

Resilience in Organizational Life

A Philosophical Study about the Rising Demand for
Resilient Knowledge Workers in Contemporary Organizational Life



Per Marquard Otzen, Danish cartoonist

16. January 2017

Master's Thesis

MSc in Business Administration and Philosophy
Copenhagen Business School

Assistant Professor Rasmus Johnsen, Department of Management, Politics, and Philosophy

Michael Birch Jørgensen, Student ID: 630577, CPR: 030888-XXXX

Word count: 157.376

ABSTRACT.....	2
INTRODUCTION	4
THE THESIS RESEARCH QUESTION.....	8
METHOD.....	9
MICHEL FOUCAULT'S HISTORICAL PROBLEMATIZATION ANALYSIS	10
<i>The Resilience Concept</i>	15
<i>Knowledge Worker and Knowledge Work</i>	21
<i>Analytic Framework</i>	25
CHAPTER ONE.....	27
RESILIENCE AND CONTRADICTIONS.....	27
<i>Resilience as an Exploitation of Human Resources?</i>	30
<i>Accept, Critique, Endure?</i>	34
CHAPTER TWO.....	39
RESILIENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE	39
<i>Hartmut Rosa's Theory of Social Acceleration</i>	40
<i>Stress-resilient Knowledge Workers?</i>	43
<i>Individualization of Knowledge Workers' Knowledge Work</i>	46
CHAPTER THREE.....	58
RESILIENCE AND SOCIAL PATHOLOGIES.....	58
<i>The U-turn of Social Pathology</i>	60
<i>Axel Honneth's Social Pathology Theory</i>	63
<i>Peter Sloterdijk's Modern Cynicism</i>	66
<i>Hartmut Rosa's Theory of Alienation</i>	69
DISCUSSION	72
CONCLUSION	77
REFERENCES	80
APPENDIX A.....	84
APPENDIX B.....	86

Abstract

This thesis offers a critical and philosophical contribution to the vibrant history of resilience research and social pathologies theories.

The origins of the resilience concept come from a study in the fields of psychology and have, in recent years, gained a rising attention in the fields of sociology and philosophy.

This notion of *original resilience theory* refers to the theoretical and empirical research on how children develop competence despite adversity in *life*.

Nowadays, this resilience concept refers to a rising phenomenon in contemporary organizational life (hereafter: organizational life) due to its presence in job advertisements (hereafter: job ads).

Within some contemporary theoretical perspectives and empirical research on the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life, individuals are considered as being responsible for being resilient by turning it into a problem of personal behavior, decisions, and psychological traits of the human subject.

In this sense, job ads reduce the notion of the resilience demand to the way individual knowledge worker must find ways to cope with conditions of organizational life. I refer to the condition of organizational life, in a metaphorical sense, as a *stand/run marathon* to which knowledge workers must aspire to willingly or unwillingly. Not only they have to participate to it, but they also have to become the accelerators of this race.

This paradoxical *stand/run marathon* is linked with social pathologies theories, given the clash of the rational logics of global competition and human emotions. *Organizational life* is affected by global competition and therefore seeks to exploit human resources. In other words, transcending the performativity of knowledge workers makes them miserable and well off at the same time.

The emergence of the resilience concept in job ads today is an example of how organizational life articulates and actively attempts to make knowledge workers transcend boundaries of *human life*. These inevitable individual failures in the fulfilment of the resilience demand in organizational life affect human behaviors in negative ways because knowledge workers adopt cynical behavior and alienate from self, others and things, despite what *Positive Psychology* inspired self-help industry tells them.

An organizational- and managerial problem is that there cannot be any solutions, which do not automatically exclude this resilience demand as an individual problem. In other words, this thesis point to how it might be possible for managers, organizations, and the self-help industry to 'help' knowledge workers in their pursuit for sustaining the resilience demand in job ads, by progressively teaching individual knowledge workers to develop resilience in *private life*.

However, the demand for resilience in *organizational life* is fundamentally a challenge for the individual knowledge workers. A challenge that, unlike humans, has no boundaries given the aims of global competition.

This thesis applies a Foucauldian philosophical perspective to gain a unique understanding of how the resilience concept is affected by the logics of organizational life and associated with social pathologies theories.

This thesis attempts to demonstrate, in a diagnostic analysis, a vicious cycle of the demand for resilience when it is associated with social pathologies in late-modern societies.

Drawing on Hartmut Rosa's notion on *Social Acceleration*, this thesis outlines, a potential problematic shift in human behaviours in the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life now.

This thesis argues and discusses how Rosa's concept of *Alienation* can be an underlying social pathology to the rising mental illnesses in modern life. In a dialogue with Rosa, I suggest how we may go from there by considering 'alienation's other' that Rosa refers as *Resonance* to be part of a solution to alienation tendencies of late-modernity.

With Sloterdijk's notion on *Modern Cynicism*, this thesis explains both how the emergence of the resilience demand in organizational life affects knowledge workers and make cynical reasoning a social pathology and how we may go from there with Sloterdijk's call for the revival of *Ancient Kynicism*.

'Where there is power, there is resistance'

Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*

Keywords: Resilience, Knowledge worker, Performance Subject, Individualization, Instrumentalization, Human Resource, Global competition, Competitive State, Stand/run marathon, Social Pathologies, Social Acceleration, Alienation, Resonance, Modern Cynicism, Ancient Kynicism.

Introduction

Today, we can find the *resilience*¹ concept as a personal demand in various job ads, from *lawyers* (Appendix A) to *social workers* (Appendix B).

We can also find the resilience concept in many various places ranging from arguments in *politics* to description of *product design*.

Our current prime minister in Denmark, Lars Løkke Rasmussen (Dinnesen, 2016) has, for example used the resilience concept in a political speech about the Danish SU-system:

“Public support [SU] and free educations are attractive... We must get it under control, which is why we must make our public support system [SU-system] more resilient.”

Technical University of Denmark (DTU), for example, argues for robust (synonymous to resilience) product design:

“When designs are not robust, we see overly specified tolerances, uncontrollable variance in production, slow ramp-up times, high scrap rates and reduced quality of the product.”

These two examples of a contemporary and various use of the resilience concept provide two important inputs for this thesis. For clarity purposes, the resilience concept and the robust concept has the same meaning in this thesis because these two concepts are quite synonymously used by job ads and in the media. The other thing is that the resilience concept, in both examples, demonstrates some connection to the concept control. Thus, this thesis explore the idea of the resilience concept to be about getting something *under control* or something to be *controllable*.

How can we know that resilience is a rising demand for knowledge workers?

A recent study, with the illuminating title *Employers Demands Resilience*, by the joint forces of newspaper UgebrevetA4 and the online job database Jobindex.dk (Holts,

¹ *Italics* is used to highlight expressions and concepts in text and quotes, and mark literary works.

2015), have statistically discovered the most used personal competences concepts in job advertisements and their historical development since 2007 until now. The resilience concept, above other concepts, has achieved the status of a *buzzword* in job ads today (Holts, 2015), which is highly interesting (See also Jørgensen, 2016).

A frequent glance at job ads, whether online or prints in recent time, demonstrates that the resilience concept is used in the same way as other highly valuable personal competences. These are typical: *independent, engaged, flexible, effective, creative, goal-oriented, result-oriented* (Holst, 2015). There are other personal skills than these, but this was merely an attempt to demonstrate that the personal competence, *resilience*, is not just as important as these other concepts, but a growing phenomenon in late-modernity.

UgebrevetA4's (Holst, 2015) analysis of data from Jobindex.dk is helpful for job seekers these days, in accordance to the founder of the webpage Jobindex.dk, Kaare Danielsen (2015):

"Resilience is the newly popular concept in job ads - Jobindex has Denmark's largest job archive with over 3 million old job ads. This archive can be used to see which types of positions organizations previously have searched for, so one knows where to send unsolicited applications. However, it can also be used to all kinds of statistics. It is, for example, quite interesting to follow the development of the concepts that are popular in job ads."

What does it mean that a survey (Holts, 2015) concludes that the resilience concept has *more than doubled* in use by employers on Jobindex.dk since 2007 until now?

Why is a resilient knowledge worker, in that notion, more in demand now than in 2007, and how and why has the resilience concept achieved the status of a *buzzword* in organizational life? In this thesis, I will not investigate whether the resilience concept has a connection with the financial crisis of 2007-08. Far more interesting, I reckon, is attempting at analysing the link between the resilience concept and social pathologies theories. Although, I do believe that organizations at the time of the financial crisis of 2007-08 up until now and beyond always want to hire knowledge workers who

accumulate most profit. The resilience demand may be a 'tool' for organizations to find these knowledge workers.

The ambition of this thesis is to open the vast knowledge of the vibrant resilience concept and resilience research that were born five decades ago. The attempt in this thesis is to acquire a unique insight into the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life, by analysing its paradoxes, and its possible associations with social pathologies theories.

Why is the emergence of the resilience concept in job ads today a problem? The ambition of this thesis is to provide a critical and philosophical contribution to both resilience- and organizational research. Thus, this thesis rephrases the question: why is this *not* a problem?

How and why can we understand and respond to this resilience demand? Perhaps some answers may emerge, after the reading of this thesis. Nevertheless, the aim of this thesis is not to give the reader a method to become resilient at work and how to reply to the resilience demand in job ads. This thesis leaves such 'help' to the self-help industry.

The aim of this initiating *Introduction* is then to chalk up the interest for this thesis topic and explain why the emergence of the resilience concept in job ads today is an important and potent phenomenon in organizational life to explore philosophically.

I am interested in this topic because nowadays, employers are essentially forcing candidates like myself to apply to those ads in a false and quite (un)knowingly unintelligible way, as this critic (Larsen, 2013), as an example, sarcastically states:

"Yes – I am very resilient – and not even that, I am more resilient than the other candidates."

Therefore, the topic of this thesis is *The Rising Demand for Resilient Knowledge Workers in Contemporary Organizational Life*. I have chosen this theme for my thesis because it resonates with us all.

The interest in the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life seems only to have risen in academia and mainstream media since the beginning of writing this thesis. Recently, as an example has Professor Ole Fogh Kirkeby (2016) criticized the resilience concept, by suggesting the antonym to resilience, roughly translated to fragile. Kirkeby (2016) describes how:

“The fragile is compassionate. He/she is responsive, listening [medhør] to each other's internal speech, she is compassionate, empathetic and gentle, but also vulnerable and sensitive. Perhaps it can come so far that you start talking nicely to each other because of him/her. Yes, even to speak properly together.”

What we can derive from Kirkeby's reference to the antonym of the resilience concept is that a very different behaviour is happening when organizations do not demand fragile knowledge worker.

In other words, what Kirkeby shows is that the demand for resilience makes knowledge workers to act cynically.

One could argue that Kirkeby is worried about this lack of sensitivity at work, which philosopher Peter Sloterdijk, later in this thesis, simply determines as self-preservation in action.

This thesis will not engage in a valuation of whether Kirkeby's 'solution' of demanding fragile knowledge workers is either a simple or brilliant idea economically and socially for organizations. However, this thesis sets out to analyze and discuss the possible affections of the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life and its possible association with social pathologies theories of organizational life.

The Thesis Research Question

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life, I attempt get a unique philosophical perspective of the paradoxes and problematics hidden within.

The problematics of this thesis are defined by this research question:

How and why does the resilience concept emerge in organizational life and its possible association with social pathologies theories of organizational life?

Work Questions:

1. How does the resilience concept emerge in organizational life?

Chapter One analyzes the problematics and contradictions in *how* the resilience concept emerges from the logics of private life to the logics of organizational life.

2. Why does the resilience concept emerge in organizational life?

Chapter Two analyzes the conditions of contemporary knowledge workers and their knowledge work. Focus here is to address *why* this rather complex resilience concept emerges in organizational life as demand for knowledge workers.

3. How can the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life be associated with social pathologies theories?

Chapter Three analyzes and discuss the link between the resilience concept and social pathologies theories. Focus in this concluding analysis chapter is to examine social pathologies theories in relevance to the resilience concept as an attempt to answer this thesis research question.

Method

The concept resilience and its presence in job ads as demand for knowledge workers today provide an example of how concepts can (and *must*) be targets for philosophical reasoning in a conceptual and historical way.

Philosophical reasoning can help clear the skies by investigating what is at *play* in the context of knowledge workers and knowledge workers' knowledge work when the resilience concept emerges as a demand.

In this method chapter, I provide answers to how philosophical reasoning by Michel Foucault's historical problematization analysis is helpful in acquiring analytic points from the chosen theoretical and empirical research applied in this thesis.

I have chosen not to have a literary review of the most important empirical and theoretical sources as part of my method chapter because I want to introduce, discuss and analyze these sources in the appropriate context.

In this method chapter, I aim at 1) introducing some of Foucault's philosophy, which is useful in the context of this thesis topic and research question. 2) introducing and discussing my hypothesis of the resilience concept when it emerges as demand in job ads. 3) introducing and analyzing how this thesis conceptualizes the notion of the knowledge worker and the knowledge workers' knowledge work as the chosen 'object' of this research.

Michel Foucault's Historical Problematization Analysis

When Foucault (1970: 90, See also Jensen, 2013: 19) faces a problem, he takes the problem as an answer and asks the question behind the problem, which the problem is an answer to:

“Quelle est la réponse à la question? Le problème
[What is the answer to the question? The problem].”

Foucault's philosophy is a philosophy about problems, and we must start with the problem. We cannot answer why resilience is a buzzword in job ads today without fully understanding the problem of this question in the first place.

Thus, I will portray an example:

Question: Why do you need to be resilient in organizational life?

Answer: You need to be resilient in organizational life because organizations do not want its workforce to be sick, thus unable to work.

I want to challenge such a simple answer by arguing that organizations' 'resilience-solution' is to be associated with social pathologies theories, thus making this 'resilience-solution' part of a vicious cycle of how to make subjects being able to work. I want to argue that the 'resilience-solution' is already embedded in the 'resilience problem' - thus a vicious cycle which solves nothing while in the meantime produce pathological activities.

Sexuality, as an example, is a problem for Foucault, because sexuality is not essentially part of human nature, but part of its culture, hence history (Jensen, 2013: 19). I argue that the same logics apply to the resilience concept, which I explore historically and conceptually in part: *The Resilience Concept*.

In Jensen's (2013: 19) reading of Foucault's work *Historie de sexualité 1*, he explains the problematization of sexuality:

“Foucault asks: which question is sexuality an answer to? He answers: sexuality is an answer to the questions: how shall I manage myself? How can I control myself?

Moreover, how can I teach others to control themselves so that we avoid most possible accidents?"

The concept of sexuality is an example of how problems must be dealt with historically, because, in Foucault's orientation, sexuality is not the same problem at all times. In the part: *The Resilience Concept*, I argue how this may apply to the resilience concept while providing this thesis conceptual understanding of how we may understand the resilience concept today in regards to its presence in job ads seeking knowledge workers.

To help with an understanding of how Foucault's philosophy is helpful for my thesis analysis, I present how Foucault, as a method in this thesis, is an inspirational research companion by the help of Raffnsøe, Gudmand-Høyer and Thaning's (2016) book on Foucault's philosophy published in 2016.

Raffnsøe et al. (2016: 457) provides a description of how Foucault's philosophy is relevant for diagnostic analysis, which this thesis attempts:

"The contemporary diagnostic analysis is thus a mediation that is currently *en route*. The analysis takes the form of an ongoing *intermediary being*, the outset of which may very well be situated, but without a *definite start or end point*. This introduces a continuous *indeterminacy* as concerns the outset and conclusion. The diagnostician begins with the movement that is in progress and applies to a certain context. However, he does not fully know this context or its implications, meaning that he does not, formally speaking, fully know the presumptions of his own work. This problem is exacerbated by the analysis not taking the immediate context for granted but rather bordering it and seeking to participate in transcending it. Furthermore, the diagnostician's transcendence of the immediate context is limited insofar as his own text is a limited entity and therefore confined to a certain time and place. The completion of the text may not be utterly coincidental in the arbitrary sense, but neither is it given by nature or necessary. The conclusion to an analysis could always be different, meaning that it is contingent and therefore always revisable."

This thesis is a both highly actual and a new topic for philosophy, which is why the analysis has no *definite start or end point*. The new theoretical material has been dealt with in this thesis until the submitting deadline. My text (this master's thesis) is a limited entity, and I have attempted to transcend the knowledge we have about

knowledge workers and the resilience concept to obtain a unique insight and critical contribution of the problematics of this topic, which I attempt to argue, well aware how my conclusion is contingent and revisable. As a diagnostician in this thesis, I discuss the analytic points in the standalone part *Discussion*.

This thesis uses Foucault's historical problematization analysis, as a method, by gaining a unique perspective.

How Foucault approach this is neatly summarized by Jensen (2013: 29) as:

“Foucault's approach is: to search for a regularity or a *pattern* in the social practice – a dispositive – and afterward search previously to see, how the pattern was formed, that means, how the pattern revealed itself as something new before it was a pattern.”

First of all, Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982: 120) prefer *interpretive analytics* instead of the concept dispositive. I will agree with this idea, by the acknowledgment of history itself to be a dispositive (interpretive analytics) in Foucault's philosophy. The characterization of Foucault's philosophy is, as he mentions in his work, “a kind of radical journalism” (1973; See also Raffnsøe et al., 2016: 426). Keeping with this portrayal of his own work, I would consider my work on this thesis along the same line. Also by adding how this thesis is as an exploratory philosophical study of a *pattern*, which I want to uncover some problematics in a journalistic manner. I found these problematics meaningful for other people to know and thus inspire other researchers to embark on theoretical and empirical researches on their own about this thesis topic.

The attempt of this thesis is, therefore, a historical and conceptual problematization of the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life. The topic of this thesis reveals that I have chosen to narrow my focus on which this thesis reference as *knowledge workers*. An explanation of this choice follows in this thesis part: *Knowledge Worker and Knowledge Work*.

Through *chapters one-three*, this thesis introduces and uses the chosen Foucauldian concepts *Normativity* and *Subjectivity* to illustrate and strengthen the analytic points. Foucault's theory of *Normativity* is introduced and applied in relevance to how the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life indicates a form of control over personal competences of individuals and normative effects of this concept. Foucault's notion of *Subjectivity* is relevant for this thesis by how Foucault (Raffnsøe et al., 2016: 56) studies:

“[H]ow subjectivity develops ethical guidelines for its own existence while seeking to create a space for itself by relating to its surroundings and self-reflection.”

Subjectivity is an understanding of how we are governed by internalities but also governed by relations to externalities. Furthermore, Foucault (1982: 326-327; See also Raffnsøe et al., 2016: 55) states:

“[I]t is not *power*, but the *subject*, which is the general theme of my research.”

The theme of my research is in large part how the subject (knowledge workers) may behave when resilience is a personal demand by organizational life.

This thesis topic and research question aim at gaining a unique understanding of how and why we may understand the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life, and how its emergence in organizational life may be associated with social pathologies theories.

The problematizations for Foucault is an entrance to an understanding of how a culture understand itself and its world (Jensen, 2013: 20).

In an explanation of problematization, Foucault (1996: 456-57, See also Johnsen, 2013: 25) argues:

“Problematization doesn't mean the representation of a pre-existing object, nor the creation through the discourse of an object that doesn't exist. It's the set of discursive and non-discursive practices that makes something enter into the play of true and false, and constitutes it as an object for thought (whether under the form of moral reflection, scientific knowledge, political analysis, etc.).”

This thesis argues that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life allow for a problematization by analysis and discussion of discursive and non-discursive practices. Foucault's notion on discursive is in a basic understanding, *a certain way of speaking* (Foucault, 1972: 193). I want to argue that valuable insight for this thesis analytic points can be obtained from discursive and non-discursive practices coming from organizations, media, knowledge workers, and employers' meanings and beliefs of the resilience concept.

Given the nature of my work on this thesis as a kind of diagnosis of the present (here and now), this thesis is in the line of thought with Raffnsøe et al. (2016) on their claims that:

"Foucault's way of working, namely that the form of philosophy he takes up is that of a *diagnosis of the present* and that the practicing of this form of philosophy implies a certain *self-modifying* role for the philosopher."

In other words, using Foucault's philosophy as a method in this thesis allows me to *a certain self-modifying role*, in a sense, that analytic points and conclusion of this thesis is highly based on subjective interpretation by me. Alternative analytic points and conclusions may be attainable for other researchers who wants to study this thesis theme.

How to analyze using Foucault's (2001: 171-72, See also Johnsen, 2009: 26) historical problematization analysis is:

"[T]o analyze the process of "problematization" ... means: how and why certain things (behavior, phenomena, processes) became a problem. Why, for example, certain forms of behavior were characterized and classified as "madness" while other similar forms were completely neglected at a given historical moment ... How and why were very different things in the world gathered together, characterized, analyzed, and treated as, for example, "mental illness"? What are the elements which are relevant for a given "problematization"? ... The problematization is an "answer" to a concrete situation which is real."

A key point in this thesis, and why Foucault's philosophy is useful, is that the demand of organizational life for resilient knowledge workers indicates *how certain things* at the workplace have become a problem.

Why is the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life an interesting and important topic to problematize?

Such a problematization may answer why this resilience phenomenon is actualizing now in organizational life, and what kind of effects such a phenomenon potentially has.

An understanding of the emergence of the resilience concept in job ads can be obtained, based on the meaning of the concept *flexibility*. This other attractive personal demand for knowledge workers in job ads these days is a synonym to the resilience concept (Holst, 2015).

On that notion, why is it the resilience concept and not the flexibility concept that is the main concept and inquiry of this thesis? A Foucauldian historical problematization analysis of the resilience concept provides answers in the next part.

After that and before the analysis chapters is an argumentation of why I have chosen knowledge workers and knowledge workers' knowledge work as being the 'object' that I study with my conceptualization of the resilience concept.

The Resilience Concept

In the following, I want to provide answers on why a study of the resilience concept and its emergence in organizational life is both relevant for philosophical and organizational analysis. I want to historically problematize the resilience concept by critically analyzing the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life.

So far, I have provided some empirical answers to why resilience is a rising demand in organizational life in the introduction, and why this phenomenon is both interesting and problematic.

The aim of this part is to formulate a hypothesis of the resilience concept based on its emergence in organizational life as a personal demand for knowledge workers to have. The resilience concept I use is this thesis hypothesis of the resilience demand. That is why this part deals with the etymology of the concept and different scholars attempts to clarify how we may conceptually understand the resilience concept. At the end of this part, we come to my conceptual understanding of the resilience concept.

The hypothesis of this thesis understanding of the resilience concept when it emerges as a personal competence for knowledge workers as demand in job ads is as following:

Resilience is a personal competence despite adversity in organizational life, which signify an act of standing firm in an accelerated race – a paradoxical *stand/run marathon*.

In the following, I attempt to historically to analyze how I can state this above hypothesis, by first bringing attention to how this resilience concept supposedly first was coined.

The roots of [original] resilience research dates to the 1970s with a particular reference to the pioneering research of Norman Garmezy on positive adaptation among children of people with schizophrenia (Luthar, 2015).

A leading scholar today in resilience research, Professor of Psychology Suniya S. Luthar (et al., 2000: 554; 2006: 742), understand the resilience concept, by referencing five decades of research, as a *competence despite adversity*, or more fittingly:

“[A] phenomenon or process reflecting relatively positive adaptations despite experienced adversity or trauma.”

Among resilience researchers (Garmezy & Masten, 1986; Werner & Smith, 1992; See Luthar, 2015: 3), an earlier concept of the resilience concept is *invulnerable*, used to describe children who functioned well despite multiple risks:

“Implicit in this change of labels [invulnerable to resilience] was cognizance that positive adaptation despite adversity is never permanent; rather, it is a developmental progression, with new strengths and vulnerabilities emerging with shifting life circumstances.”

This *change of labels* is interpreted, by this thesis, as we can *never* permanently become or be resilient. However, what these original resilience researchers suggest is that we can develop resilience in life progressively.

Thus, resilience in life is a competence an individual can develop progressively. However, how could one know if one is expressing resilience in life or not?

Resilience researchers Masten & Tellegen (2012: 349-350) argue how we may determine who is per definition resilient and who merely is successful in life:

“Resilience research required concepts of risk as well as positive adaptation. In the absence of any unusual risk or challenge posed by development or adaptive function, people who were doing well in life might be called examples of competence or *success* but they would not be examples of resilience, because to establish resilience there must be evidence there is or has been some kind of *significant threat* to the lives of the individuals in question”.

This thesis interprets Masten & Tellegen (2012: 349-350) definition of resilience on how an example of resilience shows when an individual overcomes a significant threat to the (private) life of the individual in question.

We can then argue that a psychological understanding of the resilience concept can be summarized as a personal competence when facing adversity in life, which means an act of positive adaptation despite challenges of personal life.

Thus, the notion of being resilient has connotations with private life. When the resilience concept is used in organizational life, I want to argue a problematization of such a demand when its origin is from private life.

Next, is an attempt to conceptualize how the resilience concept in job ads today can be understood.

A reason that resilience emerges as a personal competence in job ads now could be that it is perhaps a successor to another popular demand from employers in recent years, *flexibility*.

An understanding of the flexibility concept, as a synonym to the resilience concept, is by Merriam-Webster:

“[A] Willing to change or to try different things.”

Additionally, psychology scholars, Gail Kinman and Louise Grant (2010: 262; Klohen, 1996: 1068; See also Jørgensen, 2016), argue, in their reference to psychologist Eva Klohen's definition of resilience, that:

“Within the psychological literature, resilience is defined as ‘the general capacity for flexible and resourceful adaptation to external and internal stressors.’”

Found on the Merriam-Webster is a late-modern understanding of the concept resilience:

“The ability of something to return to its original shape after it has been pulled stretched, pressed, bent, etc.”

The *ability to return* resembles the simpler description from its Latin origin – Resilio: ‘I jump back’ (See Holst, 2015).

If resilience is an *ability to return* again, how can knowledge workers *learn* to be resilient, when resilience is an *ability* that happens *after* this *non-original shape*?

This thesis points to a central and open question that is:

Can one know a priori whether one can be *pulled, stretched, pressed, bent* in organizational life or private life, without experience on their own body and mind?

The Danish union paper *djøfbladet* (Santesson, 2016a) and its newly interview with a manager, Christian Dubois, is viewed as a common understanding of the resilience concept. Dubois refer to this Latin origin of resilience from the Danish Dictionary:

“Robustus [Resilience], of oak; strong [...] Meaning: Resistant for wearing, pressures or difficult conditions; which is difficult to break or be degraded [...] Can endure psychical or mental adversity [...] hardy.”

In response to this view of a knowledge worker to be *strong as oak*, we must ask ourselves: *how* and *why*?

The linguist, Michael Ejstrup, Head of Research in Language from Denmark's Media- and Journalist School, response to this *how* and *why* in the same interview (Santesson, 2016a):

"I interpret it as if we must be ready to be run down by a steamroller at work, and then is expected that we get over it, and show up again [at work] the day after."

How would a knowledge worker argue with an employer, that one demonstrate or show a resilient attitude or behavior if that knowledge worker's understanding or 'level' of resilience is different from that of his or hers employer?

In that regard, is resilience *always* a personal competence that shows itself in a clash of *the real* (as a posteriori), or is resilience a personal competence that people can *have* or *not have*, *develop* or *not develop* (as a priori)?

Arguably, employers would tend to lean to the latter understanding of resilience as a priori, when a typical sentence in job ads is (See Appendixes A-B): You *are* a resilient employee/manager.

Going back to manager Dubois, we find a contradiction of this idea of being resilient and being ready to everchanging *surroundings* of organizational life.

If someone ought to be resilient, someone must be *strong* and *stand* firm as a *tree* or *solid* as a *rock*, as manager Dubois (Santesson, 2016a) mentions.

Can we understand the resilience concept in organizational life as sometimes one must demonstrate resilience, and other times one must demonstrate abilities to change – to go with the *flow*? A contradiction in Drucker's (1999) theory, because it is the knowledge worker who is fundamentally the one to knows how to balance these demands, not the employer.

In other words, I want to argue that organizations demand knowledge workers, who can *be* resilient no matter what changes in conditions may or potentially happen.

Although the individual is fundamentally the one who knows how to balance themselves in organizational life's demand, no matter how contradictory they may be, a whole self-help industry is blossoming, because this industry can 'help' individuals to become more mentally resilient.

In other words, in late-modern society, we turn to external help to achieve resilience in what appears to be fundamentally a challenge for the individual knowledge worker. The appearance of the resilience concept in job ads is like this new stranger in town everyone has his or her story about. Stories that references a historical link and/or a contemporary idea of what a resilient knowledge worker can do (Dubois) as an opposite to what a non-resilient knowledge worker cannot.

The thesis does not engage with the notion of empirical evidence to confirm whether this is true or not. I argue that true answers may not be found, based on how research may spawn multiple answers to such a complex matter.

Thus, I reckon that it is far more interesting to analyze why we must question the resilience demand.

What can be derived from this thesis attempt to hypothesize a new understanding of the resilience concept, when it emerge in organizational life, is an idea of how it may be associated with social pathologies theories.

The main argument I want to emphasize is that the demand for resilient knowledge workers comes from organizational life's logic of competition and economic development.

In other words, the resilience concept, in this thesis, means the individual knowledge workers capacity to exploit their psychological resources best possible, not to the advantage of the knowledge workers themselves, as one may think, but to the benefits of organizations' - continuous efforts to stay ahead in the global competition. An idea that if we 'toughen up' our working force, hence knowledge workers, then we can control their own desire to exploit their psychological resources, by exploiting of the value of their productivity best possible.

Knowledge Worker and Knowledge Work

Why am I interested in a study of knowledge workers, and knowledge workers' knowledge work in relevance to the resilience concept's emergence in organizational life?

An answer is that we, in Western societies, are in a transition to a society in which the notion of *knowledge work* seems never to have been more important. Such a statement can be seen in how our society is attached to connotations of knowledge, which signifies the clear emphasis on knowledge work today over manual work. Following is some examples of such names: *Information-society*, *Post-industrial society*, and also *Societies of control* (Deleuze, 1992). There are also newer names such as *Performance-society* (Petersen, 2016) and *High-speed society* (Rosa, 2009; 2010; 2013). However, these are introduced and analyzed in *chapter two* because these kinds of societies points to answers to *why* the resilience concept emerge in organizational life today.

Starting with Deleuze (1992: 5), he theorized back in 1992 that we are in a transition towards what he states the *societies of control*:

“In the disciplinary societies one was always starting again (from school to the barracks, from the barracks to the factory), while in the societies of control one is never finished with anything.”

Today, we are ‘free’ to do whatever we decide, the possibilities seem endless, which means that we are turning away from enclosed environments to a free-floating control (Deleuze, 1992: 4).

With Deleuze notion of societies of control, I emphasize the enhanced complexity of how we work today compared to the disciplinary societies.

In the following, is an account for how I understand these ambiguous concepts *knowledge worker* and *knowledge work*, so I can provide premises onto how this thesis interpretation of the presence of the resilience concept in job ads affects both the knowledge worker and how the knowledge worker is affected by knowledge work activities. Afterward, is an account for how we may understand a *knowledge worker*

today in the context of *organizational life*, which I use synonymously for clarity purposes whenever I address the notion of late-modern society, well aware of the different meanings of society and organizations per se.

The management guru, Peter Drucker (1959), first coined the concept *knowledge worker* in 1959. Approximately ten years before Garmezy (Luthar, 2015), grandfather of resilience theory, first did his pioneering research on children development. Perhaps these concepts were made to clash at some point? Thus, Foucault's philosophy is an analysis of the connection between things, which also seeks to affect these connections.

Drucker (1999: 86) separated *manual work* and *knowledge work* in clear lines and argued:

"What is to be done is always obvious in manual work. However, in knowledge work the task does not program the worker [...] [K]nowledge workers themselves define what the task is or should be – and only the knowledge workers themselves can do that."

This separation of *manual work* and *knowledge work* can be situated in organizational life as well. A tendency to day is self-managing work, which Drucker would define as the worker defining what the task is and how to deal with this task best possible (See also Jørgensen, 2016).

Drucker (1999: 87) situates the notion of being a knowledge worker as far more *complicated* work than manual work, by addressing the seemingly boundless idea of being a knowledge worker:

"It is the knowledge worker's decision what he or she should be held accountable for in terms of quality and quantity with respect to time and with respect to cost. Knowledge workers have to have autonomy and that entails responsibility."

The thesis understanding of the concept *knowledge worker* and its *knowledge work* follows this line of thought from Drucker. The idea from Drucker is that knowledge workers should have autonomy and responsibility in performing knowledge work.

How can we answer that the resilience concept's emergence in organizational life is a form of control of the knowledge workers inherently and thus paradoxical self-managing knowledge work?

An answer could be that the resilience demand is an organizational (hence managerial) control over the knowledge workers self-managing work in order to make them keep working despite whatever happens. In other words, the answer might be that resilience is a 'tool' by management to monitor the 'self-freedom,' which inherently resides in knowledge workers' self-managing work.

By making the contemporary knowledge worker *endure never-ending tasks* (Deleuze, 1992) because *only* the knowledge worker can *define what the task is or should be* (Drucker, 1999), the demand for individual resilience seems to be a 'solution' for managers to tackle the increasing complexity of global competitive conditions that seems to govern organizational life (See also Jørgensen, 2016).

To situate the knowledge workers' knowledge work further in the context of organizational life, this thesis reference Professor Ove Kaj Pedersen's (2011) theory on how a structural transformation in our Danish state is happening now.

Pedersen's central point in his introduction of the state he names *Competitive State* is that this new state, under conversion, is actively seeking to *mobilize* the public and organizations to take part in the global competition. Also, it is a state that wants to mobilize the individuals' own responsibility in life and work (Pedersen, 2011: 12; See also Jørgensen, 2016).

This *mobilization* aim touches upon this apparent acceptance of organizations to 'exploits' the potentials of its knowledge worker personal competences. The organizations justify that by explaining how global competition is compelling them to. Throughout the analysis chapters, this thesis turns to these problematics by situating how the presence of the resilience concept in job ads today may be a mobilization aim of organizational life to take part in the global competition.

In this thesis, organizational life must be understood both in a contemporary sense and as the opposite of a knowledge worker's private life (synonym: *privacy* or *life*) in this, by reference to the so-called distinction between work and life. References to job ads in this thesis are, therefore, a synonym to organizational life. This thesis does not concern about work-life balance per se. In other words, to help the reader orientate in this thesis, the author separate two distinction of human life, which is *organizational life* and *life*, also aware of how the line between these two are becoming increasingly blurry due to our way of life in Western societies now.

This separation provides an opportunity for analysis and discussion of the resilience concept in logics of organizational life and 'logics' of life itself. Why is that separation necessary?

This thesis aim is to point to frivolous and paradoxical claims on the meaning of the resilience concept when it emerges in organizational life from its origin concerning how to be resilient in life, by the terms of private life itself, thus not the logics and goals of organizational life.

This thesis limits the concepts *knowledge worker* and *organizational life* to the understanding of Drucker's (1959; 1999) notion of knowledge workers to inherent *subjective autonomy* and Buch et al. (2009) empirical and theoretical findings of knowledge work as *immaterial- and creative work*.

In other words, this thesis understanding entails that organizational life appears to demand knowledge workers who are essentially individuals who have a *responsibility* (Drucker, 1959; 1999) to be *creative* (Buch et al., 2009) and *productive* (Pedersen, 2011; Petersen, 2016).

As a closing remark, if being a *knowledge worker* is rather confusing and complex, the attempt to be a *resilient knowledge worker* seems to be even more complex.

This thesis demonstrates through examples from chosen empirical research that knowledge workers are subjects with arbitrary opinions in regards to this rather new articulated resilience demand in job ads.

However, would resilience be unnecessary if being a knowledge worker is about *responsibility, creativity, and productivity*?

Thus, asking the question again from Foucault's work on sexuality, *Histoire de sexualité* 1 (See also Jensen, 2013: 19):

“[H]ow shall I manage myself? How can I control myself? Moreover, how can I teach others to control themselves so that we avoid most possible accidents?”

In line of thought with Foucault, this thesis wants to analyze how knowledge workers, facing this resilience demand, is about questions of how to control them to take part in a paradoxical *stand/run marathon*, that are beneficially for organizational life so far they can control themselves to avoid being unable to work.

Analytic Framework

Concepts from Foucault's 'toolbox' are introduced and applied throughout *chapter one-three* as part of an analytic strategy to help philosophical reasoning in this thesis topic and research question. In other words, this thesis analytic framework is Foucault's philosophy combined with chosen theoretical and empirical research, which I have found most relevant.

While I have a global view of the resilience concept as a phenomenon in Western societies, I do want to situate the analysis mainly from a Danish perspective. This thesis is almost entirely based on analytic points on empirical material from Denmark, which is also why this thesis has attempted to integrate Danish theoretical and empirical material.

In other words, as a Danish graduate student, the interest into this thesis topic makes it relevant, in a personal and methodological sense, to use Danish scholars, whenever possible. Another argument is that this thesis concentrates on Danish knowledge workers, in regards to how the resilience concept is affected by Danish organizations, Danish media, and Danish scholars.

The idea to work on this thesis came from UgebrevetA4 and Jobindex.dk article *Employers Demand Resilience* (Holst, 2015). From 2015 until now and perhaps long into the future, the resilience concept has gained more and more attention by scholars and the public in general.

Much of the theoretical material, hence quotes, are Danish, which I attempt to translate into English best possible way. Whenever in need, the original Danish or English words are written in brackets, if the translation somehow seems unjustified.

This thesis is written in a certain stylistic style, as the reader probably has noticed, by using such phrases as *I, this thesis, us, and we*. An argument for this choice is how the analytic points in this thesis finally reside in *me, the author*, the empirical subject Michael Birch Jørgensen.

An argument for this stylistic approach is also the idea that it helps to ensure flow and readability throughout this thesis by inviting the reader on board.

In other words, this research or more precisely this master's thesis base its analytic points on subjective interpretation. Thus, the results or outcome of this thesis resides in the analytic value and perspective of my subjective assumptions and beliefs on the chosen theoretical and empirical material.

The aim of this method chapter was to introduce Foucault's historical problematization analysis, and how I analytically choose to reach analytic points to attempt to answer the research question.

I introduced this thesis hypothesis on the resilience concept, by situating how it may be associated with social pathologies theories, hence, this thesis critical notion of the potential dangers to humanity, which inherently resides in demand for resilient knowledge workers.

An overall aim was to chalk the pitch for the reader so a progressive knowledge of the thesis topic *the Rising Demand for Resilient Knowledge Workers in Contemporary Organizational Life* can emerge before entering the analysis chapters.

Chapter One

Resilience and Contradictions

Manager Dubois' reference to the Latin origin of the resilience concept, 'I jump back' (Santesson, 2016a) resembles an act of *endurance* in organizational life. A point that in organizational life means that individuals must *endure* the condition of organizational life by 'jumping back,' because this is what the job ads list as a personal demand – and people accept this by submitting an application.

A black and white image of resilience in organizational life is already forming, which is not the aim of this thesis. However, in the following, such black and white images seem to be part of the rhetoric from different scholars and organizations. In the intersection of these images or solitary confinements of beliefs and understanding of the resilience phenomenon, this thesis aims to philosophically, in a Foucauldian method, at the same time, blur the images and gain a new perspective.

The perspective gained in this thesis is not a claim to any truths, but a claim that further empirical research on the resilience concept in organizational life is in need.

The actualization of the resilience concept in job ads in recent years is a factual claim, and throughout this *Chapter One* paragraphs, the main question is: *how?*

In other words, the aim of this *Chapter One* concerns: *How does the resilience concept emerge in organizational life?*

Chapter One is the first step on a staircase to finally attempting to answer this thesis research question in *Chapter Three*.

As already referenced to, within this thesis notion of *original resilience research*, a *change of labels* has happened from the concept *invulnerable* to the concept *resilience*.

The focus in this chapter is an analysis of how the resilience concept may be a target for a *change of label* by organizational life by not forming a new word. Instead,

confusingly, the resilience concept merely use the same meaning and understanding from *original resilience research* to its new surrounding organizational life.

Hence, meanings and understanding of the resilience concept may be contradictory, when the resilience concept is used in another context, situating a move in the label resilience from *private life* to *organizational life*.

It seems that the use of the resilience demand is a stand-alone competence, with perhaps has an implicit explanation, as this job ad from Deloitte Legal (Appendix A) shows:

“The ability to create results, work independently and *are resilient*.”

No further explanation than this blunt statement that is, however, linked to the notions of *independently* and *create results*. Nevertheless, these competences are not in the scope of this thesis to either conceptual or historical analysis, although these concepts rightfully exemplify what a knowledge worker is, as depicted earlier. Moreover, these competences seem to be mutually exclusive given that the candidate must express all of these competences at the same time to be eligible.

How, why, and what can we understand from this demand for resilient knowledge workers by organizational life?

Such questions seem important in this thesis view, as Professor Ove Kaj Pedersen (Grumsen, 2016) states:

“[T]he concept resilience is relatively imprecise because the question is: resilience according to what?”

The resilience concept, as previously stated, seems to be in a conceptual wilderness, when it is a rising demand in organizational life, due to the notion that the resilience concept draws attentions to various contradictions.

A recent survey by Epinion (Aabo, 2016) on the Danish Finance Associations members about their opinion on the demand for resilience revealed that this personal

competence is a demand that knowledge workers are highly affected by and also have various opinions towards. Here are some results from the Epinion survey that the Finance Association (Aabo, 2016) has publicized:

“The rising use of the resilience concept in job advertisements is viewed by eight out of ten [1200 interviewed] as an expression of sharpened demand and increased pressure in organizational life, that you mentally must be capable of coping with [...] Almost all financial employees estimate that they are in a job position, that demands resilience. One-third does not believe that it is a fair demand for employees, that they must be resilient.”

Resilience, by the members of Finance Association, is a demand because of rising personal demands on individuals from organizational life.

It is important to note that this thesis does not concern whether the resilience demand is fair or not. Although, when *one-third* believes that this demand is *not fair*, it does tell us that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is problematic.

In other words, the resilience concept may be rightfully viewed as an answer to *sharpened demand and increased pressure from organizational life*, as these financial knowledge workers tell us. Thus, the finance knowledge workers address concerns of the articulation of this demand for resilience by organizational life.

Pedersen thinks of the resilience demand as a demand that has been just as important in contemporary organizational life as it was fifty years ago (Grumsen, 2016):

“Do you believe that the police have not always demanded resilient employees? Has the defense department not always demanded resilient employees? I think, that they all agree, that the employees, they want, are fairly stable, also mental”.

Arguably, the demand for stable mental employees has changed in labels from an *implicit* demand to an *articulated* demand.

Although not explicitly explained in the job ads, the *very* articulation of the resilience concept points to high interest, hence demand, for knowledge workers' mental competences. In other words, the difference may be that resilience may now be a rising demand in job advertisements because of what the Epinion survey points to, which is that knowledge workers are experiencing *sharpened demand and increased pressure from organizations*.

Resilience as an Exploitation of Human Resources?

It is not in the aim of this thesis to determine whether the resilience concept first was mentioned in job ads or in self-help industry to help individuals becoming resilient.

This thesis understands the self-help industry as an umbrella term for any services aiming at 'helping' individuals in their goal to cope with demands of organizational life.

As already established, the demand for resilience is rising these years and courses to develop individual resilience are immensely popular².

A popular course, per their homepage, mentalrobusthed.dk, is a course called *Mental Resilience-Training* (MRT®). One of the aims of the MRT® course is that you will get an *insight into your psychological resources and how you can bring them in play* (mentalresilience.dk).

In other words, the MRT® courses help individuals to *instrumentalize psychological resources*. In a critical sense, this thesis interprets this as knowledge workers competing with themselves to dig deeper into their *psychological resources*. However, who is the winner of this game?

Why is that question relevant? Given original resilience research notion of the resilience concept as a *competence despite adversity* in private life, how can we apply the same logic to organizational life? Ultimately, we may argue that when an organization demands resilient knowledge workers, would that suggest, that this resilience demand aims at being beneficial for the organization?

Eva Hertz, psychologist, Ph.D., and Director of the Danish organization, *Center for Mental Robusthed*, develops this aforementioned MRT® course. In this thesis, Hertz acts as a representative of the self-help industry. However, she (Grumsen, 2016) does *not* believe, that it makes sense to recruit resilient employees:

“Approximately, an explanation of half of our mental resilience is by our biology, genetics, and upbringing, but there is still a significant part of our mental resilience, which is trainable, and that is a lifetime task. It changes all the time and

² Google Search on: Mental resilience, gave 44.300.000 results (2016-12-18).

is affected by its *surroundings*. We have a couple of tests, which can measure mental resilience, but most of them give a snapshot. You can get very resilient people, but these can be destroyed by lack of leadership, too large workload and low contact with colleagues.”

Hertz touches upon the notion that resilience in organizational life is a private competence that is subjugated by the external conditions. Being resilient, in Hertz view, is not only up to individual knowledge workers, it must also be a task for leadership to handle. Paradoxical to the point that Drucker (1999) would argue of the knowledge workers to have absolute autonomy to for example workload and how tasks should be approached. Thus, the idea of being a resilience knowledge worker is complicated given that it is the individual knowledge worker responsibility to be resilient, while at the same time can be destroyed by lack of leadership.

To highlight the advantages of the MRT® course, Hertz (Bøgelund, 2016) explains what this thesis interprets, from a perspective of private life:

“It is a common psychological training to meet the storms of life by using your psychological resources best possible.”

What Hertz points to, is the notion of being better at exploiting psychological resources as something that is a common psychological training in life.

However, what is interesting is that resilience, as mentioned, is now an articulated demand in organizational life, which actively seems to *normalize* resilience in its new surroundings – organizational life. Hence, resilient knowledge workers are not just a buzzword these years, it is rapidly becoming a *normalization* of late-modern knowledge work.

Today, we would assume that the notion of being flexible is normal in the sense of work and life. This thesis interprets this normalization of flexible knowledge workers as to how resilience (as a synonym to flexibility) in a critical sense is a personal competence that in these years is a demand, which is in danger of becoming a normalization for knowledge workers.

The resilience concept is about the *ability to return to original shape*, which requires a need of strength or stamina from the knowledge worker willing (or potentially non-willingly). *Flexibility* as a concept is about this *will to develop*.

Thus, the key difference is that the demand for *flexibility* has something to do with the *development* of the employee, and the *resilience demand* has something to do with the employee's capacity to *endure* working conditions (See Jørgensen, 2016).

If that were the case, this would allow for a re-phrasing of Hertz statement by inserting the word organizational to her sentence: *meet the storms of [organizational] life by using your psychological resources best possible*.

In Raffnsøe et al. (2016: 315) reading of Foucault, the distinction of biopolitics and biopower is relevant in the context of how Hertz, points to how we must use our psychological resources best possible:

"In *La volonté de savoir*, Foucault draws a distinction between biopolitics and biopower. Whereas the biopolitics of the population is distinguished from the disciplinary anatomo-politics of the human body, biopower designates a constellation of *both* biopolitics and discipline, that is, a type of 'power over life' directed both at the 'performances of the body' and the vital processes of the population. This biopower traverses a broad range of institutions, from the family, army, and schools to police, medicine, and the administration of collective bodies."

Foucault's concept of biopower resembles how institutions attempts to discipline the population to pursue self-development. In a sense the notion of resilience as a 'performance of the body.' In a sense, self-development is not only a way for society to 'power over life,' it is a desire for the population to take part in enhancing the 'performances of the body.' As Raffnsøe et al. (2016: 317) reads Foucault's philosophy:

"The norm is something that can be applied to both a body one wishes to discipline and a population one wishes to regularize."

Resilience can be viewed as a norm for individuals to pursue, but also as a discipline of the population to both keep working and get more people to take part in the economy at large.

What we can derive from this is that the resilience demand, which enters in job ads for individuals, is essentially becoming a norm in our society. Suddenly, it may not be the reason certain jobs require resilient workers, because resilience is just a competence we need to have. As Raffnsøe et al. (2016: 317) interprets Foucault's philosophy:

"In this sense the idea of a society of normalization designates an intersection between discipline and biopolitics, which together constitute a biopower that seeks control over both body and life."

If that were the case, then I argue that it not be only resilient knowledge workers but resilient people in plurals, which organizational life demand, because of the blurry lines separating work and life in our society today.

Thus, if normalization constitutes a biopower, how can knowledge workers respond? How can we accept a demand such as resilience if one may not be aware what problematizations such a demand requires of one's body and life, because of the complexity within the notion of resilient knowledge workers?

In *Chapter Two*, I dive more into the individualization tendencies of self-help industry and organizational life's eagerness for exploiting personal competencies of human subjects, which for example the demand for resilience is an example of.

Thus, this part's aim was to signify *how* we may understand the resilience concept's emergence in organizational life as how *normalization* of private competencies, such as resilience, can be argued to be about the desire to transcend biological boundaries of human subjects.

In the next part, I point to how we, as knowledge workers, may understand and approach the resilience demand, which is not sufficiently explained in job ads.

Accept, Critique, Endure?

A discussion among scholars and representants from organizations in recent years is about how or how much knowledge workers can *criticize* work conditions, due to this demand for resilience?

In other words, does the resilience demand hinder a critical expression about work condition? Because the resilience demand can be understood as if knowledge workers must be resilient to whatever working conditions demands.

Sociologist Rasmus Willig, who research about the concept *critique* (See Willig, 2016), and stress expert Thomas Milsted (See Milsted, 2016), to name a few scholars, reduce the resilience demand, in an interview by Danish newspaper *Kristeligt Dagblad* (Grumsen, 2016), to:

"You must be able to deal with it, and you must not criticize the conditions, that you are subjugated."

In the same interview (Grumsen, 2016), Professor Ove Kaj Pedersen, responds:

"I would like to see the investigations showing that those who demand resilient employees, later say, that the employee must not be anything else than resilient and not critical. I think that there are a lot of causal chains in this discussion, in which you will say this is the cause and this is the outcome but where are the evidences?"

Who is right and who is wrong? Perhaps both of them because it must depend on what is at *play* in the resilience concept as a demand in job ads.

By referencing Willig and Milsted's view of the lack of criticism inherent in the resilience concept, what does that have to do with the original resilience theory notion of a *competence despite adversity*?

In Willig's (2016) essay, *Afvæbnet kritik* [Disarmament of criticism], he points to a paradoxical way in which we deal with problems at work, which resides heavily on how managers for example deals with employees, as Willig (2016: 128) hints:

“Some [managers] answers more clearly than others: ‘I know, that you run fast, but you gotta run a little bit faster.’”

When knowledge workers are required to be better at *enduring* i.e. be resilient to work conditions, it presumably must be in the interest of them to not making the work conditions intentionally harder to endure.

In, Willig's work, this seems to like a situation in which we should not criticize conditions at work, as Willig (2016: 129) claim:

“We must run faster because that is a condition, which we cannot change. Thus, critique has no value, and any insistence can lead to loss of status.”

In other words, Willig (2016: 129) address how:

“The flexibility [in work] is boundless, but sets limits to those, who cannot or do not want to run faster.”

In Willig's (2016: 121) work of gathering sentences from managers and employees in real life, as the one above, he points to how:

“My [Willig's] leading assumption is that the reason for neoliberalism's actual success is its particular ability to combine the feelings fear and inadequacy, which degrades anyone, who so much as tries to question its regime.”

He argues for two *recognition-theories* observable in organizational life.

1. *Lack of recognition*: Inspired by Critical Theory, by seeking unjust or even social pathologies, because on a psychological level, it brings the individual under intense pressure, so that the individual's identity may suffer.
2. *Appreciative inquiry*: A focus on the positives of the workplace, and thus in a paradoxical sense neglects problems.

Both private and public organizations now, according to Willig, are dominated by *Appreciative inquiry*, as, for example, these sentences by managers:

“‘We do not have problems, only challenges.’ ‘I appreciate what you say, but ...’
‘See opportunities instead of limitations.’”

This thesis hypothesis of the resilience concept points to how knowledge workers, according to Willig, are dominated by neoliberalism and appreciative inquiry.

This thesis can thus attempt to argue that knowledge worker's knowledge work is increasingly contradictory. This thesis part: *Knowledge Worker's Knowledge Work*, accounted for how it is the individual's *responsibility* to be *creative*, and *productive*. However, if Willig is right, this individual's responsibility is governed by feelings of fear and inadequacy.

In this regard, the resilience concept is not a personal competence that individual knowledge workers can criticize nor accept because this demand seems to be already implicit in knowledge workers' knowledge work today.

In other words, it seems not to matter whether personal demands such as resilience is enlisted in job ads because such personal competencies already are embedded in organizational life.

As Masten & Tellegen (2012: 349-350) research tells us, if there is no *significant threat*, then it may not be the resilience demand that organizations demand, but merely *successful* people.

Successful as a personal competence might be a more honest demand than resilience. However, none of the twenty-five words from the research, by the joint forces of newspaper UgebrevetA4 and the online job database Jobindex.dk (Holts, 2015), include the terms *successful*.

Perhaps, being *successful* acts as a descriptive adjective implicit in many of the concepts used in job ads, which the resilience concept exemplifies.

Whether the resilience demand makes it harder for knowledge workers to criticize the working conditions or not, is not up to this thesis to resolve.

What this thesis only briefly have touched upon, is that the resilience concept seems much more complicated to understand in job ads. It may not be important as such - because a demand such as resilience seems to indicate that knowledge workers *should* desire to be *successful* at all cost.

However, is it possible to acquire *evidence*, even if Pedersen says there is not, that individuals cannot criticize working conditions when this resilience demand is accepted, for lack of better words, by knowledge workers?

In the light of the *original resilience theory* meaning, a *competence despite adversity* that is highly individual, someone could be considered resilient if there is a *significant threat* or *adversity*. In that sense, knowledge workers could be resilient in organizational life, if they can *criticize* conditions while still being able to work because they would *create* the conditions for *adversity*, onto which they will overcome. Thus, resilience is met.

Although that example may not be evidence, it does highlight some absurdity in organizational life's use of the resilience concept as demand in job ads.

The hype and articulations of the resilience concept in job advertisements and media point to personal competences as being highly valuable demands these days, whether we accept this or not.

As Willig (2016: 229-230) in his closing argument addresses:

“The movement from a critical attitude, over to a positive to this new resilient attitude follows the progression from flexicurity over flexploitation to flexism [...] Before we had participation [medbestemmelse], then we were listened to [medhør], and now we must be manageable [medgørlige].”

What this thesis interprets from Willig, is that critique seems to have ‘run out of steam’ today, because of this evolution of the knowledge worker who becomes now a manageable subject that could be called a resilient subject in many aspects. The idea of the knowledge worker to have autonomy and control of the knowledge work, because they are the ones who knows best, as Drucker (1999) would have it, is by the arguments of Willig seen a progression from flexicurity or participation [medbestemmelse] to his concept of ‘flexism,’ which is mainly about the workforce to must be manageable now.

This thesis explains, based on this comparison on how a manageable subject would be a subject who can *endure* whatever the organization demands, this need for resilience.

The analytic point is that a change has happened in articulated demands for knowledge workers, a *change of labels*, if one will, from *flexible* and *developing* towards *resilient* and *enduring* (Jørgensen, 2016).

Thus, the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life points to how we must accept the resilience demand if we want the job enlisting this as demand. We can try to criticize it, but that may cause that we were not resilient in the first place. Breach of contract so to speak. This would control us to endure the conditions of organizational life by the fear of not living up to the resilience demand, we already accepted by submitting the application. An extreme view, which is dominated by the historical analysis of the concept critique by the works of Willig (2016) that nonetheless touch upon the problematics of the resilience demand by organizational life.

In *Chapter Two*, this thesis attempts to find answers to *why* the resilience concept emerges as a demand in organizational life. Perhaps this new *surrounding* has a *significant* permanent *threat*, which the resilience concept may not be a solution to, but however nonetheless may provide valuable answers to.

Chapter Two

Chapter Two is the next step on the staircase, which is based on *Chapter One*' analysis of the *contradictions* at 'play' in the resilience concept when it emerges in organizational life. In other words, the analytic points from *Chapter One*' focus on *how*, in *Chapter Two*, focus is on *why* the resilience concept emerge in organizational life.

Resilience and Organizational Life

The articulated and rising demand for resilient knowledge workers in job ads these days can be interpreted as if we need to be better at enduring what organizations demand of us knowledge workers.

What is the demand for resilience in job ads an answer to?

In this *Chapter Two*, I interprets that resilience is an 'answer' to acceleration and individualization tendencies in late-modern Western societies.

This thesis re-phrasing³ of Hertz's (Bøgelund, 2016) answer on why MRT® courses is suitable for all workers, is relevant to an understanding of acceleration tendencies of late-modern society.

How to cope with this acceleration requires an exploitation of our psychological resources in the best possible way, which remind me of the band Daft Punk, when they sing: "Harder, Better, Faster, Stronger".

An analysis of the contemporary logics of increasing global competition (Pedersen, 2011) in organizational life, hence the need for increased productivity and growth is interesting and relevant to this thesis topic and research question.

The demand for resilient knowledge workers seems to act as a means to get people to *endure* organizational life's *modus operandi* of attempting accelerating goals of economic

³ "meet the storms of [organizational] life by using your psychological resources best possible."

development, by focusing on how we can optimize human resources, which in a popular phrase is the organization's most important resource.

Philosopher Anders Fogh Jensen (2001: 172-179) explains this interest ultimately as a means to maximize the bottom-line:

“The interest in human resource and management-culture within management is rarely a wholehearted attempt to create good conditions for one's neighbour but rather to maximize the hard values, the bottom-line. Although attentions have emerged for the soft values, which still are values because they are resources, they are only true in a certain sense: Someone deals with human knowledge and their well-being, but only as a means for the hard values that are the more directly measurable resources.”

The idea of optimizing resilience in knowledge workers, in Jensen argument, would represent a soft value, which only is a means for the hard values of measurable resources.

The resilience concept's emergence in organizational life can point to how the line separating private life and organizational life is already blurry now as appointed by many scholars such as Anders Raastrup Kristensen (2011).

What we then can notice is that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is not only about individuals learning how to cope with difficulties of life but also about how individuals can cope with the difficulties of the conditions linked with organizational life.

Hartmut Rosa's Theory of Social Acceleration

Modus operandi of organizational life is not to be analyzed in a comprehensive way in this thesis. However, it is relevant to analyze the tendencies in our late-modern society that may trigger the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life as a demand for knowledge workers in job ads.

As a philosophical 'tool,' this thesis uses the sociologist Hartmut Rosa's concept *social acceleration* to gain a unique understanding of why the resilience concept emerges in job ads today.

Rosa (2010: 14-15) attempts at defining an analytic framework, which can allow for a definition of what it means for a society to accelerate, by a realization that society as a structure cannot just accelerate by itself. Thus, it must be social processes that allow, in Rosa's view, for observers to bluntly state that *everything* appears to be speeding up. Rosa analyses that our society is a high-speed society (2009) or more fittingly an 'acceleration society,' when he (2010: 25) argues about the apparent scarcity of time despite technological acceleration:

"Hence, we can define [late-] modern society as an 'acceleration society' in the sense that it is characterized by an increase in the pace of life (or a shortage of time) *despite* impressive technological acceleration-rates."

Of the following is a more comprehensive understanding of why Rosa (2010: 16-25) defines late-modern society as an 'acceleration society' by a short explanation of Rosa's three categories of social acceleration:

- a. *Technological Acceleration*: Describes acceleration processes *within* society. Here is an emphasis on how technology has made it possible for transport, communication, and production to be *speeding up*, which allow for space and time to *compress*.
- b. *Acceleration of Social Change*: Describes how rates of changes themselves in the acceleration of society itself are changing. Here is an account of a historical change in family and work, which has accelerated from an *inter-generational* pace in early modern society to a generational pace in 'classical modernity' to an *intra-generational* pace in late modernity. Jobs change at a higher rate than generations.
- c. *Acceleration of the Pace of Life*: Describes how social actors in late-modern societies feel like they are running out of time. A time-hunger that is paradoxical with respect to technological acceleration.

As an example of social de-acceleration, Rosa (2010: 36) points to how:

"On the individual plane, we find such *acceleratory forms of deceleration*, for example, when stressed-out managers or teachers take some *time out* in monasteries or take part in yoga-courses which promise 'a rest from the race' just for the purpose of allowing a more successful participation in acceleratory social systems afterwards."

Late-modern society, according to Rosa (2010: 33), is made of accelerations-processes, it is not an acceleration of the society itself.

A paradox that Rosa emphasize is that technology (should) allow for knowledge workers to feel they have more time when they experience a 'time-hunger.'

Thus, what we may conclude from Rosa's theory of social acceleration that if this 'acceleration society' continues, the ability to withstand this so-called social acceleration will become to increasing value for employers these days. Hence, the resilience concept emerges in organizational life as an example of how our late-modern competitive society is increasing the exploitation of this compression of time and space which technological advantages to make it possible.

In a way, Rosa, brings an answer to this thesis hypothesis on how we may understand the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life with his explanation of accelerated social change:

"[T]he most important finding of the discussion on the ramifications of accelerated social change is that high rates of change produce a *growing pressure to adapt for both individuals and organizations*. This leads to the widespread feeling that one is standing not just on a slippery slope but on terrain that is itself slipping away (at varying speeds), as if one were on "slipping slopes" or a down escalator: in order to maintain one's position, to avoid lost opportunities, and to meet the requirements of synchronization, one has to constantly monitor and keep pace with changes in the social environment."

The resilience concept has in fact been a rising demand since 2007 (Holst, 2015) therefore, this thesis explains how it is an example of a social acceleration in late-modern society. Rosa's analogy of "slipping slopes" reminds of this thesis notion of the paradox of a *stand/run marathon*.

Thus, social acceleration of our society may point to how organizational life feel the need for their employers and employees to withstand such pressures of 'time-hunger' by making it ultimately into a problem of the individuals to solve. A view that capabilities for individuals to stay in the race and keep up with the pace of life and working life can be found within themselves. The demand for knowledge workers to be resilient points to how it is a personal competence that ultimately relies on how knowledge workers can adapt and strategically place their feet on *slippery slopes* or in a *stand/run marathon*.

The next paragraph situates how this resilience concept as a 'tool' is a way to, in a metaphorical sense, tighten the bolts and knots of the knowledge worker, so they will not become 'unworkable.'

Stress-resilient Knowledge Workers?

What we have learned so far is that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life points in a broad sense to social acceleration- and individualization tendencies' in late-modern society. How and why is the resilience concept then articulated by some as a solution to mental illnesses such as work-related stress (hereafter stress)?

The emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life points to an idea of knowledge workers to *endure* something. Quite simple, in a popular sense, when people are stressed, they are unable to work. A solution to stress in that popular understanding, could be that people must be better at using their psychological resources. Thus, an idea that one must find methods to endure work to avoid stress.

However, what this thesis want to argue, in the following, is that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life may not be a solution to stress per se. Relevant for this thesis topic and research question seems to be an analysis of how stress, as a mental illness, and the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life, as a method to endure conditions, is arguably closely related.

The idea of being stress-resilient seems like an impossibility, on the notion that we may not ever know the factors of success. Thus, the resilience concept as a 'tool' may point to how it is a challenge for knowledge workers themselves to find methods to avoid stress.

Going back to the Epinion survey, the vice-chairman of Finance Association, Solveig Ørteby (Aabo, 2016), is concerned about the glorification of this resilience demand:

"We humans do not have same limits, and we must have room for that."

If that were to be true, the resilience concept is a competence in organizational life with no limits. In other words, one can *always* become both more resilient and stressed in organizational life, which is fundamentally up to the individual knowledge worker to balance.

What we may conclude from this is that the resilience concept's emergence in organizational life is a demand for people to work despite what happens. In other words, if one is unable to work, the chances are that one may not be resilient.

Professor and resilience researcher, Peter Berliner (Grumsen, 2016), argue that resilience be about communities and not this demand for individual knowledge workers:

We get the individualized resilience-culture from the United States, and here we forget our tradition of creating sustainable and resilient communities. We have another community that has demanded hard work to build, and we forget that. It destroys the kit in our society which is precisely to the notion that resilience as something we share. One can see the rising stress levels, sick leaves, and many people are unhappy. It's a bit stupid that we're so busy getting rid of something that was good so that the individual now fends for themselves and be resilient. Resilience is something that we create together."

Berliner's argumentation points to development in recent times from a culture of 'team spirit' to a culture of individuals fending for themselves in this race for resilience when the articulation of the resilience concept indicates an individual competence in job ads (See Appendixes A-B).

Buch et al. (2009) empirical and theoretical study attempts to found explanations on what is the specifics about stress in knowledge work and which frames of understanding the knowledge workers apply in work per handle the duality enthusiasm/strains. Thus, the aim of their research is to gain an understanding of what may be in need to potentially solve problems that work entails (Buch et al., 2009: 17-19).

Their research is relevant for this thesis, because it demonstrates from empirical and theoretical research, how knowledge workers and knowledge worker's knowledge work is closely related to stress.

Stress is closely related to the resilience concept, on the notion that stress arguably is something we want to avoid. How to avoid being stressed seems to require if not resilience per se, then mental resilience, as self-help literature suggest.

Work psychologist and stress researcher, Einar B. Baldursson (Jørgensen, 2016), critically point to how stress seems to be the question, which the resilience concept in organizational life answers is false. Baldursson (Santesson, 2016a) refer to the resilience concept in job advertisements as an act of powerlessness from the employers' part:

"The employers [are perplexed and] seek after employees, who does not easily become stressed [...] It [resilient] goes hand in hand with the occurrence of stress amongst knowledge workers. Knowledge workers are to a greater extent more exposed to mental illnesses, and those we do not have found the solutions for yet".

Doctor Bo Netterstrøm (2003: 35) understands stress from a biological point of view and states:

"Stress is not a decease. Stress is the body's response to a strain that can be both physical and mental. The stress reactions in the body are the organism's attempt to *keep us alive*."

What we may conclude is that organizational life demands resilient knowledge workers, that can keep working in spite the conditions of work. One must be able to *survive* the conditions of work without getting stressed, although stress, in Netterstrøm's (2003) work, is a response to the *much* strain of keeping a resilient mode.

It appears that individuals must fundamentally themselves balance between the desired state of being resilient and undesired state of being stressed. This thesis limits itself not to discuss the idea of good or bad stress, thus focusing on how work-related stress is a major problem for knowledge workers in late-modern society.

Perhaps, therefore, we tend to mirror ourselves in people who can manage many things and who can successfully go through rough periods of stress, and then can stand stronger against stress than before when stress once again shows its ugly face. Equivalent to this, is Brinkmann's rather funny but also quite problematic notion of what he refers to as the positives tyranny, as Brinkmann (2014: 41) argue:

"A typical book title is *How I got through stress – and learned from it*, whereas I do not have knowledge of books, which are called *How I was hit by stress – nothing good came out of that.*"

Individualization of Knowledge Workers' Knowledge Work

This paragraph deals with the rising individualization of knowledge workers' knowledge work, and how this tendency can explain the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life.

In recent years, knowledge workers have been given different kind of names to describe their characteristics, for examples: the *project-human* (Jensen, 2009), the *opportunistic person* (Pedersen, 2011), and recently the *performance subject* (Petersen, 2016).

Project-human

In philosopher Anders Fogh Jensen's analysis (2009: synopsis) of the spheres of contemporary life, a seemingly blurry chaos of work, private life, love, meetings, health, vacations, schooling and self-development, he argues that these spheres follow their project logic. Therefore, the modern knowledge worker, in Jensen's view, can be described as, *projektmennesket* (abbreviated as project-human):

"We experience time, space and each other in new ways - characterized by impermanence, uncertainty, ad-hoc solutions, overbookings, cancellations and the absence of clear expectations."

The emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life seems to be a method for knowledge workers to discipline themselves to meet the demands of management.

However, as Jensen argues, the logic of knowledge workers' knowledge work is characterized by an *absence of clear expectations*.

Opportunistic person

According to Professor Ove Kaj Pedersen's (2011: 12; See also Jørgensen, 2016: 17) notion of the *Competitive State*, the new state under transformation is actively seeking to *mobilize* the public and organizations to take part in the *global competition*. Also, it is a state that seeks to *mobilize* the individual's own responsibility in work and life.

Pedersen (2011: 190) describes this new individual today, as the opportunistic person:

"Before the person was something in itself that was the irreplaceable, now the person has become a carrier of interest, of something about itself. However, more than that. He or she is also a person, for whom professionalism (or skills) is the access to become formed, to gain independence and to develop creativity i.e. to create oneself as independent and reflective [...] This empty person [the opportunistic person [...]] is *selfish and motivated by incentives*."

What we can learn from Pedersen's theory of the opportunistic person as being formed in a competitive state is that such a selfish figure is motivated by incentives, which point to 'instrumentalization' and individualization tendencies, that makes the knowledge workers want to take in the global competition. They become people governed by opportunistic behaviours.

This thesis interpretation of Pedersen's (2011) theory of the *Competitive State*, is that the *Competitive State* emphasises the individuals' responsibility to work and be motivated by incentives to self-development, it creates the selfish notion of standing stronger in the global competition.

Performance subject

One of the intentions of sociologist Anders Petersen's (2016: 15) recent essay, *Præstationsamfundet* (abbreviated roughly to *performance society*), is to provide some answers to explain the rise of depression that is widely spread in Denmark today, and explain how individual must 'smoothen the internal resilience' [smidiggøre den indre robusthed] to be able perform successful in organizational life now.

In an interview with Helle, a 29-year-old woman, she answers to Petersen (2016: 83):

“It is an individual race. You must be able to do many things at work. There is a lot of requirement, you should be this, that, and such. What if you cannot cope with that? Then you are just twice as much a loser. There is simply just not room for anyone that do not want to compete, do not want to pursue a career, and do not want to ...”

Helle explains how anyone needs to take part in this race that work has become and she tells how competition is a condition of life, which we must cope with.

I do not aim at exploring the depression concept in more details. Nevertheless, Petersen's empirical study, though mainly theoretical, provides some answers to explain the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life.

Helle's notion of 'the individual race' may be one answer to rising levels of stress and depression diagnosis in our late-modern society, which our performance society also creates. Petersen (2016: 137) explain this double effect of the performance society:

“The performance society acts both as a judge and an executioner: It creates the negative while simultaneously getting rid of it.”

As Helle seems to hint at, a competition is going on right now in organizational life, which stress-expert Thomas Milsted (Bræmer, 2015; See also Petersen, 2016: 100) understands as an aim for organizational life to find and train the winners while in the meantime dismissing the non-resilient subjects in the process.

Thus, this thesis explains how organizational life stigmatizes those who fail at being resilient in their conceptual understanding of the resilience concept. They are considered as losers in this competitive race, which this thesis refers to as a *stand/run marathon* that can have no winners given the paradoxical nature of such a race.

Petersen (2016: 136) explains how this desire to *stay in the race* is obvious for all thanks to the logics of his theory of performance society:

“To be able to succeed with its venture, the logic of the performance society has been successfully institutionalized, where its social norms and rules have become desirable ideals, that must be internalized [...] In Bourdieu [1998] optic the neoliberalism dominating the economic doctrine – where focus is sharply aimed at the markets condition of rationality – has been woven well into social, cultural

and political spheres, that it has colonized these areas. The same, I think, can be said about the performance society [...] Accordingly, the basic premises for performance society's ideals, including exaltation of the performance subject as the most creditable, and non-negotiable. They are as mentioned obvious."

Petersen argues that performance subjects are the most creditable today because the logics of the performance society has been successfully institutionalized. Thus, according to Petersen, individuals are somehow forced to take part in the performance society, because the logics of our performance society are already telling us that it obviously has to be this way.

Petersen (2016: 137) explains how individuals must become resilient, when they are forcefully required to take part in the logics of performance society:

"Although the rules and norms of the performance society's are presented as delicate and appetizing – and even easy to submit – they assume characterizations of force. It is absolutely not up to the individuals, whether or not they wish to follow the performance society's premises. Not so far, one wishes to achieve occupational and social success. In this instance, the individuals must adjust themselves to be adaptable, flexible, mobile, etc. This mixes, as I [Petersen] previously has dealt with, the claim to tune oneself onto one's own resilience – all things that requires a large smoothen of one's internal. It is via a smoothen internal, that the individual should aim at honoring the demands from the performance society. It is via the smoothen internal [smidiggørelse af det indre], that the individual can establish the demanded resilience."

This thesis argues that Petersen refers to a notion like this thesis hypothesis of resilience. Petersen's argumentation solidifies how important the demand for resilience has become for us, and how seemingly this demand has become normalized, forcefully or not.

It is a race for resilient knowledge workers that will only show result in higher percentages of people suffering from mental illnesses, per Petersen's (2016: 140) as his closing arguments states:

"The Danish Department of Health clearly shows in its report that the number of people suffering depression in Denmark is rising (Flachs et al., 2015). If we take this development ad notam, and we combine this with my [Petersen] analysis,

there is an evidence that it will continue this way [...] The primary social rules and claims of the performance society is rooted so solidly, that a major revolution doesn't seem to be knocking at the door. In that perspective, it is not considerably controversial to claim, that Denmark in the future will have more people suffering depressive disorders and quite certainly other types of mental illnesses."

Petersen may be right in his analysis combined with the Danish Department of Health's report, but this is not up to this thesis to examine, because it is first impossible to establish certainties about the future, and also not in the scope of this thesis.

What is interesting for this thesis, is Petersen's notion of the contemporary competitive race in a performance society. It is the notion that some individuals, maybe Helle, may not be able to follow it. As Petersen explains, it may be a matter of time before otherwise 'resilient' individuals may be subjected to mental illnesses down the line, in taking the combining results of the Danish Department of Health and his analysis ad notam.

Is the failure of not being resilient a 'significant threat' in late-modern society?

What these three ways of describing the individualization of knowledge workers' knowledge work have in common is the idea that individual's responsibilities and abilities take part in what organizational life demands.

Professor Niels Åkerstrøm Andersen (2016) argues in his recent historical and conceptual analysis of the responsibility concept (from 1919-) with special reference to public employees in Denmark, that:

Employee's responsibility has exploded [...] As an employee, you can never be responsible in all responsibility-concepts glances at once. Moreover, when you appeal to management, you cannot be sure whether the manager chooses to observe you through the first, second, or third concept. There are indeterminacy and indistinguishability regarding the distinction between responsibility and irresponsibility.

The fear or failure by knowledge workers and the fear of not being considered as resilient may be a *significant threat* to knowledge workers in an acceleration society indicated by performativity and competitiveness.

In other words, the failure to stay in the race, regardless whatever conceptual understanding of the resilience concept and the fear of being labeled non-resilient constitutes a significant threat. The introduction of this thesis dealt with how Kirkeby (2016) defines “resilience” as the antonym of “fragile.” An analytic observation reveals that even though mental illnesses have become part of our everyday language as signalling a diagnose culture (See Brinkmann & Petersen, 2015) today. Contradictorily, we still seem to fear our fragility. Kirkeby (2016) emphasizes that this natural human trait of being fragile is what organizations should not only accept but demand as well. However, this thesis does not argue that the fragile and the resilient are mutually exclusive, it welcomes the idea of a balance between them in accordance with how global competition is woven tightly in everyone's life.

In the following paragraph, this thesis turn a focus on why an individualization of knowledge workers' knowledge work is obvious, by addressing how individuals are targets for an industry aiming at 'helping' us all to instrumentalize our personal or psychological resources best possible – targeting our soft values for enhancing the hard values of the bottom-line, which is why it is organizational life that demand resilient people and not people who want to fulfill a kind of resilient attitude.

Self-help Industry and the Promises of Resilience

Can we consider the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life a positive or negative phenomenon?

The coaching industry as part of the self-help industry may view it as a positive phenomenon, while this thesis holds its critical stance. This argument can be observed by how MRT® courses and a new wave in the coaching industry, blossoming in these years, is inspired by *positive psychology* (mentalrobusthed.dk).

In this thesis, I reference to the psychology scholars Anders Myszak & Simon Nørby (2008) essay, *Positiv Psykologi* (abbreviated: Positive Psychology), which aim is to

introduce the *European positive psychology* (EPP). This essay is considered by some reviewers as a pioneer work for *Danish positive psychology* and is, therefore, important for this thesis attempt to explain the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life.

A historical shift in psychology has happened recently, it went from a focus on 'where things go wrong' (example: developmental disorders, personal problems and mental illnesses), to a focus on 'positive phenomenon' (example: mental well-being and human strengths) (Myszak & Nørby, 2008: 13).

It is interesting to note that the EPP and positive psychology, in general, a new field of psychology, takes its roots from the American psychologist Martin Seligman's work in 1998 (Myszak & Nørby, 2008: 7).

The aim of positive psychology is to provide answers and give recommendations, in an empirical, hypothesis-testing, and experimental way, to rather philosophical grand questions such as: What is a good life? How can you live a good life?

Myszak & Nørby (2008: 7) support this idea:

"In our time, these questions have found their way in scientific scrutiny under the term positive psychology, a modern predecessor to humanistic psychology, and even from earlier moral philosophy."

The emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life and in a self-help industry that capitalizes on this rising demand tells a story of how knowledge workers knowledge work are increasingly about how individuals can endure conditions of organizational life, and not so much how individuals can improve conditions of organizational life.

Coaches to the Rescue

A solution for individuals to keep a resilient attitude is perhaps what coach and management consultant Charlotte Mandrup (Højbjerg, 2016) recommends:

"We need to drop the notion that work is something more than work – and find the meaning of life in other places."

According to her modern work has become an existential value for knowledge workers now. Thus, she argues for a clearer separation of work and life, by recommending knowledge workers to say *no* to pressures from employers (Højbjerg, 2016).

However, scholar Michael Pedersen (Arre, 2013) states:

"It is guilt on top of guilt: at first you must handle the notion of saying no even though you know that those who make a career don't say no. And then you must gauge when it is smart to say no. It all becomes a very individual process."

Pedersen (Arre, 2013) argues that this *no* is neither easy nor difficult, as Mandrup thinks, but that it is ultimately a responsibility for individuals to handle, well aware of some consequences that a yes or no may have for their career and life.

Saying *no* to pressures from organizational life reminds me of how Willig (2013) states that if we want to be resilient, we cannot at the same time criticize. Thus, saying no, in accordance to Willig (2016), means demonstrating lack of resilience, which have consequences for your work and private life.

Mandrup (Santesson, 2016b) believes that the feminine values that organization, on behalf of management consultants, such as herself earlier in her career, has implemented, has made especially the knowledge workers 'helpless.'

It is highly presumed in this thesis that Mandrup's (Santesson, 2016b) reference to feminine values refers to her opinion about:

"Recognition should not be necessary to *survive* on the job."

In other words, as Mandrup suggest, it *must* and *should* be expected that knowledge workers are professional on the job. An understanding that, in the end, it is the knowledge worker's own responsibility to be resilient, to accommodate with what organizations demand, and not organizations' responsibility to make knowledge workers feel valued and appreciated (Jørgensen, 2016). An argument, which Drucker (1999) perhaps would tend to agree with because knowledge workers should have autonomy, hence responsibility, in their knowledge work. Although, as this thesis

wants to demonstrate, we do not live in Drucker's time anymore. Drucker would not know the struggles of late-modernity.

An argument in this thesis, is also that Petersen (2016) may not agree with Mandrup. Petersen's argumentation of our late-modern society as being a 'performance society' is closely related to Rosa's (2009) concept of 'high-speed society' or his newer definition 'acceleration-society.'

Demands for knowledge workers, in such an acceleration society, appear to be heavily about individual's responsibility to perform in the best possible way, whatever the conditions in organizational life, as Rosa (2010: 99) says it:

"All failures and shortcomings directly fall back on the individuals. It is exclusively our own fault if we are unhappy or fail to *stay in the race*."

Resilience seems to emerge in organizational life because organizations demand performant subjects who can *stay in the race*. As discussed before, why do organizations demand resilient knowledge worker instead of perhaps an even more fitting demand, *successful* knowledge workers?

This analysis then needs to recall resilience researchers Masten & Tellegen's (2012: 349-350) argument to whom we may determine as examples of resilience and examples of success:

"Resilience research required concepts of risk as well as positive adaptation. In the absence of any unusual risk or challenge posed by development or adaptive function, people who were doing well in life might be called examples of competence or success but they would not be examples of resilience, because to establish resilience there must be evidence there is or has been some kind of significant threat to the lives of the individuals in question".

If we agree to the terms of how it is the individuals' *responsibility* to be resilient, solutions or help can be obtained by attending MRT® courses or reading books from coaches such as Mandrup. However, participants in MRT® courses are not becoming resilient per se, but perhaps only learn valuable 'tools' to become successful. 'Tools' that would make individuals turn into performant subjects. A high performer is highly successful especially when human subjects are able to work whatever happens.

The Promises of Anti-Self-Help Literature

Psychology professor, Svend Brinkmann, argues to oppose against the compulsory need for self-development nowadays and, therefore, is in contrast with self-help industry, and the underlying inspiration from positive psychology.

In fact, Brinkmann (2014: 18) refers to his work as “anti-self-help” literature. Contrary to the aim of coaching that is to provide ‘tools’ for individuals to instrumentalize psychological resources, Brinkmann (2014: 13) wants you to *stå fast* (abbreviated as *stand firm*) in this accelerated culture, which he, ironically, describes in a seven-steps guide.

The aim of Brinkmann's (2014: 21) seven-steps guide is to teach readers a kind of negative mindset inspired by Stoicism, as he argues⁴:

“You will learn to observe with a mild indulgent glance how the others run babble happy inside the hamster wheel and almost like pubescent adolescent chasing the next identifier, trend or conquest (of market share or attractive partners). You will likely discover how busy you are of this chase, but you will learn to understand that this is a very immature way to manage your life.”

Brinkmann's aim is for us to stop chasing self-development goals like MRT® courses because this is an immature way of managing life. Brinkmann refers to ancient philosophy of life of Stoicism, which he makes relevant for our challenges of late-modern society.

Brinkmann's anti-self-help looks like how the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is about standing firm (as an oak-tree).

This thesis finds it interesting that Brinkmann seems to refer to resilience when he argues to a return to Stoic values.

What this thesis wants to emphasize is the argument that it may not be possible for individuals to live up to resilience, either by themselves or in organizations, because the real driver behind this demand for resilience is global competition, the societal structure of capitalist culture.

⁴ This thesis front-page cartoon, by Per Marquard Otzen, seems to illustrate how Brinkman see *the others*.

Foucault's Philosophy on Normality

Foucault concerns with how our disciplinary surveillance society is turning deficient into a problem, which needs development. The external self-help culture of our modern life exemplified above shows how deficient need helps to enter normality. Raffnsøe et al. (2016: 188-189) reading of Foucault gives a relevant account:

"In the disciplinary surveillance society, however, there is a tendency to direct attention at the ordinary and the deficient and defiant is emphasised [...] Indeed, this transition organizes lives by making everyone – especially the deficient – the objects of ongoing registration and correction [...] Since discipline placed certain external limitations on behavior, it is also ensured that the disciplined initiated a development toward a hitherto unrealised, common goal or toward a common norm."

We could interpret this, as Foucault argues, that the public in Foucault's theory of disciplinary surveillance society is affected by a desire to reach a common norm.

Raffnsøe et al. (2016: 189) argue further:

"In the work, he [Foucault] attempts to cast light on the miserable modern consciousness – its *constant demand for self-improvement* and ongoing guilty consciousness – by writing its historical origin and genealogy."

This resilience, required by organizational life, is lined to *a constant demand for self-improvement*. A modern consciousness that self-help industry wants to capitalize. Thus, we can argue in a dialogue with Foucault's philosophy that knowledge workers must improve themselves because of a guilty conscience that tells them that resilience is just something that they have to be or learn because that is the norm – which makes them miserable.

In what can be interpreted as being inspired by Foucault, the authors Raffnsøe, Gudmand-Høyer, and Thaning (2016: 463) give their view on coaching (self-help industry):

"There is a current focus on individual and particular events and individuals from whom self-affirmation through self-transcendence is a core project. In this sense we find a photographic negative of the individual ethos in the culture of coaching

and management, just as the unpredictable event and critical revolt has become a tool for economic development within contemporary event culture.”

This thesis interprets that these authors suggest that the culture of coaching and management is becoming a ‘tool’ for economic development.

It may not be a surprise by now that this thesis argues in a dialogue with Foucault and Raffnsøe et al. (2016), that the demand for resilience is indeed a ‘tool’ for economic development used by coaching and management.

To conclude, the demand for knowledge workers to be resilient in organizational life is mainly due to economic development considering that we live in a capitalist structure. This structure potentially makes people in general live in an ‘acceleration society’ of social acceleration processes. Resilience as a demand becomes the *norm* for us all. Consequently, in late-modern societies, we turn to external help to ensure ourselves to stay in a race that challenges our human capacity by attempting to transcend human boundaries for the sake of economic development.

Thus, these two different methods, *self-help*, and *anti-self-help*, are largely orchestrated around the idea of the individuals’ capacity to stand firm while accelerating on an ever-changing surface.

Aware of this thesis’ limitation on such a vast knowledge of theories concerning the individual as a subject of study, these methods of self-help and anti-self-help are merely an attempt to demonstrate how complex organizational life and private life has become when we consider the resilience demand as a *normalizing* tendency in life and organizational life. In other words, the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life may be associated with social pathologies theories, which are analyzed and discussed in *chapter three*.

Chapter Three

Chapter Three is the final step on this thesis staircase, which is based on *Chapter One*' focus on *how* the resilience concept emerges in organizational life and the possible contradictions at 'play.'

Chapter Three is also based on *Chapter Two*' focus on *why* the resilience concept emerges in organizational life, and what meaning it may have for knowledge workers themselves and knowledge workers' in the tasks of performing knowledge work.

The attempt in *Chapter Three* is to analyze *how* and *why* there are possibilities of a link between the resilience concept and social pathologies theories in organizational life.

Resilience and Social Pathologies

As we have analysed so far in this thesis, the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life turns the organizational life into as a *stand/run marathon*.

A marathon where people *stand* firm on the ground, but somehow at the same time seem to be accelerating their pace. This marathon is on a global scale and any possible finish line is nowhere in sight.

What we have, in this analogy, is an endless marathon, in a Deleuzian (1992) sense *never finished with anything*, where everyone competes to win in an unfinishable race. In other words, the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is in a metaphorical sense the act of standing firm in an accelerating unfinishable race.

Is Willig (2016) right, when he states that nowadays we have become *too* manageable in organizational life? In other words, can we openly criticize the demand for resilience, because that would make us non-competitive and therefore – fail to stay in the race?

If an individual knowledge worker criticizes any conditions at work, does it mean this person needs to train mental resilience?

As Rosa (2009; 2010; 2013) emphasizes in his work, we do not just live in a high-speed society we live in there is also social acceleration towards ever-increasing goals. A society in which, as Brinkmann (2014) says, people feel the need to instrumentalize their life to fit the purposes of external demands.

This marathon itself seems to accelerate and we accept these terms of conditions to stay ahead in the race, by an 'instrumentalization' of our psychological resources in the best way possible. As depicted earlier in *chapter one*, we apply to job ads meaning that we are, in fact, resilient knowledge workers. Thus, this *stand/run marathon* requires enduring individuals as a Nike ad says – "Just Do It".

The logics of global competitions seems to imply that all people need to take part in this race for self-improvements, as the self-help industry exemplifies. Furthermore, people must also *want* to be accelerators of this *stand/run marathon*, which is why this thesis argues that the resilience concept is associated with social pathologies theories. Depression, stress, and other mental illnesses appear to be consequences of this 'inhumane' demand for resilience. Social pathologies are dilemmas or unsolvable paradoxes that produce pathological activity. Such pathological activities may be underlying forces of behaviours such as cynicism and alienation that triggers depression, stress and other mental illnesses.

Next, I will analyze in greater details how this thesis determines the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational can be associated to social pathologies theories. A hypothesis in this thesis is that the paradoxical *stand/run marathon* is on a biological plan for human beings impossible to participate in without producing pathological activities. Thus, the emergence of the resilience demand in organizational life seem to be impossible for knowledge workers to 'have,' 'become' or 'be,' without any pathological producing activities.

What can we derive from this thesis analogy of organizational life as a never-ending *stand/run marathon*?

The resilience concept in job ads refers to *individual* knowledge workers personal competence (marathon runners).

However, when the resilience demand is rising as a phenomenon (Holst, 2015) in job ads, given attention in media, and theorized by scholars, this thesis hypothesis of the resilience concept suggest a broader societal problem that is implicit in the *very* structure of organizational life (the *stand/run marathon* itself).

The thesis attempts to explain *how* and *why* the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is associated with social pathologies theories.

The U-turn of Social Pathology

Next, this thesis analyses the historical development of the concept social pathology, and how that development is relevant to this thesis topic and research question.

To help us understand the term 'social,' we can analyse its etymology. The concept comes from the Latin *socius* (Lübcke et al., 2010: 653):

“that, which concerns the relationship between humans in a society; the social.”

A modern definition of *social pathology* is given on the Merriam-Webster:

“a study of social problems (such as crime or alcoholism) that views them as *diseased conditions of the social organism*.”

Non-resilience, whatever that may entail, arguably seems, by the revelation of the analytic points this thesis has reached so far, to be a *diseased condition of the social organism*.

Effects of social pathologies, in this thesis, are in a general understood as Desjarlis et al. (1995: 134) explains:

“[Social pathologies] often lead to a flood of social, economic and psychological problems that undermine well-being.”

What we have learned so far in this thesis, is that this demand for resilient knowledge workers by organizational life is rapidly entering what this thesis calls ‘normative demands.’ Thus, this resilience demand claims to normativity indicates how individual’s wellbeing on a societal scale is in danger – a significant threat of rising social pathological activities.

Social pathology, as a concept, in a Danish sense, dates back to the way Claudius Wilkens (1881: 213) in 1881 defines it as a societal state of decess in biological and medical terms - a notion of the society as an organism to be in afflictions which required a (social) cure.

At the time of Wilkens, the idea was that social pathologies were linked to the social question, which lead to the political discussion on how to improve the working class social and economic positions (Wilkens, 1881).

According to this thesis, the basic idea seems that social pathologies emerge because of inequality-producing contradictions in society.

Today, the concept of social pathology is still marked by connotations of the organism-analogy but has been influenced by Critical Theory and Marxism. The concept has evolved from a normative universal historical concept to a concept for concrete social criticism. Thus, focus is now on an understanding of the individual’s exposure socially by mere existence in society and not from the perspective of society (Willig & Østergaard, 2005: 175):

“Normality becomes pathological when it is restricted to a statistic utopia or valuation, which control both moral, social practice and the common perspectives on deviants, without wanting to be normative but alone an expression for an objective size.”

In this thesis we have already demonstrated this apparent change of focus by analyzing popularity of self-help literature, which means an emphasis on self-critique in contrast to a critique of society.

In other words, this thesis shows a tendency today where individuals are inclined to look *inwards* to find answers to problems, instead of looking outwards on the societal structure.

Willig's (2013) work, *Kritikkens U-vending* [The U-turn of Critique], attempts to show how a critique of managerial decisions is difficult for employees, since the terms of criticism, as mention above, seems to have undergone a change these days:

"The U-turn of Critique is about terms for criticism in contemporary society. The book's thesis is that criticism today looks noticeably different from the past: Where before, people criticized the social and the outside world, a U-turn has happened today so criticism especially has the character of self-criticism."

Willig determines in his recent book, based on conducted interviews, that neoliberalism today operates with a focus on how individuals can improve and not how society can improve, which prevents feelings of injustice to reach political level (2016: 223).

This U-turn towards connotation of individualism, is in relevance to how Rosa (2010: 41-42) attempts to answer why social acceleration is relevant for an analysis of potential pathologies of modern life:

"[W]hy should social acceleration be relevant to social philosophy, i.e. to an analysis of the normative conditions, the quality and potential pathologies of modern life?

It is of highest relevance, I would like to answer, because first, modern society is not regulated and coordinated by explicit normative rules, but by *the silent normative force* of temporal norms, which come in the forms of deadlines, schedules and temporal limits [...] the forces of acceleration, even though they are non-articulated and completely de-politicized such that they appear to be natural givens, exert a uniform pressure over modern subjects that amounts to something like an acceleratory totalitarianism."

Rosa's argumentation of this *silent normative force* indicates how this resilience demand in job ads is linked with social pathologies of modern life. Rosa shows how the world

is becoming utterly silent and alienated, an observation that this thesis analyses in the paragraph *Chapter Three: Hartmut Rosa's Theory of Alienation*.

Next, *Chapter Three* introduces and discuss chosen social pathologies theories, which this author initially considered relevant for this thesis theme.

On that note, this thesis social pathologies theories are 1) an introductory part concerning *Axel Honneth's Social Pathology Theory*, and 2) an understanding of the resilience concept as a rise in cynical behavior in *Peter Sloterdijk's Modern Cynicism*, and 3) a final notion of how the resilience concept resemble tendencies of alienations in late-modern society by *Hartmut Rosa's Theory of Alienation*.

Axel Honneth's Social Pathology Theory

Next, is an account of Honneth's social pathology theory, which is explained and analyzed in relevance to this thesis topic and research question.

In this explanation, this thesis chooses to reference to how scholar Lars Geer Hammershøj's (2007: 1), in a dialogue with Honneth's work, attempts to: "inquire into today's social pathologies," by also disagreeing with Honneth's sociological perspective.

In Lars Geer Hammershøj's (2007: 1; See Honneth, 1996: 370) article he references to how:

"Honneth emphasizes the importance of resuming the original task of the social philosophical tradition, namely to diagnose 'those developmental processes of society that can be conceived as processes of decline, distortion, or even as "social pathologies.'"

One of the arguments developed in this thesis is that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is a part of a developmental process of a distortion of knowledge workers themselves and in the performance of knowledge work. This

distortion is felt by individuals but is also a collective problem on a societal level linked to social pathologies.

This thesis, in its way, attempts to diagnose the pathologies of our contemporary capitalist culture, by the starting point of the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life as a rising demand for knowledge workers. Hence, the social-philosophical contributions of this thesis is inspired from Honneth's (1998: 37) work and Critical Theory:

"The only chance we have to keep the tradition of Critical Theory alive is to continue [...] the social-philosophical enterprise of a kind of diagnosis of our present culture, the pathologies of that culture, of a certain capitalist culture."

The aim of this part is how to associate with Honneth's theory of social pathology and Hammershøj's reading of Honneth with the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life.

We can argue, based on the analytics points made in this thesis, that the notion of being resilient is a valuable and important competence that knowledge workers should (or must) have, otherwise organizations would not demand this personal competence in job ads.

If all knowledge workers become resilient, it would mean a normalization of this demand, as if nothing is wrong with increasing your capabilities to withstand this *stand/run marathon*. Hammershøj (2007: 1) states that:

"Social pathologies no longer derive from social barriers inhibiting self-realization but from self-realization itself."

As shown in this thesis, knowledge workers seem to support the idea of self-improvements, which allows for the resilience concept to be a demand. We can as individuals both accept and criticize this *stand/run marathon*, but at the end of the day we do our best to keep up – at least I am more resilient than others. The idea of self-improvement or self-realization can explain social pathologies of our time. However,

such a claim may not support how it is, as a fact, organizational life that demands us to be resilient, and not our own desire to be resilient in organizational life.

Hammershøj problematizes how Honneth's work is: "a perspective based on the relation between the individual and the social *from the point of view of society*." Hammershøj's (2004; 2007: 9) point of view is:

"[...] that this form of individualization lies in the 'blind spot' of the sociological perspective and that the sociological perspective is therefore incapable of encompassing the current social pathologies of self-realization."

Social pathologies of self-realization, resulting in what Hammershøj's in a dialogue with Honneth (2004: 467; See also Hammershøj, 2007: 8) points to: "inner emptiness, of feeling oneself to be superfluous, and of absence of purpose," is an example of how the self-help industry is not viewing the problem of social pathologies from the view of individuals. Hammershøj disagree with Honneth by referring to:

"[...] what is needed is not a simple revival of philosophical anthropology, but a new perspective from the point of view of the individual that matches the current conditions [*from the individuals point of view*]."

The idea of self-realization being itself a problem is seen in how we, according to this thesis, as individuals, do not have 'barriers' other than our own 'invisible barriers' which the self-help industry and organizations want us to transcend.

I agree with Hammershøj's (2007: 3) thesis, that:

"In our time, social pathologies are characterized by the fact that they derive from self-realization itself and take the form of unsuccessful self-realization projects."

In my thesis, I argue that the idea of becoming resilient knowledge worker is ultimately, to use Hammershøj's expression, an unsuccessful self-realization project. Thus, the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is associated to social pathologies. The freedom in knowledge work, following Hammershøj's idea, shifts from self-determination as Drucker (1999) defines it, to failing self-realization projects, may be the reasons of the modern struggles of knowledge workers.

In the next parts to come, this thesis explains that two examples of deviant behaviors cynicism and alienation seem to be the consequences of knowledge workers struggle to meet the resilience demand by organizational life.

First, this thesis addresses how cynicism, by the philosophy of Sloterdijk, emerges for knowledge workers in organizational life because of rising personal demands, with an emphasis on the demand for resilience.

Next, Hartmut Rosa's theory of alienation tendencies today, allow this thesis to link the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life association with social pathologies of late-modernity like a social epidemic.

Peter Sloterdijk's Modern Cynicism

Next, this thesis explains that the demand for resilience is speaking the same language as the modern cynical figure, by introducing philosopher Peter Sloterdijk's (2001 [1983]: 5) theory of *modern cynicism*:

Psychologically, present-day cynics can be understood as borderline melancholy, who can keep their symptoms of depression under control and can remain more or less able to work. Indeed, this is the essential point in modern cynicism: the ability of its bearers to work—in spite of anything that might happen, and especially, after anything that might happen [...] They know what they are doing, but they do it because, in the short run, the force of circumstances and the instinct for self-preservation are speaking the same language, and they are telling them that it has to be so [...] Thus, we come to our first definition: Cynicism is enlightened false consciousness".

The present-day cynic focuses on self-development, because external conditions are telling them that it must be that way. When individualization tendencies and 'instrumentalization' of our activities dominate our life, we do not have individual problems but a societal problem cynical behaviours, which we may not desire, but somehow need to express, because self-preservation aims are telling each of us that this is how it must be, and we cannot do anything about it.

In other words, organizations demand knowledge workers who can work, even when things get rough and unbearable, as Baldursson (Santesson, 2016a) and Sloterdijk (2001 [1983]: 5) concludes.

Hence, it appears that knowledge workers are not only aware, but *self-preservation* is telling each of them, that *external conditions* seem unchangeable – one needs to change, or one will fail to stay in this *stand/run marathon* that keeps accelerating.

Sloterdijk's theory of modern cynicism is essential for this thesis, given the Merriam-Webster definition of the cynic as:

“[...] based on or reflecting a belief that human conduct is motivated primarily by *self-interest*.”

The thesis argues that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life impacts individuals, who then express cynical behavior to uphold this resilience demand.

A cynical behavior that Pedersen (2011: 190) seems to confirm, with his idea of the modern opportunistic person that he describes as: “selfish and motivated by incentives.”

In Sloterdijk's (2001 [1983]: 5) argumentation, this cynical (or insensitive) approach to work to accommodate modern conditions of organizational life is already reflexively buffered by individuals.

Thus, this thesis points to how the emergence of resilience concept in organizational life is affiliated with Sloterdijk's theory of modern cynicism and therefore is a social pathology of modern private- and organizational life.

As depicted earlier, the attempt to be resilient in organizational life, requires *endurance*, as this thesis hypothesizes. On that note, what Sloterdijk (2001 [1983]: 6-8) points to is how we must *survive* organizational life, as he explains:

“The compulsion to *survive* and desire to assert itself have demoralized enlightened consciousness. It is afflicted with the compulsion to *put up* with pre-established relations that it finds dubious, to *accommodate itself* to them, and finally

even to carry out *their* business [...] In fact, the question of "survival," of *self-preservation* and self-assertion, to which all cynicisms provide answers, touches on the *central problem of holding the fort and planning for the future in modern nation-states.*"

Contemporary theorists Fleming & Spicer (2003), as if they were in accordance with Sloterdijk, express that:

"Cynicism is a way of escaping the encroaching logic of managerialism and provides an inner 'free space' for workers when other avenues for *opposition have dried up.*"

Cynicism seem to be a way to cope with external pressures, that individuals feel like they cannot resist anyway. What Sloterdijk (2001 [1983]), Fleming & Spicer (2003) and possible others seem to address is, in their own words, that *opposition has dried up* and we *accommodate* ourselves to *carry out their business* (organizational life). Although we know what we are doing, we do it because, *in the short run, the force of circumstances and the instinct for self-preservation are speaking the same language, and they are telling them that it has to be so.*

On these analytic points, this thesis points to the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life as being associated with rising cynical behaviour as a social pathology of organizational life.

The idea that this thesis wants to emphasize, is that for someone to be considered resilient, others must be less resilient, which follow the logics of competition.

As a concluding remark this thesis points to how we all, us knowledge workers, in respect to Sloterdijk (2001 [1983]), Fleming & Spicer (2003) and Willig (2013), seemingly already know that the demand for resilient knowledge workers from organizations encompasses a rising cynical behaviour towards work activities, colleagues, family, and friends, even though we may not believe it ourselves. If Sloterdijk is right, this is already reflexively buffered.

Hence, organizational life is compelling us to compete for resilience when we all seems to know, that cynical behaviour and alienation from people, things, and ourselves appears to be the downside of our capitalist structure.

Hartmut Rosa's Theory of Alienation

Next, is an account of how Rosa's notion of Social Acceleration leads to his theory of Alienation.

Rosa's interesting and insightful examples of everyday life activities in our modern world shows how the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life as symptomatic to how we live our lives (both private- and organizational life).

Rosa (2010: 89-90) describes an alienated feeling he experiences on an *individual* plan, of course, but nevertheless an experience, potentially billions of people (collectively) in Western societies have felt:

"For example, today, I turned on this computer because I wanted to write this book on acceleration and alienation. (In fact, I am not so sure whether I REALLY want to do that right now – perhaps I'd rather listen to this new U2 album I just bought, but the manuscript is now overdue for almost two years!). However, before I started to write, I quickly surfed some of the webpages I usually consult: I had a glance on CNN, one on German Soccer-Results, and one on a webpage for the latest Progrok news. Now, I am not sure whether I 'really' wanted to surf this way – I had a strange feeling when I did, and this slight feeling of dissatisfaction increased with every 'hop' I took – for I virtually never finished reading one of the articles to the end. Nevertheless, you might say that this really is my personal problem, it is a weakness of the will and has nothing to do with alienating social structures. Well, I could counter by saying that this same, alienating, sucking experience is shared by millions or billions of internet-users and hence can scarcely be attributed to my individual weakness [...] In almost any realm of work, employees (as well as employers) complain that the time they actually devote to their 'core-business' dwindles.

Rosa (2010: 83-97) attempts to locate five kinds of alienation that are alienation from a) Space, b) Things, c) our Actions, d) Time, e) Self and Others. Rosa argues that these feelings of alienation be all due to the social acceleration of late-modern society, and this thesis attempts to highlight the main aspects of these five kinds of alienations:

- a. *Space*: Rosa points to how some observe that the age of digitalized 'globalization,' separates the social and physical world increasingly.
- b. *Things*: Rosa points to how things are distant to us in this acceleration society, and thus, that we live and work with alienation from things.
- c. *Our Actions*: We justify activities such as watching TV and buy new clothing, as something we must do, and we do it voluntarily, while this 'to do list' grows. This is instead of aiming at what we 'really want to do'.

- d. *Time*: A tendency today is that experience is anachronistic and somehow useless because one always has to be ready for the new and unforeseen. We have *short/short-pattern* of late-modern time experience. As Rosa argues from Walter Benjamin supposed distinguish of *Erlebnissen* (i.e. episodes of experience - *short*) and *Erfahrungen* (experiences which leave a mark - *long*). In our later-modern media-world 'time is running on both ends' – the time devoted to both, remain *alien* to us.
- e. *Self and Others*: Self-alienation is in Rosa's view, an imminent danger today. By a review of the previous kinds of alienation, this might result in an 'exhaustion of the self' or even in *burnout* (stress) and *depression* as Rosa (2005: 388) and Alain Ehrenberg (1999) suggests. The feeling of short on time makes it difficult to establish deep connections with others because it is time-consuming.

What is interesting is that a possible way for being able to do these never-ending demands of both private life and organizational life is resilience. However, Rosa (2010: 97) suggest the notion of *resonance* as 'alienations other:'

"Alienation from the world and alienation from self are not two separate things but just the two sides of the same coin. It persists when the 'axes of resonance' between self and the world turn silent."

If what we all need is *slowing* down in a societal sense, hence organizational life, by bringing resonance in our lives, social pathology of alienation from our world and our self, can turn to 'the good life' as Rosa (2010: 100) is convinced that:

"[T]he silencing' of the world, the deafness in the relationship between self and world is the most persistent and most threatening concern in all the diagnosis of 'pathology' that we find in critical social analysis of modernity: The idea that we cannot but call out into the world and wait for a response which we might never get is not only the root of existentialist accounts of the absurd, as Camus has it, but it also lies at the heart of early Marx' concept of alienation, of Weber's concern for disenchantment, of Durkheim's analysis of anomia, of Lukacs' (and Marcuse's or Honneth's) account of reification and of Adorno and Horkheimers's fear of the complete dominance of instrumental reason."

Rosa (2010: 100) demonstrates above how he justifies his claim that the world has become utterly *silent, cold, indifferent, and repulsive* for us in an acceleration society as if it was dominated by instrumental reason.

This thesis does not aim at analyzing how Rosa came to his claims through the mention scholars above. The attempt was to demonstrate how Rosa's claim is essential to how we can develop an understanding of the emergence of the resilience concept in

organizational life as being associated with social pathologies theories, thanks to Rosa's concepts: Social Acceleration, Alienation, and Resonance.

Does life imitate organizational life or is it the other way around? Perhaps one cannot know since many would argue that the lines separating work and life are increasingly becoming blurry these days, as Rosa (2010: 75) argues:

“‘I really have to go to work now, I really need to fill in the tax form; I have to do something for my fitness; I got to learn a foreign language, I must update my hard- or software now, I have to catch up with the news’ - the list is boundless, and in the end, we ‘really have to do something to relax and calm down and get some rest’ - otherwise we are threatened by a heart-attack, by depression, or by burn-out. *‘Daily life has become a drowning sea of demands.’*”

Knowledge workers may require resilience to ‘survive’ in organizational life, however paradoxically, as this thesis argues with Rosa, this eventually results in what the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life seems to ‘cure’, for example stress or other mental illnesses.

If Rosa is right that somehow *daily life has become a drowning sea of demands*, it seems that either private life imitates organizational life, or perhaps the other way around.

However, as established in this thesis, modern life (meaning the combination of private- and organizational life) seems to be dominated by logics of organizational life: competition, speed, increasing ‘to do lists,’ and economic development.

What Rosa, seem to suggest in relevance to the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life, is that if we keep focusing on how to ‘build up’ our own individual resilience towards increasing demands of organizational life, it may not be a question of *why* this demand for resilient knowledge workers is associated with social pathologies theories. It may be more interesting to discuss where we must go from here if the analytic points of this thesis are valid.

Discussion

Where there is power, there is resistance – Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*

Where do we go from here if the analytic points, a kind of characterization of doomsday diagnosis, are right? Foucault would possibly argue that we can counter this resilience demand in job ads with resistance. This thesis has argued that the resilience concept is associated with the notion of *control* and associated with social pathologies theories. We may resist the power of organizations to exploit its human resources, by discussing how we may get away or change this *stand/run marathon* by shifting the perspective away from organizational life to a perspective from human life.

Thus, the aim of this discussion chapter is to discuss the analytic points from the analysis chapters and reflectively indicate where we may go from here.

Drucker (1999) emphasizes the importance of knowledge workers to be responsible in their knowledge work but apparently, the opposite seems to have happened now. Willig (2016) explains that we are increasingly becoming manageable to fit the purposes of organizational life.

Today, based on the analytic points of this thesis, it makes sense to address how knowledge workers have a 'pseudo-control' in the performance of knowledge work. An example of this 'pseudo-control' is how employers demand that employees are resilient by forcing employees to *want* themselves to be resilient which in the end is beneficial for organizations in the short run, but nonetheless leads to pathological 'dehumanization' in the long run.

I think that the capitalistic structure of global competition and emphasis on economic development has begun a dehumanization of knowledge workers when demand for resilience reaches *normalization* in the way we work and live.

I want to challenge the idea from self-help industry that resilient knowledge workers, inspired by the theory of *positive psychology*, can overcome challenges of the logics of global competition and economic development of organizational life by 'jumping back' to work again continuously without feelings of underlying pathological activities of alienation and cynicism.

We can discuss how such a view may be false and misleading given that no one is alike, hence that we are all individuals. However, an understanding of the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life in a metaphorical way as a *stand/run marathon* demonstrates how we all, as individuals, are taking part in a dehumanizing race. The attempt to stay in such a race is causing social pathologies like stress, depression and other mental illnesses, by emphasizing the notion of keeping a resilient attitude in work and life.

In other words, knowledge workers cannot overcome challenges in organizational life, because these challenges are not 'human-challenges' per se, these challenges come from the logics of organizational life, and are not, in a biological sense, challenges in which humans can keep 'jumping back' into.

An individual knowledge worker's attempt to be resilient in organizational life by turning to human emotions of cynical behavior and alienation creates the foundation for social pathologies like stress, depression and other mental illnesses to emerge, which is counterproductive, in the sense that resilience supposedly should 'solve' such problems.

When organizations seem to bring more attention to the resilient demand than the flexibility demand, it points to a society producing inequality by creating a gap between those who can work in spite of what happens and those who fails, being unable to stay in the race.

We must discuss this problematic pattern of rising need by organizational life to demand personal competences such as resilience by devaluating other personal and professional competences.

We are supposed to be free, but somehow this free-floating control (Deleuze, 1992) of our time is making us unhappy and unhealthy (Rosa, 2010).

If we understand human beings as having limits on a biological plan, then I can argue that this demand for resilience is an attempt to transcend humans on a biological plan, not for the benefit of humans, but for the benefits of organizational life to maximize economic development from the pressures of global competition, telling them it must be so.

I can argue that organizational life is based on rationality. Thus, Mandrup's (2016) idea to leave our emotions at home makes sense.

However, we cannot separate ourselves from emotions because feelings are part of human nature. Anti-feelings are also a feeling – Let us say you leave your emotions at home, as Mandrup says, and go to work. This choice would make you emotionless towards work activities such as dealing with the employer, colleagues, customers, and the very 'things' of the office. However, the state of emotionless is an emotion that we could call insensitive. This insensitive way of being is not only an emotion, but it touches upon the idea of the cynic. The idea for someone to be resilient shows that we must become cynical in our surroundings as mechanism to be considered resilient for example. This points to a vicious cycle of pathological activities. When resilience is a demand for individual's capacity to stand firm, while at the same time trying to meet expectations of organizational life's demand for flexibility and self-development, then we have a paradox of being a 'running rock.' In fact it is a physical and mental challenge, which may not be even possible for humans to accommodate with, yet we try anyways. Nonetheless, as Sloterdijk says, such a paradox may already be reflectively buffered as an enlightened false consciousness.

What is possible is the resilience demand to be associated with social pathologies theories. Rosa suggest that a feeling of alienation from things, self and other, may be felt on a personal level, but it is shared by potentially billion other individuals which is central to the notion of social pathology. A social pathology today is the desire for individuals to be considered resilient, hence 'workable,' which creates the trigger for increasing levels of stress and depression diagnosis.

Hartmut Rosa's Promises of Reintegrating Resonance

Rosa (2010: Synopsis) explains how we must reintegrate resonance in our daily grind with his notion of a 'time-famine' in Western societies:

"In all western societies alike, time-famine is rising and individuals report the impression that they have to run faster and faster each year – not in order to get somewhere, but just to stay in place!"

Furthermore Rosa (2010: 100) explains:

"For late-modern subjects, the world (including the self) has become silent, cold, indifferent or even repulsive."

His dark view on late-modern subjects and the world tells us that if we want to feel less alienated from things, ourselves and people, must start the activity of reintegrating resonance in our work and life:

"Every day we are confronted with tasks that we have to solve quick, efficient, and without any resonance. Hence we create ourselves certain oases of resonance: Drinking a beer on Friday night or going to a concert, where we can switch gears [...] one should reintegrate resonance taking it out of the oases and putting it back to daily grind."

It is not enough that we schedule certain oases of resonance, we must reintegrate resonance in *all* we do. As I interprets it, Rosa is himself is part of a self-help industry, given that he points to how we must be careful to live in the moment, by viewing resonance as 'alienations other' (2010: 101) as a promise to live a better life.

What does that mean in regards to the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life? I think it means that we need to be aware of how this resilience demand in negative ways impact people and how we must continue the ongoing discussion of what organizations can demand of personal competences from its employees. We must discuss how we can resonate instead of alienate, embarking on a more prosperous road ahead by valuating the 'human' in the notion of human resources.

Sloterdijk's Revival of Kynicism

We can discuss a more prosperous way by reading Sloterdijk's work, which may or may not be an anti-self-help guide in itself (Sloterdijk, 2001 [1983]: xi)

"Sloterdijk sees cynicism as the dominant operating mode in contemporary culture, both on the personal and institutional levels, and he suggests reviving the tradition of kynicism [...]"

Thus, Sloterdijk argues for the return of the kynic (2001 [1983]: 3), as the Ancient world knows as:

"[A] provocative, stubborn moralist. Diogenes [of Sinope] in the tub is the archetype of this figure."

Ancient kynicism is about universal or *collaborative* orientation, where modern cynicism is *individually* oriented (Sloterdijk, 2001 [1983]: 3; See also Jørgensen, 2016).

In Sloterdijk's argumentation, this thesis points to how we today may experience rising cynicism from people attempting to be resilient because *self-preservation* is telling them that it must be so. What we need, according to Sloterdijk (2001 [1983]: xviii), is not that self-preservation aims guide us into the future but a return to resistance exemplified by Diogenes:

"Diogenes comes to represent the "self-embodiment in resistance" [...] that actually undercuts the modern notion of a stable identity, attacks the armored, self-preserving, and rationalizing ego of capitalist culture, and dissolves its strict separations of inside and outside, private and public, self and other.

On one level Sloterdijk's return to the *kynic body* may appear as a merely adolescent and regressive gesture whose potential for effective resistance is a priori contained and even vitiated by the way in which sexuality, the body, the corporeal have been deployed, instrumentalized, and co-opted by the contemporary culture industry. [...] [H]ow can the mere impudence of the postmodern Diogenes hope to break through the layers of reification and power [...]"

In a dialogue with Sloterdijk, we need to resist the rationalizing homo oeconomicus traditions of our capitalist culture and invigorate the *kynic body* by breaking with the dominance of reification and 'instrumentalization' tendencies that makes us miserable and well off at the same time (Sloterdijk, 2001 [1983]: 5).

Conclusion

Today the resilience concept is a buzzword, not only in job ads, but as a concept used by various people in various settings ranging from politics and product design. The resilience concept points to ideas of getting something under *control* and something to be *controllable*.

In this thesis, I have examined the etymology of the resilience concept, the knowledge worker and the notion of knowledge work.

I have developed a hypothesis stating that the emergence of the resilience demand in organizational life, as a personal competence, indicates that knowledge workers can overcome challenges despite adversity of the logics of organizational life. An indication that knowledge workers can stand firm in an organizational life of acceleration tendencies, which simulates the idea of knowledge workers to not only take part, but also *wanting* themselves to take part in a paradoxical *stand/run marathon*, because self-preservation aims are telling them that it must be so.

In *Chapter One*, I explored *how* we may explain the resilience concept as an exploitation of knowledge workers human resources, by making the knowledge workers *want* for themselves to exploit their mental resources such as resilience in the best possible way by for example getting 'help' from the self-help industry's MRT® courses inspired by *Positive Psychology* or from the so-called *Anti-self-help* literature as psychology professor Brinkmann advocates in contrast to the self-help industry.

It seems as if we accept the resilience demand by submitting in the same way we accept terms of condition on a product we buy. We seem to simply not care about how the normalization of this resilience demand affects our humanity and in according to Willig's notion of knowledge workers today to have become *too* manageable. This thesis demonstrates that the resilience demand is entirely for the benefits of the logics of organizational life. If we should criticize the resilience demand a priori or a posteriori, according to Willig, this would only expose our failure to realize the

resilience demand. What knowledge workers can then do is to find ways for them to cope with working conditions asking for resilient knowledge workers.

In *Chapter Two*, I explored *why* the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life can be seen in the way we today feel like we have a 'time hunger' according to sociologist Hartmut Rosa's explanation.

Rosa's concept *social acceleration* is used considering that the resilience demand is valuable for organizations that want their employees to withstand mentally, hence be resilient to the 'significant threat' of our modern pace of life despite technological improvements and global competition that makes us wanting to speed up just to stay in the race.

Stress and other mental illnesses can be seen as a failure to the self-realization of the resilience demand. In other words, these problems or pathological activities of rising cynicism and alienation from things, ourselves, and others cause mental illnesses such as stress and depression to emerge, which the demand for resilience should 'cure.' However, this thesis argues that the 'unwanting' mental illnesses and the *want* for realization of resilience is a vicious cycle feeding each other. In this vicious circle of a stand/run marathon, the only 'winners' are organizations, because knowledge workers cannot get out of this circle by themselves, but organizations can attract and dismiss as they please. As Bo Netterstrøm says, stress is not a disease it is a response. This thesis argues that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is at the same time a response to the rise of stress and depression diagnosis and a response to modern working conditions that require us to take part in a paradoxical *stand/run marathon*.

In contemporary times knowledge workers are called *project-humans* (Anders Fogh Jensen), *opportunistic persons* (Ove Kaj Pedersen), and *performance subjects* (Anders Petersen). These descriptions of the knowledge worker today show how the purpose of individualization tendencies of realizing our inner personal self is – to be available to the goals and exploitation by organizational life, when the resilience concept emerges in job ads.

In *Chapter Three*, I discussed *how* and *why* the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life is linked with the nature of organizational life itself.

An interesting analytic point is that the emergence of the resilience concept in organizational life seems to force knowledge workers to adopt cynical behavior towards people, work and feelings of alienation from self, others, and work itself. These underlying feelings of cynicism and alienation suggest that knowledge workers are experiencing social pathologies of stress, depression and other mental illnesses.

The resilience is associated with social pathologies theories given that, although we criticise, accept, endure or discuss the positive and negative aspect of this demand, we can never permanently become resilient. The attempts of becoming resilient are only making us more and more cynical in our work and more and more alienating from others and ourselves.

A possible more prosperous road ahead for us all would be to reintegrate Rosa's reinvention of *resonance*, as the notion of 'alienations other,' in our daily grind. If we achieve that, we, as individuals, may feel better about ourselves and may feel the world to be less indifferent, repulsive, silent, and cold, but this individual change may not have an impact on a societal level. Resilient knowledge workers may still continue be valuable for organizations despite their paradoxical nature,

Sloterdijk's resistance to modern cynicism is the return to the philosophy of Ancient Kynicism inspired by the stubborn moralist Diogenes. Inspired by Sloterdijk's notion of our need to revive Ancient Kynicism collaborative orientation, we need to move apart from the individually oriented cynical behaviour experienced by knowledge workers today when resilience emerges as demand in organizational life and remember the words of Foucault "where there is power, there is resistance."

References

- Aabo, B. (2016): *Finansjob er ikke for de svage* (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-11 – <https://www.finansforbundet.dk/da/nyheder-aktuelt/Sider/Finansjoberikkefordesvage.aspx>). København K: Magasinet Finans.
- Andersen, N. Å. (2016): *Derfor kan du ikke svare på spørgsmålet hvornår lever jeg op til mit ansvar* (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-11 – <http://vpt.dk/psykisk-arbejdsmiljo/derfor-kan-du-ikke-svare-pa-sporgsmalet-hvornar-lever-jeg-op-til-mit-ansvar>). København K: Viden på Tværs.
- Arre, K. (2013): *Kend Forretningen*. København K: Magasinet for medlemmer af Djøf, Nr. 02.
- Baldursson, E.B. (2009): *Hyperstress – Essays om moderne arbejdspsykologi*. København K: Frydenlund.
- Buch, A., Andersen, V., and Sørensen, O.H. (2009): *Videnarbejde og Stress – mellem begejstring og belastning*. Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag.
- Brinkmann, S. (2014): *Stå fast – Et opgør med tidens udviklingstvang*. København K: Gyldendahl Business.
- Brinkmann, S. (2016) *Ståsteder – 10 gamle ideer til en ny verden*. København K: Gyldendahl Business.
- Bræmer, M. (2015): *Stress-ekspert – man skal jo nærmest være elitesoldat for at være ansat i det offentlige i dag*. (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-11 – http://www.ugebreveta4.dk/man-skal-jo-naermest-vaere-elitesoldat-for-at-vaere-a_20297.aspx). København: Ugebrevet A4.
- Bøgelund, E. (2016): *Mental robusthed – eller kunsten at sige nej*. København K: Magasinet for medlemmer af Djøf, Nr. 08.
- Danielsen, K. (2015): *Robust er det nye modeord i annoncer* (Internet blog, last consulted 2017-01-11 – <https://www.jobindex.dk/blogs/job/255/robust-er-det-nye-modeord-i-jobannoncer>). Frederiksberg: Jobindex.dk.
- Deleuze, G. (1992): *Postscript on the Societies of Control*. October, 3-7.
- Desjarlis, R., Eisenberg, L., Good, B., Kleinman, A. (1995): *World Mental Health*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dinnesen, T. (2016): *2025-plan: SU'en skal finansiere regeringens plan*. (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-11 – <http://magisterbladet.dk/news/2016/august/2025plansuenskalfinansiereregeringensplan>). Frederiksberg: Magisterbladet.
- Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P. (1982): *Michel Foucault – Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago University Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (1959): *Landmarks of Tomorrow*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999): *Knowledge-Worker Productivity: The Biggest Challenge*. California Management Review, XLI:2, pp. 79-94.
- DTU (2016): *Robust Design*. (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-011 – <http://www.robustdesign.mek.dtu.dk/>). DTU.
- Ehrenberg, A. (1999): *La fatigue d'être soi : dépression et société*, O. Jacob, Paris.

- Flachs, E. M, Eriksen, L., Koch, M.B., Ryd, J. T., Dibba, E., Skov-Ettrup, L., Juel, K. (2015): *Sygdomsbyrden i Danmark – Sygdomme*. København: Sundhedsbestyrelsen.
- Fleming, P. & Spicer, A. (2003): *Working at a cynical distance: Implications for subjectivity, Power, and Resistance*. *Organization*, 10 (1), 157-179.
- Foucault, M. (1970): *Theatrum philosophicum*. In *Dits et écrits* bd.I, T80.
- Foucault, M. (1972) [1969]: *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Tr. A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1973): 'Le monde est un la grand asile', *Dits et écrits* II.
- Foucault, M. (1976): *Historie de sexualité 1, La volonté de savoir*, Paris: Gallimard 1976/Viljen til viden. *Seksualitetens historie 1*, Frederiksberg: Det lille forlag 1994.
- Foucault, M. (1982): *The Subject and Power*, in: J.D. Faubion (ed.): *Power*. London: Penguin Books, 2000; 326-349.
- Foucault, M. (1996): *The Concern for Truth*, in Foucault, M.: *Foucault Live, Semiotext(e)*, New York.
- Foucault, M. (2001): *Fearless Speech, Semiotext(e)*, Los Angeles.
- Garnezy, N., & Masten, A. S. (1986). *Stress, competence, and resilience: Common frontiers for therapist and psychopathologist*. *Behavior Therapy*, 17, 500-521.
- Grumsen, N. A. (2016): *Forskere: Robusthed er et misforstået modeord*. Kristeligt Dagblad publication 13. May.
- Hammershøj, L. G. (2004): Nye patologier i selvdannelsens tidsalder, *Sociologi i dag*, 3, pp. 83–106.
- Hammershøj, L. G. (2007): *The Social Pathologies of Self-Realization: A diagnosis of the consequences of the shift in individualization*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Holts, C. (2015): *Arbejdsgivere efterspørger robusthed* (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-11 – http://www.ugebreveta4.dk/solid-og-robust-er-arbejdsmarkedets-nye-modeord-er-d_20202.aspx). København: UgebrevetA4 og Jobindex.dk.
- Honneth, A. (1996): "Pathologies of the Social: The Past and Present of Social Philosophy" in *The Handbook of Critical Theory*, ed. D.M. Rasmussen, Wiley-Blackwell, Cambridge, pp. 369.
- Honneth, A. (1998): *Philosophy in Germany*. *Radical Philosophy* 89.
- Honneth, A. (2004): "Organized Self-Realization: Some Paradoxes of Individualization," *European Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 463-478.
- Honneth, A. (2005): *Pathologies of the Indeterminate*. University Presses of California, Columbia and Princeton, New Jersey.
- Højbjerg, M. (2016): *Der er for meget føleri på jobbet*. Politiken – Debatsektion 2016-03-05.
- Jensen, A. F. (2001): *Metaforens Magt – Fantasiens fostre og fornuftens fødsler*. Aarhus: Forlaget Modtryk.
- Jensen, A. F. (2009): *Projekt mennesket*. Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Jensen, A. F. (2013): *Mellem ting. Foucaults filosofi*. 2. revideret udgave. Forlaget THP.
- Johnsen, R. (2009): *The Great Health of Melancholy - A Study of the Pathologies of Performativity*. Ph. D. Series 25. Frederiksberg: CBS.

- Jørgensen, M.B. (2016): *Being Resilient in the Modern Working Life*. CM (fil.) Advanced Integrated Project. Frederiksberg: CBS.
- Kinman, G., and Grant, L. (2010): *Exploring Stress Resilience in Trainee Social Workers: The Role of Emotional and Social Competencies*. British Journal of Social Work (2011) 41, 261–275.
- Kirkeby, O. F. (2016): *Om det robuste og om det skrøbelige* (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-11 - <https://www.lederne.dk/ledelse-i-dag/ny-viden/2016/ledelse-i-dag-juni-juli-2016/om-det-robuste-og-om-det-skrøbelige/>). København: Lederne.
- Klohen, E. (1996): *Conceptual analysis and measurement of the construct of ego-resiliency*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70(5), pp. 1067–79.
- Kristensen, A. R. (2011): *Det grænseløse arbejdsliv: At lede de selvledende medarbejdere*. København: Gyldendahl Business.
- Larsen, K.H. (2013): *Robust medarbejder søges*. (Internet article, last consulted 2017-01-11 - <http://politiken.dk/debat/kritikerskolen/art5477852/Robust-medarbejder-soges>). Politiken.dk.
- Lübcke et al. (2010): *Politikens Filosofileksikon*. København: Politikens Forlag.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., and Becker B. (2000): *The Construct of Resilience: A Critical Evaluation and Guidelines for Future Work*. Child Development, Volume 71, Number 3, pp. 543-562.
- Luthar, S. S. (2006): *Resilience in development: A synthesis of research across five decades*. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental Psychopathology: Risk, disorder, and adaptation* (pp. 740-795). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Luthar, S. S., Crossman, E. J., & Small, P. J. (2015): *Resilience and adversity*. In R.M. Lerner and M. E. Lamb (Eds.). *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science* (7th Edition, Vol. III, pp. 247-286). New York: Wiley.
- Mandrup, C. (2016): *Vær professionel på jobbet – lad følelserne blive hjemme*. People's Press.
- Masten, A.S. & Tellegen, A. (2012): *Resilience in developmental psychopathology: Contributions of the Project Competence Longitudinal Study*. Development and Psychopathology no. 24, 345–361. Cambridge University Press.
- Myszak, A. & Nørby, S. (2008): *Positiv Psykologi – en introduktion til videnskaben om velvære og optimale processer*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Netterstrøm, B. & Zachariae B. (2003): *Stress – når kroppen siger fra*. Kroghs Forlag.
- Pedersen, O.K. (2011): *Konkurrencestaten*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Petersen, A. (2016): *Præstationssamfundet*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Raffnsøe, S., Gudmand-Høyer, M., Thaning, M. S. (2016): *Michel Foucault – A Research Companion*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rosa, H. (2009): *High-speed society – Social Acceleration, Power, and Modernity*. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Rosa, H. (2010): *Alienation and Acceleration – Towards a Critical Theory of Late-Modern Temporality*. Summertalk Vol. 3. NSU Press.
- Rosa, H. (2013): *Social Acceleration: A New Theory of Modernity*. Columbia University Press.

- Santesson, T. (2016a): *Hvorfor skal vi nu alle sammen være robuste?* København K: Magasinet for medlemmer af Djøf, Nr. 05.
- Santesson, T. (2016b): *Vi har alt for store forventninger til jobbet.* København K: Magasinet for medlemmer af Djøf, Nr. 05.
- Sloterdijk, P. (2001 [1983]): *Critique of Cynical Reason*. Theory and History of Literature, Volume 40. University of Minnesota Press. SAGE Publications.
- Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1992): *Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wilkens, C. (1881): *Samfundslegemets Grundlove. Et Grundrids af Sociologien*. København: Wroblewskys Forlag.
- Willig, R. (2013): *Kritikkens U-vending*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Willig, R. (2016): *Afvæbnet Kritik*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Willig, R. & Østergaard, M. (2005): *Sociale patologier*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.

Appendix A



Deloitte Legal søger kollega med speciale i ansættelsesret i København eller Aarhus

Vi har travlt hos Deloitte Legal, og søger derfor efter en kollega med speciale i ansættelsesret, som kan indgå i vores team. Kan du gennemskue komplekse juridiske problemstillinger og er du fagligt stærk? Har du ambitionerne og drivet, så har vi jobbet til dig.

Jobbet

Du vil yde juridisk rådgivning inden for ansættelsesret både til vores danske og udenlandske kollegaer i Deloitte netværket, og til vores kunder. Du vil få egne ansvarsområder og opgaver inden for rådgivning af primært individuel ansættelsesret, herunder udarbejdelse af incitamentsordninger, udstationeringskontrakter men også rådgivning om kollektiv arbejdsret kan opstå.

Du skal være med til at videreudvikle og styrke vores forretningsområde indenfor ansættelsesret, således at vi kan vækste yderligere indenfor dette speciale. Rollen vil have et varierende, spændende og udviklende arbejdsindhold med stor mulighed for medindflydelse og ansvar. Vi forventer, at du har:

- Forretningsforståelse og erfaring med (eller mod på) at være sparringspartner og rådgiver for såvel kolleger og eksterne kunder.
- Evnen til at skabe resultater, arbejder selvstændigt og er robust.
- En høj faglig standard og sætter en ære i at levere høj kvalitet.
- Gode kommunikative færdigheder både mundtligt og skriftlige – såvel på dansk og engelsk.

Din profil

Du er uddannet cand.jur. eller cand.merc.jur., og du har minimum 4-5 års relevant erfaring inden for området. I dag er du sandsynligvis ansat i advokat- eller rådgivningsbranchen, organisationsverdenen eller en større virksomhed, hvor du har beskæftiget dig indgående med ansættelsesret. Du har en forretningsmæssig forståelse og ønsker at yde juridisk rådgivning på et højt niveau. Vi forventer, at du hurtigt kan danne dig et overblik over og gennemskue komplekse juridiske problemstillinger og

processer. Vi forventer, at du kan arbejde selvstændigt, er fagligt nysgerrig og let tilegner dig ny viden.

Vi tilbyder

Du bliver en del af Deloitte Legal, der leverer juridiske ydelser indenfor en række forretningsområder og er en del af det globale Deloitte Legal med kontorer i mere end 72 lande. Vi er et team af professionelle og kvalitetsbevidste medarbejdere, der primært arbejder med selskabsret, ansættelsesret, fast ejendom og generel erhvervsret - og vores mål er altid at levere et produkt af høj kvalitet til vores kunder inden for den aftalte deadline.

Ansøgning og ansættelse

Send os din ansøgning, CV, eksamenspapirer samt andre relevante dokumenter via den online søgefunktion. Ansøgningsfristen er mandag d. 5. december 2016, men vi behandler ansøgningerne og indkalder løbende til samtale. Derfor opfordrer vi dig til at søge stillingen hurtigst muligt. Angiv venligt i ansøgningen hvilket kontor, du ønsker at komme betragtnings hos - København eller Aarhus.

Vil du vide mere om den ledige stilling hos Deloitte Legal, er du velkommen til at kontakte Partner Helle Vestergaard Rasmussen på telefon +45 3093 6669.

Læs mere om Deloitte på deloitte.dk og om karriere i Deloitte på karriere.deloitte.dk.

Ansøgningsfrist:	05-12-2016
Arbejdstid:	Heltid
Arbejdsdage:	Dag
Yderligere oplysninger fås hos:	Helle Vestergaard Rasmussen Telefon: +45 3093 6669
Hjemmeside:	http://karriere.deloitte.dk
Søg online:	Send ansøgning

Appendix B



Vi mangler 2 fagligt velfunderede Social- og sundhedshjælpere/assistenter til dagvagt

Plejecentret Rosenhaven i Skovlunde søger to social- og sundhedshjælpere/ assistenter til dagvagt med weekendvagt hver anden uge. Begge stillinger er på 32 timer ugentlig. Stillingerne er til besættelse 1. januar 2017.

VI ØNSKER, DU ER/HAR

- Fagligt velfunderet og klar til hele tiden at udvikle dine kompetencer
- Erfaring indenfor ældreområdet
- Erfaring eller interesse for demensområdet
- Erfaring med brug af IT (vi bruger Rambøll Care)
- Er fleksibel og mødesikker
- Gode samarbejds- og prioriteringsevner
- Er robust og gå på mod

LIDT OM OS

Plejecenter Rosenhaven er et stort nyt plejecenter med 72 plejeboliger fordelt på 4 afdelinger. Plejecenter Rosenhaven er velfungerende og arbejder bl.a. med rehabilitering og brugerinvolvering i det daglige arbejde. Vi søger at tilpasse kompetencer og faglighed til opgaverne, som til stadighed bliver mere komplekse.

LØN OG ANSÆTTELSESVILKÅR

Løn og ansættelse ifølge gældende overenskomst efter principper om lokal løndannelse efter aftale med den forhandlingsberettigede organisation.

YDERLIGERE INFORMATION

Ring og hør mere om stillingerne ved at kontakte afdelingssygeplejerske Mona Rekve på telefon 2974 6542.

Rosenhaven er beliggende på Bybjergvej 11, i Skovlunde – ca. 5 min. gang fra Skovlunde Station. Se yderligere: www.rosenhaven/ballerup.dk

ANSØGNINGSFRIST: 16. DECEMBER 2016

Vi foretrækker, at du sender din ansøgning online. Klik på "send ansøgning" og vedhæft din ansøgning og dit CV.

[Send ansøgning](#)

ANSØGNINGSFRIST:
16. december 2016

TILTRÆDELSE:
1. januar 2017

STILLINGSTYPE:
Fastansættelse

UGENTLIG TIMETAL:
32 timer

AFDELING:
Plejecenter Rosenhaven

KONTAKTPERSON:
Mona Rekve

TELEFON:
2974 6542

SÆRLIGE KRAV:
Tillfredstillende Straffeattest

JOB.NR:
16-464

Del:

