mundane. Marx saw this as a fundamental problem of industrialization and alienated labor. Nonetheless, polarizing and centralizing facets of work and life presented less permeable boundaries potentially favorable for workers.

My point here is to recognize the ebb and flow of work and life interrelationships in relation to cultural, social, and economic circumstances. Pre-capitalist societies reflect what we would identify today as an integration of work and life. Industrial and Fordist formations, with
the exception of company towns, did not reflect such integrations. In late capitalism, especially in the case of DanTech’s corporate campus, a reintegration of work and life emerges. As Dale and Burrell (2008) note:

‘Workspace’ as a distinctive bounded place has become a problematic concept. In the post-industrial era of consumption and the rise of the service sector, workspaces for many people are diverse and not bounded at all by the traditional separation of spheres of production, consumption, and reproduction. (p. 2)

Thus, not only are realms of work and life conflated, but these are not divorced from realms of consumption and reproduction as well. Workers cross traditional boundaries and borders of work and life. However, workspaces, particularly corporate campuses, are saturated with consumptive tendencies. As DanTech indicates, campus is potentially where you work, play, meet your spouse or partner, shop, spend money, and create money. Sandra summarized:

It sort of fulfills a lot of your day-to-day requirements so that it makes life more convenient for you. People meet their spouses there. You have everything there. We have a corporate store you can get, you know, DanTech hats and clothing. You can get books, take any type of class, programming or otherwise.

As Sandra illustrates, DanTech’s campus blurs conventional boundaries between life-realms as well as the modernist production/consumption dichotomy. The DanTech store provides a consumptive space for employees in addition to other services available for purchase. Again, Sandra references the interspersion of romantic relationships throughout DanTech, illustrating the integration of dating in organizational life. This is interesting because we traditionally view the relationship with one’s romantic partner as one of the most private elements of life. However, for many DanTech employees, dating rituals begin on-campus. Ellen also offered an interesting description of the production/consumption integration:

Through [DanTech's] recreation department, they get discounted trips and they do group trips with DanTech employees. So once a year there’s a skiing trip and once a year there’s a white-water rafting trip. They have at least three or four trips per year that you
can go on. I mean some people are really, I mean, they do everything with DanTech. It’s their friends, it’s their job.

Ellen’s description demonstrates two important points. First, it shows the capacity of DanTech’s campus to integrate production and consumption. Employees working on campus generate product and capital, both for the organization and for themselves. However, they also purchase products and spend money. Second, Ellen illustrates the extent to which campus life impacts employees’ professional and personal lives. Work and leisure are bound, as are “working” relationships and “friendships.” In essence, DanTech has the ability to mediate every aspect of employees’ lives on both micro and macro levels.

To reiterate, in line with Dale and Burrell (2008), corporate campuses are ideal spaces where production, consumption, and reproduction coalesce. As both Ellen and Sandra noted, DanTech’s campus is the place where romantic partners meet, where employees cultivate friendships, and make vacation plans. Campus is also the place where employees both make and spend money. In fact, the ability to perform all of these functions is an intention component of the campus design.

The contemporary corporate campus form and its amenities provide a calculated reintegration of work and life to allay the stressors associated with everyday life. Campus enables easy access to non-work related responsibilities. Thus, employees can manage their work, fitness, diet, familial relations, financial planning and so forth. Clearly, this formation inserts elements of non-work life into the workplace. Conversely, as evidenced in the discussion surrounding physical, temporal, and psychological borders, elements of work are interspersed in one’s non-work life. Central to this project are the ways in which campus and blurred boundaries work to discipline and govern DanTech employees. The examples that follow
examine the integration of work and life and how they operate as vehicles of governmentality by
shaping political subjects through creating and managing regimes of truth and populations. I
specifically address how this relates to notions of employee health, the Employee Assistance
Program, and the emotions experienced by employees when they “fail” to meet perceived
expectations.

Truth regimes, as recognized by Foucault, rely on upon expert knowledges to lend them
credibility. Expert positions, for example, those of doctor, and psychologist, are employed to
craft the defining features of ideal populations. As Foucault states:

Each society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of
discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances
which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is
sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisitions of truth; the
status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (1980, p. 131)

Thus, truths are created, not given. Foucault also addresses how truth regimes hinge
upon science and the credibility of experts. He states, “It is a question of what governs
statements, and the way in which they govern each other so as to constitute a set of propositions
which are scientifically acceptable, and hence capable of being verified or falsified by scientific
procedures” (1980, p. 112). Hence, truths are established through discourse and largely rely
upon scientific validation. Many authors write of how this process happens. For example,
Pickard (2009) describes the role of general practitioners in government as they define and
diffuse medical discourse. Here, they use their expertise as doctors to define and circulate truths
regarding medical “facts.” Definitions of health at DanTech undergo similar processes and as
suggests that organizational fitness initiatives are driven by managerial notions of health.
Further, defining health in a particular way privileges managerial perspectives on what it means
to be healthy, largely to the benefit of employing organizations. Undoubtedly, DanTech, through fitness facilities, wellness programs, seminars, and so on, creates a specific organizational definition of health which ultimately functions to discipline employee attitudes and behaviors.

For example, Janelle described the impact of the fat and caloric content placards. She stated:

If I’m working out and I’m trying to look halfway decent, I’m not gonna mess it up by eating some foods. So it helps me make the decision because I know when I get over there, “This is good for me, this is not good for me.” It kind of writes it out there for you.

Janelle indicated that she trusts the food placards to help her make educated decisions about what to eat. The information provided to her is taken-for-granted as medical fact. However, the information provided on the placard originates from DanTech employees including many medical and health professionals, including doctors and nutritionists. Thus, DanTech management uses professionals with specific credentials in particular areas of expertise to normalize their own definition of “health” and subsequently, the “healthy employee.” Janelle is certainly correct in suggesting that the information influences her choices. Indeed, governmentality seeks to structure the field of possibility for subjects, and Janelle’s narrative offers insight into how governing assemblages operate. Janelle’s idea of health is molded by DanTech’s dispersions of their own definitions of health. As Janelle eats in the cafeteria, she knows what she should eat, and what she should avoid, in order to look a particular way and reflect the managerially defined “healthy employee.” While Janelle may experience resulting health benefits, the key point is that she self-governs her attitudes and behaviors to fulfill DanTech’s idealized employee population.

Jason similarly addressed the connection between the emphasis on fitness, employee health, and organizational interest. He stated:
A gym on-site means you don’t want people to be sedentary. Again, you talk about the risk of a sedentary lifestyle. Even stuff like cancer, I’ve read, there’s a link between having a sedentary lifestyle and cancer or a heart attack, all that stuff. And again, other companies would probably say, “You know what, somebody dies, who cares?” With us, again, if somebody dies, well, you’ve lost that many years of experience. So that’s something that I really appreciate.

Jason indicated that on-site fitness facilities were clearly efforts to impact employee behaviors. The gym, according to Jason, is nearby to prevent people from leading sedentary lives. Thus, DanTech wants employees to use fitness facilities to meet their standards of health. What's more, from Jason's view, DanTech wants employees well because unhealthy employees translate to a loss of experienced workers. The latter portion of Jason’s quote demonstrates the degree to which structuring the field of possibility benefits DanTech. According to Jason, DanTech wants employees to live long and healthy lives because if they don’t, the organization suffers by losing experienced workers. Consequently, if DanTech shapes prescriptions of health, they maintain a productive, efficient, and less costly workforce. Ultimately, creating a truth regime of health that relies on “professional” expertise allows DanTech to shape attitudes and behaviors of employees that work toward the best interest of the organization. Further, DanTech is able to capitalize on employee health because it is such a prominent feature in organizational life, illustrating one of the governing consequences of weaving the “private” or “personal” into the “public” or “professional” setting.

In addition to experts opinions on employee health, several employees referenced the experts employed by DanTech that offer advice on life matters. It is clear that employees value expert opinions and eagerly apply them to their lives. For example, Lance described parenting advice administered by DanTech employees:

My son was transitioning to middle school and they actually had seminars on what to expect in middle school. And I went and everything they described, my son was going
through or went through in the next couple weeks. It was extremely useful to have that information. We were able to apply some suggestions from the expert and it just, it made a world of difference.

Sandra similarly described the expert staff, “They have a staff of social workers who work on parenting issues for instance, that you can go over to talk to somebody if your child is ADHD and strategies to deal with it.” Both Lance and Sandra place enough credence in the staff’s advice to actively incorporate their suggestions into their daily lives. These examples illustrate how DanTech employees are conditioned by expert knowledge in regards to parenting and psychology. Thus, the staff of social workers acts as a vehicle of organizational control by shaping employees’ ideas and behaviors.

DanTech’s campus is replete with similar examples of organizational control. As I’ve discussed above, organizational control can encompass many areas of employees’ personal and professional lives. May (1999) addresses organizational control of the personal and professional when he states, “They [companies] no longer provide only a time and place to labor but also provide an opportunity for the psychological and physical development of employees” (p. 12). While campus and amenities benefit employees, they carry a set of political implications. May writes specifically about Employee Assistance Programs and their penetration of what used to “belong” to the employee, namely, body and mind. He states:

[EAPs] represent a gradual, yet significant departure from the old social contract between employer and employee of a “fair day’s work for a fair day’s pay.” Replacing it is a more flexible but ambiguous contract that represents a contested terrain over not only an employee’s body but also his or her mind and, occasionally, soul (1999, p. 13).

Employee Assistance Programs are designed to help employees with “personal” issues that might negatively impact employee performance (decreased productivity). Many EAPs focus on health, well-being, and psychological counseling. DanTech’s web site indicates that the organization offers mental health education, support services, and consultation to “assist those
dealing with issues related to mental health.” Ellen used DanTech's EAP when her mother was
dying. Ellen could not deal with her ailing mother on her own and DanTech offered eldercare
services that she could obtain for her mother. Ellen’s case demonstrates how the lines between
public and private are obscured. Further, the EAP certainly helps Ellen in this instance. Yet,
EAPs exist primarily to reduce employee stress so they may focus on capitalist production. Ellen
accepts the help of the EAP but, in doing so, she further gives up more of her personal life
thereby inserting her further into the productive sphere. Additionally, Jordan described the EAP
in terms of its breadth when he stated, “They have any kind of work/life balance, or any kind of
seminars about your personal life. They have a work/life department so if you need to talk to
somebody there’s always an expert.” According to Jordan, DanTech has some resource, be it a
seminar or counselor, to help you with all aspects of your life. Further, DanTech offers their
“experts” for employees' support. However, these experts are employed by DanTech and must
meet managerial expectations. Thus, as EAPs and similar programs are sponsored by employing
organizations, managerial interests permeate definitions of psychological and physical well-
being. DanTech, not only offers an EAP, but largely, the entire campus operates as a vehicle for
disciplining psychological and physical health. In essence, DanTech’s campus is entirely a self-
help space where employees are encouraged to fulfill the roles of the good citizen and
enterprising subject. Additionally, blurring of the public and private, or work and home, is
crucial to modern forms of governmentality, thus, making corporate campuses ideal vehicles for
governmentality. Ouelette and Hay (2008) describe the aforementioned interrelationships when
they state:

As the liberal capitalist state is reconfigured into a network of public–private
partnerships, and social services from education to medical care are outsourced to
commercial firms, citizens are also called upon to play an active role in caring for and
governing themselves through a burgeoning culture of entrepreneurship. (p. 472)
Three key themes emerge in this quote. First, self-governance requires networks between the public and private, an integration clearly demonstrated at DanTech. Second, “social services,” or those elements of life typically regarded as “private,” now travel commercial avenues. Thus, the private or the “commons” is imbricated in capitalist exchange. Again, DanTech’s campus demonstrates a mixing of the public and private as well as productive and consumptive tendencies. Third, ideal citizens are those that are enterprising subjects in all aspects of life. DanTech’s campus, essentially a self-help space, enables employees to pursue their ideal selves at every turn. Thus, DanTech’s campus clearly illustrates each of these three key themes.

DanTech’s corporate campus certainly provides a convenient space for employees to manage their work and lives. However, DanTech’s campus makes it impossible not to perform work and life functions. In this way, organizational control pervades arenas of life that have traditionally been outside of organizational purview. This is essentially Deetz’s (1992) argument in regards to “corporate colonization” in which all aspects of life come to be dominated by corporations and their fundamental principles. DanTech employees express a form of guilt they experience if they do not employ certain facets of campus. For example, Janelle described her fitness routine and noted that the convenience of DanTech’s exercise facilities made it difficult for her to find excuses not to exercise. Several other employees such as Mike and Cheryl expressed similar sentiments when they described DanTech’s free personal training and their guilt at not using it (when they felt that they should). While no one at DanTech is forced to use campus services such as fitness facilities, the discursive construction of “health” at DanTech is powerful enough to inspire guilt in those who do not fit the description of the healthy employee. Further, employees expressed an overall confusion and disdain for those who did not use campus
services and amenities. For example, Lance, a DanTech employee who attended financial planning and parenting seminars, questioned why people wouldn’t use services and campus amenities. He stated:

I’m sure there are people here that don’t take advantage of anything, that come in, they do their work, and they leave. I just kind of question, why? Why would you not take advantage of these things? They’re for your benefit. They help you with whatever is going on.

Again, DanTech does not mandate the use of services and amenities so some employees do not seem to use campus resources. Regardless, organizational discourse (either intentional or not) puts forth a certain set of values and suggests how one should attend to her/his life. Thus, the integration of work and life boundaries has more than material consequences. That is, the phenomenon is more nuanced than simply putting a gym on campus or mobile access to email. The significance lies in the amount and forms of influence one’s employer has in terms of how and where people spend their time, but also in terms of how they feel about health, family, loyalty to the organization and so on. Overall, DanTech’s campus is a powerful governing force. DanTech’s campus enables the creation and dissemination of ideal employee populations through campus services and amenities. In addition, the ways employees self-govern are molded by both managerial ideologies that saturate service offerings and campus amenities.

**Taking Work Home: Business Principles in Everyday Life**

On DanTech’s campus, in many ways, work and life are reintegrated. This reintegration does not cease at the boundaries of DanTech or the home. In fact, one of the most significant facets I’ve noticed throughout this research is the way in which business ideologies carry over into the non-work lives of employees. The most apparent of these are emphases on efficiency with a constant referral to time. E.P. Thompson wrote that “…all time must be consumed,
marketed, put to use: it is offensive for the labour force merely to ‘pass the time’” (1967, p. 90-91). As Taylor’s (1995) work indicates, within the realm of capitalist production, maximizing the use of time was essential to productivity. While some might suggest Taylor’s work and ideas are dated and insignificant to contemporary capitalism, I side with Ritzer (1993) and his assertions that for so long we have valued and sought efficiency, productivity, and time management that it is no longer simply a set of principles we apply to the workplace. Rather, the productive use of time is an assumed and taken-for-granted way of life. Andrew (1999) similarly suggests that Taylor’s principles are integrated into daily life. Andrew discusses Taylor’s belief that principles of scientific management were applicable to all aspects of life. Leisure, for example, could be structured to maximize efficiency and productivity. Andrew (1999) writes, “Leisure activities, like productive activities, serve to enhance the productive collectivity. Productive and recreational activities are integrated within a system of total management” (p. 152). DanTech’s campus integrates realms of life to make employees happy and make their lives easier. However, DanTech accomplishes this by enabling employees to streamline their days (and workouts and haircuts…) and structure them in such a way that maximizes time usage and their degree of productivity for the organization. More specifically, leisure activities and campus services at DanTech articulate employees into populations of “productive worker” and “productive citizen.” For example, Katherine spent 26 years at DanTech before she was laid-off. She spoke highly of campus and specifically the ability to pick up food to take home for dinner. She stated, “[Take-out food] may sound small but that’s a quality of life and time issue.” She elaborated on this example and stated that if single person did not have to cook dinner, they could use that time in whatever way they choose. Therefore, on-campus convenience frees-up off-campus time. Thus, campus helps Katherine fulfill her duties as an employee and manage
her time on and off-campus. On the whole, Katherine exhibits the tendency of subjects to carefully manage time in all realms of life.

Through our processes of work, which are largely designed around principles of efficiency and productivity, we now calculate much of our lives in a similar psychological and ideological vein. Ritzer (1993) frames this notion as “McDonaldization,” defining this as “the process by which the principles of the fast-food restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society as well as the rest of the world” (p.1). He identifies these principles as efficiency (the fastest method), calculability (the capacity for quantification), predictability (knowing what to expect), and control. Elements of one’s non-work life are subject to such principles. It follows, as Hochschild (1997) suggests, “Efficiency has become both a means to an end—more home time—and a way of life, an end in itself” (p. 212). Contemporary late-capitalist subjects are chiefly oriented around those standards valued in the workplace such as time savings.

Many employees commented on the desirability of working on campus as primarily related to savings in terms of time and money. Echoing Thompson (1967), DanTech employees reflect the contemporary propensity to economize time. What’s more, as DanTech employees indicate, the time savings is a large part of the organization’s allure. One employee described the benefits of campus, “It’s all self-contained and all easy.” He continues, “It’s 70% convenience and 30% cost savings.” Not only does he suggest the importance of economizing time, but he demonstrates Ritzer’s (1993) notion of calculability as he computes the value of campus and its amenities. Mike similarly described the time savings of getting his hair cut on-campus. He stated, “The haircut as an example. I can call and schedule that. I go over there and it’s on campus, it’s on my way to or from someplace, and that saves me a lot of time.” If Mike could
not build the hair cut into his day on-campus, he would have to schedule time away from campus or on the weekend. Clearly, this is time Mike cannot spend with his family or friends or pursuing leisure.

Discourses of time and time savings ran throughout interviews. DanTech employees described living and working in the grip of Hochschild’s (1997) time-bind. Katherine stated, “I mean think about how fast-paced and pressured people’s lives are now. It is a real quality of life thing to have everything nearby and not have to go off campus for everything.” She indicates how contemporary capitalist subjects must negotiate issues of time in both work and life demands. Bridget similarly stated:

It’s what makes the job so desirable to so many people. I think everybody’s feeling like they’re always struggling to balance it all. There’s always more that you could give but there’s only so much time that you have. But working at a place like DanTech recognizes that you do have a life outside of your job and that you’ll be more productive and happy and loyal in the long run if you feel like you can manage it.

Others similarly economized time, and life in general, when describing campus and how they feel it benefits them and improves their lives. Jordan noted the value of time when he stated, “Time is way more important than money.” Jordan described his draw to campus fitness facilities and specifically framed his thoughts in terms of time and money savings. He stated:

I looked at the gym and I was like, “Oh wow.” This is really top of the line equipment and that attracted me too because that’s going to save me money. I’m not going to have to join a gym. And it’s also going to save me a lot of time.

DanTech employees suggested that the time savings from campus and amenities translates into more “free time” at home. Thus, efficiently economizing time, including its predictability and calculability, enables work and life processes to take on the essence of Ritzer’s (1993) McDonaldization. In other words, all realms of life are subject to principles of efficiency. One woman states, “When you’re trying to do your work, and be efficient, and maximize your
time so that you can spend time with your family and friends enjoying your personal life, that’s really important.” She proposed that campus, by incorporating non-work activities into the working environment, generates more opportunities for her to engage in private life. Katherine stated:

I, as a single person, I ate my main meal of the day there five days a week for nearly 26 years. I spent less on food. I spent less time planning meals, spent less time cooking and grocery shopping than I would have. And for couples who work there, you go home and have less to do at night.

Here, Katherine focuses on one aspect of campus and elaborates on its implications for her life, specifically, food consumption at campus cafeterias. Campus provided easily accessible food during her working hours. However, the implications of DanTech’s cafeterias permeated several facets of Katherine’s life. Eating frequently on campus meant she required less food at home. Less food at home means both less time and money spent at the grocery store and in food preparation at home. It seems logical that campus frees time for employees to engage in non-work and non-organizational activities. However, this strain of thinking only considers two of Hoffman and Cowan’s (2007) three components of borders. Physically and temporally, DanTech maximizes employee work time by providing a space in which people efficiently work and attend to non-work responsibilities. However, this fails to consider the work that takes place when employees are off campus, on their “own time,” and the psychological commitment to both the organization and their work. Ladner (2008) explores this notion in his research about mobile technologies. He examines the capacity for organizations to use technology to garner more work from employees when they are outside of the standard spatial and temporal boundaries of the organization. Ironically, flexible boundaries often translate into more organizational control, not less. DanTech employees seem willing to put in extra hours and/or work from home. Jason, an engineer, claimed to work many Saturdays simply because he enjoys his job. Others note that
they feel valued by the organization and, thus, are willing to “go the extra mile,” work from home, or come in after hours. In large part, DanTech employees cultivate this willingness in relation to the gratitude they experience for campus and the benefits it provides. In many ways, DanTech employees find themselves willingly working outside traditional boundaries of the organization. What’s more, they largely embrace the integration of work and life. Cheryl, who described working at DanTech as a lifestyle, likes this assimilation. She said:

I like [the integration of work and life] because like I said, if I’m curious or if I’ve got something to finish that I really want to do, I can do it at home. And I don’t really count the time I work at home because it’s what I do. It’s not really counting the hours.

When espousing the above statement, Cheryl stumbled a bit. She continued to describe, like many other DanTech employees, the difficulty in saying “This is work, and this is life, and they are separate.” Rather, what we see, especially in light of DanTech’s campus, is that life is filled with work, family, friends, and community. Likewise, workplaces like DanTech, as a facet of life, are filled with family, friends, and community.

**Making Communities Work**

While DanTech’s campus exerts measures of control, employees are not manipulated drones. They are subject to forms of discipline but are not entirely positioned by them. A persistent emphasis on time and money savings provides some evidence for a Taylorized or McDonaldized existence. However, time and money savings free resources for other endeavors. In this way, employees use DanTech’s resources to configure ways of life that benefit them. Again, why DanTech offers these services is beside the point for many employees. They recognize that the organization surely derives benefits from campus and its amenities, but they are secondary to the ways in which campus and services better the circumstances of their own lives.
In addition to saving employees time and money, DanTech’s campus provides an environment where it’s easy to forge communal bonds. Many academics have examined the notion of community and analyzed the various functions fulfilled by communities. Much of this work romanticizes community as the place outside of work where “authentic” areas of “life” exist. As Hochschild (1997) notes, if work is dubbed the “profane,” then family and community are certainly the “sacred.” In our conversation, Ted suggested that DanTech’s founder clearly understood the social aspects of community and created a space in which these types of bonds could be shaped. Ted stated:

The need for community is strong. So if you don’t have family, if you don’t have nuclear family around, where’s the most likely place to create social bonding? In the workplace [since] you spend so much time there. If you’re going to have social bonding there, it should be of high quality and there should be facilitation for that to occur.

What’s more, Ted suggests, DanTech’s founder sought to create a particular form of workplace community in order to garner maximum efficiency and productivity from his workers. Ted illustrated this thought process:

One of the things that’s bad, in workplaces where there are no communal bonds and workplaces where there is no camaraderie, because you as a person need it, you seek it outside. So the same person whose juices could be flowing into the work community and adding value to the company and to the people you work with, you get involved in politics, PTA, church groups. Not that that’s bad, but that is energy that’s siphoned off of the energy that could be added into the work community.

Here, Ted summarized the value and power of creating a sense of community at work. Dale and Burrell (2008) describe this operation when they state, “The attachment to the organization as a ‘second home’ comes about by making it equivalent to one’s home community” (p. 119). Ted’s sentiments, read through the lens of Dale and Burrell, arouse a series of important questions. First, what are communities for? Secondly, what does it mean to have a workplace community that inescapably revolves around capitalist exchange? Lastly, especially
considering the prior concern, are communities necessarily positive facets of social and cultural life?

Miller and Rose (2008) address some of these concerns in their discussion of community. Their analysis, influenced primarily by theories of governmentality, locates the creation and implementation of community as a means to create and control populations. They locate three key components of community including spatiality (the “what” or “where”), ethicality (what is valued and what is not), and identification (a sense of belonging to the community). They cast a critical eye upon creating communities when they state:

Government through community, even when it works upon pre-existing bonds of allegiance, transforms them, invests them with new value, affiliates them to expertise in some false sense. But it should alert us to the work entailed in the construction of community, and the implications of the logics of inclusion and exclusion, of responsibilization and autonomization, that they inescapably entail (2008, p. 93).

In other words, belonging to or within a community has vast implications far beyond cultivating social and communal bonds. Community can condition who, what, and how we are because our communities help define “proper” behaviors, attitudes, and actions. Miller and Rose (2008) continue, “We can thus be governed through our allegiance to particular communities of morality and identity” (p. 93).

Ted’s previous quote illustrates the ugly side of community in accordance with Miller and Rose (2008). According to Ted, DanTech’s founder recognized the power of community and sought to create a communal working environment with which people would highly identify. What’s more, Ted indicates, the creation of community at work is instrumental in maximizing work potential and productivity. The question easily follows, if DanTech is a community, what type of community is it? How might we conceptualize the spatiality, ethicality, and identification of a DanTech community?
On the whole, DanTech employees expressed no sentiments similar to Miller and Rose’s (2008) critique. Employees certainly do conceptualize DanTech as a community. What’s more, employees value and appreciate the notion that “work” feels like “community.” Many employees suggested that the feeling of community largely exists in relation to campus and service amenities. As Katherine noted, “If you play and eat and work there, it kind of has the feel of a community as opposed to just a company you drive to.” According to Katherine, in the absence of play, eating, and other facets of life traditionally conceptualized as non-work, DanTech is simply a workplace. However, in light of the integration of non-work activities, campus transforms into a community.

I asked DanTech employees to describe their sentiments regarding a workplace as a form of community. Specifically, I inquired about how having a sense of community at work impacted their notions of outside-work community(ies). Two themes permeated responses; first, many employees noted cultural and spatial shifts within an American context that create a greater need for community at work. Secondly, employees stated having a sense of community at work added fulfillment to their lives and did not isolate them from other forms of community.

The theme of cultural and spatial shifts first emerged in my interview with Ted. He described his childhood (in what I estimate to be in the mid-1940s to 1950s) in an industrial city in the north. He described his neighborhood and the proximity of his extended family. Ted portrayed a form of community in which families stayed close to one another, living just down the street from parents, brothers, sisters, and cousins. While this image of the 1950s American extended family is certainly a Rockwellian depiction, he introduced some interesting points. American cultural forms have changed. With the growth of the suburbs and movement away from urban centers, many of us do not have this relationship with a centralized place that
includes communal, familial, and working relationships. Corporate campuses appear to be a response to this spatial-decentralization.

Kevin also addressed movements in American socio-spatial forms. He described his neighborhood and relationships:

In my current neighborhood, I don’t know many of the people in my neighborhood. I know faces and I try to do my part to go around the neighborhood to introduce myself to people, but it’s not the same as when our parents were growing up. I think a lot of that is just the change in culture within our generation and the workplace does tend to replace it. It’s not really anything that companies are doing because I think companies, any of these companies where you spend a lot of time, you’re going to grow these relationships at your work and then you start doing things with them outside of work.

Kevin, who described his neighborhood as a suburban subdivision, articulated a sense of distance from the space in which one lives as well as the relationships cultivated in such a space. He noted that DanTech was not responsible for this shift; rather, DanTech was responsive to changing cultural norms. Jason, an Applications Tester, also expressed a comparable attitude. He addressed specifically the relationship between community and child rearing when he stated:

The whole idea was you actually had a community to help raise the kids. And we’ve lost that and like I said, there’s nothing the company can do about that. But we are trying to make it better and sort of instill a community at work and do the best we can with the situation we have.

In the views of Kevin and Jason, creation of community on campus is a way DanTech meets the changing shapes of traditional community. They each recognize that DanTech is responding to changes in the social fabric, not necessarily creating it.

Many employees expressed an overall human tendency to seek out social relations in the form of community. Further, interviewees from DanTech illustrated an appreciation for the creation of community at work. As Stacey described:
No matter what, people need to feel like they’re connected to something more. And having a community at work, it doesn’t mean that you can’t also go to [the local] farmer’s market. It’s like you have two [communities] instead of just one. I think they enhance each other. I don’t think it’s one or the other, I think they enhance each other.

Stacey illustrated both the desire for community as well as the fluidity of communities.

Overwhelmingly, DanTech employees suggested that creating a sense of community at work enriched their lives and did not undermine other forms of community that employees encounter and embrace. As Lance noted:

When I leave here it’s leaving this community behind and joining whatever community, whether it’s my tae kwon do family or my church family or whatever we’re doing. I don’t see it eroding my ties of my community family at all. I just think it’s another community that I’m involved with.

Lance and others mentioned their participation in multiple communities. They reflect the general feeling that “more community” presents increased opportunities for involvement. Jordan stated the following about workplace community: “It opens me up as opposed to closing me off.” Additionally, responses indicate that various forms of community augment one another. Katherine stated, “Community is in your church and in your neighborhood. And now there’s a sense of community at work too. To me, that’s more community instead of less.” The latter third of Katherine’s assertion was a direct response to my inquiry regarding employee perceptions of the potential eclipse of traditional non-work communities in favor of those forms found on DanTech’s campus. This question garnered curious responses because, once again, employees ostensibly found it difficult to find fault in campus and its offerings. Employee thoughts surrounding DanTech’s campus community did not prove to be an exception. For example, Mike stated, “The stuff we do on campus, health club, dry cleaning, eating lunch, that’s undermining strip mall traffic.” Mike’s comment suggests that campus and amenities benefit employees and aren’t part of a sinister ruse to isolate employees from traditional forms of community. Mike
continued and jokingly stated, “When I walk into the doctor’s office, it’s not like I walk in and I’m sitting with all my workmates and we’re all sitting here talking about work and singing the company song.”

Overwhelmingly, DanTech employees did not feel as if working on campus cut them off from community in any way. Rather, as the interview quotes suggest, having a sense of community at work added to employee’s overall senses of community or enabled them to think of community as a multitude. In this way, campus and the integration of realms of life perhaps bolsters Warhurst et al.’s (2008) notion that the interpenetration of work/life can be positive and beneficial for workers. With the integration of “work” and “life” and the blurring of physical, temporal, and psychological boundaries, envisioning community as multi-faceted makes sense. DanTech employees expressed difficulty in binarizing their work and non-work lives. It is logical then that they would experience a similar difficulty in dividing community into such a polarization. This not only speaks to the reintegration of work and life and the blurring of borders, but also suggests much in the way of subject position. Employees are positioned in and through their work. Yet, they also understand themselves in relation to this positioning and configure their work/lives in such a way that works to their advantage. For Foucault, this is what constitutes people as free subjects. He states:

I say that governmentality implies the relationship of self to self, which means exactly that, in the idea of governmentality, I am aiming at the totality of practices by which one can constitute, define, organize, instrumentalize the strategies which individuals in their liberty can have in regard to each other. It is free individuals who try to control, to determine, to delimit the liberty of others and, in order to do that, they dispose of certain instruments to govern others. That rests indeed on freedom, on the relationship of self to self and the relationship to the other. (1988, p. 19)

In other words, subjects can appropriate governing structures to work in their own interests. At DanTech, we see this in how employees’ use campus and in their attitudes regarding
community at work. While the governing capacities of DanTech’s campus are problematic, employees do in fact use resources at hand to improve the conditions of their lives and work.

Summary

In this section, I addressed my third research question. Specifically, I examined how DanTech campus employees demonstrated tendencies to blur life-realms. I examined facets of the “private” as they emerge on DanTech's campus. I also examined the overflow of business ideologies, that of the “public,” into the everyday lives of employees. Lastly, I addressed the construction of community on DanTech's campus and examined the beneficial and potentially problematic elements of such a community.

In the next chapter I discuss the implications of this project. I situate the study within appropriate literatures and examine the major contributions of the work.
Chapter Five

Implications and Contributions

Introduction

This chapter summarizes my primary arguments and addresses both the implications and contributions of the project. I examine each area of inquiry in turn, restating my research questions and reviewing major claims and analyses. I elaborate on the project’s relationship with extant literature and situate my assertions and conclusions within this literature. In doing so, I address the practical and theoretical significance of the project.

Research Question One

Summary

My first research question examined the creation of DanTech’s campus as a space and place in relation to matrices of power. Following Massey et al. (1992), I questioned the politics and socio-spatiality of DanTech’s corporate campus. My specific sub-questions include:

What type of environment does the corporate campus create? What are the physical and material attributes of the campus? What are the array of employee amenities and service offerings? How do these interact to create an organizational setting? In essence, what does DanTech’s campus “stand” for?

Geographically, DanTech is situated in a traditionally idealized setting of semi-rurality. Like most company towns and contemporary corporate campuses, DanTech is located near, but not in, larger cities. Mimicking Ford’s desire to straddle the city and country, DanTech’s immediate environment is textbook suburban. A series of strip malls, fast food restaurants, and
grocery stores litter the lands adjacent to campus. The views of this suburbanity are obscured after one proceeds through the entry gate. DanTech seems at home here due to campus’ striking similarities to nearby subdivisions and gated communities. Location is valuable to DanTech since a suburban context connotes connection to (but not dependence on) both the metropolis and the idyllic (Crawford, 1995; Marchand, 1998).

Once on campus, the traffic of the avenue subsides. Trees and hilly contours hide the bustle of the “outside.” The contrast of “inside” and “outside” is necessary in distinguishing the alterity of campus because it is with this othering that workers gain a sense of organizational and employee identity (Massey et al., 1992). Nice, awesome, and beautiful are the most commonly used terms by employees to describe campus environs. Green trees, trimmed grass, massive sculptures, and coifed flora speckle campus grounds. Overall, campus appeals to picturesque notions romanticizing nature. However, as a visitor (or employee) knows, while one may feel far away from it all, the freeway is just down the road. Employees like the physical environment. They like looking at grounds that have been tended to. They like their offices and the buildings in which they’re found that are also well cared for.

In addition to the physicality of campus, employees also like and appreciate the amenities and service offerings provided to them by DanTech. These run the gamut from healthcare, childcare, cafés, haircuts, and so on. Each service and amenity is easily accessible on campus. Every employee I interviewed used some of DanTech’s amenities and service offerings. I did not interview one person who chose to employ all off-campus resources.

While DanTech employees willingly use campus offerings, both campus and amenities carry degrees of control. All organizations are potential sites of power and control (Deetz, 2007;
du Gay, 2007; Heelas, 2002). I have argued that a campus setting has significant implications for the subject positions and identities of employees. On the most basic level, the ways employees are governed in relation to campus is multifaceted. Campus enables organizational control over various facets of everyday life. Such mechanisms of control include the normalization of managerial notions of health, disciplining exercise habits, and regulating mobility. Employees operate under the impression that they are agents free to make choices in regards to campus services and amenities. To reiterate, governmentality relies on subjects’ sense of agency.

Implications

I agree with scholars such as Deetz (2007), du Gay (2007), Heelas (2002) and others, who argue that working context and environment certainly impacts employee subject position. Employees suggested that the bucolic characteristics of campus are quite a contrast to other austere working environments. Similarly, these sentiments reflect the cultural tendency to valorize nature. DanTech employees’ comments support Ross’ (2003) notion that knowledge workers in these contexts are sophisticated consumers of place. DanTech’s campus was constructed with the intent of impacting employee attitudes and behaviors. Campus spaces and ideas are organizationally mediated and, as such, exercise power and control.

In my purview, campus clearly comes with measures of control and contributes to processes of governmentality by creating idealized employee populations and conditioning thought and behaviors. The most obvious and persistent example is the creation of specific definitions of health. Zoller (2003, 2004) describes the tendency for organizations to control definitions of health in organizational fitness facilities and DanTech demonstrates a remarkably similar tendency. The overall emphasis on health at DanTech is pervasive, both in body and
mind. The ways in which employees can care for their bodies are ubiquitous. For example, physically, DanTech employees can exercise, eat healthy foods, and groom themselves. Campus makes is very easy for employees to perform visions of the healthy, successful knowledge worker because they have every opportunity to (literally and figuratively) shape themselves into the professional bodies described by Nadesan and Trethewey (2000) and Trethewey (1999), as they suggest, a successful body is fit, educated, and accompanied by a sound mind. The pursuit of the professional body is abbreviated for DanTech employees because campus not only provides the tools to construct such a being, but DanTech perpetuates vocabularies and material practices that value this project of the self.

Contributions

As I have suggested, employing organizations and one’s working context contributes to subject positions. Specifically, DanTech’s campus serves as a means of governing employees by shaping their thoughts and actions. However, while corporate campuses are commonly praised in American popular press, little academic work addresses their significance. I believe my project illustrates key areas of interest and import in regards to corporate campuses, what they do, and why they are deemed simultaneously problematic yet desirable workspaces.

One of the primary contributions of this study is to describe the governing capacities of DanTech’s physical campus. Along with a litany of organizational scholars who have argued for an examination of the materiality of workspaces, a long list of geographers address the impact of space, particularly workspace, upon subjects. For example, Massey (2005) is a well-known geographer who theoretically examines what space is, and also what it does. She writes, “Space is more than distance. It is the sphere of open-ended configuration within multiplicities” (2005,
Her work pushes readers to examine their assumptions about space as static and easily-definable. She also argues for the sociality of space and interrelatedness of space when she writes:

“…space presents us with the social in the widest sense: the challenge of our constitutive interrelatedness—and thus our collective implication in the outcomes of that interrelatedness; the radical contemporaneity of an ongoing multiplicity of others, human and non-human; and the ongoing and ever-specific project of the practices through which that sociability is to be configured. (2005, p. 195)

Thus, space is continually changing, contested, and constitutive of social practices that have direct consequences for identities and subject positions. As the above quote indicates, space is collectively created and shared, hence, overwhelmingly social. What’s more, as many have noted (Deetz, 2007; DuGay, 2007; Heelas, 2002), workplaces are important spaces of analysis due to workers’ financial dependence upon their employing organizations, the time workers spend upon organizational grounds, and measures of control that can be exacted upon the minds and bodies of employees. For example, Mitchell et al. (2003) write of the spatial and social element of one’s work. They address traditional spaces of work, but also the diffusion of work into various spaces of one’s life. Further, using a Foucauldian lens, they argue that bodies and knowledges are “…firmly invested in and strategically monitored through space” (2003, p. 428). Thus spaces in general, and workspaces in particular, are often deliberate arrangements that contribute to the subject positions of employees. Yet Mitchell et al. (2003) also point to the fluidity of spaces of “life’s work” when they state:

And the managerial-professional class is wired to work in cars, on flights, at children’s soccer games, and at the dinner table—but, to compensate for any lingering resentment this might cause, their ‘play’ can now be accommodated at work, as work ostensibly metamorphoses into play (p. 429).

The ideas present in Mitchell et al.’s quote lead us to several important implications for the DanTech study. First, clearly, spaces are fluid and carry significant measures of control.
fact, the fluidity itself can operate as a mechanism of control as lines between work and life, or public and private, are blurred. This is a concept I will revisit in my discussion of the implications regarding my third research question. However, secondly, in regards to DanTech’s physical campus and its spatial and social dynamics, space and interactions are imbued with the playfulness required by much of the creative class of knowledge workers. As innovative workers, they require innovative space. This is present at DanTech because of campus and the sociality it encourages.

DanTech’s campus is a site of power that is negotiated and contested. Gender is an important power dynamic evidenced in the spatiality of campus. McDowell (1999) offers a list of gendered binaries that she explores throughout her feminist analysis of gender, identity, and place. She offers this list in which she juxtaposes traditional masculine characteristics with corresponding feminized ideals: public/private, outside/inside, work/home, work/leisure and pleasure, production/consumption, independence/dependence, power/lack of power. McDowell argues that places and spaces are imbued with power, but more, places and spaces are gendered and constitute people as gendered subjects. Analysis of the intersections of space, place, and gender identity is the thrust of her work. McDowell states that she seeks to “…examine the range of places in which our sense of ourselves as a man or as a woman is constituted. I want to argue that both people and places are gendered and so social and spatial relationships are mutually constituted” (1999, p. 30). Similarly, Wright (2006) argues, “…feminine and masculine subjectivities are wound into a never-ending circuitry of material production, occurring across scales from the most intimate bodily functions to the networks of a global firm” (p. 13). Thus, spaces of production are intimately gendered.
If we take seriously McDowell’s (1999) and Wright’s (2006) claim that workspaces are steeped in gendered power dynamics, DanTech’s campus must be gendered, but how? Revisiting McDowell’s list of binaries, the masculine descriptor in each binary is standard for most traditional workplaces, both in terms of material place and managerial ideologies that circulate. However, at DanTech, and corporate campuses in general, the feminized descriptors are also prominent. Taking each binary in turn, DanTech evidences both the masculine and feminine throughout the campus workspace. As a for-profit organization, employees go to DanTech to engage in paid labor, a phenomenon typically associated with the masculine propensity for participation in public life. However, much of the traditionally feminized private is also present on DanTech’s campus. Alongside the public act of working, integrated into the same space, are occurrences associated with the feminized private such as building in domestic duties into campus as well as leisure and pleasure activities. For example, food preparation, an activity associated with the domestic, now occurs on campus for many employees. Child rearing, another activity relegated to the home, also occurs on campus. Additionally, employees engage in leisurely pursuits and play by attending classes and seminars they enjoy, engaged in sport, or perhaps by taking a relaxing walk around campus. As a computer software powerhouse, DanTech workers produce product and profit, activities deemed masculine. Yet, workers participate in many forms of feminized consumption as well. DanTech employees purchase services, buy various products, and eat food. The final pair of binaries, those of independence/dependence and power/lack of power are also simultaneously present on DanTech’s campus. Employees exercise independence by structuring their days as they see fit without much direct managerial intervention. They also make decisions regarding campus and how they use it. Additionally, this suggests that employees exercise power by (somewhat)
tailoring their lives and work on campus to their benefit. However, as several interviews indicate, employees often become dependent upon campus and what DanTech offers them in that space, indicating that while employees may exercise some degrees of control, they are constrained by the organization. For example, employees elect to take a DanTech sponsored class on time-management. On the one hand, they make the independent choice to attend the class, demonstrating the power to exercise agency. On the other hand, a class on time-management teaches attendees how to structure all of their lives using managerial and bureaucratic ideologies. Thus, through the employee’s act of power and independence, they actually become further mediated by organizational ideologies and interests.

Many of the standard gendered tropes apply to DanTech. As Hanson (2009) notes, spaces of business and entrepreneurialism are traditionally masculine, and DanTech as a for-profit organization certainly fits this description. Similarly, Katz (2005) describes the masculine process of establishing “professionals” by valuing credentials and expertise, a phenomenon also evidenced at DanTech through their regard for the technologically savvy knowledge worker. In general, many business-oriented organizations project an air of managerialism in which the masculine dynamic is largely implied and not overtly stated. Wright (2006) terms this phenomenon the prosthetics of supervision, or the supervisory dynamic, and describes a detached (yet largely present) masculine dominance that dictates relations between manager and worker. As a gendered space, DanTech substantiates the notion that masculinity is built into organizational forms and practices. However, reading gender beneath the surface at DanTech, campus transcends ideas regarding the traditionally masculine workplace since feminine characteristics and practices figure so prominently on campus. In essence, DanTech’s campus provides an androgynous space, where realms of the public and private, and masculine and
feminine co-exist. However, the intent of DanTech’s campus is the integration of “life” (read: feminized) into the workspace in order to free time and psychological pressures of employees. Ultimately, the integration of masculine and feminine practices primarily serves the interest of the organization by creating an environment where employees are maximally efficient and productive. Further, DanTech’s campus enables the masculine usurpation of the feminized realms of life by taking them out of the private and inserting them in public life. This is an important implication and one examined more closely when discussing my third research question.

Research Question Two

Summary

My second area of inquiry addressed the potential impact of DanTech’s campus upon employees’ understanding of their jobs and employer. Following Deetz and Hegbloom (2007), as well as Ross (2003) and Massey et al. (1992), I agree that working context and environment can have significant consequences for employee subject positions, particularly in relation to how employees feel about their work and employing organizations. My sub-questions here were as follows:

How does the corporate campus impact, if at all, how employees feel about their jobs?

How does the corporate campus impact, if at all, how employees feel about their employer?

Employee responses to the former question were somewhat varied. While some interviewees stated that campus had a large impact on how happy or satisfied they were with their jobs, others did not. Those who did express satisfaction suggested that the type of work
they performed at DanTech was their first and foremost concern. In other words, if they were not happy with their particular job roles and functions, campus would not overcome these feelings of discontent. This reinforces past scholarship about employee identification and specific industries that indicates that the type of work employees perform is of utmost importance (Kunda, 2006; Massey et al., 1992; Ross, 2003). More specifically, DanTech employee attitudes reflect trends within the technology industry that value innovation, intellectual challenge, and technological savvy.

In response to the latter sub-question, most, if not all, employees stated that campus and service offerings indicated that DanTech “cared” about employees. The responses here addressed DanTech’s care of presentation and aesthetics, care of the client, and care of employees. Overall, employees stated that they were well aware that DanTech derives profit from the material campus as well as their employee service offerings. However, this was of little import because, as many pointed out, “at the end of the day,” the organization does in fact exist to make money. Again, the fact that DanTech garners profit from campus and service offerings did not squelch the fact that everyone I interviewed stated clearly that campus and employee amenities helped them manage their lives. When asked if campus made their lives better, each employee responded with a resounding “yes.”

Implications

Overall, research question two reinforced the basic idea that working context matters. In DanTech’s case, campus and employee offerings generally bolstered positive feelings regarding job function and DanTech as an employer. My analysis suggests that there are potentially both positive and negative characteristics that emerge from this type of environment. While
employees value and appreciate campus and service amenities, many interviewees expressed the hazard of becoming dependent upon campus and its offerings. As some DanTech workers indicated, people who consider leaving DanTech often find that campus and its associated services make the decision incredibly difficult. Additionally, employees largely find that they tolerate quirks they would not elsewhere because of campus offerings.

If DanTech is, in fact, involved in making people, they most certainly seem to make people who are happy (for the most part) with their jobs and especially their working environment. In addition, campus suggests to workers that DanTech is concerned about the well-being of its employees. Regardless of whether or not DanTech garners profit from campus and its amenities, employees overwhelmingly appreciate and value these resources. As campus psychologically positions employees, campus also serves to subject workers to processes of governmentality. DanTech employees are governed in that they are positioned to be articulated into the population of the idealized employee that is both docile and productive. Additionally, employees willingly participate in their governance. This is evidenced by the fact that DanTech employees choose for themselves what they use on campus and how. If employees do not turn a critical eye upon the organization, the ways in which the organization exerts control is unnoticed or obscured, thus, further enabling governance and discipline.

**Contributions**

Based on interviewee responses, it is clear that, overwhelmingly, employees like working at DanTech. However, employees expect and demand that they be challenged in their jobs. Further, this challenge is directly related to the industry in which DanTech is situated. DanTech is a software company poised amid discourses of technology, innovation, and creativity.
Massey et al. (1992) argued for the relevance of industry in their analysis of research parks. My project reinforces the view that the type of industry is important when performing any sort of organizational analysis. Further, several employees made clear that, while campus had dramatic impacts upon how they felt about their jobs and DanTech, campus and amenities are not necessarily enough to retain them. The people I interviewed (in fact, almost all DanTech employees) are highly skilled, highly trained, and highly educated knowledge workers that are steeped in communicative and cultural formations that value progress and technology. Thus, DanTech provides a working context that prides itself on generating cutting-edge, technological advances. In this sense, DanTech employees have developed expectations in regards to campus, DanTech as an organization, and job functions that are creative and challenging. This dissertation posed and addressed several questions regarding what happens to this type of knowledge worker (Florida, 2002) when situated on the grounds of a corporate campus.

I see one of the major contributions of this project as highlighting the importance of industry when performing analyses of employing organizations. Several authors have made this point, (Kunda, 2006; Massey et al., 1992; Ross, 2003); however, few discuss at length the connections with larger social discourse in regards to particular industries. However, Turner (2009) writes of the nuances involved in high-tech work cultures. In fact, he argues that the cultural framework for organizational life at Google is paralleled by Burning Man, a participatory art festival held each year in the Nevada desert. Turner describes the cultivation of playful corporate workspaces that serve as a “…home-away-from-home…” for high-tech workers (2009, p. 77). He offers this description of Google and how cultures of high-tech organizations have evolved:
To anyone accustomed to visiting the main offices of industrial-era information technology (IT) powerhouses such as IBM or AT&T, a stop in the lobby of Building 43 at Google’s Mountain View, CA headquarters, presents something of a shock. The cool blond wood and carefully recessed lighting which have marked the power of industrial firms for decades have disappeared. In their place, plain white walls are posted with some two dozen unframed photographs of giant sculptures set out in a flat, white desert and of fireworks exploding over the head of a giant neon stick figure. On the floor above, another 30 images line the hallways and overlook an in-house cafe and pool table. In these pictures, shirtless men in pantaloons spin fire-tipped batons in the dark. A tiny clapboard house with a bicycle out front stands alone on an empty plain, while a two story-tall chandelier lies crashed to the ground, baking under the sun. (Turner, 2009, pp. 73-74)

Turner describes a high-tech working environment whose culture has departed from stuffy cubicles in drab buildings. The space and the surrounding culture have transformed into areas of employee expression and growth. While Turner specifically describes Google’s corporate culture, common themes emerge across organizations and employees involved in high-tech industries. Workers in these contexts are knowledge workers, those who earn a livelihood from intellectual labor. High-tech knowledge workers are part of what Florida (2002) describes as the “creative class,” or, workers who produce through the use of innovation and creativity. Creativity, according to Florida, is the wonderstuff of today’s successful organization. He writes, “In virtually every industry, from automobiles to fashion, food products, and information technology itself, the winners in the long run are those who can create and keep creating” (Florida, 2002, p. 5). Even before the rise of the creative class, or the creative economy, technology industries and organizations have stressed creativity and innovation for decades. Kunda’s (2006) study of engineers is one such example in which he describes an organizational culture that values imaginative and inventive thought. Similarly, Massey et al. (1992) make similar claims about dominant themes surrounding research parks as spaces of ingenuity. As Florida sees them, creative knowledge workers “…share a common creative ethos that values creativity, individuality, difference and merit” (2002, p. 8). Specific to industry, high-tech
workers are accustomed to fast-paced change and intellectual challenge where employees experience both independence and collaboration (Terranova, 2000). Neff (2005) considers this a community approach to production, while similarly, Turner (2005) describes high-tech organizations as both communal and commercial.

A vast majority of DanTech employees are knowledge workers and members of the creative class. They exhibit industry standard themes for what is expected and valued—namely, creativity, innovation, competition, and collaboration. Additionally, they desire working contexts which similarly value these tropes, and, they are attracted to organizations that craft such spaces. Florida (2002) notes this tendency of the creative class when he describes regional clusters of creative people in and around cities, and more specifically, actual workspaces. Considering the intersections among creative knowledge workers and high-tech industries, the cultivation of corporate campus spaces appears a logical outgrowth of the emphasis on creativity and collaboration. As many interview responses indicate, challenge and satisfaction in one’s actual job, including being challenged and inventive in one’s work is priority for DanTech employees. Campus facilitates their ability to perform their jobs in the manner they would like because the pressures of other facets of life are muted by campus’ penetration into life realms. This is simultaneously beneficial and problematic for employees. DanTech’s campus is desirable precisely because it mutes other realms of life by closely integrating them into organizational space. However, while campus makes it easier for employees to manage different aspects of their lives, campus and employee use of it to mitigate life’s stressors reinscribes work as the primary realm of life, relegating all other facets of life as secondary (Hoffman & Cowan, 2008; Hoffman & Cowan, 2010; Kossek et al., 2010).

Research Question Three
Summary

My third and final area of inquiry addresses the blurring of boundaries of various life-realms. I examined relationships between “work” and “life” and how they seem to inform one another. Additionally, I considered notions of community and how they related to DanTech’s campus. Specifically, my sub-questions were:

How, if at all, does the corporate campus blur the traditional boundaries between work and life? What does this suggest about traditional notions of community? How does this enable us to reconceptualize community?

Campus most certainly enables the blurring of realms of “work” and “life.” Much of what employees can do on campus is not necessarily related to their jobs. Campus is intentionally designed so DanTech employees can integrate other realms of their lives into what is traditionally conceptualized as the workday. Leisure activities, food consumption, grooming, and educational pursuits are built-in to the organizational environment.

DanTech employees stated that they considered their working context a valued form of community in their lives. Many of them discussed the changing American landscape over recent decades with the expansion of suburban sprawl and the spatial and social distancing related to such a phenomenon. As such, employees valued the community environment they experienced at DanTech because it offered a support structure and social outlet.

Employee responses highlighted the potential benefits of creating community in their working context. However, reading these notions alongside critically oriented literature introduces the idea that community can serve as a vehicle for managerial interests. In other words, management attempts to prescribe specific forms of community that ultimately serve the
interests of the organization. Yet DanTech employees embrace the idea of community in their working contexts and claim that such formations improve their relationships and lives.

**Implications**

Clark’s (2000) notion of border-crossers conceptualizes employees as individuals who can (and must) shift from work and life domains. The ability to cross borders in this way enables workers to balance the demands of their lives. Yet Dale and Burrell (2008) discuss the problems of conceptualizing “work” and “workspace” as bounded areas and practices. Hoffman and Cowan (2007) similarly state that, while some notion of borders or boundaries exists, they must be permeable and flexible. Thus, contemporary subjects do not live compartmentalized lives. For many knowledge workers within the creative class, boundaries between life realms are incredibly porous and flexible. However, as McGowan (2005) notes, flexibility in itself is a technique of governance. Flexibility is framed as desirable, connoting individual agency and control over time spent. Yet, flexibility enables production to seep into ever more areas of life. For DanTech employees, flexibility means working from home, working from mobile devices, and spending leisure time on campus grounds.

DanTech’s corporate campus demonstrates flexibility between life realms through their intentional integration. Some material, spatial, and psychological borders and boundaries exist. However, as employees, campus, and theoretical literature demonstrate, the idea of such borders may be falling by the wayside. Obviously, many activities occur on DanTech’s campus that are not “work” related. What’s more, as private aspects of life are incorporated into campus, the domestic becomes closely tied to capitalist production. In this way, campus serves as a means to colonize the feminine domestic by inserting it into a masculine, productive, business context.
Efficiency and productivity, the foundations of business ideologies, are largely ingrained in the everyday actions and mentalities of many workers. This is evident in the ways employees economize their time both on and off-campus. Campus is ideal for employees because it saves them time and money, freeing up those resources for “non-work” realms of life.

Following authors such as Weber (2008) and Deetz (1992), it is easy to critique the permeation of business discourses and actions in everyday life. I agree that the scientific management of work erases a spontaneity and unknowingness that can offer unique political subject positions and renegotiations of power. Yet, I also take seriously Warhurst et al.’s (2008) assertion that the interpenetration of work/life can be positive and beneficial for workers. Many DanTech employees discussed overwhelming demands upon their time in multiple contexts. Time “management” enabled them to deal with such strains and structure their lives so they could pursue their interests, leisure, and/or familial responsibilities. Overall, DanTech employees value the ability to structure their time on-campus efficiently so they can consequently structure their time off-campus to suit their needs and desires.

Lastly, another form of interpenetration is the incorporation of community into working contexts. Community was traditionally thought of as life and contexts outside of work. However, increasingly, working contexts are considered community settings. Miller and Rose (2008) discuss some problematic aspects of community, in general, including the notion that they can be engineered settings carrying power relations and furthering processes of governmentality. Creation of community in the name of primarily organizational interests is certainly a threat. Yet, feelings of community do not necessarily operate to the detriment of employees. Again, workers are potentially positioned to use formations of community toward their advantage.
Contributions

My project problematizes the bifurcation of work and life by suggesting that these are facets of one’s reality and not merely contradictory necessities of human existence. Corporate campuses provide clear examples of the interplay between realms of life. Campuses often mimic home and living spaces. In fact, one of the most interesting insights from this project is that corporate campuses are a means of colonizing domestic space, incorporating feminized aspects of “home,” and inserting them into modes of capitalist production. This is similar to Fleming’s (2009) claims regarding modern forms of informal control in workspaces. He argues that organizational emphasis on fun and discourses of “be yourself” exist to corporatize everyday life. This is akin to Nadesan’s (2008) Foucauldian examination of governmentality, biopower, and everyday life in which she claims that various forms of governance enable market capitalization of everyday life. Du Gay (2000) offers a similar sentiment when he describes the governing capacities of organizational life. He states, “The aim [is to] induce efficiency, enhancing ‘cultural change’ in organizational and personal conduct through the introduction of market-type relationships—no matter how ostensibly artificial they might be—into evermore spheres of existence” (2000, p. 170). Again, the key issue Du Gay addresses here is market penetration of life realms, or, the emphasis on life’s imitation of market relations. McDowell (2004) similarly states:

…the current social and economic transformations of industrial societies do not respect the common or long-standing distinctions between the public and the private, between the state and the family. They are instead recasting the divisions and recombining them in ways that make brutally plain the ways in which the activities of production and reproduction are fundamentally interconnected. (p. 147)

Thus, not only are lines crossed between public and private, but the erasure of these boundaries inserts everyday life into capitalist production. Alternately, home, a traditionally
private space, is dominated by work and business ideologies. As Sotirin et al. (2007) note, “While managerial principles are presented as choices people are free to take up or ignore, choice is not really free. Managerial ideology casts happiness, morality, and the good family as achievable only through efficiency, rationality, control, and similar tenets” (p. 246). Here, Sotirin et al. argue that successful, ideal families are as such because of their ability to apply the managerial principles of efficiency, rationality, control, etc., to home life. Similarly, McDowell (2008) writes of the commoditization of the home, specifically of childcare. She notes:

Childcare has been recast through a substitution lens into a commodity form, reconstituted as a social responsibility enacted through the market and performed by the labour of socially unrelated others, either in state- or market-provided specialist facilities, or in the homes of individual families. This has the effect of transforming the home into a site of commoditized interactions, rather than a locus in which social relationships were assumed to be based on ties of love and affection. (2008, p. 156)

Thus, we see the propensity of managerialist ideologies to dominate both public and private spaces, or home and work. As different facets of one’s reality, I believe academics should continue to analyze the relationships between them as opposed to reinscribing the duality. I have tried to model my project in this light and demonstrate what such a critique could include. Additionally, governmentality is an ideal lens with which to view the problematics of corporate campuses and the integration of the private into productive realms. With attention toward assemblages of power, governmentality enables analysis of various forms of power and control.

In addition to the blurring of boundaries between work and life, my study also offers important insights regarding disciplining of employees in high-tech campuses that offer numerous amenities to further develop oneself (Brown, 2009; Nadesan & Trethewey 2000; Trethewey, 1999; Zoller, 2003; Zoller, 2004). In the case of DanTech and its corporate campus, the organization generates an environment where employees are encouraged to construct the
enterprising self (Halford & Leonard, 2006; Miller & Rose, 2008). Du Gay (1996) proposed the idea of the enterprising self to explain the propensity of subjects to be productive in all realms of life. Many others have examined how people internalize entrepreneurial identities (Cohen & Musson, 2000; Fenwick, 2002; Mitchell et al., 2003; Ogbor, 2000; Nadin, 2007; Storey et al., 2005; Watson, 2009). Definitions of the enterprising self outline how subjects are positioned to strive for personal growth and productivity. For example, Fenwick writes, “This [enterprising self] is the new ideal of individualization, where individuals are self-reliant, engaged in continuous reflexive self-assessment and self-marketing” (2002, p. 704). Storey et al. (2005) similarly state:

These management attempts to reconstitute the subjectivities of employees are multifaceted, but a central theme of these attempts to regulate identity as a form of organizational control is the use of various components of the language of enterprise (notably, through such constructs as liberalization, self-actualization, autonomy and empowerment). (p. 1035)

Thus, subjects are positioned as self-aware agents who can and should act in ways that improve themselves and their lives. Further, Watson (2009) conceptualizes an entrepreneurial identity as a cultural stereotype that people may have attached to them by others, internalize on their own, or some combination of both. Du Gay elaborates on the governing potential of this form of subject position (2000). He writes, “…[techniques of governance] encourage the governed to adopt a certain ‘entrepreneurial’ form of practical relationship to themselves as a condition of their effectiveness and of the effectiveness of this form of government” (2000, p. 168).

What we can take from these authors writing about the enterprising self is threefold. First, definitions of the enterprising self are social and cultural. Thus, we communicatively create the significance of the enterprising self, just as we socially emphasize this as a desirable
identity. Secondly, organizations capitalize on their employees’ adoption of the enterprising self. Theoretically, if employees take it upon themselves to be productive, efficient, and innovative, they require less direct organizational control. Hence, they strive to be productive on their own, translating into increased organizational productivity. Third, organizations, especially those with corporate campuses, can create an environment where enterprising subjects pursue self-improvement and efficiency at every turn. As Watson notes, “…the principle of the ‘enterprising self’ and emphasizing how an ‘ethos of enterprise’ pervades every aspect of the modern consumerist society…” (2009, p. 253). At DanTech, we see this ethos of enterprise in employees’ work, but also within the organizational space.

A key contribution of my project is the notion that DanTech’s campus and employees evidence the social drive towards the entrepreneurial self. As I have argued before, campus quite literally is a self-help space. Employees can maximize their time, both working and tending to other facets of life, by using campus amenities and services. What’s more, as my interviews indicate, employees clearly state that they value the ability to structure their work and lives in relation to campus, suggesting the degree to which they have internalized the enterprising self.

In light of reconsidering the work/life duality, academics must also consider how this transforms definitions and uses of community. Using the lens of governmentality, many authors suggest that constructions of community are mechanisms for creating self-governing populations (Conway & Crenshaw, 2009; Flint, 2002; Ilcan & Basok, 2004; McDermont, 2004; Roe, 2009; Rose, 2008). Such authors examine how community defines populations, and then articulates subjects into those populations by normalizing behaviors. For example, Ilcan and Basok (2004) examined the intersections between governmentality, community, volunteer organizations, and
the making of “responsible citizens.” They describe the framework of these intersections when they state:

As a concept, community government refers to the ways in which the contemporary politics of government has come to define, shape, and orient communities (for example, volunteer communities) such that they engage in activities that attempt to responsibilize certain groups of citizens for particular purposes and ends. (Ilcan & Basok, 2004, p. 130)

In Ilcan and Basok’s (2004) study, processes of governmentality mold and position subjects for participation in community formations for the advancement of liberalism, not necessarily for the benefit of those who comprise the community. Similarly, in Flint’s (2002) article about housing agencies and the governance of anti-social behavior, community establishes behavioral norms by which subjects must abide. Flint states:

A key aspect of such discourse is the use of ‘community’ as a technology of informal social control and the perceived ability of community to transmit norms and regulate behavior and ‘mold compliance’ to the dominant values of responsibility and risk management. (2002, pp. 624-625)

Thus, key features of community include defining a population and outlining standards of thought and behavior. Additionally, subjects choose to align themselves with particular communities on their own accord. McDermont suggests as much and writes, “…once people identify themselves as members of a community, governing occurs through utilizing the individual’s allegiance to collective norms. An individual’s own sense of responsibility towards the community values is mobilized in a government of the self” (2004, p. 858).

This sense of community is an important component of DanTech’s campus and the everyday reality of employees. First, as I stated several times, DanTech intentionally incorporates elements of the private sphere into the workspace. Hence, the organization purposely molds a workspace community. The dominant values of DanTech’s community reflect those of the enterprising self and dominant trends associated with high-tech organizations.
In other words, DanTech’s is a community that values efficiency and productivity in all realms of life, hence the efficacy of campus and employees’ willingness to bureaucratize and calculate the “non-work” realms of life. Additionally, DanTech’s community celebrates creativity, innovation, and intellectual challenge. Second, in accordance with principles of governmentality, DanTech employees are positioned to “freely” integrate themselves into the workspace community, at least in theory. However, when employees do not assimilate into DanTech’s community, discomfort is keenly felt. For example, many employees stated that they experienced pressure to be happy and grateful for the resources DanTech provides, consequently, shutting down expression of discontent. Thus, standards of DanTech’s community include appreciation and deference to the organization. While employees are free to articulate themselves into DanTech’s community (or not), it is certainly not in an employee’s best interest to be viewed as a dissenting voice. Yet another example is found in employees’ expression of guilt in regards to being overweight and not using campus fitness resources. DanTech’s community values the enterprising self, and to echo Nadesan and Trethewey’s (2000) sentiment once again, a professional body is a fit body. An “unfit” body positions one outside of the idealized employee by suggesting her/his lack of proper bodily management, which reflects one’s inability to manage time and available resources.

Incorporating elements of community into a workspace is a powerful means of creating populations and mechanisms to govern them. As Ilcan and Basok (2004) note, “The political attraction to community is its apparent innocence and neutrality, particularly its non-political or pre-political status. In many ways, the seeming naturalness of community has facilitated a mode of government through communities” (p. 131). Indeed, DanTech employees, while expressing discomfort when outside of communal norms, overwhelmingly take community for granted and
celebrate the fact community is present on campus. DanTech employees repeatedly expressed that campus community was a great value to them both personally and professionally and rarely did an employee problematize the concept. I believe this happens for two reasons. First, community does appear as natural and neutral. Socially, we are governed to insert ourselves into certain populations, hence, communities. However, secondly, we would be remiss to simply dismiss community as a tool of governance. We attain a sense of belonging and cultivate strong social ties through our acceptance of community. At DanTech, people like the relationships they forge with others. Employees state that this improves their lives at work, and consequently, their lives overall. Employees’ negotiations of community provide insight into their precarity, as Gill and Pratt (2008) outline the concept. While campus and community are problematic in their governing capacities, employees retain the ability to make resources work for them. In this way, employees can use DanTech’s campus and resources to alter their own subject positions. Employees indicate as much in their descriptions of how DanTech’s campus, resources, and community benefit them.

As Ross (2003) suggests, when employees state that they like certain facets of their employing organizations, or more, that they like or even love their jobs or their employing organization, academics should pay attention. Thus, when DanTech employees state, “Yes, campus makes my life better,” academics should attend to the reasons why. This dissertation examined organizational, social, and personal negotiations of DanTech discerning some of the reasons campus creates a desirable environment. My analysis is rooted in critical theory, using the lens of governmentality, to discuss the problematics of DanTech’s campus. However, academics must also pay attention to the ways in which problematic structures are appropriated by those that use them.
In the next and final chapter, I offer concluding thoughts and directions for further research. I suggest that the contributions I’ve outlined in this chapter warrant further examination and discussion. Additionally, I suggest some of my study’s limitations and how future research can remedy these limitations.
Chapter 6
Conclusions

Purpose and Intent

It’s been many years since my days of working near Portland, my drive to and from the office punctuated by a longing to work and play on Nike’s corporate campus juxtaposed with my co-worker’s scoffing of the organization. Our reactions to campus, one overwhelmingly positive and one overwhelmingly negative, demonstrate the breadth with which corporate campuses can be viewed. There are many benefits to campuses as my interviews suggest. Employees value time savings, good food, educational opportunities, and other amenities. Yet, some drawbacks emerge as well. Whether employees recognize it or not, they are governed by the corporate campus space that surrounds them. Some people feel as if they cannot express discontent, some considered DanTech employees spoiled, and others feel bound to their jobs at DanTech because they are unable or unwilling to forsake campus amenities.

My purpose in this project was to use governmentality as a theoretical lens and examine a corporate campus environment, especially considering social, cultural, spatial, and organizational elements. I believe corporate campuses are a relevant topic of study because they are routinely described as desirable places to work. They are lauded in the popular press for being humane workspaces. Corporate campuses are also routinely praised by the employees who work at them. Additionally, they overtly and intentionally integrate realms of life into their design, creating interesting gendered dynamics while obscuring the lines
between production and other realms of life. Lastly, they offer material, cultural, and ideological texts to analyze alongside contemporary definitions of work.

My first research question explored the type of environment DanTech’s campus created. In other words, I examined what DanTech’s campus does, both on its own and in regards to employees. In addressing this question, I attended to the physical and material attributes of campus, employee services and amenities, and their intersections. My second research question explored how campus and amenities impacted employee understandings of their jobs and DanTech as an organization. Here, I also addressed knowledge workers of the creative class and specifically information technology workers. Lastly, research question three examined the blurring of boundaries at DanTech’s campus including those between work and life, labor and leisure, and public and private. I situated this discussion as it relates to the creation of community and how that plays out at DanTech.

**Process and Research Methodology**

To answer my research questions, I relied largely on information gathered in one-on-one interviews. I conducted interviews with both current and former employees of DanTech. The primary eligibility criterion was that interviewees were current or former DanTech employees at the corporate campus headquarters. In all, 14 interviews were conducted with current employees and six were conducted with former employees. The average interview time was 46 minutes. All interviews took place at the location preferred by the interviewee. Some interviewees were unable or unwilling to meet in person and I conducted and recorded these conversations over the phone. I approached each interview as a semi-structured conversation. While I had specific questions to pose to interviewees, I did not constrain
interviews to follow a particular order in my questioning. Participants appeared to embrace the nonlinearity of the interviews and I feel that the format encouraged them to feel comfortable and forthcoming with their perspectives and opinions.

While I was unable to spend extended periods of time on campus, I made every attempt to prolong each visit and record field notes. Since many of my interviews took place on campus, I would often sit in my car writing my thoughts and observations of campus. On several occasions, I drove around campus grounds observing material facets of campus.

Over 100 pages of interview transcripts served as my primary source of data. My own observations were an additional form of data. Academic literature informed my project throughout and I also garnered much from popular press. Thematics, groupings, and categorizations were done in alignment with my research questions. I continually revisited data, literature, and themes tweaking them to best address my research questions.

**Summary of Research Questions and Conclusions**

Exploring various facets of DanTech’s campus environment under the lens of governmentality introduced interesting questions about the influence of materiality and spatiality and how they intersect with organizational culture and offerings. It is difficult to draw parameters around “campus,” since campus exists in relation to social, cultural, and physical norms. For example, corporate campuses largely rely on suburban contexts which valorize idyllic and bucolic settings. Such suburbanization is intimately bound with mobility (cars and freeways for example) and social ideas regarding purity and cleanliness (the city is “dirty,” the country is “clean”). While I did not address these factors in great detail, I did recognize their import in cultivating campus environments. Thus, DanTech’s campus,
situated in a suburban context, demonstrates a romanticization of nature and one which both employees and clients appreciate. In addition to an aesthetically pleasing space, DanTech’s service offerings and amenities appeal to employees and outside evaluators as demonstrated by the organization’s continual reference on *Fortune’s* Best Places to Work list. Available employee service offerings, as I’ve stated several times, is extensive. Employees can attend to their health, families, fitness, education, and so on.

On the surface, campus may appear innocuous. However, campus provides a context in which employees are intensely governed. Employees encounter discourses modeling the ideal employee as one that is productive, determined, efficient, and self-determined. Campus molds employees’ thoughts and actions through discursive, ideological, and material practices. In this way, campus shapes the fields of possibility for employees.

In addressing research question two, employees suggested that campus and amenities certainly impact their everyday, how they understand their jobs, and how they understand DanTech as an organization. Research question two reinforces Deetz’s (2007) claim that working environments are cultural and steeped in power. While all employees indicated that campus had an impact, employees were not uniform in how they defined those impacts. When I asked if campus made employees’ lives better, every single employee interviewed answered with an enthusiastic “yes.” Everyone suggested that the benefits garnered from campus were considerable. Yet, employees offered several different perspectives regarding the types of impact they and/or their co-workers experienced. Only one person indicated that campus was the sole reason they remained at DanTech. A majority of interviewees indicated that campus and amenities existed in relation to performing a job they liked which offered continual challenge and room for intellectual growth. This indicates the importance of
studying organizational contexts (DanTech’s campus in this case) while carefully considering the types of employees interviewed and industry in which they’re involved.

While all employees openly express their praise of campus and service amenities, at least half of interviewed employees also addressed some potential pitfalls. One former employee stated that he encountered difficulty in deciding whether or not to leave DanTech even though he felt stagnant in his job. His hesitation stemmed largely from losing access to campus and amenities as he recognized that he would have to earn over $20,000 more in salary to “make up the difference.” Similarly, another employee recounted the story of a friend who remained at DanTech because she had children in the campus daycare. Stories such as those of employees who feel as if they can’t leave because of the campus amenities pepper interviews. Yet another woman suggested that any open statement of discontent was commonly considered ungracious complaining.

Regardless, employees ultimately didn’t care why DanTech provided campus and amenities. They mostly suggest that they feel it’s some combination of doing the right thing and providing an efficient environment that streamlines productivity (and consequently profit). In general, employees suggested that the arrangement was mutually beneficial, enriching both themselves and DanTech as an organization.

Addressing my third research question, DanTech’s campus suggests a significant blurring of boundaries and elements of life that are traditionally binarized. Clearly, campus complicates a separation of “work” and “life” as DanTech, and corporate campuses in general, are constructed to intentionally combine facets of one’s life. Campus enables the easy access of many realms of life. This is somewhat to be expected since spatial, temporal,
and psychological flexibility are steadily increasingly for many people (Clark, 2000; Dale & Burrell, 2008; Hoffman & Cowan, 2007). In terms of community, border flexibility did not appear to contribute to any sense of “loss of community.” In fact, employees liked the sense of community they experienced at DanTech.

**Potential Limitations**

In conducting this research, I encountered some challenges that potentially limited my capacity to address the research questions. When I originally conceptualized the project, my ideal research methodology included a heavily ethnographic component in line with Madison’s (2005) critical ethnography. I worked very closely with a current DanTech employee to secure a job on campus. Ultimately, after several weeks of negotiating, I was unable to secure any position on campus. While I am not certain of the exact reasons, I know DanTech encountered legal issues in “hiring” me without pay and I also believe they were hesitant to grant an academic this type of access for fear of any disparaging references of the organization. I certainly feel that ethnographic methodologies would have been ideal for the project. However, researchers have traditionally encountered much resistance in gaining access to corporate settings as Alvesson and Deetz (2000) explain.

Because I was unable to work on campus, in-depth interviewing emerged as both the most logical and accessible means to address my research questions. Obviously, interviewing current employees at DanTech’s headquarters and corporate campus was useful in gaining insight into everyday organizational life. Since they are currently employed on campus, these employees offered up-to-date perspectives on DanTech and campus life. I also interviewed former employees of DanTech’s campus. Some critics may suggest that
interviewing past DanTech employees is less effective because of their distance from the organization. This is a valid critique because these employees no longer are on the campus daily. As a result, they are less aware of the current social and cultural dimensions of campus life. However, I feel that, while these employees have more distance from the organization, both material and psychological, this distance can actually enrich interview responses. For example, consider the response of one participant who claimed DanTech’s employees were “spoiled” by how well they were treated. In this employee’s purview, it was hard to offer critiques of DanTech because on the whole, he felt employees were treated very well. However, without this proximity to the organization, former employees appeared more willing to speak of problems they observed and encountered while working at DanTech. Thus, what could be labeled as some as a potential limitation, I argue that interviewing both current and former DanTech employees provides more nuanced perspectives.

Another potential limitation of my sample was that I only interviewed white-collar professional workers. DanTech is unique because everyone who works on campus grounds is a DanTech employee. This includes “non-professional” and service workers such as cooks, landscapers, security guards, janitorial staff, and so on. Undoubtedly, service workers must have a different take on their working lives, as they relate to campus and their off-campus lives as well. While I made many efforts to interview such workers, I was unsuccessful in obtaining any contacts.

One final potential limitation is that, while I make some broader claims about corporate campuses, I focus my research on one primary site. Specificity of context is generally a positive facet in research. For example, corporate campuses may look very different based on industry and region. I tried to attend to the specificities of the site
recognizing DanTech’s campus context as unique. However, I do believe that campuses have
many similarities that suggest a lot about contemporary negotiations of realms of life. 
Working on highly regarded corporate campuses are coveted positions for many people. 
Thus, campus environments speak to a particular segment of American workers for a 
multitude of reasons. I suggest that this may be true due to permeation of business ideologies 
in everyday life and the ease in pursuing the enterprising self on campus (Nadesan & 
Trethewey, 2000; Trethewey, 1999). It is true that campuses are contextual entities in and of 
themselves but they are also reflective are larger social and cultural norms and desires. 
Undeniable differences and similarities emerge when analyzing multiple campuses. As such, 
one corporate campus can be studied for both its individual characteristics as well as how it 
overlaps with other campuses and what that ultimately suggests about cultural formations.

Directions for Future Research

In conducting research and addressing my research questions, several affiliated 
notions emerged as ideal areas for the pursuit of future research. Several key concepts 
surfaced that I will describe in turn. First, examining corporate campus contexts as 
androgynously gendered spaces enables a masculine colonization of feminine realms of life. 
Future research in this vein could elaborate upon how this androgynous space constitutes 
workers as gendered subjects. Second, campuses are also ideal locations for pursuing the 
enterprising self and furthering the incorporation of business ideologies into other realms of 
life. Future research could address more specifically how this reflects the subject position 
and desires of creative knowledge workers, particularly in the information technology 
industry. Third, the ways community is employed and understood by campus workers offers 
an interesting window into how subjects are both governed and find ways out of governance
by appropriating facets of campus. Relatedly, future research could address how employees occupy the position of the precariat and use resources to work in their own best interest. Finally, my project potentially highlights the benefits of interviewing former employees of an organization who might be more forthcoming in their insights. Future research could explore the tactic of interviewing former employees, especially for researchers having trouble gaining access to particular organizational settings and organizational members.

The first area for future research addresses the (gendered) spatiality of corporate campuses. Following critical organizational theorists and a litany of geographers, corporate campuses are spaces where power is exercised through ideological and material means. This suggests that no space is neutral. Thus, when examining corporate campuses and how they function, academics must be sensitive to power dynamics. As I have argued, campus grounds are part of processes of governmentality and contribute to the formation of the “ideal employee” by establishing truths. Campus also shapes possible fields of action for employees by shaping norms of behavior and thought.

One of the most interesting power dynamics on DanTech’s campus is the gendering of the space. Space is not only power-laden in a general sense, but all spaces reflect gendered power dynamics and constitute individuals as gendered subjects. On DanTech’s corporate campus, the boundaries between “work” and “life” are erased as these realms of life bleed into one another. However, the obscuring of these boundaries is in and of itself highly gendered and enabled through campus space. On the most basic level, work is largely regarded as participation in the public sphere; hence, if often considered a masculine activity that occurs in masculine spaces. Corporate campuses are interesting because, while they certainly are spaces of/for work, they also incorporate many elements of private, the home,
and hence, the feminine. Thus, campus is an androgynous space where masculine and
feminine ideologies and actions intermingle.

Though campus is an androgynous space, it cannot be said to be equally masculine
and feminine. On the surface, corporate campuses appear to integrate the feminized realms
of life (domestic labor, childcare, food preparation, etc.) with masculinized norms of “work.”

On the one hand, this phenomenon reinforces the idea that realms of life are increasingly
interpenetrative. However, what emerges as perhaps a more interesting notion is how
corporate campuses enable masculinized management and monitoring of the traditionally
feminized realms of life. If one considers this with a critical lens, blurring boundaries of
various life-realms is steeped in gendered power dynamics. It seems there is an easy
transition for applying masculinized business principles and practices to “non-work.” In this
way, people economize time and “manage” everyday life. Perhaps the influx of the
feminized into masculinized space does not suggest a renegotiation of gendered
organizational dynamics. Alternately, these actions could provide a vehicle for
institutionalized and organizing the feminine domestic. Thus, renegotiations of the
masculine and feminine, while certainly influencing each other, are differentially valued and
applied.

As I have argued, the integration of the feminized private realm into the masculine
(and public) arena of work enables capital’s appropriation of the traditionally domestic and
communal. In other words, DanTech’s campus, and corporate campuses in general, colonize
the feminine and insert “the Commons” into capitalist production and exchange. Such
contexts indicate the capacity for the articulation of everything, everyone, and every
relationship into relations of capitalist exchange. While this is not necessarily so, and far
from an inevitability, corporate campuses demonstrate the potential for capital’s usurpation of
all life-realms. Future research on corporate campuses and blurring of life realms can
certainly elaborate on the spatial elements of corporate campuses, how they are gendered,
how they constitute gendered subjects, and how colonizing the feminine actually furthers
positions “private” life realms firmly in relations of capitalist production.

The second area of future research examines the enterprising self in corporate campus
contexts, particularly those situated in information technology industries. Corporate
campuses are highly regarded and sought-after working environments, despite their ability to
govern thoughts and behaviors. We could attribute their success, regardless of their
problems, to employees’ ability to appropriate campus resources to suit their own needs and
desires. However, while employees certainly do use campus to meet their needs, they also
exist in a series of power relations beyond their control that mold how they live and work.
One such exercise of power is the circulation and internalization of discourses surrounding
the enterprising and entrepreneurial self.

On the whole, the United States is largely a society permeated by discourses of
productivity and efficiency. What is clear is that many people feel social and cultural
pressure to constantly engage in productive activities in a perpetual effort at improving the
self. The enterprising-self is a subject position that depends on constant development and
progress (Halford & Leonard, 2006; Miller & Rose, 2008). The realms of life in which such
actions take place are numerous. One can improve diet, fitness, education, parenting skills,
sexual prowess, outward appearance, and grooming habits to list only a few. Considering the
list of amenities and employee services offered by DanTech and other well-known corporate
campuses, such environments appear as ideal spaces for employees (and sometimes their
families) to engage with their quest of the enterprising-self. Since employees can manage multiple realms of life at their place of employment, as in fact this is the intention of campus, an organizational culture of maximum output seeps into these life-realms. In other words, corporate campus services and amenities provide not only a means for life management and maintenance, but also reinforce cultural norms of productivity and persistent progress in regards to the project of the self. Perhaps this is why some DanTech employees stated that others were “stupid” if they did not use certain on-campus resources, or why others expressed guilt for not using fitness facilities even though they felt they should. This notion is closely in line with Nadesan and Trethewey’s (2000) idea that a professional, successful body is a fit body. Alternately, the conspicuously unfit body connotes lack of dedication and discipline, two characteristics that no serious professional should possess. Ultimately, future research in this vein will consider modern notions of the enterprising self, or the project of the self, and analyze the ways in which corporate campuses create environments where people can easily participate in constant self-improvement.

Largely, contemporary capitalist subjects, specifically creative knowledge workers, are positioned as perpetual entrepreneurs. As such, all realms of life, work, home, and leisure “should” be efficient and productive. The self is a continuous project in which one strives for personal growth and the norms that define idealized populations. DanTech’s campus illustrates modern subjects’ pursuit of the enterprising self both by making everyday lives of employees efficient and productive through the design of organizational space, but also by offering programs and service that advocate and enable personal growth. DanTech’s campus is a veritable self-help space in which employees improve their education, health, fitness, financial standing, appearance, familial relations and so on. In a sense, they are governed in
the ways they freely articulate themselves into idealized citizens by embracing the enterprising self. DanTech’s campus encourages and eases access to resources that help transform individuals into entrepreneurial subjects. Perhaps future research can further examine corporate campuses as self-help spaces, and/or spaces where the pursuit of the enterprising self is streamlined into the everyday lives of employees.

Further, a vast majority of those working on corporate campuses are professional knowledge workers and members of the creative class (Florida, 2002). These workers experience, and often times demand, new forms of flexibility in their lives and work. I believe this is one reason for the success of corporate campus environments. Professional knowledge workers, particularly information technology workers, want intellectual challenge, freedom to “think outside of the box,” and spatial and temporal flexibility with their lives and work (Turner, 2009). Many are not comfortable compartmentalizing work and life and desire just as much “play” at work, as they do “work” in their play. As academics consider industry-specific work trends, it is interesting to analyze how these trends intersect with (technology) knowledge workers and the constructions of corporate campuses.

A third area of potential future research addresses the use of community upon corporate campuses. A key contribution of this project is the analysis of how discourses of community are created and understood on DanTech’s campus. The integration of community onto campus is yet another example of how life and work are integrated into DanTech’s space. Community is typically thought of as part of the domestic and/or private and certainly outside the realm of work and production. This, however, has changed. As my interviews indicate, employees perceive DanTech as a community, and what’s more, they want it to be a community. They experience a sense of belonging by being a part of the DanTech
community. However, on-campus, notions of community articulate populations (such as the idealized employee), establish behavioral norms, and discipline those who act outside of such norms and violate the cultural bonds of the community. In this way, on-campus community governs employees by exercising extreme degrees of control over their lives and work.

Lastly, I believe my study offers a methodological contribution that can inform future research. I feel that interviewing both current and former employees of a particular organization offers well-rounded perspectives and responses to research questions. Current employees offer the most up-to-date perspectives. However, former employees demonstrate a willingness to openly critique the organization in contrast to current employees who were open and honest in their responses, but covertly phrased their discontent. A balance of current and former interview participants can enrich data and also serve as a means to mitigate issues of accessing current employees.

Final Thoughts

Overall, the phenomenon of corporate campuses offers unique insight into the ways we live, or rather, the ways many people want to live. Their massive popularity and desirability for potential employees suggests that we exist within social and cultural matrices that position such organizational contexts as ideal working and living environments. The fundamental question then becomes simply, why? Why do many people value these working contexts? What do we gain from them? And what do we lose?

This dissertation examined a few facets of one particular corporate campus. The case of DanTech demonstrates the nuances of a campus environment in material, spatial, ideological, and cultural terms. DanTech employees clearly articulate with resounding
regularity that, yes, campus makes a difference in their lives. Further, campus makes their lives better. Such sentiments pose interesting questions for future research regarding what constitutes “better,” what we value, and why.

All workplaces/spaces carry particular mechanisms of power. Corporate campuses are fascinating contexts to study for many reasons. First, the incorporation of the feminized “private/domestic” into the masculinized “public” domain introduces interesting ideas regarding the usurpation of all realms of life into capitalist production. Additionally, continuing this gendered analysis, corporate campuses create androgynous spaces, albeit not equally gendered, which constitute workers as gendered subjects. Second, corporate campuses demonstrate creative knowledge workers’ desires for flexibility on temporal, spatial, and psychological levels. While workers may embrace such a context, flexibility as a problematic concept is often overlooked. In other words, in the case of corporate campuses, flexibility means you can attend to your “life” while at “work.” But it also means that much, if not all, realms of life are penetrated by one’s employing organization. Thus, the flexibility of work and work environment ultimately create greater reliance upon one’s employing organization, not less. Third, corporate campuses problematize the compartmentalization of “work” and “life,” just as the further complicate notions of work/life balance. Such compartmentalization oversimplify the permeability of life realms while also positioning “work” as the most important facet of “life.”

Certainly, corporate campuses can enrich employees’ lives. Yet, they can also exact measures of discipline and control. In this sense, campuses have both positive and negative aspects. Both the positive and negative come to bear on the bodies and psyches of employees. Corporate campus contexts intersect with employee subject positions in
important ways. Continued analyses of these intersections offer academics much insight into contemporary conceptualizations of work and life and how political structures constrain and enable those employees working within them.
## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Time with company</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Still with DanTech</th>
<th>Interview Duration (minutes)</th>
<th>On/Off Campus interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9.5 years</td>
<td>Multiple departments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>Upper-level Management</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.5 years</td>
<td>Tech Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>Applications Tester</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Programmer</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Management Training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Software Developer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Creative Designer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Social Media Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Glenda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Mainframe Support Manager</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>Multiple Departments</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Janelle</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>Tech Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>Software Developer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>Technical Writer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Technical Writer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>Publications Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bridget</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22 years</td>
<td>Sales Representative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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