



Call for Papers

Special Issue

Organizational Working Time Regimes: Managerial, Occupational and Institutional Perspectives on Extreme Work

Special Issue Editors:

Renate Ortlieb, University of Graz, Austria

Georg Schreyögg, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany; University of Graz, Austria

Sara Louise Muhr, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Blagoy Blagoev, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

Submission deadline (full papers): 31 August 2017

Expected date of publication: August 2018

This Special Issue invites empirical and conceptual papers that examine and theorise organizational regimes with excessive working hours: their emergence, evolution, persistence, consequences for employee well-being, including work–life balance, and, in particular, approaches to changing these regimes.

Extra-long working hours have become a salient phenomenon. Often, they are associated with constant availability expected by clients and superiors as well as a poorly predictable, high-paced workflow (e.g. Costas et al., 2016; Hewlett and Luce, 2006; Muhr et al., 2012). While they are particularly prevalent in professional services and other knowledge-intensive firms (e.g. Kärreman and Alvesson, 2009; Kuhn, 2009; Kühn et al., 2016; Perlow, 2012), they may spread over other sectors, too. For a long time accepted as a symbol for loyalty, excellence and commitment to work, more recently such working time regimes have been called into question in the context of work–life/family balance and health issues (e.g. Kreiner et al., 2009; Michel, 2011; Pfeffer, 2010; Ramarjan and Reid, 2013;). As a result, the question of how to change these extreme working time regimes has come to the fore.

In response to this rising critique, many firms have started programmes to redesign work and to alleviate regimes with extreme work (for an overview, see Kossek et al., 2010; Perlow and Kelly, 2014). Yet these programmes did not really work; time regimes have proved particularly resistant to change. Managerial efforts to attenuate long hours patterns often do not bring about the intended results, while established working time regimes largely persist (e.g. Blagoev

and Schreyögg, 2015; Kärreman and Alvesson, 2009; Michel, 2014). For instance, scholars increasingly observe that the traditional “accommodation model” of addressing regimes with excessive working hours through the provision of workplace flexibility programmes (e.g. part-time work, flextime, teleworking, etc.) are likely to fail or fizzle out (e.g. Perlow and Kelly, 2014).

There are various reasons for this surprising persistence: resistance to change, path dependence, fear of marginalisation or negative career consequences (Alvesson, 2000; Bailyn, 2006; Blagoev and Schreyögg, 2015; Perlow and Kelly, 2014; Reid, 2015). Only more recently, management scholars have started to study the drivers behind the emergence and perpetuations of regimes with excessive working hours. In particular, research points to the importance of, among others, organizational control and power (Kärreman and Alvesson, 2009; Michel, 2011), gendered cultural norms (Bailyn, 2006; Williams, 2010), reified occupational identities (Ashcraft, 2013), path dependence (Schreyögg and Sydow, 2011) and the use of advanced communication technologies (Mazmanian et al., 2013; Wajcman, 2014).

This Special Issue aims to extend these lines of inquiry by explicitly examining the organizational, occupational, technological and institutional drivers underlying regimes with excessive working hours in an effort to deepen our knowledge of how to change them. We particularly invite empirical studies and conceptual approaches that look at the emergence, evolution and change of organizational working time regimes. In terms of business sectors, we also welcome work on areas beyond the “classic” extreme work organizations, such as oil rigs, surgeries and IT start-ups. Furthermore, we invite research that compares and contrasts working time regimes from an institutional perspective aiming to explain differences among countries and cultures.

Contributions could focus on one or more of the following questions:

- Which forms of long working hours regimes are applied in different organizations, industries and institutional environments?
- What kind of organizational temporal structures (e.g. boundaries of work vs. non-work), rhythms (e.g. periods of intensive vs. non-intensive work) and orientations (e.g. concerning the past, present, and future) are prevalent in different organizational contexts?
- What are the consequences of existing regimes with long working hours for individuals, organizations and societies (e.g. in terms of work–life conflict, health, gender issues, changing demographics, etc.)?
- How are employees’ bodies entangled in the continuous (re-)production of regimes with extreme work?
- What factors form the gendered nature of long working hours regimes, and what does this mean for approaches to change?
- In which way may a socio-materiality lens provide new insights into the dynamics of working time regimes?
- What dynamics arise when different rhythms of families, organizations, industries and countries meet and/or collide?
- How does law affect organizational working time regimes and changes thereof – and how are legal regulations circumvented?
- What is the impact of organizational control and unobtrusive forms of power on the stability and/or change of working time regimes?

- What is the relation between systemic processes, on the one hand, and individual agency, on the other, in particular when individuals do not conform to and/or resist established extreme working time regimes?
- What models and interventions are most likely to succeed at modifying and/or breaking highly institutionalised regimes with long working hours?
- What kinds of working time regimes – beyond common flexibility programmes – can foster sustainable forms of working and living?
- What contrasting cases do exist (e.g. in Sweden)? And what makes deviation possible in these cases?

Submissions

In order to be considered for publication in the Special Issue, full manuscripts (max. 10,000 words) must be submitted by **31 August 2017**. The manuscripts should be written in English and submitted through <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ghrm>. The submission guidelines of the *German Journal of Human Resource Management* are available through <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/gjh>.

The German Journal of Human Resource Management (GHRM)

The *German Journal of Human Resource Management* (GHRM), formerly *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung* (ZfP), was founded in 1987 and is one of the world's oldest academic journals published in this specialism. From its origins as a forum for research from Austria, Germany and Switzerland, the *German Journal of Human Resource Management* has broadened its reach to the international academic HR community.

Editors of the Special Issue

Renate Ortlieb is Professor of Human Resource Management at the University of Graz, Austria. Her current research interests include migrant/ethnic minority employees and refugees, national working time configurations, gender and diversity, academic careers and job quality of young self-employed people.

Georg Schreyögg is currently Professor of Management and Organization Studies at the School of Business & Economics of Freie Universität Berlin, Germany, and University of Graz, Austria. He has published widely on organization theory, leadership and corporate governance. His recent research has focused on organizational path dependence and organizational capabilities.

Sara Louise Muhr is an Associate Professor at Copenhagen Business School's Department of Organization, Denmark. Her work focuses on questions of identity, gender, diversity and leadership. She is currently engaged in studies of identity in military organizations and intercultural aspects of police work.

Blagoy Blagoev is a post-doctoral scholar at the Department of Management, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany, and Governing Responsible Business Fellow at the Department of Intercultural Communication and Management, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark. His research focuses on working time regimes in management consulting firms, organizational change and persistence as well as time and temporality in organizations.

References

- Alvesson M (2000) Social identity and the problem of loyalty in knowledge-intensive companies. *Journal of Management Studies* 37(8): 1101–1124.
- Ashcraft KL (2013) The glass slipper: “Incorporating” occupational identity in management studies. *Academy of Management Review* 38(1): 6–31.
- Bailyn L (2006) *Breaking the Mold. Redesigning Work for Productive and Satisfying Lives*. 2nd ed. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Blagoev BV and Schreyögg G (2015) Locked-in working time regimes: Exploring barriers to change in a management consulting firm. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2015(1).
- Costas J, Blagoev B and Kärreman D (2016) The arena of the professional body: Sport, autonomy and ambition in professional service firms. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 32(1): 10–19.
- Kärreman D and Alvesson M (2009) Resisting resistance: Counter-resistance, consent and compliance in a consultancy firm. *Human Relations* 62(8): 1115–1144.
- Kossek EE, Lewis S and Hammer LB (2010) Work–life initiatives and organizational change: Overcoming mixed messages to move from the margin to the mainstream. *Human Relations* 63(1), 3–19.
- Kreiner GE, Hollensbe EC and Sheep ML (2009) Balancing borders and bridges: Negotiating the work–home interface via boundary work tactics. *Academy of Management Journal* 52(4): 704–730.
- Kuhn T (2009) Positioning lawyers: Discursive resources, professional ethics and identification. *Organization* 16(5): 681–704.
- Kühn C, Eymann T, Urbach N and Schweizer A (2016) From professionals to entrepreneurs: Human Resources practices as an enabler for fostering corporate entrepreneurship in professional service firms. *German Journal of Human Resource Management* 30(2): 125–154.
- Mazmanian M, Orlikowski WJ and Yates J (2013) The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals. *Organization Science* 24(5): 1337–1357.
- Michel AA (2011) Transcending socialization: A nine-year ethnography of the body’s role in organizational control and knowledge workers’ transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 56(3): 325–368.
- Michel AA (2014) Participation and self-entrapment: A 12-year ethnography of Wall Street participation practices’ diffusion and evolving consequences. *The Sociological Quarterly* 55(3): 514–536.
- Muhr SL, Pedersen M and Alvesson M (2012) Workload, aspiration, and fun: Problems of balancing self-exploitation and self-exploration in work life. In: Holmqvist M and Spicer A (eds) *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* (Vol. 37). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing, pp. 193–220.
- Perlow LA (2012). *Sleeping with Your Smartphone. How to Break the 24/7 Habit and Change the Way You Work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Perlow LA and Kelly EL (2014) Toward a model of work redesign for better work and better life. *Work and Occupations* 41(1): 111–134.
- Pfeffer J (2010) Building sustainable organizations: The human factor. *Academy of Management Perspectives* 24(1): 34–45.
- Ramarajan L and Reid E (2013) Shattering the myth of separate worlds: Negotiating non-work identities at work. *Academy of Management Review* 38(4): 621–644.
- Reid E (2015) Embracing, passing, revealing, and the ideal worker image: How people navigate expected and experienced professional identities. *Organization Science* 26(4): 997–1017.
- Schreyögg G and Sydow J (2011). Organizational path dependence: A process view. *Organization Studies* 32(3): 321–335.
- Wajcman J (2014). *Pressed for Time. The Acceleration of Life in Digital Capitalism*. Chicago, Ill. et al.: University of Chicago Press.
- Williams J (2010) *Reshaping the Work–Family Debate: Why Men and Class Matter*. Cambridge, Mass. et al.: Harvard University Press.