Administrative Theory & Praxis

ISSN: 1084-1806 (Print) 1949-0461 (Online) Journal homepage: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/madt20

"That's What the Money's for": Alienation and Emotional Labor in Public Service

Sharon Mastracci & Ian Adams

To cite this article: Sharon Mastracci & Ian Adams (2018): "That's What the Money's for": Alienation and Emotional Labor in Public Service, Administrative Theory & Praxis, DOI: 10.1080/10841806.2018.1485449

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2018.1485449

Published online: 05 Sep 2018.

Administrative Theory & Praxis, 0: 1–16, 2018

ISSN: 1084-1806 print/1949-0461 online
DOI: 10.1080/10841806.2018.1485449

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

"That's What the Money's for": Alienation and Emotional Labor in Public Service

Sharon Mastracci and Ian Adams
University of Utah

As the face of government, street-level bureaucrats interact with the citizenry and engage in emotional labor. Here we argue that public servants risk becoming alienated due to the unsupported emotional labor demands of their jobs. Alienated public servants can, in turn, alienate citizens from their government via emotional contagion, and because targets of emotional labor can detect inauthentic surface acting, they will distrust encounters with government as a result. Human resource management practices and organizational structures can mitigate or exacerbate this effect. The problem, though, is that public service is rooted in scientific management, which reifies top-down hierarchy, increasing the likelihood of alienation through its commitment to the bureaucratic form. By extending emotional labor theory to self-estrangement and fellow-beings estrangement, our argument incorporates all four of Marx's dimensions of alienation, including commodity fetishism, where people are things and feelings qua feelings are part of an overall public service delivery package.

Don: "It's your JOB! I give you money, you give me ideas."

Peggy: "And you never say 'Thank you'!"

Don: "That's what the money's for!"

In the foregoing exchange from Mad Men (2010), Peggy feels alienated from the product of her labor and she further perceives a lack of procedural justice: She argues that Don's advertising award was based on her idea. The lack of recognition underscores that her ideas are not her own. She also resists deeper and more complete alienation, just as Don reinforces it, and betrays his own complete work estrangement: He emphasizes extrinsic rewards—money—while she still seeks the intrinsic reward of his gratitude. Don also reasserts strict centrality of authority and her lack of control over work processes by reminding Peggy of her place in the organizational hierarchy. Furthermore, the setting is late in the evening at the office: Peggy just canceled a dinner date with her boyfriend, who breaks up with her over the phone. This illustrates another important antecedent of work alienation, which is the extension of the working day: "The ideology of work is increasingly hegemonizing the spatial and temporal experiences of many in advanced economies" (Erickson & Ritter, 2001,

Address correspondence to Sharon Mastracci, Department of Political Science, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA. E-mail: sharon.mastracci@poli-sci.utah.edu

p. 371). Marx predicts that the alienated worker will seek self-actualization in things, in purchases, which he calls commodity fetishism. Of course, commodity fetishism is Don's raison d'être; the entire series ends with Don's smirk, as he discovers how to commoditize his own fully-realized alienation from his (false) self, his family, and society. Work is all he has left, which Lauer (2008) characterizes as another hallmark of alienation. This brief scene exemplifies several aspects of work alienation: one's work is no longer one's own; the absence of control over work processes and lack of autonomy; strict hierarchy; role ambiguity; lack of procedural justice; an emphasis on extrinsic rewards; and extended work hours crowding out nonwork identities. In this article, we argue that this scene could just as easily have taken place in a government agency. Moreover, the alienation brought about via emotional labor in public service is particularly damaging to the individual and can be especially damaging to society. We demonstrate how emotional labor in public service can lead to alienation of the public servant from herself and her work, which in turn, can alienate citizens from their own government. In alienation via emotional labor, the product from which the worker is estranged is not a thought or idea, but rather her smile, her mood, her feelings.

Emotional labor is the on-the-job effort to express appropriate emotions and/or suppress inappropriate emotions in oneself or in another, where "appropriate" and "inappropriate" are defined by the job (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994). Emotional labor can manifest through surface acting, where only the appearance of "appropriate" is performed, or deep acting, where the worker internalizes display rules in order to genuinely feel what is expected. Work alienation is the estrangement or disconnect from the product and process of one's own work, the context of work, and oneself, and others (Newman & Guy, 1998), and can result from emotional labor (Brook, 2009b). Alienation from one's own government is the estrangement, disconnect, or exclusion from the administrative process felt by the citizen whom government is meant to serve (Tsai & Huang, 2002). The mechanism by which the alienated public servant alienates citizens from their own government is twofold. First, via emotional contagion: "An individual's tendency to mimic and synchronize facial expressions, vocalizations, postures, and movements with those of another person, and consequently, to converge emotionally" (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 1001). Second and specific to emotional labor, alienation is also transmitted by detection: Citizens can detect inauthentic surface acting and they react negatively (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Grandey & Melloy, 2017; Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005; Newman & Guy, 1998; Tsai & Huang, 2002) distrusting encounters with government altogether. Surface acting is one approach to meeting the emotional labor demands of a job, and the link between surface acting and work stress is confirmed by research (Humphrey, Ashforth, & Diefendorff, 2015). Management scholars have carefully laid out numerous concepts to name and understand workplace stress: Burnout, dissatisfaction, engagement, commitment, deviance. No complete synthesis has yet been agreed, perhaps because all these various concepts are symptoms, and alienation is the disease. To make our argument, this article is structured as follows. First, alienation is defined, and its antecedents and outcomes discussed. The relationship between emotional labor and alienation is discussed as well. Second, we examine alienation via emotional labor, and survey the literature that explains how recipients react to inauthenticity. Third, we combine the implications of the second section with evidence from the first section to make the case that the alienated public servant risks alienating those with whom she interacts. As the

face of government, street-level public servants embody the state (Lipsky, 2010). A public servant alienated from the product and process of her work alienates citizens from the state by fomenting distrust in citizen/state encounters via emotional contagion and because inauthenticity is detectable. In the fourth section, we propose human resource management practices that can either reproduce alienation or interrupt the sequence from surface acting to worker alienation to alienating citizens from government. Other examples of how negative effects of emotional labor spill over beyond work are provided and further underscore the potential for alienation to reach beyond the individual.

ALIENATION

To be alienated from a thing is to be disconnected, estranged; the thing is foreign and unrecognizable. Work alienation is to be estranged from the product and process of one's own work: "Marx identifies four basic categories of alienation in the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844: (a) alienation of the worker from the products of his labor, (b) alienation of the worker from the process of production, (c) alienation of humans from their species-being as self-creating agents, and (d) alienation of humans from each other" (Lauer, 2008, p. 43). Marx describes the first category thusly (Marx, 1932/2009, pp. 29–30 [emphasis in original]):

> The object which labor produces—labor's product—confronts it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labor is labor which has been embodied in an object, which has become material . . . the worker is related to the product of his labor as to an alien object. The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him . . . the external character of labor for the worker appears in the fact that it is not his own, but someone else's, that it does not belong to him, that in it he belongs not to himself, but to another.

Alienation arising from unsupported emotional labor in public service is especially damaging to society—specifically surface acting, where the public servant conveys feelings that he does not really feel and thereby suffers from the dissonance between what is feigned and what is felt. Unlike alienation in the private sector, emotional labor in public service can alienate citizens from government.

Newman and Guy (1998, p. 27) offer a streamlined definition of work alienation as "estrangement or disconnect from work, the context, or the self" and contrast alienation from similar constructs such as burnout, dis-engagement, workplace deviance, and dissatisfaction. They argue that failing to examine alienation specifically as a workplace experience distinct from other, extensively studied phenomena, is a dangerous oversight given the roles of psychological pain and potential violence unique to alienation but not inherent to burnout or workplace deviance. Likewise, Queirós, Kaiseler, & da Silva (2013) find linkage between what they deem depersonalization and increased aggressiveness and violence. While they do not use the term alienation, their findings confirm our argument that alienation stands unique among workplace phenomena due to its potential for violent outcomes. The authors follow

the original definition of depersonalization, as defined by Mastracci and Thompson (2009, p. 402): "an attempt to put distance between oneself and the service recipients." This definition embraces Marx's alienation dimensions, albeit using a more modern name, and the authors confirm that depersonalization, but not other dimensions of burnout such as emotional exhaustion, is positively associated with increased aggressiveness, anger, and violence (Queirós et al., 2013).

"The concept of alienation has not received much attention in the literature after the 1980s" (Newman & Guy, 1998, p. 40), in favor of other negative workplace outcomes. Nair and Vohra argue for a resurrection of the construct: "The study of burnout or deviance alone [does] not sufficiently explain or capture the state of being alienated" (Nair & Vohra, 2012, p. 42). For instance, a lack of commitment "may or may not lead to negative affect and belief about the uselessness of work and sense of being pained" as alienation does (Newman & Guy, 1998, p. 29). Moreover, unlike related constructs, alienation is all consuming: "The negative side of work is not dissatisfaction, it is alienation" (Hall, 1994, p. 111). Work alienation distinguishes itself from related negative work experiences as "alienation is not merely the polar opposite of any one concept, but has been linked to satisfaction, commitment, engagement, burnout, and deviance variously. It stands as a concept in its own right worthy of greater attention by management scholars" (Newman & Guy, 1998, p. 44). Alienation from self precedes each of these other concepts, and even determines a worker's capacity to experience them: "According to Marx, self-estrangement arises when people are unable to express themselves through their work and to develop their mental and creative energies" (Matheson, 2007, p. 235). Furthermore, alienation touches all aspects of a worker's life. While the spillover effects of burnout have been examined (Jin & Guy, 2009), alienation differs from related concepts in its comprehensiveness, reaching all spheres of one's life in its fully-realized form including pain and an affective state of distress (Newman & Guy, 1998), and one's image of self (Costas & Fleming, 2009). Workplace deviance, including aggression, sabotage, bullying, or hostility, are behavioral manifestations of alienation. Alienation is, therefore, a predictor of workplace deviance. Antecedents of alienation include routine and repetitive work processes and a lack of control over how one works, role ambiguity, isolation and multiple authority systems, lack of autonomy and discretion, and a high degree of centralization as found in strict hierarchies. Costas and Fleming (2009) add the absence of procedural fairness to the list of alienation antecedents. Recall how one of these is enacted in the opening vignette.

Finally, Marx predicted work alienation would result in commodity fetishism: Alienated workers would resort to finding meaning in things once they abandon the possibility of realizing fulfillment through their jobs. In the next section, we discuss the particularly damaging effects to the individual public servant arising from work alienation via emotional labor. In the third section, we examine the damaging effects to society arising from work alienation in government. There, we also describe fully realized work alienation as the relationship between things. The disaffected public servant engaging in superficial performance, with an objectified citizen consuming that performance. The burned-out emotional laborer sees each new customer as the potential source of the next grievance. Fully realized alienation is the hollow exchange between the public servant's fake smile and a potential complaint, as represented by the citizen-as-customer. Each is alien to the other, the public servant feels separated

TABLE 1.
Marx's Categories of Alienation and Corresponding Emotional Labor Concepts

Alienation categories (from Manuscripts of 1844)	Emotional labor in public service
1. Alienation from the product of one's labor	A smile, a gesture connoting concern from a social worker, or the terse tone of the parole officer, TSA, or border patrol agent.
2. Alienation from the process of one's labor	The process by which concern or terseness is conveyed; emotional labor is the effort to generate a gesture or tone to get the job done.
3. Alienation from self	Surface acting in a hierarchy: Less control over the work process, centralized authority.
4. Alienation from others (and others from self, where the public servant represents government)	Via emotional contagion, public servants can become alienated from the citizenry, and, in turn, citizens-as-customers become alienated from their own government, via detection of falseness on the part of the emotional laborer.

from her work, and the citizen estranged from his own government. The following Table 1 shows each category of microlevel alienation as theorized by Marx (1844) and the corresponding concept described by emotional labor in public service.

ALIENATION VIA EMOTIONAL LABOR

Emotional labor is exerted in the effort to obey display rules, whether through deep acting or surface acting. Display rules represent "a regulative system of coercive training based on observation, incentives (or disincentives), and evaluative procedures that compel the individual to behave in predictable, normative ways . . . [leading to] spiritual alienation in which the subjects of surveillance are compelled to modify their behaviors and beliefs in ways that inhibit or retard self-actualization" (Lauer, 2008, p. 49). To the extent that workplace display rules force one to pretend to suppress her feelings and/or express unfelt emotions, the public servant is alienated from self, just as Marx describes. Display rules are at the heart of these alienation processes. Display rules "dictate the form, content, and appropriateness of emotional displays, thereby separating workers from the design and control of the labor process. Workers, therefore, are estranged from their emotional product and the process of emotion production" (Brook, 2009a, p. 12). Emotional labor is not automatically alienating, however: Pretending or surface acting is linked to burnout, while deep acting is not, and can even bring about job satisfaction (Hatfield et al., 1994; Humphrey, Ashforth, & Diefendorff, 2015).

Commoditization of Human Feeling

Marx theorized work alienation under capitalism by workers engaged in physical labor. The process and product unique to service work, however, are the performance of emotional labor and feelings, respectively (Hsieh, Jin, and Guy, 2012, p. 198 [emphasis added]):

> Those who perform emotional labor in the course of giving service are like those who perform physical labor in the course of making things: Both are subject to the rules of mass production. But when the product—the thing to be engineered, mass-produced, and subjected to speed up and slow down—is a smile, a mood, a feeling, or a relationship, it comes to belong more to the organization and less to the self.

Hochschild discusses emotion work separately from emotional labor: The former benefits one's personal relationships and is done voluntarily; the latter is dictated by the employer, benefits the organization, and is required of the job. As such, it is fundamental to the service produced and sold: "Just as gestures of emotion work can be exchanged in private, so they can be exchanged in the marketplace, as an aspect of what is sold and bought as labor power. In such a case we can speak of 'commoditization' of emotion work. This prevails more for workers whose job it is to make and sustain meanings" (Hochschild, 1979, p. 572). This is echoed by Brook (2009a, p. 11):

> Emotional labor . . . involves the commercialization of workers' feelings through a transmutation of "private sphere" feelings into a package of emotions that is consumed by the customer as a commodified service interaction. The process has the effect of alienating frontline workers from their emotional product through management's wresting of formal ownership and control from workers of the form, timing, giving, and withdrawal of feelings, moods, and their display.

Erickson and Ritter (2001, p. 152) further underscore the potential insidious effect on the worker when the product is a feeling, an emotion: "One's sense of authenticity also has been identified as being compromised by the performance of emotional labor." Other researchers have also noted the special relationship between emotional labor and work alienation: "Alienation is a condition in which the individual becomes isolated and cut off from the product of his or her work, having given up the desire for self-expression and control over his or her own fate at work. The individual enacts a role estranged from the kind of life of which the individual is capable" (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2014, p. 302 [emphasis added]). While the product of an interaction between public servant and citizen can be physical—a building permit, a driver's license—the product is also emotional: A sense of being treated fairly and efficiently. Garot underscores the power of feelings (2004, p. 736): "If not for the poignant resonance of emotions [they] would hardly be worth 'managing.'" This aspect of service delivery underpins citizen satisfaction and therefore the performance indicators and even the annual budget for a government agency under New Public Management (NPM). Emotional labor in public service is found across a wide spectrum of government jobs, not just human services or crisis response (Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011; Krannitz, Grandey, Liu, & Almeida, 2015). Work alienation via emotional labor exacts especially insidious costs from public servants: "After many months of deep acting, it becomes difficult to ascertain where 'real' selves end and company selves begin. Over time, employees cannot distance themselves from what they perceive to be 'inauthentic' attributes even off the job" (Erickson & Ritter, 2001, p. 359). The frontline public servant can be alienated from both her product—her smile, her caring demeanor—and the process—emotional labor—as Hochschild posits (1983/2003, p. 133): "The worker wonders whether her smile and the emotional labor that keeps it sincere are really hers. Do they really express a part of her? Or are they

deliberately worked up and delivered on behalf of the [organization]?" Estrangement from one's own feelings is a particularly dear price to pay for adhering to display rules and delivering quality public services. Moreover, alienation from self is not solely the consequence of faking emotion: "Deep acting may ultimately lead to self-alienation as one loses touch with this authentic self, and it may impair one's ability to recognize or even experience genuine emotion" (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, p. 97). Close identification with one's work and overall job satisfaction are no assurance against alienation, either. While Jackson and Maslach (1982) hypothesize that caring about one's work is a buffer against alienation, and Costas and Fleming (2009) demonstrate how one who feels disconnected from her work can become alienated, Lauer (2008) argues that too much identification with work—to the exclusion of other identities within one's family and community—is also alienating. This potential antecedent to alienation is especially relevant in public service delivery. Public servants self-select into government jobs out of a dedication to teaching, fighting crime, or protecting vulnerable citizens. The extent of their own public service motivation (Queirós, Kaiseler, & da Silva, 2013) may render public servants' emotional displays authentic. Even so, given a baseline level of dedication to public service, alienation from one's work can arise if dissonance exists between one's view of a vocation and its enactment in a public-service agency.

Ashforth and Humphrey (1993, p. 99) discuss both pros and cons of closely identifying with work: "Individuals who define themselves in terms of other social groups or idiosyncratic characteristics whose display rules are discrepant with those of the organizational role are more apt to experience emotive dissonance and self-alienation." Close identification with one's work can lead to work alienation, yet alienation can also arise from identifying too closely with nonwork roles, if dissonance exists between work and nonwork roles. The impact is even more profound for the public servant, through interaction with their public service motivation (Queirós et al., 2013). As they become alienated from their work product, a separate but equally damaging aftershock occurs as they experience alienation from deeply held parts of their identities as public servants: The compassion, sense of social justice, and civic duty that preceded their public service become commoditized, made alien.

Critics (Bolton & Boyd, 2003; Boyd & Kyle, 2004) question the link between emotional labor and alienation, by noting that not all interpersonal work is emotionally laborious all of the time, and that workers possess the capacity to resist display rules. Others, too, have revealed fulfilling aspects of emotional labor (Hatfield et al., 1994; Humphrey et al., 2015), and find such work not inherently alienating (Zyphur, Warren, Landis, and Thoresen, 2007). It does not follow, however, that no link exists between emotional labor and alienation. Furthermore, the capacity to resist display rules does not suggest a license to ignore them entirely. Finally, for frontline service delivery personnel, emotional labor is not a one-time or occasional demand, but rather, a defining aspect of the job: "Deep acting tends to become more difficult with each iteration of the role. Frequent repetition tends to blunt felt emotion" (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, p. 97).

Marx describes the progression of alienation from self to alienation from others: "As the worker is estranged from his own body and mind, he is also estranged from other human beings . . . [in] an asymmetrical power relationship in which the worker experiences his work and the fruits of his labor as an alien force over which he has no control" (Lauer, 2008, p. 44). The power relationship in bureaucratic hierarchy is inherently asymmetrical and the

enforcement of display rules by management engenders a work product under constant surveillance and critique: "The on-the-job task of creating and sustaining appropriate meanings . . . 'up and coming' or 'on the go,' 'caring' or 'reliable' . . . feeling rules are of utmost salience in jobs such as these; rule reminders and sanctions are more in play" (Hochschild, 1979, p. 570). We now discuss how the public servant's alienation transmits to the citizen.

From Alienated to Alienating

Just as commoditization of feeling makes emotional labor a particularly pernicious type of alienation, so does the context of the public sector make emotional labor in public service especially pernicious in its effects on society. The alienated public servant ultimately alienates citizens from government. Emotions are transmitted via two means. First, citizens can become alienated from government through emotional contagion between themselves and the alienated public servant with whom they interact. Psychologists define emotional contagion as the tendency to mimic another's facial expressions and tone of voice for the purpose of converging emotionally, where this tendency is "relatively automatic, unintentional, uncontrollable, and largely inaccessible to conversant awareness" (Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994, p. 5). Second, and specific to emotional labor, citizens can become alienated from government because inauthenticity is detectable and engenders distrust. As the face of government, the alienated public servant engenders distrust between citizen and state through his insincere performance of emotional labor. The detectability of false face–acting has been confirmed and reconfirmed in the literature, even as early as Hochschild's seminal book on emotional labor: "Employers are wise to want workers to be sincere, to go well beyond the smile that's 'just painted on'" (Hsieh et al., 2012, p. 33). Sincerity is fundamental to generating a positive reaction: "The falseness of surface acting denies the sincerity and individual attention that customers desire as part of quality service" (Grandey et al., 2003, p. 89). Similarly, "Employees who are deep acting are more likely to be perceived as more sincere and friendly" (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 1006). Making through emotional labor is central to satisfactory service delivery, and the process must be perceived as authentic, "Perceptions of good service hinge on more than just mechanical conformity with display rules: They hinge on the extent to which the service agent conveys a sense of genuine interpersonal sensitivity and concern" (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993, p. 96 [emphasis added]).

Failing to evoke competence and caring in an authentic manner produces distrust: "When service providers do not seem sincere in their expressions it is less likely to create a positive impression in the customer; instead, a false smile may seem manipulative and the employee's impression management attempt fails" (Grandey and Melloy, 2017, p. 52). Inauthenticity generates negative reactions in the targets of emotional labor (Guy & Newman, 2004). In fact, "Synthetic compassion can be more offensive than none at all" (Thompson, 1976, p. 115). Tsai and Huang (2002, p. 1006) examine the effect of employee affective delivery on customer behaviors and their evidence confirms the presence of emotional contagion as well as the negative consequences of inauthenticity.

Much of the research on emotional labor examines the private sector. A unique aspect of emotional labor in public service is that the alienated public servant can, in turn, alienate citizens from government. In this way, the distrust engendered by inauthenticity has broader

impacts on society—unlike the negative reactions generated by insincere workers at a retail store. Customer alienation from one store prompts the customer to patronize another store. Citizen alienation from government threatens trust in public institutions altogether.

ALIENATION FROM GOVERNMENT: A CONSEQUENCE OF EMOTIONAL LABOR IN PUBLIC SERVICE

> When our government is spoken of as some menacing, threatening foreign entity, it ignores the fact that, in our democracy, government is us. (O'Donohue and Nelson, 2014, para.23)

When our government is spoken of as a menacing, threatening foreign entity, we are alienated from it: "Alienation of citizens toward government can be linked directly to the exclusion of citizens from the administrative process" (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 555). Interacting with an alienated, inauthentic, and insincere public servant foments distrust and excludes citizens from the administrative process. The NPM reforms redefining the citizen as consumer further erode the sense that government is us. Further, because alienation is deeper and more comprehensive than burnout, disengagement, or dissatisfaction, and includes despair and psychological pain (Newman & Guy, 1998), the consequences of citizen alienation from government can prove especially detrimental to society. Failing to examine alienation distinct from other social phenomena is a dangerous oversight, given the potential for violence unique to alienation (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 565):

> The alienation that citizens feel toward government today can be tied directly to the distance from the public that administrators have traditionally maintained. That alienation is played out in many ways, from general mistrust of government to NIMBY events, to violence like the bombing of government buildings.

The NPM reforms may have intended to draw the citizen into a closer relationship with their government through coproduction arrangements and market-based reforms such as the customer-is-king ethos (Bolton, 2003) found in the private sector. However, given the negative outcomes of surface acting, a "service with a smile" approach to public service (Mastracci, Newman, & Guy, 2006, p. 123) ultimately reproduces the same negative consequences in the public sector. Yet, while emotional labor certainly has profoundly negative consequences in the private sector, instilling those demands in the public sector risks much more. Fully realized alienation in the private sector, demonstrated by Don and Peggy, does not risk alienating citizens from their own government.

The consequences of citizen alienation from government are no less than this: Antigovernment violence and antagonistic rhetoric surrounding, to use a recent example, the high costs of public pensions. This creates a dangerous narrative, which pits neighbor against neighbor where the firefighter's retirement comes at the cost of primary education; where the police officer's disability comes at the cost of the schoolteacher's raise. Marx explained the alienation of labor under capitalism, and while the public sector may seem outside Marx's scope, in the United States, government and all institutions operate within a regulated capitalist context. Furthermore, NPM reforms introduce the discipline of the market into public-sector service delivery and minimize the role of the state: "The central focus of New Public

Management on contracting out would seem to favor low degrees of publicness in order to maximize efficiency" (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 559). Moreover, customer satisfaction and other performance indicators shape government services and therefore encourage public servants to mimic private sector service delivery. Lauer traces this phenomenon further back in the history of Western civilization, describing "the post-Enlightenment citizen-cum-consumer" (Lauer, 2008, p. 45), who exerts competitive pressure on local government service delivery and expresses his preferences by voting with his feet (Timney & Kelly, 2000). The market mentality not only produces the citizen/consumer, but also rationalizes shifting public services to unelected and unaccountable contractors: "The widespread use of outsourcing and privatization is increasingly distancing administration even further from the public. The long-term effect of this exclusion may be even greater alienation and mistrust of government. . . . So long as NPM and public administration itself are committed to [the value of efficiency], the possibility for genuine deliberation is in jeopardy and the further alienation of the public toward government is assured" (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 567).

Finally, not only can unsupported and unchecked emotional labor in public service alienate the public servant from the product and process of her labor, self, and the citizens with whom she interacts, but it can also replace people with things, as Marx predicts. Alienation from fellow beings and commodity fetishism complement one another in that "human, social relations between people are only realized indirectly as relations between things" (Weyher, 2012, p. 353 [emphasis in original]). In the absence of interventions to mitigate the effects of alienation, the emotionally labored public servant eventually becomes nothing more than her affectation. Her mood is her product, and it is no longer hers, but the organization's. Emotional contagion extends the alienation of the public servant to the citizen: "Citizen alienation can be linked to efficient administrative processes managed by unfeeling bureaucrats" (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 557 [emphasis added]). In addition, the citizen-as-customer ethos results in "the objectification of service recipients as sources of fees" (Tsai & Huang, 2002, p. 558). The alienated public servant subsequently alienating the citizens with whom he interacts fully realizes Marx's relations between things. Human resource management practices, however, can disrupt the sequence from surface acting, to alienated, to alienating.

HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES THAT REPRODUCE OR DISRUPT ALIENATION

O'Donohue and Nelson locate causes of alienation at both the job and organizational levels (2014, p. 302): "The genesis of this condition can be traced to changes external to the individual arising out of the industrialization process, with the creation of large factories characterized by organizational hierarchies, job specialization, and work supervision reliant on formal authority." Job characteristics and organizational structures exacerbating alienation include fragmentation of the labor process, such that workers perform repetitive tasks without a sense of their contribution to an overall product; the absence of control over work processes; the lack of discretion and autonomy; strict hierarchy; role ambiguity, lack of procedural justice; an emphasis on extrinsic rewards to the exclusion of intrinsic rewards; and extended work hours that crowd out nonwork identities.

Job Characteristics and Management Practices

O'Donohue and Nelson (2014, p. 307) directly link alienation, emotional labor, human resource management (HRM) practices, and organizational structure:

> Other problematic HRM issues include work disengagement and questions over satisfaction at work, cynicism, burnout, and depersonalization, stress and alcohol use, powerlessness and lack of control, and [the negative effects of] emotional labor. These are, in turn, often attributed to external factors such as mass production technologies, oppressive work of one sort or another, poor management, and organizational leadership problems.

While HRM practices can mitigate or exacerbate alienation, the history of public service borne of scientific management reifies top-down hierarchies that increase the likelihood of alienation through its commitment to the bureaucratic form (Stivers, 2000). Furthermore, the core/ring staffing strategy—where a ring of contingent workers in flexible working situations protects a core of full-time, full-year workers from economic fluctuations to keep costs down—has been found in federal agencies (Mastracci & Thompson, 2009), even though this approach produces worker insecurity, stress, and alienation (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2014, p. 306):

> Some management practices can exacerbate the issue of stress with dysfunctional consequences in terms of alienation, workplace stress, and employee wellbeing, including . . . The use of contingent workers, who in comparison to workers in traditional employment have lesser rights and benefits, fewer training and development opportunities and can be dismissed more easily, offers the possibility of enhanced control to management.

Performance appraisals can address procedural justice concerns (Boyd & Kyle, 2004) and explicit display rules can be incorporated into job descriptions so that they may be compensated, or they can be eliminated altogether in favor of different approaches to eliciting the desired effect. "Rather than putting the onus on the employee to create an authentic display, management would benefit from inspiring authentic positive emotions in workers through positive leadership or increased autonomy" (Grandey & Melloy, 2017, p. 53). Autonomy and discretion are key aspects of job design related to alienation as well. The individual's need for freedom and autonomy at work in tension with the organization's need for control is the "root cause of alienation" (O'Donohue and Nelson, 2014, p. 307). An overemphasis on extrinsic rewards to the exclusion of intrinsic rewards betrays an assumption by management that workers will only meet minimum requirements unless coerced (Newman & Guy, 1998). Shifting that assumption to acknowledge workers' desire to find meaning in work mitigates alienating conditions as well.

Key characteristics of alienation include powerlessness, meaninglessness, and isolation (Newman & Guy, 1998). Powerlessness arises from the elimination of individual discretion and decision making from the work role. Meaninglessness comes from the fragmentation of work processes such that the worker has no sense of his overall contribution. Regular feedback to frontline work groups addresses this problem. Isolation is related to work fragmentation, but also incorporates physical isolation from others: "With many employees confined to their workstations and having only computers for company, isolation and a lack of social

interaction have increased . . . individuals come to perceive themselves to be little more than cogs in gigantic non-social machine-like organizations" (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2014, p. 309). Powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, and self-estrangement through work processes must be addressed to overcome employee alienation; autonomy and discretion are key. "The harm in all three could be reduced, I believe, if workers could feel a greater sense of control over the conditions of their work lives" (Hsieh et al., 2012, p. 187).

The negative effects of emotional labor spill over to public servants' lives outside work. "We see more sick forms. We see more cases of situational depression. We see more alcoholism and drugs, more trouble sleeping and relaxing" (Hochschild, 1983/2003, p. 131). Furthermore, increased surface acting increases emotional exhaustion, insomnia, and work/family conflict (Wagner, Barnes, & Scott, 2014). Surface acting also increases problems between married couples (Krannitz, Grandey, Liu, & Almeida, 2015) and saps emotional and cognitive resources beyond work boundaries (Zyphur, Warren, Landis, & Thoresen, 2007). Even if HRM practices change to mitigate the risk of work alienation, however, organizational forms may still operate to sustain alienating conditions.

Organizational Structure

Scientific management "is predicated on five fundamental tenets: Top-down control, centralization of authority, hierarchical structure, differentiation between management and labor, and reliance on 'laws' of human nature" (Newman & Guy, 1998, p. 288). Laws of human nature relate to management's assumptions that only coercion and money motivate workers to work. The four remaining tenets relate to organizational structure. Bureaucracy emphasizes top-down control and hierarchy, where authority is centralized and management and labor are clearly delineated. While O'Donohue and Nelson (2014, p. 309) recognize Max Weber for "pointing out the deleterious effects of 'rule by whim,'" the resulting bureaucratic organizational systems and processes "strangle individual freedom." Work alienation is realized most completely in the bureaucratic form (O'Donohue & Nelson, 2014, p. 305):

> The organizational context in which alienation has been most studied is bureaucracy. The defining characteristics of the bureaucratic form of organization—job specialization, authority hierarchy, merit appointment, record keeping, rules, and impersonality—have been found in combination to produce a depersonalizing effect on the individual and a loss of self or personal identity, with accompanying feelings of being a mere cog in a dehumanizing machine.

Musolf (1992, p. 175) extends this to incorporate emotional labor:

> In scientific management, Taylorism—the management of employee time and motion—fostered alienation. Roles and rules constrained interaction, but feeling rules remained flexible . . . Hochschild's research reveals . . . a new role expectation: Emotional display. Feeling rules require workers to manage and commercialize their emotions, a new form of alienation and a new object of knowledge to scientifically manage.

Participatory decision making, job rotation, or job sharing—any HRM practice that serves to flatten the hierarchy—would blunt the negative effects of specialization and reduce the risk of work alienation. With respect to management practices to counteract organizational

structure, Newman and Guy (1998) recognize in Mary Parker Follett's writings the humanistic approach to management as an important antidote to hierarchy. Follett's management practices to flatten hierarchy include participatory management and pluralistic decision making. "Ideally, she believed that the exercise of power flows in both directions. Both she and Frederick Taylor believed that management can teach, but it can also learn. Follett recognizes that knowledge is not the sole prerogative of managers" (Newman & Guy, 1998, p. 292). In the spirit of two-way rather than top-down power dynamics in the giving of orders, Newman and Guy recommend the following (1998, p. 292): (1) depersonalize orders; (2) replace orders with instructions on how to perform a job; (3) give reasons and explanations, so that a worker has a sense of the bigger picture; and (4) make sure that everyone knows the purpose behind the directions.

Follett's managerial practices confront alienation on at least two fronts: First by flattening the hierarchy and disrupting the central concentration of power, and second by approaching the workplace as an integrated whole with management and staff as coproducers, thereby combating meaninglessness and purposelessness inherent to strict bureaucracy. While NPM reforms set out to integrate citizens into service delivery via coproduction, the principle/agent undercurrent of its reward system sets government and citizens in opposition to each other and fosters alienation.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

By extending emotional labor theory to its effects beyond the workplace, we address Marx's four dimensions of alienation: Alienation from the object of one's labor, from the work process, from oneself, and from one's fellow beings. A class analysis of emotional labor in public service is complicated by the fact that, unlike retail trade in the private sector where much of the research on emotional labor has occurred, in government, sometimes the public servant possesses more power than her clients (Lopez, 2010). Furthermore, emotive satisfaction is found to result from even the toughest public-service jobs (Guy et al., 2008).

We reintroduce alienation as the taproot from which spring other negative worker outcomes, including dissatisfaction, burnout, and deviance. There remains a need for further analysis in all four dimensions defined by Marx. While we have illustrated how a worker becomes alienated from the product of her own emotional labor, more needs to be done to examine how that workplace separation may undermine stability of self-concept outside the work boundary. While clearly a public employee may become alienated from the citizen as consumer, how does that employee experience alienation from fellow public service employees? In a time where e-government initiatives are expanding rapidly, do we see a lessening of emotional labor demands (and thus alienation) for employees, who are now more likely to interact with citizens via e-mail or at another level of remove? In an increasingly surveilled and sousveilled world, do workers perceive a greater burden to comply with the display rules expected of them in a customer-service oriented public sector? Understanding alienation as a theoretically important dimension in the study of public management is only a first step.

In this article, we underscore the consequences of failing to recognize the particularly insidious effects of alienation via emotional labor, and the uniquely damaging effects of worker alienation in public service to alienate citizens from government. Scholars have long argued for the need to recognize emotional labor in public service as a trainable skill, to reward public servants who do it well, and to continue to support them throughout their careers. "Making emotional labor visible is the first step; making it compensable is the next" (Guy & Newman, 2004, p. 296). But if "what the money is for" is to compensate emotion as commercial enterprise to benefit the organization, we must do better in government to avoid alienating the citizenry.

Sharon Mastracci is an professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Utah. She conducts research on gendered dynamics in organizations and emotional labor in public service.

Ian Adams is a PhD student in the Department of Political Science at the University of Utah. His research is focused on policing, emotional labor, and surveillance.

ORCID

Ian Adams http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5595-8070

REFERENCES

Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. Academy of Management Review, 18(1), 88–115.

Bolton, S. C. (2003). Multiple roles? Nurses as managers in the NHS. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 16(2), 122–130.

Bolton, S. C., & Boyd, C. (2003). Trolly dolly or skilled emotion manager? Moving on from Hochschild's Managed Heart. Work, Employment and Society, 17(2), 289–308.

Boyd, N. M., & Kyle, K. (2004). Expanding the view of performance appraisal by introducing social justice concerns. Administrative Theory & Praxis, 26(3), 249–278.

Brook, P. (2009a). The alienated heart: Hochschild's 'emotional labor' thesis and the anti-capitalist politics of alienation. Capital & Class, 33(2), 7–31.

Brook, P. (2009b). In critical defense of emotional labor: Refuting Bolton's critique of Hochschild's concept. Work, Employment & Society, 23(3), 531–548.

Costas, J., & Fleming, P. (2009). Beyond dis-identification: A discursive approach to self-alienation in contemporary organizations. Human Relations, 62(3), 353–378.

Erickson, R. J., & Ritter, C. (2001). Emotional labor, burnout, and inauthenticity: Does gender matter? Social Psychology Quarterly, 64(2, 146–163.

Garot, R. (2004). You're not a stone': Emotional sensitivity in a bureaucratic setting. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 33(6), 735–766.

Grandey, A. A. (2003). When 'the show must go on': Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. Academy of Management Journal, 46(1), 86–96.

Grandey, A. A., Fisk, G. M., Mattila, A. S., Jansen, K. J., & Sideman, L. A. (2005). Is 'service with a smile' enough? Authenticity of positive displays during service encounters. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 96(1), 38–55.

Grandey, A. A., & Melloy, R. C. (2017). The state of the heart: Emotional labor as emotion regulation reviewed and revised. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3), 407.

Guy, M. E., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Women's jobs, men's jobs: Sex segregation and emotional labor. Public Administration Review, 64(3), 289–298.
Guy, M. E., Newman, M. A., & Mastracci, S. H. (2008). Emotional labor in public service: Putting the service in public service. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
Hall, R. H. (1994). The Sociology of work: Perspectives, analyses, and issues. Pine Forge Press.
Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). Emotional contagion. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. American Journal of Sociology, 85(3), 551–575.
Hochschild, A. R. (1983/2003). The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Hsieh, C. W., Jin, M. H., & Guy, M. E. (2012). Consequences of work-related emotions: Analysis of a cross-section of public service workers. American Review of Public Administration, 42(1), 39–53.
Hülsheger, U. R., & Schewe, A. F. (2011). On the costs and benefits of emotional labor: A meta-analysis of three decades of research. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16(3), 361–389.
Humphrey, R. H., Ashforth, B. E., & Diefendorff, J. M. (2015). The bright side of emotional labor. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36(6), 749–769.
Jackson, S. E., & Maslach, C. (1982). After-effects of job-related stress: Families as victims. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 3(1), 63–77.
Jin, M. H., & Guy, M. E. (2009). How emotional labor influences worker pride, job satisfaction, and burnout. Public Performance & Management Review, 33(1), 88–105.
Krannitz, M. A., Grandey, A. A., Liu, S., & Almeida, D. A. (2015). Workplace surface acting and marital partner discontent: Anxiety and exhaustion spillover mechanisms. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20(3), 314–325.
Lauer, J. (2008). Alienation in the information economy: Toward a Marxist critique of consumer surveillance. In N. Carpentier & B. deCleen (Eds.) Participation and media production: Critical reflections on content creation (pp. 41–53). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Lipsky, M. (2010). Street-level democracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
Lopez, S. H. (2010). Workers, managers, and customers: Triangles of power in work communities. Work and Occupations, 37(3), 251–271.
Marx, K. (1932/2009). Economic & philosophic manuscripts of 1844. Translated by Milligan, M. and revised by Struik, D.J. for Marxists.org. Material downloaded 4/6/2017.
Mastracci, S. H., Newman, M. A., & Guy, M. E. (2006). Appraising emotion work: Determining whether emotional labor is valued in government jobs. The American Review of Public Administration, 36(2), 123–138.
Mastracci, S. H., & Thompson, J. T. (2009). Who are the contingent workers in federal agencies? American Review of Public Administration, 39(4), 352–373.
Matheson, C. (2007). In praise of bureaucracy? A dissent from Australia. Administration & Society, 39(2), 233–261.
Musolf, G. R. (1992). Structure, institutions, power, and ideology: New directions within symbolic interactionism. The Sociological Quarterly, 33(2), 171–189.
Nair, N., & Vohra, N. (2012). The concept of alienation: Towards conceptual clarity. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 20(1), 25–50.
Newman, M. A., & Guy, M. E. (1998). Taylor's triangle, Follett's web. Administrative Theory & Praxis, 20(3), 287–297.
O'Donohue, W., & Nelson, W. (2014). Alienation: An old concept with contemporary relevance for human resource management. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 22(3), 301–316.
Queirós, C., Kaiseler, M., & da Silva, A. L. (2013). Burnout as predictor of aggressivity among police officers. Journal of Police Studies/Cahiers Politiestudies, 1(2).
Stivers, C. (2000). Bureau men, settlement women: Constructing public administration in the Progressive Era. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
"The Suitcase". (2010, Sept. 5). Mad Men season 4, episode 7. Weiner, M., Writer; Getzinger, J., Director.
Thompson, V. A. (1976). Bureaucracy and the modern world. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Timney, M. M., & Kelly, T. P. (2000). New Public Management and the demise of popular sovereignty. Administrative Theory & Praxis, 22(3), 555–569.

Tsai, W. C., & Huang, Y. M. (2002). Mechanisms linking employee affective delivery and customer behavioral intentions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(5), 1001–1008.

Wagner, D. T., Barnes, C. M., & Scott, B. A. (2014). Driving it home: How workplace emotional labor harms employee home life. Personnel Psychology, 67(2), 487–516.

Weyher, L. F. (2012). Re-reading sociology via the emotions: Karl Marx' theory of human nature and estrangements. Sociological Perspectives, 55(2), 341–363.

Zyphur, M. J., Warren, C. R., Landis, R. S., & Thoresen, C. J. (2007). Self-regulation and performance in high-fidelity situations: An extension of ego-depletion research. Human Performance, 20(2), 103–118.