

COMMUNICATION & LANGUAGE at work

Resisting Attempts at Organizational Socialization - Ambivalence and Resistance towards the Use of Time Registration

Thomas Borchmann

Associate Professor, Aalborg University, Denmark
borchman@ikp.aau.dk

Bendt Torpegaard

Associate Professor, Aalborg University, Denmark
torpe@ikp.aau.dk

Abstract

The study explores resistance towards managerial attempts at socializing workers to specific forms of behaviour. The case regards the introduction of time registration practices among upper secondary school teachers. Data originates from interviews with 31 teachers. Qualitative content analysis is used to map the stances towards time registration and their supporting arguments. The arguments supporting a negative or ambivalent stance are linked to two different norm-creating contexts and sets of rules which are viewed as the bases that legitimize resistance. Findings are that ambivalent and negative stances dominate. These stances are grounded in arguments which express both professional and political concerns. Professional concerns regard the need to protect a professional identity and the needs of clients and can be linked to norms and sets of rules acquired through professional socialization. The political concerns regard the inadequacy of time registration as a means to regulate effort. These concerns can be linked to the norms and sets of rules acquired by co-worker socialization. A critical attitude towards time registration is complicated by the fact that time registration is also championed by the union. However, both the consideration of possible negative side effects unforeseen by the union and experiences of active rule-twisting from management can make rule breaking legitimate even if the rules broken are also championed by the union.

Keywords

Organizational socialization, workplace rules, workplace resistance, organizational misbehaviour, critical management studies

1. Introduction

1.1 *Organizational socialization and resistance to organizational socialization*

Organizational socialization constituted itself as an independent field of research during the 1980s. Since its foundation the field has attracted a great deal of scholarly interest and the number of research themes being pursued have grown rapidly (Klein & Heuser, 2008; Antonacopoulou & Güttel, 2010). Organizational socialization has also managed to have an impact on HR-agendas in many corporations where in particular onboarding of new members has become a concern (Bauer et al, 2007). The research themes that have dominated the field have included themes as 1) the process and stages of organizational socialization and organizational tactics for achieving socialization (e.g. Van Manen & Schein, 1979; Chao, 1988), 2) the content of socialization (e.g. Feldman, 1981), 3) the outcomes of socialization (e.g. Bauer et al, 2007), 4) the relationship between content and outcomes (e.g. Chao et al, 1994) and 5) the relationship between organizational tactics and specific outcomes (e.g. Saks et al, 2007; Saks & Gruman, 2010), etc.. However, being dominated mainly by a functionalist or interpretivist orientation (Alvesson, 2008), the interest in trying to understand resistance towards managerial attempts at organizational socialization - and in particular the rationality in such resistance - has not been widely shared within the field. To pursue such an interest, we must look elsewhere. One possible place to look is to inquiries conducted under the headings *worker resistance* and *organizational misbehaviour*.

The concepts worker resistance and organizational misbehaviour are concepts which in some way overlap. However, they also differ in terms of connotations and scope. Hodson defines worker resistance as “any individual or small-group act intended to mitigate claims by management on workers or to advance workers’ claims against management” (Hodson 1995). This way of defining resistance clearly situates resistance as a move in the struggle over “the frontier of control” (Goodrich, 1971), which plays out between labour and capital. However, a narrow theoretical model of control and resistance in the workplace can also make us overlook and leave out forms of resistance which are better captured by the wider phrase “organizational misbehaviour” (Woodcock, 2017; Thompson, 2016; Collinson & Acroyd, 2005). This point is also made by Karlsson who reminds us that organizational misbehaviour can be viewed as acts of resistance, which take place whenever our dignity is threatened or denied (Karlsson, 2012). In their book *Organizational Misbehaviour* from 1999, Ackroyd and Thompson defined organizational misbehaviour as “*anything you do at work, that you are not supposed to do*” (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999, P.2.). This behaviour can include anything from dragging your feet to industrial sabotage or wildcat strikes. In his book *Organizational Misbehaviour in The Workplace* from 2012, Karlsson expands this definition by defining organizational misbehaviour as “*anything you are, do and think at work, which you are not supposed to be, do or think*” (Karlsson, 2012, p.156). The main argument for including the dimensions of thinking and being is to direct our attention towards managerial attempts of influencing or controlling workers’ identities through the manipulation of culture and the workers’ attempts at counteracting or resisting these attempts at behavioural influence and control (Karlsson, 2012).

1.2 *Misbehaviour as rule-based rule breaking*

Organizational misbehaviour is normally viewed as self-conscious rule breaking, where the rules being broken are the rules that are put forward by management (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999: 2016). Departing from the maxim that there is no such thing as rule-free rule breaking Karlsson explores the possible norm creating contexts and alternative sets of rules which can legitimize the breaking of management rules. Based on an empirical study of different groups of health care workers Karlsson points to three different contexts of origin and associated sets of rules. These sets of rules are *service rules*, *collective rules*, and *professional rules* (Karlsson, 2012). *Service rules* are informal rules or tacit agreements that evolve through *the interpersonal work relationship between the health care workers and their clients*. The constitution and strength of service rules are dependent on a series of structural aspects of the work as such. These aspects include a) how central the contact and relationship with the client is in their work compared to contact and relations to colleagues and superiors, b) the duration and closeness of the client relationship, and c) the existence of negative job characteristics such as monotony, which enhances the importance of a good relationship with the clients (Karlsson, 2012). *Collective rules* are formed by the collective interpretation and understanding of work and work-related issues and evolve from the *formal and informal interactions between workers*. These rules can explicate norms for how work is to be done, how the rules laid out by management are to be interpreted and how to balance a diversity of needs. The strength and impact of these norms are influenced by a variety of factors including the degree of interactions between the workers (Karlsson, 2012: Lysgaard, 1985). *Professional rules* are constituted from outside the organization and stem from *formal education and membership of a profession*. However, the strength of these rules does not only depend on formal education and socialization, but also on the daily interactions between professionals (Karlsson, 2012). Due to the difference in professional qualifications and the different structural conditions of work that

the different groups of health care workers had in Karlsson's study, the strength and impact of the outlined sets of rules were also found to differ in the groups (Karlsson, 2012).

1.3 Challenges associated with researching misbehaviour as rule-based rule breaking

When misbehaviour and resistance are discussed, the difficulties associated with studying this phenomenon are often pointed out (E.g., Woodcock, 2017). Among the difficulties are the difficulties of observing - or being allowed to observe – the sporadic and often hidden acts of opposition. However, in our view another set of challenges also exist when trying to research misbehaviour and in particular misbehaviour as rule-based rule breaking. These challenges are associated with 1) the definition and demarcation of management rules, and 2) the variety of possible origins that management rules can have. The challenges associated with a definition and demarcation of management rules soon become visible when you consider that rules can take several forms. They can be hints or wishes or demands. They can be clear and consistent or vague and ambiguous and allow for a variety of interpretations, and rules can even exist without being enforced. These aspects can make the identification of specific rules and the variety of attempts to contest or ignore them a complex task. This point is also partly acknowledged by Karlsson in his recommendation of a widened focus on cultural aspects of managerial regimes (Karlsson, 2012). The challenge associated with the variety of possible origins of management rules is that not all rules that are enforced by management or classified as management rules originate from management alone. As an example, rules enforced by management can be imposed by law or be a product of formal collective agreements.

2 The case: Resistance towards Time Registration among Upper Secondary School Teachers in Denmark

Some of the complexities mentioned before can be exemplified when casting a glance at our present case which concerns resistance against the use of time registration practices among upper secondary school teachers in Denmark. In 2013 the general upper secondary school teachers in Denmark had their common working time agreement terminated as part of the collective agreement between the teacher's union and the employer. The termination, that allowed school leaders to assign portfolios of tasks to teachers without a departure in fixed and commonly shared working norms, was justified as a way of strengthening the rights of management and can be seen as a token of the managerialism witnessed within the educational sector in most of the Anglo-Saxon world (Tolofardi, 2005). The termination of the common working time agreement was strongly opposed by the great majority of teachers but to no effect. Major reasons for the opposition were that the termination of the common working time agreement meant, that there was no longer any fixed upper limit to the number of tasks, which could be placed on the individual teachers, and that teachers at the same school could have very different workloads assigned. The termination of the common working time agreement also provided the backslash for the introduction of time registration as the new agreement also made it mandatory for schools to make time registration systems available for the teachers. Time registration practices were originally described and championed as a managerial tool which could allow for the monitoring and management of the individual teachers' task portfolios and working hours. In the publication "Etablering af tidsregistrering" (In English it would translate roughly into "Establishing Time registration practices"), the readers are informed that: "With the new agreement management have gained the management prerogative - and thus the duty – to organize the working time of the teachers" (Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration, 2013, p.1 – our translation). Later readers are informed that: "Time registration is a necessary instrument which can provide inputs to a dialogue between teacher and manager about the organization, execution and prioritizing of tasks" (Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration, 2013 p.1 – our translation). In a later publication this managerial rationale is stated even clearer:

"All managers in the state have as their task to ensure that their institutions are fulfilling their core tasks in an efficient way and create results to the benefits of the public. To fulfil this task management needs to establish the best possible foundation for managing and prioritizing. The management must make its decision on an enlightened basis. Time registration is part of the management information that you as a manager of an upper secondary school can use for the best possible management of the school" (Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration, 2015 p.1 – our translation).

And:

“Time registration is one of the instruments which management can use in a systematic way to ensure that the working time of the teachers is used in accordance with the strategy of the school – to the benefits of students. When time registration is used as a managerial tool, it provides a basis for making the following judgements: Which teachers solve which tasks most efficiently? Are the tasks distributed in an appropriate way or can the tasks be divided in another and more beneficial way, e.g., by having teachers share their teaching materials to a larger extent? Is the strategy of the school reflected in the way the time of the individual teachers is used or is a link between the goals of management and the teacher’s workday missing? Are the tasks distributed and prioritized in the best possible accordance with identified potentials for improvement” (Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration, 2015 p.1– our translation).

Given the above rationales and its status as a managerial instrument, one should think that time registration would serve as a prime example of something which would be promoted and enforced as a management rule. However, this was not the case. Some schools chose to return to something like the old work time agreement and didn’t do much to introduce time registration practices. Some schools made time registration voluntary, and some made it mandatory (Danish National Union of Upper Secondary School, 2016). This illustrates that management rules can take several forms. E.g. in the form of suggestions or actual demands. Furthermore, the example of time registration illustrates that not all rules that are enforced by management originate from management alone. As mentioned earlier time registration was also championed by the union. This advocacy was mainly based on a view of time registration as a tool to document and control the number of working hours put in on an individual and collective level (Danish National Union of Upper Secondary School, 2015). Finally, the example of time registration also illustrates that a variety of local interpretations and practices can be associated with a given instrument. According to several teachers in some schools, time registration was not used as a tool for dialogue or a tool for local school leaders to determine what would be a reasonable workload for each teacher, but only promoted as a tool for the teachers’ self-management (Pedersen & Borchmann, 2021). As one teacher put it:

“What you are told is that you shouldn’t register your time for their sake but register as a tool for self-management. And regularly it happens that colleagues with overtime are told that you cannot register your way into overtime. That has become a classic motto. This means that the motivation to use time registration isn’t high because the management won’t use it as a management tool and because it is difficult to get your overwork acknowledged, right?” (Pedersen & Borchmann, 2021, p. 78– our translation).

Among the teachers, the new practice of time registration was received in different ways as some accepted and some ignored or opposed this new practice. In the present study, we look closer at the different stances towards the use of time registration, and the arguments put forward in support of these stances. Finally, the arguments put forward in support of a negative or ambivalent stance are linked to two different norm-creating contexts and sets of rules which can be viewed as the contexts and sets of rules that legitimize resistance.

3 Method

3.1 Participants

The data used in the present study originate from an occupational health psychology study of strains and coping strategies in the work of the general upper secondary school teachers (Pedersen & Borchmann, 2021). The data in that study were obtained from semi-structured qualitative interviews with 38 upper secondary school teachers. 23 participants were female and 15 were male. 7 worked as shop stewards and 31 as common teachers. The interviews were conducted in two stages. The first stage was a pilot stage in which the interview themes were tested and refined. This stage included 10 interviews with teachers from 4 different schools. This stage took place in November and December 2019. Of the 10 interviews 1 interview was discarded due to poor sound quality. The second stage took place in the spring of 2020 and included 28 interviews with teachers from 5 different schools. Participants were recruited by contacting the shop steward on a series of schools. Subsequently, the shop steward recruited local teachers. In total 13 schools were approached and 9 ended up participating. The schools selected were chosen based on geographical location. No special consideration was given to age, sex, seniority, or subjects taught in the local recruitment of teachers.

3.2 Measures

Due to its nature as an occupational health psychology study the overall themes which were made subject of discussion in the interview were: 1) *strain related to job insecurity and ways of coping with insecurity*, 2) *strain associated with work intensification and ways of coping with work intensification*, 3) *strain associated with a blurred work-life balance and ways of coping with a blurred work-life balance*, 4) *strain associated with role-conflicts and ways of coping with role conflict*, 5) *strain associated with illegitimate tasks and practices and ways of coping with illegitimate tasks and practices*, 6) *factors that limited autonomy and control*, and 7) *factors that limited social support and local union work* (Pedersen & Borchmann, 2021, p. 11). The data used in the present study mainly originate from discussions associated with theme 2, 3, 4 and 5.

3.3 Procedure

Before every interview each interviewee was sent information which informed about the study as such and the specific themes of the interview. In addition, every interviewee was assured of confidentiality and anonymity and informed about where to seek additional information if such were needed. Every interview started out by securing consent to the recording of the interview. The ten interviews conducted in the first stage took place as face-to-face interactions. In the second stage, seven interviews took place as face-to-face interactions while the remaining 21 interviews used Teams or other online meeting platforms due to the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic. In most of the interviews two interviewers participated in the interview.

3.4 Analysis

In the original study interview data were analyzed using directed qualitative content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The basic units of analysis were the major themes outlined above and categories and sub-categories were derived from data in conjunction with the overall themes. In the present study, all interview parts mentioning time registration practices were analysed using conventional qualitative content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). The specific focus of the analysis was a) *attitude towards time registration*, b) *arguments put forward in support of a positive stance*, and c) *arguments put forward in support of an ambivalent or negative stance*. The reason that we chose directed qualitative content analysis in the original study is that strains and coping-strategies are already well theorized and researched topics within the field of occupational health psychology, which means that analysis of work specific articulations of strains and strategies work can benefit from being informed by preestablished categories. The reason that we chose a conventional approach to qualitative content analysis in our analysis of the arguments put forward in stances toward time registration is that the arguments and themes identified were derived primarily from the empiric material itself and not from prior theorizing.

4 Results

Attitudes towards the use of time registration practices were discussed in 31 of the 38 interviews. The use of time registration emerged as a discussion theme in relation to discussions of ways of coping with work intensification, a blurred work-life balance and role conflict and strain associated with illegitimate tasks and practices. All quotes used in the following sections are translated from Danish to English.

4.1 Attitudes towards time registration

Attitudes towards the use of time registration practices can be classified as either positive, negative, or ambivalent. A positive attitude towards the use of time registration practices was seen among most shop stewards as well as a handful of teachers (see table 1). A positive attitude was displayed in statements like:

“I always ask my members to register their time. It might be a poor bulwark (against overtime), but it is the only one we have got” (Shop steward).

And:

“Time registration was introduced and there was a lot of resistance against it, but I was happy that it came” (Shop steward).

The main part of the teachers displayed a negative or an ambivalent attitude towards the use of time registration practices which also lead to a refusal of using time registration (see table 1). These attitudes were displayed in statements like:

“I haven’t used it and I won’t use it” (Teacher).

“I don’t use time registration” (Teacher).

“I have stopped using it. I can’t be bothered anymore” (Teacher).

“Time registration is a tool which I hate, but of course I use it because it allows for control, and tells me when to stop” (Teacher)

Table 1: Stances towards time registration

	Frequency	Percent
Teachers with a positive stance	7	22,6%
Teachers with an ambivalent or negative stance	17	54,8%
Shop stewards with a positive stance	5	16,1%
Shop stewards with an ambivalent or negative stance	2	6,5%
Total	31	100.00%

The arguments (or worries) put forward in support of the different stances are examined in the following paragraphs.

4.2 Arguments put forward in support of a positive stance

The positive attitude towards the use of time registration practices found among shop stewards was founded in the argument also put forward by the union. This argument stated that time registration was the only possible tool to document the amount of work time associated with the new task portfolios. This argument is visible in statements like:

“I always ask my members to register their time. It might be a poor bulwark (against overtime), but it is the only one we have got. But in the real world, I guess 90 percent of my colleagues don’t use time registration. When they get extra work assignments, they just work faster” (Shop steward).

Or:

“Sometimes it can be difficult to make everyone register their time, but it is the only way we can say: ‘Well, the planning estimates can’t be any good, because we are all using more time’” (Shop steward).

However, some shop stewards do also note that the process of questioning planning numbers can be hard, since management tend to individualize problems with overtime, modelling this as the result of poor planning or poor task execution.

The positive attitude towards the use of time registration practices found among common teachers is either founded in an argument according to which time registration helps the teacher to adjust the amount of working time spent or an argument according to which time registration helps relieve feelings of guilt. The first argument is displayed in statements like:

“I use time registration. It helps me stay at those 42 hours a week, and it helps me having control” (Teacher).

“Today, I’m less prepared for my teaching than I was 10 years ago. And it cannot be any different if I don’t want to work 100 hours a week, and of course I will not do that. It is also an act of prioritizing on my behalf. We use time registration, and I keep an eye on my time registration. I take care that I do not work too much or too little, and this is to protect myself” (Teacher).

and:

“The job of teaching at an upper secondary school... well you can always do more. You can always prepare more, you can always tutor the students more, you can always develop your courses. There is no limit to what you can do. So, you must restrict yourself and I think that I’m working at being better at this, at saying now is enough, now I will shut down the computer, and then I won’t work any longer today. And then I must remind myself that it is okay. That it is okay to shut down after 30 hours in some weeks if I have been busy in other weeks. I use time registration as a tool to remind myself. If I worked 70 hours there and 70 hours there, then I only have to work 30 hours another time.” (Teacher).

The second argument is displayed in statements such as:

“Earlier I have struggled with keeping a work-life balance, but time registration helps me. Many don’t like it, but it gives me direction to be able to say to myself; if I can’t make it, it is not because I have not spent the time, it is because there are too many tasks” (Teacher).

“Earlier I felt guilty if I came in at 10. Or if I had done nothing during the students’ winter vacation. Then I felt I had to work lots of Saturdays and Sundays to catch up. This is overcompensation and it is also inefficient to have work routines where you are watching television, and then do some work. This has become better with registration” (Teacher).

And:

“I use time registration. I do this for my own sake. Because I need to remember not to feel guilty if I work less in some weeks” (Teacher).

4.3 Arguments put forward in support of an ambivalent or negative stance

The arguments put forward in support of an ambivalent or negative stance can be clustered in five different arguments. The five arguments are 1) *Time registration is a problematic practice because it is incompatible with a professional identity*, 2) *Time registration is pointless because it cannot be used to control one’s effort because a limitation of working time is incompatible with the actual work demands*, 3) *Time registration is a dysfunctional practice that does not fulfil its intended political goals*, 4) *Time registration is a problematic practice because it can foster competitive behaviour and increased workloads* and 5) *Time registration is a problematic practice because it is difficult to determine when you are working and when you are not working*.

4.3.1 Time registration is a problematic practice because it is incompatible with a professional work identity and vocation

A first argument for resisting or feeling ambivalent about the use of time registration is that time registration is problematic because it is incompatible with a professional work identity and vocational calling. This argument is displayed in statements such as:

“It is not that I would fully reject the usefulness of time registration. I just think something has changed. [Using time registration would represent] A slide into a wage labour identity from a professional vocation” (Teacher).

“So, this practice of saying: Now I have worked from this time to this time, this would be a completely different way of perceiving my work relation” (Teacher).

“The union recommends that we use time registration, but I’m not good at it. I try for a couple of months every year, but then I give up and can’t be bothered. I will try again next year, because someone became grumpy and thought it was disloyal behaviour towards my colleagues, so that is why I want to try again. But I think it is a strange practice in some ways. It might damage ... maybe it could be good for me ...well it restricts my feeling of freedom” (Teacher).

“Time registration is not something you absolutely have to do. But I thought it would benefit my own administration and my time consumption, too. I thought that I would become more professional and

emotionally settled on when to stop working if I did it. But in my experience the opposite happened. I became frustrated by discovering how much time I used. And so now I believe that if I stop registering my time, then I will forget that I'm paid to be a teacher, and then it is just how my day is, and this is what I do, and that is how my life is" (Teacher).

And:

[If I don't register my time] "The fact that I am employed and must solve a task, which I then solve, disappears. Also, that it is work which is paid. This fact becomes a detail of minor importance or rather it becomes something which just takes place on the side. This self-deception works for me. The fancy that what I do is not work, it is just something that I do, and someone sends me some money every month. To be sure, I won't recommend this as an example to be followed – I can just see that this is how I feel – and I am not alone in feeling this" (Teacher).

All the above quotes emphasise that the use of time registration is believed to threaten a professional identity or work relation. As can be seen from the last two quotes, actively ignoring time registration is believed to actively aid a suppression of the wage labour aspects of the work as well as the fact that more work hours are put in than you are paid for.

4.3.2 Time registration is pointless because it cannot be used to control one's effort because a limitation of working time is incompatible with the actual working demands

Another argument for resisting or feeling ambivalent about the use of time registration is that time registration is pointless because it cannot be used to control one's effort because a limitation of working time is incompatible with the actual working demands. These demands stem from the perceived need to teach students in a "proper" or professional way: As one teacher puts it:

"We have this 'wonderful' little device called time registration that really opens your eyes for the real world, especially if you.... We have this app that we can use to see how much overtime you put in, and I don't think that I will be able to.... We don't get to take time off, we can't. You can't tell your class: 'I'm sorry today there is no teaching. We can't do that. So, I use more time on the different tasks. This has to do with... If you work with students, who you know are standing there, it is harder to say I'm sorry, but this work sheet was only half finished" (Teacher).

It should be noted that this extra time spent is not solely founded in professional regards, but also concerns the need of protecting oneself from the dreaded task of teaching unprepared. As one teacher puts it:

"I'm not staying within my prescribed number of hours. It is not possible. Then I would have to meet my classes unprepared. I could do that, but it is not... Then the stress level starts to rise. It is not a pleasant experience at all" (Teacher).

4.2.3 Time registration is a dysfunctional practice that does not fulfil its intended political goals

A third argument for resisting or feeling ambivalent about the use of time registration is that time registration is a dysfunctional practice, that does not fulfil its intended political goals. These goals are the individual or collective balancing of tasks with the agreed work time or compensation for overwork. The lack of fulfilment of individual goals is displayed in statements such as:

"I'm not using it. The reason for this is that I have used it before, and when I showed management that the tasks I was given made me work overtime, they just looked at me and said: time registration is for your own sake, so your registrations are not for us. So, I can't be bothered. It also takes time to do those registrations" (Teacher).

"Time registration makes no sense, for me, that is. If something is too stupid, I become autonomous and don't do it. And no one objects, so we work it out, we come to an agreement this way. But you could say the only one whose interests are damaged is me. There is no one... Management doesn't care if I use time registration as long as I solve all my tasks. I can't document that I work 60 hours a week, so

there is no point – I don't know if I work that much – but it has no point. Because I won't get anything from time registration, so it would only be a pointless game" (Teacher).

As can be seen in the two quotes above, for some teachers the classification of time registration as a dysfunctional practice that does not fulfil its intended political goals is founded in personal experiences. These experiences have also resulted in frustration and distancing and a view of compliance to time registration as something that would violate one's dignity.

The lack of fulfilment of collective goals is displayed in statements such as:

"I have stopped using it [time registration]. I can't be bothered anymore. First, it is depressing to witness the enormous amount of time you spend working. Secondly, I will never get paid for the overtime. So, I just view time registration as extra work without any relevance. I know that the union thinks we must do it to document our work efforts, but it makes no sense, so I have just stopped doing it. Why should I spend time on this? There is no chance that this registration can be used for anything. If only they would give a little more time. But this I don't experience. You know, the tasks that are here are here, and even though we become fewer and fewer teachers, they must be solved" (Teacher).

And:

"I've stopped using time registration because I discovered that I was...It was not. The point of using time registration from a union perspective is to limit how much work they can ask us to do, but the way the organization of managers and principals are putting it forward is as a tool for self-administration and self-management. And I have concluded - and at my school, it is only a tool to self-management, because no one, there is no one...no bosses look at these registrations. It doesn't happen" (Teacher).

As can be seen in the last two quotes the teachers that legitimize their negative view on time registration in the argument stating that time registration is a dysfunctional practice that does not fulfil its intended political goals are fully aware of the union's stance on time registration.

4.2.4 *Time registration is a problematic practice because it can foster competitive behaviour and increased work loads*

The fourth argument for feeling ambivalent towards time registration is based in a series of worries associated with the use of time registration. These worries concern among other things the potential of time registration practices to make people report fewer hours than they have used to appear more productive or to avoid getting fired:

"Something that worried us regarding time registration was how it was used. If you worked fast, wouldn't you get fired or...? Or would you get punished for working fast. Get more classes. So, we have discussed it a lot" (Shop steward).

4.2.5 *Time registration is a problematic practice because it is difficult to determine when you are working and when you are not working*

Finally, the argument that time registration is a problematic practice because it is difficult to determine when you are working and when you are not working, is articulated by several teachers. The argument is displayed in statements such as:

"I think it is hard to determine when you are doing something work-related. In some ways I feel my brain is always working. If I experience something and think: Oh, this could be great to use in my teaching, then I will go ahead with this idea. And when I read the newspaper, it is something that I bring straight to my teaching" (Teacher).

"When I am writing mails at home, should I register this as work? Things became fluffy to me. I didn't think time registration made any sense. So now I have settled on a different solution. I think that I work what I am supposed to work. To be sure, I do not work less than I should, but I'm not wildly exceeding my hours either. I'm better at coping this way. But in some ways, I wish that I had the energy to register, and that it wasn't just an extra stressor, but when you are running around all day when are you

supposed to sit down and consider when did I start to solve this particular task? I think the character of our work is special” (Teacher).

However, for most teachers this argument is put forward in conjunction with the other arguments.

5 Discussion

In our discussion of the results, we will start out with a discussion of the possible causes to the different attitudes towards time registration found among the teachers, and then continue to a discussion of the possible influence of different norm creating contexts on the formation of arguments for the different attitudes. The different stances can in some instances be due to the different practices associated with time registration found at the different schools. As an example, a uniformly negative stance towards time registration is found at a school that chose to give up on time registration and return to working time agreement (See School A in table 2 below). However, differences among teachers at the same school are also clearly visible (See School B – G in table 2 below).

Table 2: Stances towards time registration at the individual schools

School	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Number of teachers and shop stewards with 0 a positive stance towards time registration		3	1	1	3	2	2
Number of teachers and shop stewards with 4 an ambivalent or negative stance towards time registration		3	3	3	3	2	1

The consistent pattern showing differences in the teachers’ stances towards time registration at six of the seven schools clearly indicates that other causes than the different practices associated with time registration found at the different schools must be at work. In the following, we suggest that a possible cause to the different attitudes could be differences in the way individual teachers are influenced by different norm creating contexts.

When examined closer the five arguments for an ambivalent or negative attitude towards time registration can be divided into three different subgroups consisting of arguments based on professional concerns (argument 1 and 2), arguments based on political concerns (argument 3 and 4), and arguments based on practical concerns (argument 5). The labels political and professional concerns also make the possible influences of different norm creating contexts evident. The influence of professional socialization is evident in a) the appeals to professional identity and the worries that this identity cannot be upheld if time registration is used, and b) the evaluation of time registration as a problematic tool, because its possible outcome (the reduction of time put in) conflicts with a professional obligation to meet the students’ needs and expectations to the outmost of your capabilities. The influence of the worker collective as a possible norm creating context can be traced both in the arguments for a positive stance towards time registration, and in the political concerns that support a negative stance. This is because the arguments which are grouped under the heading political concerns are clearly concerned with the possible outcomes of managerial actions for both the individual teacher and the collective group of teachers. In the present case, this concerns the ability of time registration to regulate the work effort (or the monetary rewards) both on an individual and a collective level. As can be seen in the worries presented by several of the teachers, the teachers are also confronted with an additional dilemma which departs from the fact that the use of time registration is also championed by the union and union representatives. Inspired by Karlsson we can ask the question how can resistance towards managerial rules be legitimized when the rule or practice you oppose is sanctioned by representatives of you yourself and your co-workers? There seem to be several different answers which point to other factors than just professional socialization and professional rules. For some, the ambivalence and active rule breaking gets its legitimacy from having discovered some possible and unforeseen side effects of time registration: the acceleration of competition which makes teachers report fewer hours than they spent. For others, it is the twisting of the promised uses of time registration that is displayed by management that makes rule breaking legitimate. This finding in many ways overlaps with findings from the study of the possible triggers of wildcat strikes. As an example, Attleton (Attleton, 1973) points to rule breaking from management as one of the possible triggers of such strikes. Finally, it seems possible to argue that the fifth argument *time registration is a problematic practice because it is difficult to determine when you are working and when you are not working* could also be labelled as a professional concern or even a political concern. The argument for classifying it as a professional concern would emphasise the origin of the inability to distinguish work from non-work in the professional character of the work, e.g. knowledge

gathering with the aim of knowledge sharing. The argument for classifying it as a political concern would emphasise the unjust character of imposing an impossible demand on the work force.

6 Conclusion

Resisting attempts at organizational socialization can be viewed as a kind of organizational misbehaviour which, in turn, can be seen as a conscious rule breaking activity. Rule breaking can be understood as an activity which is legitimized by drawing on other sets of rules. Typically, this means that management rules can be contested and overruled by other sets of rules. Such sets of rules can be service rules, collective rules, and professional rules (Karlsson, 2011). In our study the ambivalence and resistance towards the use of time registration is found to be based mainly on professional and political concerns. Professional concerns mainly concern the need to protect a professional identity and self-esteem and the need to protect the need of clients (students) and can be linked to the norms and set of rules acquired through professional socialization. The political concerns concern the inadequacy of time registration as a means to regulate effort (or rewards) both on an individual and a collective level, and the potential of time registration practices to make people report fewer hours than they have used in an attempt to appear more productive. These concerns can be linked to the norms and sets of rules acquired by the formal and informal interactions between co-workers (Karlsson, 2012). A critical attitude towards the use of time registration based on political concerns is somewhat complicated by the fact that the use of time registration is also championed by unions and union representatives. However, both the consideration of possible negative side effects unforeseen by unions and the experience of an active rule-twisting from management, can make rule breaking legitimate even if the rules that are being broken are also championed by unions.

7 Contributions and Limitations

With the present study we hope to have contributed to a deeper understanding of 1) the complex nature and possible forms of the phenomenon which we label managerial attempts at organizational socialization, 2) the possible origins of resistance towards managerial attempts at organizational socialization in a variety of different norm- and rule creating contexts, 3) some of the possible conditions which can complicate the breaking of managerial rules, and 4) some of the lines of reasoning which can help overcome these complications. However, due to its nature as a small and exploratory study a note on the limitation of the study must be made. This limitation concerns the external validity and representativity of the study.

References

- Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration/Moderniseringsstyrelsen (2013) Etablering af tidsregistrering.
- Agency for the Modernisation of Public Administration/Moderniseringsstyrelsen (2015) Tidsregistrering på gymnasier – Tidsregistrering som et styringsværktøj. ISBN-nr. 87-7956-461-5
- Ackroyd, S. and P. Thomson (1999) *Organizational Misbehaviour*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Ackroyd, S. and P. Thompson (2016) *Unruly Subjects: Misbehaviour in the Workplace*. Handbook of the Sociology of Work and Employment, edited by S. Edgell, H. Gottfried and E. Granter (2016), London: Sage Publications.
- Alvesson M, Ashcraft KL, Thomas R. 2008. Identity matters: reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organization studies. *Organization* 15(1):5–28
- Antonacopoulou, E. P. & W. H. Güttel. (2010) Staff induction practices and organizational socialization-A review and extension of the debate. *Society and Business Review*, Vol. 5 No. 1, 2010 pp. 22-47
- Atleton, J. B. (1973) Work Group Behaviour and Wildcat Strikes: The causes and functions of industrial civil disobedience. *Ohio State Law Journal* volume 34. 1973 Number 4

- Bauer, T.N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D.M. and Tucker, J.S. (2007), "Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: a meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92, pp. 707-21.
- Chao, G. T. (1988) The socialization process: Building newcomer commitment. In M. London & E. Mone (Eds.), *Career growth and human resource strategies* (pp. 31-47). Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Collinson, D. and Ackroyd, S., (2005) Resistance, misbehaviour, and dissent. In: S. Ackroyd, R. Batt, P. Thompson and P. Tolbert, eds. *The Oxford handbook of work and organisation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 305–326.
- Danish National Union of Upper Secondary School/Gymnasieskolernes Lærerforening (2015) Styr på tiden. <https://www.gl.org/loenogans/arbejdstid/Sider/Styr-paa-tiden.aspx>
- Danish National Union of Upper Secondary School/Gymnasieskolernes Lærerforening (2016) Medlemsundersøgelse 2016
- Feldman, D. C. (1976) A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21, 433-452.
- Goodrich, C. L. (1971) The Frontier of Control: A Study in British Workshop Politics
- Hodson, R. (1995) 'Worker Resistance: An Underdeveloped Concept in the Sociology of Work', *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 79–111
- Hsieh, H. F. & Shannon, S.E. (2005) Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Karlsson, J. Ch. (2012) *Organizational Misbehaviour in the workplace – Narratives of Dignity and Resistance*. London: Palgrave – MacMillan
- Klein, J. H. & A. E. Heuser (2008) The learning of Socialization content: A framework for researching Orientating Practices. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, Volume 27, 279–336
- Lysgaard, S. (1985) *Arbejderkollektivet*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Pedersen, B. T. & Borchmann, T. (2021) *Belastninger og håndteringsstrategier i gymnasielærerarbejde*. SNOW. AAU. ISBN 978-87-972965-0-9
- Saks, A.M. & Gruman, J. A. (2010) Getting newcomers engaged: the role of socialization tactics. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 26 No. 5, 2011 pp. 383-402
- Saks, A.M., Uggerslev, K.L. & N. E. Fassina (2007) Socialization tactics and newcomer adjustment: A meta-analytic review and test of a model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 70 (2007) 413–446
- Thompson, P. (2016) Dissent at work and the resistance debate: departures, directions, and dead ends. *Studies in Political Economy - A Socialist Review*
- Tolofari, S. (2005) New Public Management and Education *Policy Futures in Education*, Volume 3, Number 1, 2005
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. (1979) Toward a theory of organizational socialization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 1, 209-264.
- Woodcock, C. (2017) *Working the Phones*. London: Pluto Press