



LEEDS
BECKETT
UNIVERSITY

Citation:

Till, C (2017) "Commercialising Bodies: Action, Subjectivity and the New Corporate Health Ethic." In: Lynch, R and Farrington, C, (eds.) Quantified Lives and Vital Data Exploring Health and Technology through Personal Medical Devices. Health, Technology and Society . Palgrave Macmillan, London, pp. 229-249. ISBN 1349952354, 9781349952359 DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95235-9_10

Link to Leeds Beckett Repository record:

<https://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/4516/>

Document Version:

Book Section (Accepted Version)

The aim of the Leeds Beckett Repository is to provide open access to our research, as required by funder policies and permitted by publishers and copyright law.

The Leeds Beckett repository holds a wide range of publications, each of which has been checked for copyright and the relevant embargo period has been applied by the Research Services team.

We operate on a standard take-down policy. If you are the author or publisher of an output and you would like it removed from the repository, please [contact us](#) and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Each thesis in the repository has been cleared where necessary by the author for third party copyright. If you would like a thesis to be removed from the repository or believe there is an issue with copyright, please contact us on openaccess@leedsbeckett.ac.uk and we will investigate on a case-by-case basis.

Till, C. (2018) 'Commercialising Bodies: The New Corporate Health Ethic of Philanthrocapitalism' in R. Lynch and C. Farrington *Quantified Lives and Vital Data: Exploring Health and Technology through Personal Medical Devices* Palgrave-Macmillan. pp 229-249.

Chris Till
Leeds Beckett University.

Author note.
Chris Till, School of Social Sciences.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Chris Till, School of Social Sciences, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, LS1 3HE. Contact: c.till@leedsbeckett.ac.uk

This is the version of the paper accepted for publication in the book *Quantified Lives and Vital Data: Exploring Health and Technology through Personal Medical Devices* edited by Rebecca Lynch and Conor Farrington and published by Palgrave. Verbatim quotations and page references should not therefore be taken from this version. Please contact the author for more details.

Till, C. (2018) 'Commercialising Bodies: The New Corporate Health Ethic of Philanthrocapitalism' in R. Lynch and C. Farrington *Quantified Lives and Vital Data: Exploring Health and Technology through Personal Medical Devices* Palgrave-Macmillan. pp 229-249.

<http://www.palgrave.com/de/book/9781349952342>

COMMERCIALISING BODIES: ACTION, SUBJECTIVITY AND THE NEW CORPORATE HEALTH ETHIC

Full Ref:

Till, C. (2018) 'Commercialising Bodies: The New Corporate Health Ethic of Philanthrocapitalism' in R. Lynch and C. Farrington *Quantified Lives and Vital Data: Exploring Health and Technology through Personal Medical Devices*. Palgrave-Macmillan. pp 229-249.

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is on the use of particular kinds of commercial personal medical devices (PMDs) which track activity. It will be suggested that these digital self-tracking (DST) devices¹ enable the broad commercialisation of bodies through their transformation of exercise activity into data and integration of personal wellness activities into corporate structures. While some evidence has shown that many users often quickly abandon devices (Ledger and McCaffrey, 2014) there is much optimism in their potential to instigate healthy behaviour change (Campbell, 2015) and significant growth in investment in DST indicating a clear push from corporations (Davies, 2015; Field, 2014, Statista, 2015). The use of corporate wellness (CW) programmes has also increased dramatically in the last few years, especially outside the USA where they are most well established (BuckConsultants, 2014). In addition, there are expected to be 13 million self-tracking devices used in CW by 2018 (ABI search, 2013) implemented on the assumption that they will increase productivity through better engagement and motivation at work (Moore and Robinson, 2015). These initiatives are attempts by employers to improve the 'wellness' of their employees through the improvement

¹ DST use accelerometers to measure the acceleration of forces and are central to self-tracking activities and culture as they are the main proxy used when counting the amount of steps taken or energy expended (Swan, 2009: 510).

of morale and the creation of a ‘culture of health’ at work which it is proposed will ultimately increase the ‘bottom line’ of the employer (GCC, undated b).

CW initiatives have been identified as an effective tool for the transmission of a corporate ethic (Conrad and Walsh, 1992) and such programmes are considered to be particularly useful in the encouragement of an ethic of self-governance (Haunschild, 2003; Maravelias, 2009), which internalizes control mechanisms by making them seem like the choices of individuals (Dale and Burrell, 2014). This control is considered to be particularly powerful through its engagement with the self-formation of individuals and the encouragement of blurring of work and non-work tasks and spaces (Conrad 1992; McGillivray 2005, 135). Some scholars have proposed that DST could be consistent with this kind of management ideology due to the prominence of an entrepreneurial disposition of self-improvement in their design (Lupton, 2013; Ruckenstein and Pantzar, 2015; Whitson, 2014).

This chapter will suggest that a conflation between work and health is being achieved through a reorientation of wellness as within the remit of employers and as an issue best tackled through management strategies. This will be approached firstly through my reading of two, until recently, largely overlooked philosophers (Guéry and Deleule, 2014) to show how the bodies of the population become integrated into the machinery of production. Secondly, I will propose that companies are taking a ‘philanthropic’ interest in health and wellbeing that is *not* reducible to the profit motive but *is* inseparable from it. The health of the individual and the health of the economy/organization are increasingly intertwined but the definition of health (through a focus on ‘wellness’) is being aligned with productive capacity. This is happening on both a practical and conceptual level. Practically, the digitization, accumulation and analysis of bodies through fitness tracking enables the detached management of health and exercise practices. Also, the use of CW programmes encourages the kinds of exercise practices which are conducive to corporate or organizational interests.

The research is based on thematic analysis of nine in-depth interviews conducted with people responsible for implementing or managing digital self-tracking exercise programmes in the UK at large employers and discourse analysis of promotional material from producers of tracking devices (eg. *Fitbit*) and providers of wellness programmes (eg. Global Corporate Challenge (GCC)). All programmes offer forms of digital self-tracking, all used step counts and some included other forms of exercise. All of the initiatives included a competitive element in which participants were arranged into teams who collate their steps together to achieve a goal in a set time period. Several of the initiatives were provided by GCC (GCC, undated a). Some of the other initiatives were developed and maintained by the employers themselves but followed similar models to GCC. Full informed consent to publish verbatim quotations from interviews was given by all research participants.

Productive Bodies

DST when used personally and for CW programmes have the potential to enter into a highly intimate relationship with users. Wearable devices integrate with, analyse and potentially affect the biological rhythms of the human body. As with any measurement or analysis those enabled by these devices only present a partial representation and suggest certain kinds of behaviour as desirable. I suggest that a core, although only partially acknowledged, rationale for these programmes is the generation of ‘productive bodies’ through engaging the subjectivity of the individual. The conceptualisation of ‘productive bodies’ is derived from the 1972 book (published in English in 2014) *The Productive Body* by François Guéry and Didier Deleule and is outlined below.

‘Productive bodies’ are those which form an efficient and effective cog in the capitalist machine, that is, they constitute ‘the productive body’. This notion (of ‘productive bodies’ in the plural) is my addition to Guéry and Deleule’s conceptual distinction between

the biological body (the material body), the social body (the collective population constituted through cooperation) and the productive body (the population that drives and embodies productivity). In order to produce a genuinely productive body (which I suggest is made up of productive bodies) capitalism cannot concern itself merely with the actions and time directly connected with work but requires hegemony over the whole productive process. To do this 'it needs to appropriate for itself not only the function of unifying the productive body [...] but also the productive force itself' (Guéry and Deleule, 2014: 82). What is required, then, is to 'appropriate not the means of production [but] the means of *productivity* or the inner springs of production'. The energy of the working population is thus harnessed through engagement with 'life itself' which comes to be presented as 'productive power' (Guéry and Deleule, 2014: 106).

It becomes necessary, therefore, for capitalism to engage the entire corporeal and subjective being of the individual. Guéry and Deleule emphasise the role which psychology plays in transforming 'the living machine entirely into efficacious motion' (Guéry and Deleule, 2014: 112) by short circuiting the process of reflection and attempting to make desired actions habitual. The most efficient, effective and productive body is that which 'functions without receiving its orders from consciousness [...]. Thus the machine moves by itself' (Guéry and Deleule, 2014: 115). The central task is, therefore, to enable 'the living machine' to become 'as adapted as possible to the social mechanism into which it is, in fact, integrated, so that that [sic] its productive act develops in optimal conditions and its gears don't grind too loudly' (Guéry and Deleule, 2014: 118). The productive body requires reactive (not thinking or reflecting) subjects. The habit formation which is central to almost all behaviour change approaches to health (and especially those employing self-tracking) would seem to be a good example of this philosophy.

Contemporary management discourse is suffused with the necessity of engaging the entire subjectivity of the worker in order to maximize their productive output through maintaining engagement (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2005) and for some political economy is becoming identical with ‘subjective economy’ (Lazzarato, 2014: 8). The subjective focus of management has merged with tactics borrowed from public health which has shifted its gaze from the biomedical to the social and the subjective (Armstrong, 1995) through a focus on ‘choice’, ‘personal responsibility’ and ‘lifestyle’ (Armstrong, 1993: 405; Herrick, 2011: 3; Larsen, 2011: 206). The task of public health initiatives has thus become increasingly built around the enabling of autonomous individuals who can effectively integrate into their social milieu ‘in conformity with the demands of neo-liberal democratic structures and values’ (Petersen and Lupton, 1996: 173; Dean, 2010). The kind of subjects whose ‘gears don’t grind too loudly’.

The importance of engaging the subjectivity of individual workers in the context of CW is acknowledged by GCC on their website with the assertion that ‘people must engage and participate willingly because ultimately only an individual can make the key lifestyle changes required to improve their physical and mental health’ (GCC, undated c). Engagement is seen to be the key factor in achieving wellness but is always tied to profitability for the company as a GCC report asserts:

The data shows that employees with the highest engagement levels also reported feeling more productive [...] In other words, those who were connected with their workplaces reported better outputs (GCC, 2016a).

In the contemporary economy in which productivity is dependent on affective skills, creativity and symbolic manipulation and with workers who demand autonomy from the stifling bureaucratic structures previously common it is through engagement that workers are

integrated with the machinery of capitalism. The ‘means of productivity’ and the ‘productive power’ (Guéry and Deleule, 2014: 106) which capitalism must appropriate now is not just physical capacities (as in Marx’s day) or the psyche (as it was for Guéry and Deleule) but the affective lives of the workers. This can be seen through the interest GCC shows for happiness:

[E]ven though the reason someone is happy may have nothing to do with the workplace, research shows that happier workers are better liked and often out-perform their less happy colleagues.

They stay with their employers for longer, have fewer sick days, are more punctual and more likely to contribute beyond the requirements of their job.

Given the evidence, work is an appropriate place to start the conversation about happiness (GCC, 2016b: 5).

Although the significance of happiness for productivity can be traced at least back to early twentieth century management gurus Frederick Winslow Taylor and Elton Mayo (Cederström and Spicer, 2016: 73) the technical approach and behaviourist philosophy make the current approach distinctive. Happiness is shrunken to a phenomenon which can be enabled through management strategies and ‘nudges’ from electronic devices as ‘that’s essentially what happiness is: a healthy habit’ (GCC, 2016b: 7). Crucially these happiness habits are enabled by cultural not structural factors. But this is a particular way of understanding culture, as something transmitted like a virus through a collection of monadic individuals. This can be seen in the assertion that the way in which employers can enable workers to be happy is through their own disposition and enabling ‘positive emotional contagion’ (GCC, 2016b: 7). In this model happiness is something which can be ‘caught’ from others but is only made possible through individualised strategies:

We often get so busy that we neglect the things that bring us joy, we forget self-care. The irony is that we're doing it to be more productive. Yet when we prioritise self-care, and positivity within that, we become happier and more productive (GCC, 2016b: 10).

William Davies interprets this incorporation of happiness into the productive process as a utilitarian understanding of emotions in which it is seen as a source of energy which is valued only when it is 'directed towards goals other than being happy' (Davies, 2016: 115) rather than as an intrinsic good in itself. Happiness is thus a force which is outside of capitalist enterprise but is valued only when channelled in such a way as to increase productive intensity. In the contemporary workplace happiness, self-realisation and authenticity take on an ideological character and present an ideal worker defined through their happiness and productivity (Cederström and Grassman, 2010: 111, 120-2). Workers are encouraged to identify with this ideal which is nevertheless always out of their reach and through this become subject to discipline and control through affective investment in securing a happier and more balanced life (Bloom, 2016: 600).

Through behavioural tactics and automated prompts and reminders the devices and programmes discussed in this chapter attempt to constitute a reactive subject smoothly integrated with their productive context. The qualities and behaviours encouraged are those which enable the integration of bodies into capital accumulation rather than those associated with health per se. Intervention through these means enables corporations and organizations to fulfil their aims of doing social good through constituting healthy subjects while creating conditions for greater productivity.

Philanthrocapitalism

While the constitution of well-integrated, ‘productive bodies’ is necessary for productivity this cannot simply be achieved through authoritarian commands for individuals to fall in line with the demands of capitalism. Rather, the practices of capital accumulation must be integrated with an ethical calling (Weber, 2001). I claim that an aim of CW DST initiatives is the instantiation of a productive ethic through encouraging practices of self-assessment and management. The companies involved in selling DST devices and using them for wellness programmes both have a genuine interest in the wellbeing of the public and feel a responsibility to make a positive impact on it. However, they expect to do this while further enhancing productivity and broader capitalist interests. For this reason I suggest that they are engaged in a form of “philanthrocapitalism” defined as:

the idea that capitalism is or can be charitable in and of itself. The claim is that capitalist mechanisms are superior to all others (especially the state) when it comes to not only creating economic but also human progress; that the market and market actors are or should be made the prime creators of the good society (Thorup, 2013: 556).

Thorup (2013: 558) builds on Boltanski and Chiappelo (2005) to suggest that ‘philanthrocapitalism’ is one of the key ways in which contemporary ethical critiques of capitalism are integrated into its practices and become a strength. Philanthropy is not something which happens outside of business hours or in addition to commercial activity, rather, it is part of ‘competitiveness planning’ and the capitalist enterprise is itself seen as philanthropic (Thorup, 2013: 563).

I suggest that an analogous situation is emerging in the field of health and (particularly) exercise. Corporations increasingly see it as their role to improve the health and wellness of the population (not only for their employees). This general tendency can be seen in a research report produced by the organisation 'Business for Social Responsibility' who found that:

...companies face increasing pressure to improve health outcomes by promoting wellness and prevention—not only for their employees, but for the broader population that is impacted by corporate actions. Stakeholders from employees, government, community organizations, consumers, and investors recognize that private sector action [...] reflects a sphere of influence that extends well beyond a company's core employee base (BSR, 2015: 5).

The report also suggests that increasingly employees want to work for companies who demonstrate that they care for their employees (BSR 2015). Crucially, companies consider their philanthropic activities to be commensurate with their organisational and usually consider the best route to achieving them to be through responsabilising the individual (Thorup, 2013: 561). This alignment of management strategy with the values of workers was a clearly a driving factor for the participants in this study. As one HR worker asserted:

From our perspective it was very much [...] advertised as a staff benefit [...] on a larger scale it attracts employees to the [organisation] and retains them once they're here [...] Alongside that it also has additional benefits some go towards the efficiency of the university itself including the amount of carbon produced and also perhaps things such as increased levels of motivation amongst employees and others are far more individual such as weight loss, healthy habits being implemented into everyday life for the employees.

The CW programme at this organisation was paid for out of a carbon reduction fund and was considered to be an effective means of addressing management concerns for productivity with staff desires to improve their health along with broader environmental strategies. All three of these can be interpreted as ethical projects which are neatly combined through technological disciplining of individuals. Another participant working as an HR manager assessed the success of their initiatives against responses in their staff survey which measured to what extent the organisation was perceived to care about the wellbeing of employees. They made sense of their high scores on this measure as being due to the fact that initiatives are offered rather than their objective outcomes in terms of behaviour change or health benefits:

I think the reason that we are higher [...] isn't because we've got lots of people participating in these things. I think they just know that it's there and it gives them a good feeling about working for an employer that does these things even if they choose not to participate.

This 'good feeling' is seen as central to motivating workers in the contemporary economy as a 'thought piece' published by the UK government back employee engagement task force 'Engage for Success' states:

People are seeking something more meaningful and sustainable than engaging with a corporate strategy. Many employees want to engage with social missions beyond the organisation (Sparrow, 2014: unpagged).

Health and environmental improvement are seen as the kinds of goals which provide workers with the motivation to improve productivity through infusing work with meaning beyond immediate organisational concerns. One participant summarised their organisation's motivation for instigating the DST programme as being:

[...] a healthy workforce but it was engagement, the whole staff engagement thing as well. The feedback we got from the people who did was, aside from some of the competitiveness, it was more of a real team spirit and there was a buzz in the air. GCC uses the potential for their programmes to boost engagement as one of their key selling points. Similarly, to the comments from participants above it is not necessarily individual behaviour or concrete health outcomes that are significant, rather, ‘culture’ is the target. They suggest that:

Cultures that promote wellbeing, safety and human connection drive engagement and ultimately become more competitive. GCC Insights data shows that healthy, engaged employees are productive employees. Employee engagement may be intrinsic, but employers can create a culture that connects it to better business outcomes (GCC, 2016a: 7).

DST initiatives are seen as a means to encourage engagement and ‘re-energise’ teams (GCC, 2016a: 10) which increases productivity both through disciplining workers into productive practices and, perhaps more significantly, making them *feel* better about their workplace and themselves. This latter affective force is essential for the maximisation of productivity in contemporary capitalism (Berardi, 2009; Lazzarato, 2014).

When companies are discussed as philanthrocapitalist this is usually due to their charitable giving which does not apply to the context which is explored here. Instead, I refer to the tactics which companies use to construct themselves as ‘a self-avowed socially-conscious, forward-thinking corporate citizen’ (Giardina, 2010: 135) and in so doing claim an area of social life as legitimately within their remit. Crucially, it is strategies of (or associated with) capitalist accumulation which are presented as the most effective means of achieving a social good; in this context improved wellness. Philanthrocapitalism is driven by ‘the desire to bring ‘hard-nosed’ strategy [and] performance’ (McGoey, 2014: 111) to philanthropy. As

will be demonstrated below business strategies (focused on productivity) and an emphasis on performance metrics are central to self-tracking approaches to health and especially those implemented as part of wellness schemes.

Activity

The philanthrocapitalist intervention of corporations and organisations into the intimate lives of individuals is primarily predicated not on the improvement of health as such but on the increase in activity. This can be seen in the focus on the reduction of sedentarism and the emphasis on devices and initiatives built around walking and running as is exemplified by the slogan of Global Corporate Challenge; “Get The World Moving”. It has previously been noted that the practices of self-reflection and optimisation associated with ST are consistent with neo-liberal ideology and an entrepreneurial disposition towards the self (Lupton, 2013b; Ruckenstein and Pantzar, 2015). Central to the constitution of the subject of neo-liberal governmentality —in Foucault’s (2008: 231-2) analysis — is ‘human capital theory’ which is based on the ‘managerialization of personal identity’ and the ‘capitalization of the meaning of life’ (Gordon cited in Bröckling, 2016: 27). But in order for this to occur ‘life’ needs to be formulated in such a way that ‘capitalization’ is possible. In practice this means that it is made equivalent and comparable. In the contemporary form of capitalism:

the general equivalent - what the status of persons and things is measured by - is *activity*...[which] surmounts the oppositions between work and non-work, the stable and the unstable, wage earning and non-wage-earning class, paid work and voluntary work (Boltanski and Chiapello, 2005: 109).

‘Activity’, for Boltanski and Chiapello has become a generic measure of virtuous behavior; ‘activity’ is a good in and of itself. Similarly, Stephan Lessenich has proposed that the

promotion of ‘activity’ is the primary organizing principle of contemporary capitalism (Dörre, Lessenich and Rosa, 2015) which can also be observed in the often identified ‘cult of busyness’ (Ehrenreich, 1985; Robinson and Godbey, 2005). This means that capitalist enterprises promote ‘activity’ as an inherently virtuous activity only partly due to its connection to productivity. For Muriel Gillick walking and running are now seen as inherent personal and social goods and the marker of general wellness which in increasingly morally ambiguous times are considered unproblematically virtuous activities (Gillick, 1984: 381). This point highlights not only the well-worn insight that health and fitness have long been associated with morality but also explains the widespread uptake of a particular activity (running) through its seemingly natural alignment with personal and social virtue which has only increased since Gillick’s article was published. Therefore, when employers and corporations become dedicated to encouraging individuals to engage in running or walking this puts their actions outside of potential critique. ‘Activity’, through its reconstitution as a virtuous activity has become simply ‘good practice’ inside and outside of work.

It is my suggestion that DST devices and CW programmes using such technologies function to constitute productive bodies while achieving social ‘goods’ in a manner consistent with capitalist enterprise and that the main way in which this is done is through the promotion of ‘activity’. A function of corporate wellness initiatives is to conflate work and non-work life and practices (McGillivray, 2005: 125; Holliday and Thompson, 2001: 125) in particular through transforming the workplace into a ‘health-promoting setting’ (Chu et al, 1997: 381). The developments discussed here represent a more specific intensification of this process. Rather than working from the assumption that ‘a healthy worker is a good worker’ it suggests that ‘activity’ is inherently good for work and health.

Activity is perceived as inherently good for all but it must be directed in a productive way. The balance between ‘disengagement’ (or lack of activity) and ‘burnout’ (from being

overactive) has become one of the main concerns of human resource management (Dagher et al 2015; Maslach and Leiter 2008; Saks 2006; Wollard and Shuck 2011). Interview respondents in my study placed great emphasis on the ability of CW DST programmes to encourage and stimulate activity, as one occupational therapist responsible for implementing such an initiative stated:

Our key aim was to have an impact mainly on sedentary roles but also recognising as well that we could have the busiest of people like for example porters or nurses who are on their feet all the time but they'll go home and do absolutely nothing. So I suppose we tried to look at it quite holistically but the other thing for us as well was more about engaging with the people who didn't do things.

The focus for this respondent was clearly on increasing activity even for those highly active roles at work. For many of the respondents the programmes were not just useful in encouraging physical activity, rather they were part of stimulating broader engagement. In particular, greater social interaction (particularly between workers who did not usually engage with one another) was seen as a major benefit. Friendly rivalry and teamwork were considered to be a fundamental aspect of the initiatives which was inspired by the sharing achievements via social media. The automated digitization of activity in all kinds of DST makes comparison and sharing of achievements with others particularly easy and has led some to suggest that self-tracking is an inherently communicative phenomenon (Lomborg and Frandsen, 2015).

One organisation which developed an app with the help of an external company which was used as part of a walking challenge built their whole strategy around 'activity':

we put together the “active staff” programme which has different strands, one strand of “active staff” being [...] our large scale challenges and events including our walking challenges. [...] Another aspect of our programme is “active sites” [...] We have our “live active” [...] which is a GP exercise referral scheme which runs across [local health authority] that is a referral from your GP practice to a physiotherapist but as a part of the “active staff” programme we are currently piloting a self-referral pathway so the idea is that staff can access the “live active” service, which is a one-to-one intervention for behavioural change support.

‘Activity’ and being ‘active’ are here thoroughly integrated across the whole approach to workplace wellness. This emphasis on increasing activity is mirrored in the advice provided by *Fitbit* on their website:

Doing the dishes? Multitask when you stand at the sink and load the dishwasher. Do calf raises while rinsing, and pause to do a squat for every plate, bowl, or glass you put in the machine.

Go upstairs, again. Doing a chore that requires your presence on the second floor? Slip in an extra flight on your way there, by walking up, immediately turning around to go down, and walking up again

(Farrell, 2015).

This advice is not directly connected to the tracking devices which *Fitbit* sell, rather they have an interest in increasing activity more broadly. This advice can be read as simply part of the advertising strategy to bring readers to their site and demonstrate their caring credentials. I am, however, less interested in their genuine motivations (if such things can be determined)

than the fact that they see such an interest in the health of people in general as at all within their realm of responsibility or concern. Companies such as *Fitbit* see the improvement of health, through the promotion of activity, as part of their mission.

It is also through activity that the work and health contexts are brought together. On their website *Fitbit* articulate the convergence of exercise and work through advertising copy for their *Surge* wristband:

Work hard.

But, also, work better.

Designed with advanced smartwatch features, *Surge* lets you run your day, your way. Text and call notifications keep you on your game throughout the day, while music control helps you find the motivation you need to prepare for a big meeting or beat your best in a big race.

(Fitbit, undated).

The motivational phrasing can be applied to exercise or work:

See what you've done, then do more. *Surge* automatically and wirelessly syncs to your computer and 120+ leading smartphones—showing your stats as detailed charts and graphs—so you can access your progress anywhere.

(Fitbit, undated).

Using the kinds of technologies currently available movement is much easier to track than other forms of wellness promoting behaviour thus it is becoming one of the key organising principles of contemporary capitalism. This is because it is useful for increasing the productivity of workers (for directly generating income through sales of devices and the

production of valuable data) and for its virtuous aura which justifies the spread of capitalist logics to increasing areas of life.

Activity is here presented as beneficial for the improvement of health and productivity. The promotion of activity by corporations is thus deemed to be a social good in itself as it will increase the health and wellbeing of the individuals who engage in it at the same time that it helps those individuals to be more productive at work. The promotion of activity is also useful for the producers of DST and employers who implement them as part of wellness activities. The former benefit from the generation of valuable data and the latter from a more productive and engaged workforce. While there are other means through which to achieve health and wellness these devices and initiatives are helping to constitute an increasing alignment between activity, morality and health.

Conclusion

Digital technologies perhaps integrate the bodies of the population into the machinery of capitalism more completely than at any other time in history. This is achieved so comprehensively because it is done through merging the goals of the organization with people's everyday lives. Undoubtedly this means that companies are more ethical (in the sense that they are engaged with ethical practice) but does not mean that they are any less engaged in the process of formulating social relations for the purposes of profitability. Capital accumulation and ethical practice have merged in contemporary capitalism; what is good for the company and what is good for society have come to be seen as the same thing. As Boltanski and Chiappelo (2005) show the critiques of capitalism which it integrates into its functioning are a vital part of the legitimation process. But when capitalism seeks to make itself more ethical it does not leave the object of its ethical attentions untouched. Rather, just as capitalist enterprise is reformed through engagement with critique so is that which it seeks

to improve in society. What has been shown here is that attempts by corporations and organizations to improve the health of the public and employees reconstitute health in terms which are useful for capitalism. Principally, health is redefined in terms of activity and engagement with others; healthy bodies become synonymous with productive bodies.

The emphasis on activity for producing health is partly due to the existing capacities of tracking technologies; they can monitor particular kinds of movement (such as running and walking) in a much more meaningful way than, for instance, meditation. Manufacturers of PMDs used for self-tracking and those designing and implementing CW programmes draw explicit connections between exercise activity and productivity with the same devices being positioned as able to improve both. This is perhaps not surprising given that information technologies (which DSTs can be classified as) were initially, principally designed as a means for the control of workflow (van Dijk 2006: 69). When technologies and managements systems built for the maximization of productivity are applied to exercise it makes sense that the latter will start to seem more like work. Employers and corporations have shown a growing interest in promoting exercise activity as a moral good. Simultaneously, digital technologies have enabled the kinds of measurement, standardisation and incentivisation often associated with work to seep out into everyday lives. In the process health and exercise are coming to be judged in terms of productivity and work is being presented as a means of achieving wellness and self-fulfilment. Work and non-work seem to be blurring with productivity increasingly the key measure of both.

References

ABIresearch (2013). 'Corporate Wellness is a 13 Million Unit Wearable Wireless Device Opportunity'. 25 September 2013. Available at:

<https://www.abiresearch.com/press/corporate-wellness-is-a-13-million-unit-wearable-w/>

[Accessed on 12 October 2015].

Armstrong, D. (1993) 'Public Health Spaces and the Fabrication of Identity' *Sociology* 27(3): 393-410.

Armstrong, D (1995) 'The rise of surveillance medicine' *Sociology of Health & Illness* 17(3): 393-404.

Berardi, F. (2009) *The Soul at Work: From Alienation to Autonomy*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Bloom, P. (2016) 'Work as the contemporary limit of life: Capitalism, the death drive, and the lethal fantasy of 'work-life balance' *Organization* 23(4): 588-606.

Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (2005). *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Verso).

Bröckling, U. (2016) *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject* (London: Sage).

BSR (2013) *A New CSR Frontier: Business and Population Health: Mobilizing CSR to Strengthen Corporate Engagement on Health and Wellness across the Value Chain*.

Available at:

http://www.bsr.org/reports/BSR_A_New_CSR_Frontier_Business_and_Population_Health.pdf [Accessed on 10 April 2016].

BuckConsultants (2014). *Working Well: A Global Survey of Health Promotion, Workplace Wellness, and Productivity Strategies*. Available at:

https://www.bucksurveys.com/BuckSurveys/Portals/0/aspdnsf/BuckSurveys_OrdersDownload/Health%20and%20Productivity/GW_Exec_Summary_Global.pdf [Accessed on 7 January 2016].

Caffentzis, G. (undated) 'The work/energy crisis and the apocalypse' Available at: <https://libcom.org/library/workenergy-crisis-apocalypse-george-caffentzis> [Accessed on 10 April 2016].

Campbell, D. (2015). 'Prof Bruce Keogh: wearable technology plays a crucial part in NHS future'. *The Guardian*, 19 January 2015. Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2015/jan/19/prof-bruce-keogh-wearable-technology-plays-crucial-part-nhs-future> [Accessed on 9 September 2015].

Cartwright, S. and Holmes, N. (2006). 'The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism' *Human Resource Management Review* 16(2): 199-208.

Cederström, C. and Grassman, R. (2010) 'The Unbearable Weight of Happiness'. In C. Cederström and C. Hoedemakers (eds.) *Lacan and Organization* (London: MayFlyBooks).

Cederström, C. and Spicer, A. (2015) *The Wellness Syndrome* (Cambridge: Polity).

Chu, C., Driscoll, T. and Dwyer, S. (1997). 'The health-promoting workplace: an integrative perspective'. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* 21(4): 377-385.

Clarke, J. (2004) 'Dissolving the public realm?: The logics and limits of neo-liberalism'. *Journal of Social Policy* 33(1): 27-48.

Conrad, P. and D.C. Walsh. (1992). 'The New Corporate Health Ethic: Lifestyle and the Social Control of Work'. *International Journal of Health Services Research* 22(1): 89-111.

Curtis, S. and Taket, A. (1996) *Health and Societies: Changing Perspectives* (London: Arnold).

Dagher, G.K., Chapa, O. and Junaid, N. (2015). 'The historical evolution of employee engagement and self-efficacy constructs'. *Journal of Management History* 21(2): 232-256.

Dale, K. and Burrell, G. (2014). 'Being occupied: An embodied re-reading of organizational "wellness"'. *Organization* 21(2): 159-177.

Davies, S. (2015). 'Wearable Tech Usage To grow by 60 Percent This Year' *Bionicy*, 3 November 2015. Available at: <http://bionicy.com/wearable-tech-growth-emarketer/> [Accessed 4 Nov 2015].

Davies, W. (2016) *The Happiness Industry: How the Government and Big Business Sold Us Well-Being* (London: Verso).

Dean, M (2010) *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.

Ehrenreich, B. (1985). 'Hers' *The New York Times*, 21 February 1985. Available at: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/dell/2012/05/17/managing-distraction-beware-the-cult-of-busyness/>[Accessed 5 January 2016].

Dörre, K., Lessenich, S. and Rosa, H. (2015) *Sociology, Capitalism, Critique*. London: Verso.

Farrell, K.D. (2015) '8 Crazy-Simple Ways Parents Can Slip Fitness into Their Day' *The Fitbit Blog*. Available at <https://blog.fitbit.com/8-crazy-simple-ways-parents-can-slip-fitness-into-their-day-2/> [Accessed 24 April 2016].

Field, A. (2014). 'Venture Capital Flocks to the 'Quantified Self''. *the network: Cisco's Technology News Site*, 3 June 2014. Available at: <http://newsroom.cisco.com/feature-content?type=webcontent&articleId=1425860> [Accessed 10 November 2015].

Fitbit (undated). 'Train smarter. Go farther'. *Fitbit.com* Available at: <https://www.fitbit.com/uk/surge> [Accessed 7 January 2016].

Foucault, M. (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Fuchs, C. (2014) *Digital Labour and Karl Marx* (London: Routledge).

Giardina, M.D. (2010). 'One day, one goal? PUMA, corporate philanthropy and the cultural politics of brand 'Africa'. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics* 13(1): 130-142.

Gillick, M.R. (1984). 'Health Promotion, jogging, and the Pursuit of the Moral Life'. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 9(3): 369-387.

GCC (undated a) 'GCC' *gettheworldmoving.com* Available at: <https://www.gettheworldmoving.com/> [Accessed 10 April 2016].

GCC (undated b) 'Proof it works' *gettheworldmoving.com* Available at: <https://www.gettheworldmoving.com/proof-it-works> [Accessed 10 April 2016].

GCC (undated c). 'How it works' *gettheworldmoving.com* Available at: <https://www.gettheworldmoving.com/how-it-works> [Accessed 10 April 2016].

GCC (2016a) 'Get Engaged: How a healthy culture can drive greater employee commitment and engagement' *GCC Insights*. Available at http://info.gettheworldmoving.com/engaged-employees.html?utm_source=resourcespage&utm_medium=website&utm_campaign=engagement [Accessed 16 September 2016].

GCC (2016b) 'Happy Days: Drive better business outcomes with happiness and positive emotion' *GCC Insights*. Available at: http://info.gettheworldmoving.com/happiness-at-work-US.html?utm_source=homepage&utm_medium=website&utm_campaign=happiness [Accessed 16 September 2016].

Guéry, F. and Deleule, D. (2014). *The Productive Body* (Winchester: Zero Books).

- Haunschild, A. (2003). 'Humanization Through Discipline? Foucault and the Goodness of Employee Health Programmes'. *Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Science* 2(3): 46-59.
- Herrick, C. (2011) *Governing Health and Consumption: Sensible citizens, behaviour and the city* (Bristol: The Policy Press).
- Herschbach, L. (1997) 'Prosthetic reconstructions: Making the industry, re-making the body, modelling the nation'. *History Workshop Journal* 44: 23–57.
- Holliday, R. and Thompson, G. (2001). 'A body of work', in R. Holliday and J. Hassard (eds), *Contested Bodies* (London: Routledge).
- Huber, M., Knottnerus, A., Green, L. van der Horst, H., Jadad, A. R., Kromhout, D., Leonard, B., Lorig, K., Loureiro, M. I., van der Meer, J.W.M, Schnabel, P., Smith, R., van Weel, C. and Smid, H. (2011). 'How should we define health?'. *British Medical Journal* 343:d4163, doi:10.1136/bmj.d4163.
- Larsen, L.T. (2011) 'The Birth of Lifestyle Politics: The Biopolitical Management of Lifestyle Diseases in the United States and Denmark' In U. Bröckling, S. Krasmann and T. Lemke (eds.), *Governmentality: Current Issues and Future Challenges* (London: Routledge).
- Lazzarato, M. (2014) *Signs and Machines: Capitalism and the production of subjectivity* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e)).
- Ledger, D. and McCaffrey, D. (2014). *Inside Wearables: How the Science of Human Behaviour Change Offers the Secret to Long-Term Engagement*. Endeavour Partners. Available at: <http://endeavourpartners.net/assets/Endeavour-Partners-Wearables-and-the-Science-of-Human-Behavior-Change-Part-1-January-20141.pdf> [Accessed 2nd January 2016].

- Lomborg, S. and Frandsen, K. (2015). 'Self-tracking as communication'. *Information, Communication & Society* DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2015.1067710.
- Lupton, D. (2013). 'Understanding the Human Machine'. *IEEE Technology & Society Magazine* 32: 25–30.
- Maravelias, C. (2009). 'Health Promotion and Flexibility: Extending and Obscuring Power in Organizations'. *British Journal of Management* 20(S): 194-203.
- Maslach, C. and Leiter, M.P. (2008). 'Early Predictors of job Burnout and Engagement' *Journal of Applied Psychology* 93(3): 498-512.
- McGillivray, D. (2005). 'Fitter, Happier, More Productive: Governing Working Bodies through Wellness' *Culture and Organization* 11(2): 125-138.
- McGoey, L. (2014). 'The philanthropic state: market-state hybrids in the philanthrocapitalist turn'. *Third World Quarterly* 35(1): 109-125.
- Moore, P. and Robinson, A. (2015). 'The Quantified Self: What Counts in the Neoliberal Workplace'. *New Media & Society* DOI: 10.1177/146/4448/5604328.
- Omran, A.R. (1971) 'The Epidemiologic Transition: A Theory of the Epidemiology of Population Change' *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 49(4): 509-538.
- Petersen, A. and Lupton, D. (1996) *The New Public Health: Health and Self in the Age of Risk* (London: Sage).
- Rabinbach, A. (1992). *The Human Motor: Energy, Fatigue, and the Origins of Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Robinson, J.P. and Godbey, G. (2005). 'Busyness as Usual'. *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 72(2): 407-426.

Ruckenstein, M. and Pantzar, M. (2015). 'Beyond the Quantified Self: Thematic exploration of a dataistic paradigm' *New Media & Society* doi:10.1177/1461444815609081.

Saks, A.M. (2006). 'Antecedents and Consequences of Employee Engagement' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 21(7): 600-619.

Scholz, T. (ed.) *Digital Labor: The Internet as Playground and Factory* (London: Routledge)

Seltzer, M. (1992) *Bodies and Machines* (London: Routledge).

Smith, K.P. and Christakis, N. A. (2008). 'Social Networks and Health'. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:405-29.

Sparrow, P (2014) *Are we now mature enough to ask the harder questions, the 'engage with what?' challenge*. Engage For Success. Available at: <http://engageforsuccess.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Paul-Sparrow.pdf> [Accessed 16th September 2016].

Statista (2015). 'Facts and statistics on Wearable Technology' *Statista*. Available at: <http://www.statista.com/topics/1556/wearable-technology/> [Accessed 1 January 2016].

Swan, M. (2009) 'Emerging Patient-Driven Health Care Models: An Examination of Health Social Networks, Consumer Personalized Medicine and Quantified Self-Tracking' *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 6(2):492-525.

Terranova, T. (2013) 'Free Labor'. In T. Scholz (ed.) *Digital Labor: The Internet as Playground and Factory* (London: Routledge).

Thorup, M. (2013). 'Pro Bono? On philanthrocapitalism as ideological answer to inequality'. *ephemera: theory & politics in organization* 13(3): 555-576.

Till, C. (2014) 'Exercise as Labour: Quantified Self and the Transformation of Exercise into Labour' *Societies* 4(3): 446-462.

Van Dijk, J.A.G.M. (2006). *The Network Society: Social Aspects of New Media* (London: Sage).

Weber, M. (2001). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Routledge).

Whitson, J.R. (2014). 'Foucault's Fitbit: Governance and Gamification' In S.P. Walz and S. Deterding (eds), *The Gameful World: Approaches, Issues and Applications* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press).

WHO (2006). 'Constitution of the World Health Organization' *Basic Documents*. Available at: http://www.who.int/governance/eb/who_constitution_en.pdf [Accessed 7 January 2016].

Wollard, K.K. and Shuck, B. (2011). 'Antecedents to Employee Engagement: A Structured Review of the Literature'. *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 13(4): 429-446.