Risk Junctions: Reflexive Modernization and the Hybrid Workspace

van Baalen, P.J.

Publication date
2012

Citation for published version (APA):
van Baalen, P. J. (2012). *Risk Junctions: Reflexive Modernization and the Hybrid Workspace*.
1-18. Paper presented at Organisations as Spaces of Work
Organization Studies, Rhodos, Greece.

Risk Junctions:
Reflexive Modernization and the Hybrid Workspace

Peter van Baalen
Department of Decision and Information Sciences
Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam
April 2012

1. Introduction

Today's workplace is invaded by multiple information and communication technologies (ICTs) and new work practices in order to support organizations to become agile, efficient, sustainable and even inspiring. Organizations set up new ways of working-programs that include new work practices like telework, mobile work, open and flexible workplaces, outsourcing- and offshoring practices, virtual teams, unified collaboration and communication environments, social media- and cloud computing, and flexible work arrangements. All these new work practices and new technologies are pointing to a future of work systems that deviate fundamentally from our past industrial work systems. A popular and recurring claim of most new ways of working-programs is that people can work at 'any place', at 'any time':

> "Well before the year 2000 dawns the city office worker won't have to get up every morning to take the polluting commuter trail. He could be doing his job just as effectively from his living room at home. . . ."(quote in Albertson, 1977: 32)

> "Welcome to the 2020 workplace! If you think this scenario is farfetched, think again. In the year 2020, our office will be everywhere; our team members will live halfway around the world. How, where when, and for whom we work will be up to us – as long as we produce results." (Meisters and Williyerd, 2010: 15)

The 'any time, any place'-philosophy is an attempt to liberate modern work organizations from the temporal regularities, some say even rigidities, and fixed work locations in order to make them agile and flexible. For the individual employee 'any place, any time' primarily means autonomy to decide where to work, when to work and how to work. The underlying assumption is that work is conceived as a series of context-free activities that can be carried out at any place and at any time. 'Any time, any place' seems to be an (utopian) end-state situation resulting from the long march of the liberation (modernization) of work and the workers from structures of convention.

To question the underlying assumption of the 'any time, any place'-philosophy is relevant as US and European organizations are increasingly adopting distributed and remote working practices over the last two decades. Within new ways of working-programs telework has received the most attention in academic research and business practice. Estimations indicate that in the United States and the European Union around twelve percent of all employees telework to some extent (James 2004; WorldatWork 2009), and this number is expected to grow to nearly twenty percent by 2016 (Forrester Research 2009).

In spite of this increased academic attention there are concerns about a lack of theoretical foundations for studying telework (Bailey and Kurland, 2002; Allen et al., 2003). However this concern is not confined to telework but to work in general. Beck (2000) argues that work has become so omnipotent that there is really no (theoretical) concept that opposed to it. A society without work cannot survive as it lacks a system that produces goods and services that are valued by this society. Theories of work emanate from industrial work regimes and separate *paid work in employment* relations from other activities. Recently, some researchers have called for a new sociology of work (Pettinger et al, 2005) arguing that the boundaries of the domains of work are permeable and blurring, that work is embedded in all kinds of social relations, that different forms of work are interconnected with different levels of the social structure, and that the relationship between pay and wages and work cannot be taken for granted anymore. In short, "work is not assumed to be a

discrete activity carried out in exchange for remuneration in institutions but is conceptualized as being embedded in other domains and entangled in other sorts of social relations" (Parry et al, 2005: 4). In similar vein, organizational theorists are urging scholars to bring work back into the study of organizations (Barley and Kunda, 2001; Sinha and Van de Ven, 2005). They argue that our images of work need to be updated to understand the impact of the rise of globalizing, knowledge-intensive organizations, new information technologies, and the rise of post-industrial organizational forms.

In this, largely, conceptual paper I will use the theory of reflexive modernization as a theoretical lens to discuss the transformation of work and in particular telework. Although telework is not a brand new work practice, the first telework programs were initiated in the 1970s, it is still pioneering in our current conceptions of work.

The theory of reflexive modernization is not an organizational theory but it helps to understand and explain changes in some crucial dimensions of work like time, place, technology, trust, and control. I will pay particular attention to different types of risks that are associated with the implementation of telework. This is not to deny or neglect that there are many benefits to both the organization and the individual employee of telework programs. However, I will argue that the reflexive modernization of work, by introducing telework and other distributed and remote working programs, result in what Halford (2005) has called *hybrid workspaces*, which are characterized by high levels of uncertainty and different types of risks. I will call those workspaces *risk junctions*.

2. Material and Symbolic dimensions of Work

Defining work is not an easy task. It is hard to find an invariable definition that covers all types of work, for all times, and for all cultures. Lask and Urry (1993) define work as the "human activity which transforms matter and energy, and which uses information with the ultimate aim of providing means of needs satisfaction". According to Grint (1998) work is a socially constructed phenomenon and the meanings of work are contingently present and permanently fragile. However, as Grint (1998) argues, the meanings are delimited by the cultural forms in which work is practiced. The two definitions emphasize two different dimensions of work, the *material* and the *symbolic* dimension, which are derived from the neo-institutional theory of Friedland and Alford (1991). The material dimension can be defined as "(supraorganizational) patterns of human activity by which individuals and organizations produce and reproduce their material substance and organize time and space". At the same time, institutions are symbolic systems, ways of ordering reality, and thereby rendering the experience of time and space (Friedland and Alford, 1991: 243). The authors further argue that three levels can be distinguished: individuals competing and negotiating, organizations in conflict and coordination, and institutions in contradiction and interdependency. These levels are mutually interdependent ("nested'), in that organization and institutions specify progressively higher levels of constraint and opportunity for individual action. Friedland and Alford (1991) also argue that these different levels differ with respect to temporal frames (dureés) and spatial reach.

In this paper I adhere to Vallas' minimal and abstract definition who defines work as "any expenditure of human effort aimed at producing a socially valued good or service" (2012: 3). In this definition both the material and symbolic dimension of work are represented. Explicit reference is made to the means-ends relationship of work activities (material dimension). Moreover it emphasizes the social valuation (time-place experience) of the things that are produced by human effort (symbolic dimension. Social valuation, then, should be interpreted as the prevalence of a discourse on work that defines the boundaries of work in a society. This social valuation has been created out of competing discourses on work over time (Granter, 2009). Work, as it was viewed in

our Western, industrial society, was defined in the discourse of economics and economic rationality which means that activities are carried out for wage or, *paid work* (Gortz, 1982). It contrasts the pre-industrial work regime where work is embedded in familial, clan and communal interpersonal relations, its lacks a monetary exchange value (Granter, 2009).

The material dimension of telework does not fundamentally differ from other types of work (i.e. human effort to produce a good or a service). The symbolic dimension (time-place experience), however, transforms over time as a result of competing discourses on work.

Haddon and Brynin (2005) distinguish four key elements in telework: time, place, technology, and work arrangement. I will use this distinction to structure my brief discussion on the theory of reflexive modernization. Work arrangement refers to the contractual relationship between employee and employer. Instead of this I will use the concept of trust-control nexus (I will explain in the next section).

3. Theory of Reflexive Modernization

The reflexive modernization theory (RMT) is a social theory on the modernization process and is most fervently propagated by Giddens, Beck, and Lash. The authors argue that the industrial society is being dissolved and replaced by a new, *reflexive modernity*. Large, globalizing and pervasive developments are contributing to the dissolution of the industrial society. The central premise of RMT is that modern society is transforming into a new, *second modernity* which is characterized by a high level of uncertainty, unintended consequences and risks. These unintended consequences and risks emanate from the self-referential, non-linear, reflexive nature of modernization, "modernization is becoming its own theme" (Beck, 1992: 19).

In his books *Risk Society* and *The Brave New World* of Work Beck provides a critical and provocative analysis of the modern society of work. To Beck (1992) individualization and standardization run as core processes through the rise of modern institutions and organizations. Individualization is split into three dimensions: 1) *liberating dimension*, removal of from historically prescribed social forms and commitments (disembedding); 2) *disenchantment dimension*: the loss of traditional security with respect to practical knowledge; 3) *reintegration dimension*: new type of social commitment (re-embedding). As Beck (1992) points out, an essential characteristic of individualization is the lack of compensation by any *conscience collective* in the cultural sphere and hence the individual becomes the reproduction unit of the social in the life world. The process of individualization is accompanied with a process of standardization, which applies to all symbolic and material aspects of life (money, market, law, education, labor market etc.). Through this twin process of individualization and standardization the individual is confronted with the paradox of institutionally dependent control structures of individual situations (Beck, 1992). One of the most important implications of this novel situation is that is the individualization of risks that are produced by institutions and society (Beck, 1992):

> *"People's lives are being broken-down into separate functional spheres making them only partly integrated into society through its institutions as students, voters, taxpayers, car drivers etc. They are therefore dependent on those institutions that facilitate these interactions (universities, taxation office, government agencies etc.). There is a paradox here in that people's lives are differentiated and at the same time standardized by the legalities and norms set by society's institutions. So, it may be argued that individualization results in people living non-identical lives that are mediated through institutions" (Pick, 2004: 105).*

With respect to work, we are, according to Beck, standing at the beginning of a counter-industrial rationalization process of the employment system, which was based on a high degree of standardization of the labor contract, the place of work, and the working hours (Beck, 1992). This highly standardized system is becoming subject to temporal and spatial flexibilization (*de-standardization*), which means that the boundaries between work and non-work are becoming fluid (Beck, 1992). Whereas the industrial work regimes brought about the standardization of work, new, flexible work regimes involves the individualization of work (Beck, 2000). He sees a growing multiplicity of employment arrangements at the, individual, corporate, and institutional level and concludes that modern, flexible work regimes have become *risk regimes*.

The most important characteristic of reflexive modernization is that the boundaries between social spheres are multiplied (Beck et al., 2003). Boundaries are no longer given but have become choices. Moreover, there is a multiplication of plausible ways in which boundaries can be drawn.

RMT is much debated and criticized for its conceptual imprecision and confusion in the discipline of sociology (see e.g. Alexander, 1996). However the basic premise of RMT and some theoretical notions on the four key elements of telework (time, place, technology, and trust-and control) are relevant to understand and discuss current telework practices.

4. Reflexive modernization theory: four key elements of work

Beck's interpretation of reflexive modernization converges to a large extent with Giddens' grand social theory. Giddens is theoretically more specific on time, place, technology, and trust and control. I discuss these key elements rather schematically.

4.1 Time-Space-Distanciation

In Giddens' view modernization is primarily characterized by the dismebedding, 'lifting out', of social relations from local contexts of interaction   and reorganizing social relations across indefinite time-space distances (1990). This is what he calls *time-space distanciation*. Time and space are 'emptied out' and have become abstract categories without concrete meanings. In pre-modern cultures time and place were indissolubly connected: "when" was almost universally either connected with "where" or identified by regular natural occurrences" (Giddens, 1990, edition 2000: 17). Time and place are tied together in the "situatedness of place (Giddens, 1990: 16, see Tietze and Musson, 2002: 318). According to Giddens (1990) the invention of the mechanical clock and its diffusion to all spheres of life were essential for the separation of time from space, as the clock expressed the "uniform dimension of empty time". The emptying of time served as a precondition for the emptying of space, because it can be understood as the basis for coordination and control across space. Giddens (1990) further distinguishes place from space, whereas place refers to the physical settings of social activities and space to the place that has been emptied out of concrete meaning. The concrete implication here is that by emptying out time and place they have become interchangeable; they lost their 'situatedness' and have become *space.*

4.2 Technology as a disembedding mechanism

According to Giddens, there are two *disembedding mechanisms* that are intrinsically involved in the rise of modern institutions: *symbolic tokens* and *expert systems*. Symbolic tokens are media of interchange, for example money, which can be passed around without specific meaning to

individuals or groups. Money does not have an intrinsic value but is understood as an empty medium that expresses the value of a good or a service in an exchange across time and space. More important for this paper is the role of expert systems which refer to the systems of technical accomplishments (like information and communication technologies) and professional expertise that organize large areas of the material and social environment in which we live today (Giddens, 1990). Expert systems are disembedding mechanisms because they remove social relations immediacies of context and are 'stretching' coordination and control of social systems over time and space. The internet is of course the most obvious example. Beck et al. view it as a "de-spatialized means of societal inclusion" (2003: 25). This stretching of coordination and control across time and space are intricately associated with unintended consequences, hazards and risks. Unintended consequences may arise as there is no amount of accumulated knowledge about social life that encompasses all circumstances (Giddens, 1990).

4.3 The Trust-Control Nexus

According to Giddens trust is related to absence in time and in space. There is no 'situatedness' to which can be referred to. The prime condition for trust is the lack of full information (Giddens, 1990). When there is full information, no trust is needed. Trust and risk intertwine, in the sense that trust reduces or minimizes the fear of risks. Giddens makes a distinction between trust in social relations and in expert systems. Bijlsma-Frankema and Costa (2005) explain how trust and control are related. Formal control relies on codified information and specification which implies that exploitation of value can specified ex ante. Controlling then means that transactions and behavior, can be monitored to determine if actors deviate from the rules agreed upon (Bijlsma-Frankema and Costa 2005). In the case of intangible products and complex and dynamic processes codification and abstraction of information are very costly and mostly impossible (Boisot, 1998). In these low-codification situations, trust-based mechanisms are better fitted to deal with valuable, intangible resources. Bijlsma-Frankema and Costa (2005) distinguish two different theoretical perspectives on the trust-control relationships. In the substitution perspective trust and control are inversely related, that is, more formal control results in less trust and vice versa. In the complementary perspective trust and control are considered to be mutually reinforcing. Formal control mechanisms may increase trust by providing people with objective rules and measures on which they can rely.

5. Synchronizing and Resynchronizing Time Regimes

According to Giddens time-space distanciation is featuring the reflexive modernization process. The emptying of time is preconditioning the emptying of place. Time istherefore viewed as an ordering device to structure work regimes. In the course of the modernization process three *epitomes of work regimes* can be distinguished: the domestic work regime, the bureaucratic-hierarchical work regime, and flexible work regime. I discuss briefly the changes in time regimes in the three work regimes.

5.1Multiple Domestic Time Regimes

The centrality of time in de process of the rise of modern organization is most explicitly expressed by Mumford in his seminal book *Technics and Civilization*: "The clock, not the steam engine, is the key machine of the modern industrial age" (1934, ed. 1963: 14). Mumford points out that the clock dissociated time from human events and that it helped to create the believe in an independent world of mathematically measurable events (1934). In the clock-time perspective time came to be viewed as homogenous: an objective, linear, measurable, and infinite divisible quantity (Hassard, 1990).

Lackoff and Johnson (1980) (see Hassard, 1990) point out how time has come to be associated with three dominant economic metaphors: time as money; time as a limited resource, and time as a valuable commodity. During the rise of industrial capitalism time and money became increasingly interchangeable commodities (time = money). Time became the major symbol for the production of economic wealth (Hassard, 1990) and lost its sacred meaning it had in pre-industrial times (Zerubavel, 1981, edition, 1985; Mumford, 1934, ed. 1963). In his seminal paper on the relation between time and work-discipline Thompson (1967) discusses how during the rise of industrial capitalism the task- orientation in domestic work regimes came to be replaced by a timed-orientation in industrial work regimes. Pre-industrial task-oriented work regimes of peasant families and domestic industries disregarded clock time and worked upon what is 'an observed necessity', that is, people worked upon a task as long as it needed to complete it, (Thompson, 1967: 60). In pre-industrial times nearly all craftsmen were self-employed, working in their own homes with their own tools, in their own time till the work was finished (Zerubavel, 1979). This task-orientation resulted in very irregular work rhythms. Gradually, time-orientation was introduced and time began to become money (of the employer). Due to the introduction of a time-orientation to work people began to experience the distinction between their employer's time and their own time. Time was owned by the worker or by the employer. As the employer must use the time, and prevent people from wasting their time, not the task but *value* of time were deemed to be important: "Time is now currency: it is not passed but spent" (Thompson, 1967: 61).

However, preventing people to waste time makes only sense when working time can be monitored. In domestic work systems there was no way to do this. In the *putting out system* work was contracted by a central agent to subcontractors who completed the work in their own facilities, either in their own homes or in workshops with multiple craftsmen or unskilled workers. The putting out system was characterized by piece wage as working at home which made the monitoring of time impossible (Mokyr, 2002). Mokyr (2002) argues that the rise of the factory system marked the beginning of a process in which the domestic work system (households) started to lose their position as the prevalent locus of production. The early factory systems began to introduce clock time but still in a very arbitrarily way. "In reality there were no regular hours: masters and managers did with us as they liked. The clocks at the factories were put forward in the morning and back at night, and instead of being instruments for the management of time, they were used as clocks for cheating and oppression" (Schor, 1992: 54). Until the early 20th century management had no micro-technology to measure and standardize time and work (Karsten, 1996). Frederick W. Taylor's time and motions studies epitomized the advent of management technologies to externally control the worker's time (Tietze and Musson, 2002). Time keepers were the new regulators and controllers of work as they quantified and transformed activity in monetary value (Hassard, 1990; Karsten, 1996; Merkle, 1980). Moreover, the rise of the factory system, and later the modern office, meant that work came to be organized at distinct places and with distinct time schedules and therefore was 'lifted out' of the social relations of the traditional work setting in which clear demarcations between work and family life were absent. As a consequence, work was only 'activated' within certain spatial and temporal boundaries (Zerubavel, 1981: 15).

5.2 Synchronizing Time Regimes
In his historical account of the rise of the information society Mokyr (2002) argues that the factory system should not be only perceived as a physical central location of work activities, but also as a time-organizing institution which regulates time and demarcates what is conceived as work and non-

work. Standardized, commoditized time became a 'key ordering device' (Tietze and Musson, 2003: 439) for synchronizing not only work but also maintenance (household) and leisure activities. As Adams (1990) points out, a strict temporal order was pertinent for rationalized, bureaucratically structured organizations.

Many researchers have showed that workplace and households have different 'temporal regimes', (Kaufman, 2006; Glucksmann, 2005)) representing different time-related structures, practices, and rules of using time. Glucksmann (2005) showed how temporalities between weavers community and casual women community in Lancaster in the 1920s-1930s differed to a large extent. Even within households and workplaces different time patterns exist, interacting with temporal regimes of other organizations (schools, sports clubs, transportation systems, child care systems, shopping systems etc.). However, the synchronizing of temporal regimes takes place at different levels in order to allow individuals to take part in different kinds of activities. By this synchronizing, temporal regimes do not only become mutually interdependent but are also nested within a multiplicity of other temporal orders as temporal regimes are established a different levels (Adams, 1990).

Zerubavel (1983) emphasizes the social nature of these temporal regimes, he calls them sociotemporal orders, as he defines them as socially constructed artifacts which rest upon rather arbitrary social conventions. Sociotemporal orders are settled by four distinguishing elements: sequential structuring (the order in which events take place); duration (the length of an event); temporal location (when does the event take place); rate of recurrence (how often does the event take pace). These different elements weave different patterns and regularities in our social life (including work) at different levels and with different force. They are instrumented by different temporal devices, like the clock, calendars, and schedules. The synchronizing of temporal regimes resulted, at least in the Western industrial world, in "timed everyday life" (Adams, 1990: 104). *Paid work working time* structures not only the time at work but social time in general (Castells, 1994).

The arbitrariness, to which Zerubavel refers, suggests some kind of temporal flexibility at the collective (cultural) level. The research of Manrai and Manrai (1995) indeed confirms this cultural arbitrariness with respect to temporal regimes. They found significant differences in time usage patterns between individuals originating from high-context (e.g. Asian and African countries) and low-context cultures (e.g. Western Europe and US). They give the example of the resistance by many Third World countries to adopt supermarkets. Shopping for groceries or fruits and vegetables on a day to day basis may be viewed as an outing and an avenue for socialization. This probably can be explained by the dominance polychromic and collectivistic approaches to life which blurs the boundaries between work and non-work (Manrai and Manrai, 1995). The arbitrariness to establish synchronized temporal regimes suggests a kind of voluntary collective choice, which ignores the historical intrigues by which temporal regimes are settled over time and the nested nature of temporal-spatial orders (Adams, 1990).

5.3 De- and Resynchronizing Time Regimes

Numerous writers have envisioned the advent of post-industrial organizations and their work systems, ranging from optimistic, utopian views (Bell, 1973; Levine, 1995; Malone, 2003; Meisters and Willyerd, 2010), to very critical, dystopian views (Rifkin, 1995; Beck, 2000; Head, 2003; Sennett, 2006; Bauman, 2000). Common themes in most analyses are the rise of network organizations, information and communication technologies, individualization, globalization, and flexibility. Flexibilization takes place at all societal levels. The large, hierarchical, bureaucratic organizations are

coming to be replaced by fragmented and flexible networks, collaborating at a global scale "to get better faster everywhere" (Hagel III and Brown, 2005).

Within companies a shift has taken place from the Taylorist and Fordist production system to flexible specialized production systems which is accompanied with a transformation of workplace time and place. Shorter production runs for specialized consumption involves a continuing restructuration of the workplace spatial layout. Moreover, the length of time that a job entails is changing from very short cycle job-task in the Fordist production system have been displaced by longer cycles of job-task (Lash and Urry (1994: 56)

At the individual level there is a growing need to individualize employment relationships. Employees want to play a proactive role in shaping and customizing their on-the-job activities, work settings, and employment conditions through idiosyncratic *i-deals* (Hornung et a. 2008)

In most societies and organizations the flexibilization of work regimes are high on the political and strategic agendas. In the Netherlands the government explores new temporal orders as the current cultural temporal order unable deal with traffic jams, environmental pollution, and needs for flexible work arrangements. "We live", as Edwards (2006: 380), points out, in an "era of flexible accumulation", which results in the breaking down of the rhythmicity of the industrial temporal-spatial order.

In discussing the temporal dimensions of the network society Castells (1996) points to the fact that enterprises are, in their search for more flexibility, affected by plural and divergent temporalities. At society level this may result in an "unmanageable development of contradictory temporalities within the same structure (Castell, 1996). The de-synchronization of temporal-spatial orders does not only derive from the flexibilization of work systems but also from a myriad of other changes, like the gradual reduction in working time, and in parallel the increase of leisure time, the increase of participation of women in the labor force, changing life styles, and demographics (Gershuny, 2000).

Whereas the rise of the industrial organization became intricately associated with the "abstract, context free uniform metronomic beat" of the clock time (Adams, 1990: 116), the temporal metaphor has now been radicalized into the 'any time, 'any place-philosophy. According to Castells, the linear, measurable, and predictable clock time is disappearing in the network society. It is coming to be replaced by what he calls *timeless time*, which refers to a "not self-expanding but self-remaining, not cyclical but random, not recursive but incursive conception of time" (1996: 433), In similar vein, Castells calls for a reconceptualization of place: 'spaces of flow'. According to Castells, localities become disembodied from their cultural, historical, geographic meaning, and reintegrated into image collages, inducing a space of flows (1996: 375).

This is not an historical or empirical account of the recent de- and resynchronizing of temporal regimes. Rather it is an illustration of how the 'any time, any place'-philosophy has started to compete with the dominant clock time-philosophy of the synchronized temporal-spatial order of the industrial work regime. It further illustrates what Beck has called the destandardization and individualization of work, time and place resulting from the reflexive modernization of the industrial society (1992: 153). These processes are associated with the production of risks in employment relations. Risk itself is distribute unequally, "wealth accumulates at the top, risk at the bottom"(Beck, 1992: 35, Edwards, 2006: 378).

6. Risks in Distributed and Hybrid Workplaces

The de-synchronization of work regimes gave rise to a large variety of new and flexible work practices, enabled by information and communication technologies that 'stretch' communication,

coordination and control over large spans of time and place. Of these new work practices telework has probably received the most attention in organizational practice and academic research. Telework is been heralded as a strategy to make organizations more flexible, to increase employee satisfaction, to respond to employee's needs for more empowerment and a healthy work-life balance, to reduce the organization's real-estate costs, to avoid traffic jams, to increase productivity, and to make the organization more flexible (Bailey and Kurkland, 2002; Tietze and Musson, 2002). In their extensive review of more than 80 published academic empirical studies and over 50 other academic studies on telework Bailey and Kurland (2002) found a large number of disappointing results. It remains elusive who participates in telework, it is unclear what the motivations are of teleworkers, on the side of managers there exists reluctance to initiate or facilitate telework for having concerns about the costs and the of losing control, and finally there is little evidence that telework increases productivity and employee satisfaction. Moreover, as Allen et al. (2003) point out, much research reveals mixed and contradictory findings regarding productivity, satisfaction, morale, and work-life balance.

This is not to say that telework brings about only negative or disappointing (side) effects. There are also researches that have shown positive results (see for overview Baruch, 2000). What it does say, however, is that telework, as one of the primary, much lauded flexible new work practices, and is associated with clear, observed but also with unidentified social and economic risks (Beck, 1992). These risks are not inevitable. In this section I will discuss two types of those social risks, without pretending to be exhaustive, that emanate from time-place flexibility strategies in work. The first type of risks concerns those risks that are associated with the blurring of the boundaries between work and home. The second are related with problems of distance.

6.1 Blurring Boundaries

The large, hierarchical, bureaucratic organization has been vehemently criticized for its rigid temporal rhythms and fixed locations. Work and life were separated by rather impermeable boundaries in time and space. However these rigid synchronized temporal-spatial orders have also been protective as they "prevent everything happening at once" (Wheeler, unknown source). Linear, synchronized time conceptions create distance in time; activities can be sequenced, planned and scheduled. The same holds for space, in that it "prevents everything from happening to me" (Wheeler, unknown source). Giddens (1991) argues that place is becoming 'phantasmagoric', that is, 'locales are thoroughly penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influence quite distant from them'. In a recent paper Halford (2005) draws attention to the spatial hybridization of work. Many people do not work either at the organization or at home but at multiple locations: domestic space, organizational space, and cyberspace. So, employees are engaged in a continuous process of locating, dislocating and relocating work. As Halford (2005) argues, this spatial hybridity has important and serious implications for the employee, the nature of work, organization and management. It is not only the blurring of the boundaries between work and life but also the *multiplification of presence* (*and absence*) in work and life settings.

Recent academic research has identified and addressed several issues that are related to these time-space risks. The one that is probably the most studied is work-life balance. Telework has the potential to helping individuals to balance work and family responsibilities and saving time in commuting. The employer can benefit from it in terms of reduced estate costs, increases in efficiency and maintaining good morale among the workforce (Tietze, 2002). Results of research on work-life balance are not unambiguous, partly depending on the theoretical lens that is taken. Spillover theories assume that work and non-work (or life) environments are similar and that what happens in

one environment will have the same effect in the other environment. This can be either *additive* (feelings about work are a part of feelings about life in general), *alienating* (feelings about work directly influence feelings about life in general) or *cognitive/behavioral* (work is seen as a place for socializing and learning, which carries over into life in general). Cognitive spillovers effects are particular relevant in knowledge work as thinking cannot be 'switched off' in the brain. Conflict theories of work-life balance assume that time is a limited resource and that success in one environment is only possible if sacrifices are made in the other environment. Conflicts may arise when demands in both environments (work and home) are high which may lead to overload and stress. In discussions on work-life balance work organizations are often presented as 'greedy institutions' (Coser, 1974; Tietze, 2005) as they consume private time when boundaries are blurring. There is quite some evidence for this company consumption of private time (Dimitrova, 2003; Halford, 2005). In our own (yet unpublished) research on teleworkers we found that teleworkers make more hours and this positively influenced employee satisfaction. At the same time it had a negative impact on the work-life balance, as "work is always there" (Mulki et al., 2009). Tietze (2005) points out that the household should not be seen as the "peaceful antithesis to the 'nasty' ways of industry and commerce". Like work, the household is a 'greedy institution' that demands undivided loyalty and commitment from their 'members' which may lead to an escape *to* work (Tietze, 2005; Baruch, 2000).

6.2 Autonomy

In his book *The Future of Work* (2004: 34) Malone depicts the process of individualization as extremely beneficial to both the individual and the organization. When people make their own decisions about how to do their work and allocate their time, they put more effort and energy and creativity in their work. People like to have control over all aspects of their life (including work). In telework research autonomy and empowerment have received a lot of attention for two different reasons. The first relates to autonomy as a basic psychological need (Deci and Ryan). People have an intrinsic need for self-control, it enhances feelings of personal responsibility and accountability. Research over the last two decades have demonstrated a consistent, positive relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction, job performance, and reduced stress (Allen et al. ,2003). The other reason is that some extent of self-control and autonomy is required because of the absence direct supervision. In Beck's reflexive modernization theory individualization, and therefore increased autonomy, is associated with increased risks. As Pick points out, "individualization and risk together point to a gradual breaking-down of existing political, social and cultural institutions and arrangements leaving people in a state of chronic disembeddedness" (2004: 105). In their study on telework Felstead and Jewston (2000, referred to in Halford, 2005) observed that teleworkers must become 'entrepreneurs of the self', having less resources to support them. The risk of the disembedding of work from the organization to the re-embedding of it into households may result in a decrease social, economic, and technical support that is traditionally provided by the work organization. Furthermore, some doubts can be raised about the extent to which teleworkers experience true individual autonomy. Tietze and Musson (2002) showed how teleworkers *internalized* the clock time-discipline when working at home like starting *on time* and wearing particular clothes. Clock time remained an important device in structuring the day (Halford, 2005: 27). Dimitrova (2003) showed that teleworking employees synchronized their work rhythms with co-workers and clients and continued to complete most of their work during regular working hours. Halford (2005) observed that teleworkers, especially women, felt the pressure to prove oneself and

that women work harder than men to convince themselves and others that they are really working when located at home. Internalized time-discipline may result in diffuse temporal boundaries of work and home and give people the feeling of being "always on the job" (Tietze and Musson, 2003; Zerubavel, 1981).

6.3 Trust-Control Nexus

Physical boundaries and synchronized temporalities in workplaces served as a panopticum for the supervising employees at work. The temporal and spatial hybridization of postindustrial workplaces give rise to new problems in the trust-control nexus. The control-trust risks has been debated and studied since the first telework programs were introduced since the 1970s. It is often argued that the absence of information (visibility and presence) about the behavior and performance of employees, as the fundamental basis for exercising control, requires new forms of control and/or a fundamental shift to trust-based employee relationships. Bailey and Kurland (2002) found that, in general, managers fear a loss of control when telework programs are implemented. In their critical investigation of managerial control strategies in telework programs Felstead et al. (2003) found that teleworkers face an ambivalent situation. On the hand they see the spatial context of home as a way of avoiding, and even resisting managerial surveillance (liberation), while on the other hand they fear neglect and attention by their supervisors when they are not physically present of the office (isolation). Moreover, the researchers found that managers devised a range of techniques, comprising a new network of managerial control mechanisms, to compensate for the lack of visibility and presence. Examples of these new techniques were new surveillance devices, ICT-based monitoring tools, target-setting, and home visits. This new network of managerial control mechanisms appeared to be not very effective. Finally, the authors discuss how managers invoked trust "as a residual solution" for managing teleworkers. So, trust served as a *substitution* for controlling teleworkers (Bijlsma-Frankema and Costa, 2005).

Dimitrova (2003) shows in her study on different types of teleworkers, that those control-trust issues remain controversial. Two main findings emerge from her research. The first was that telework did not significantly change existing control mechanisms. For different groups of teleworkers different mixes of formal and informal control mechanisms were used. These differences are based on the nature of the tasks of teleworkers. Not surprising but still very relevant, control mechanisms were more sophisticated in the case of jobs with standard routine tasks. Explicit and codified information can more easily derived from routine tasks and therefore provide better opportunities for outcome measurability, ex ante programmability and formal control. Teleworkers with non-routine tasks and tacit skills had fewer rules and worked more independently from their supervisors. Furthermore, formal supervisory procedures and work rules remained intact and informal practices changed little. A correlate conclusion, not made by Dimitrova, is that employees with non-routine tasks have more opportunities to 'escape from managerial controls' compared to colleagues with more routine tasks. At the same time, managerial control should not be considered negative by default. In the complementary perspective on the trust-control relationship trust and control are mutually reinforcing (Bijlsma-Frankema and Costa, 2005). Formal control mechanism may increase trust by providing people with objective rules and clear measures resulting in higher levels of cooperation. In our own research we found support for the *complementary*, reinforcing role of formal control and trust (Kamps, 2011).

In contrast to Felstead et al. (2003), Dimitrova (2003) found no evidence for strengthening management by results (performance based control) or by the use of ICT-based monitoring tools.

The second main finding is that telework reproduces pre-existing social relations and inequalities, "telework cannot act as an equalizer" (Dimitrova, 2003: 191). This finding contrasts most previous research and common sense that remote working has a deteriorating and eroding impact on the supervisor-subordinate and interpersonal relationships in general. For newcomers, however, telework may have a negative impact on the relationship with their supervisors as it appears hard to develop trust-based relationships with their bosses. They have to develop an alternative strategy, like 'hanging around in the office' to meet their supervisors to become visible and get support (Dimitrova, 2003). This means that fault lines are activated between groups of employees, depending existing trust relationships. Dimitrova firmly concludes that "telework did not lead to more democratic procedures based on trust and abolishment of hierarchical structures at work" (2003: 1992).

7. Reflexivity in Hybrid Workspaces

The risks that have been addressed in the previous section are only a very small subset of the risks that can be imagined. The omnipotence of work in our society, where Beck (2000:10), refers to, makes it impossible to make reasonable assessments of the chance of occurrence and their impact, even at the organizational level. My own brief analysis of telework shows the intricateness of these risks that are related to work.

Because of the omnipotence of work and the large transformations that have taken place at different levels of society Glucksmann (2005) recently attempted to the redefine field of the sociology of work. Her 'total social organization of labour' (TSOL) is a relational conception that attempts to study work at macro, meso, household, and individual level and diachronically. Reflexive modernization theory might serve as a complement to TSOL. Reflexive modernization theory is helpful in understanding the transformations of work, be it at a relatively abstract level. It helps to explain the nature transformation of work and to explore the notions on time, place, technology, standardization and destandardization, flexibility, control and trust theoretically. An important insight that the theory of reflexive modernization brings about is that telework, and other distributed and remote work practices, can be viewed managerial solutions to problems in work in postindustrial work organizations, whereas hybrid workplace can be considered an *unintended consequence* of it.

However, the theory of reflexive modernization is primarily about meta-changes and attempts to take into account "the whole breadth of the modernization process" (Beck et al., 2003: 13). At first glance, the theory doesn't seem to be very helpful for organizational action or intervention. In their definition of reflexivity Beck et al. even seem to explicitly refrain from it:

> *"Reflexivity does not mean that people today lead a more conscious life. On the contrary. Reflexive signifies not an increase of mastery and consciousness, but a heightened awareness that mastery is impossible" (Beck et al. 2003: 3).*

In similar vein, Giddens points out that reflexivity should be understood not merely as "'self-consciousness'" but as the monitored character of the ongoing flow of life" (1984, edition 1986: 3). Human beings are purposive agents who have both reasons for their actions and are able to elaborate discursively upon those reasons. This is not to equate purposive agents with rational actors who make decisions upon individual events or options. Rather, human action is a continuous *flow* within a spatial-temporal context. In Giddens' view reflexivity is integral to modernity and has been radicalized in the late modern society by the amount information available, the media through which

information is disseminated, and the enormous range of options over which decisions have to be made (Edwards, 2006: 379). This is leading to an 'existentially troubling' situation for human beings who cannot rationally oversee the flood of options and enormity of decisions to make (Giddens, 1990, edition 2000: 94).

So, how should the hybrid workspace be understood from a reflexive modernization perspective? In my opinion, the hybrid workspace can be considered as a *risk junction*, where flexibility has been radicalized and which produces risks in different spheres of life (see previous section). It does not mean that hybrid workspaces should be avoided; they can be great places/spaces to work in. However, risks and risk regimes have, like Beck points out, a shimmering ambivalence (2000: 71). On the one hand hybrid workspaces provide great opportunities to customize work settings and to attune different temporalities, while on the other hand they can turn into disorganized, private time consuming, isolated places to work (and live) in.

A prominent question then is of course how individuals and organizations can cope with those risks (from a theoretical perspective). Reflexive modernization theory does not provide a straightforward answer. However, both, Giddens and Beck, view reflexive modernization as a rational process that is concerned with reasoned decision making (Edwards, 2006). Beck does not reject modernity, but its radicalization into risk regimes. The cognitive nature of reflexive modernization opens possibilities for individuals to *reflect* critically on situations and transformations and hence how to change them (Lash and Urry, 1994). The concept of reflection differs from reflexivity as it used in reflexive modernization theory and in other theoretical strands of research and philosophical debates. Reflection is mostly defined, assuming an objectivist ontology, as a stepping back from a problem at hand or a situation in which one is engaged (Cunliffe and Jun, 2005; Schippers et al., 2008). It does not require an existential questioning of the objective, means and the relevance of actions. In my opinion, reflexivity and reflections are both needed to the cope with the risks that are produced by the hybrid workspace.

8. Conclusions

In this paper I made a first attempt to look at the risks that are related to the introduction of telework programs from a reflexive modernization theory perspective. Based on results from empirical research (by other researchers) on different aspects of telework I concluded that telework, and other distributed, remote work practices (e.g. mobile working) produce hybrid workspaces. These hybrid workspaces are labeled *risk junctions* in this paper. They emerge as a result from the blurring of boundaries between different social spheres that have different temporal rhythms. As I have pointed out, the blurring of boundaries is one of the main characteristics of reflexive modernity. A risk approach, derived from the theory of reflexive modernization, to new work practices like telework, might be a challenging venue for bridging between social theory, organization theory, organizational behavior theories, and information management theories. The broader theoretical 'reach' of social theory allows for theorizing about very different subjects in comprehension.

This paper is a 'grand stroke' and requires theoretical, methodological and empirical precision, balancing, elaboration, and sophistication.

Two very important types of risks that have not been addressed sufficiently in this paper are related to technology, social cohesion, and identity. Giddens' notion on technology as a disembedding mechanism is very relevant but theoretically not very sophisticated. Social cohesion and (multiple) identity are extremely relevant topics in research in telework. These themes are already investigated

by different telework researchers but a risk approach could complement the current theoretical perspectives.

Finally, in the last section I very briefly touched upon the distinction between reflexivity and reflection. Both concepts require further explorations in the context of telework. The instrumentation of these concepts helps to make the insights that are gained from academic research relevant for telework practice.

References*

Allen, D. G., Renn, R. W., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The impact of telecommuting design on social systems, self-regulation, and role boundaries. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 22*, 125-164.

Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A review of telework research: Findings, new directions, and lessons for the study of modern work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(4), 383-400.

Baruch, Y. (2000). Teleworking: Benefits and pitfalls as perceived by professionals and managers. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 15*(1), 34-49.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* Sage Publications Ltd.

Beck, U., Bonss, W., & Lau, C. (2003). The theory of reflexive modernization. *Theory, Culture & Society, 20*(2), 1-33.

Beck, U., & Camiller, P. (2000). *The brave new world of work* Cambridge Univ Press.

Bijlsma-Frankema, K., & Costa, A. C. (2005). Understanding the trust-control nexus. *International Sociology, 20*(3), 259-282.

Castells, M. (2011). *The rise of the network society: The information age: Economy, society, and culture* Wiley-Blackwell.

Cowen, R. S. (1983). More work for mother. *NY: Basic Books Inc,*

Davenport, T. H. (2005). *Thinking for a living: How to get better performance and results from knowledge workers* Harvard Business Press.

Edwards, R. (1998). Flexibility, reflexivity and reflection in the contemporary workplace. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 17*(6), 377-388.

Felstead, A., Jewson, N., Phizacklea, A., & Walters, S. (2002). The option to work at home: Another privilege for the favoured few? *New Technology, Work and Employment, 17*(3), 204-223.

Felstead, A., Jewson, N., & Walters, S. (2003). Managerial control of employees working at home. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 41*(2), 241-264.

Giddens, A. (1990). The consequences of modernity: The raymond fred west memorial lectures.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration* Univ of California Press.

Glucksmann, M. A. (1998). What a difference a day makes': A theoretical and historical exploration of temporality and gender. *Sociology, 32*(2), 239-258.

Haddon, L., & Brynin, M. (2005). The character of telework and the characteristics of teleworkers. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 20*(1), 34-46.

Halford, S. (2005). Hybrid workspace: Re-spatialisations of work, organisation and management. *New Technology, Work and Employment, 20*(1), 19-33.

Halford, S., & Leonard, P. (2006). Place, space and time: Contextualizing workplace subjectivities. *Organization Studies, 27*(5), 657-676.

Kamps, H. (2011). *How to manage the Invisible Employee? The effects of control and trust on motivation in Telework*. Master thesis, Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Kenyon, E. (2000). Time, temporality and the dynamics of community. *Time & Society, 9*(1), 21-41.

Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of signs and space* Sage Publications Ltd.

Malone, T. W. (2004). *The future of work: How the new order of business will shape your organization, your management style, and your life* Harvard Business Press.

Sennett, R. (2007). *The culture of the new capitalism* Yale Univ Pr.

Steward, B. (2000). Changing times. *Time & Society, 9*(1), 57-74.

Taskin, L., & Bridoux, F. (2010). Telework: A challenge to knowledge transfer in organizations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(13), 2503-2520.

Tietze, S. (2002). When" work" comes" home": Coping strategies of teleworkers and their families. *Journal of Business Ethics, 41*(4), 385-396.

Tietze, S., & Musson, G. (2005). Recasting the home-work relationship: A case of mutual adjustment? *Organization Studies, 26*(9), 1331-1352.

Tietze, S., & Musson, G. (2003). The times and temporalities of home-based telework. *Personnel Review, 32*(4), 438-455.

Tietze, S., & Musson, G. (2002). When 'Work'Meets 'Home'. *Time & Society, 11*(2-3), 315-334.

Zerubavel, E. (1985). *Hidden rhythms: Schedules and calendars in social life* Univ of California

*The reference list is incomplete yet.

Table 1. Work dimensions in Work Regimes

	Pre-industrial work regimes	Industrial work regimes	Post-industrial work regimes
Symbolic dimension of Work		Exchange value	Aesthetic value
Place	Domestic	Large, bureaucratic organization	Any, Distributed, Hybrid, Flow
Time	Task-time, natural time, sacred time	Clock time	Any, Timeless time, time as a resource
Technology	Manual	Machine	Information
Trust-Control Nexus	Community control	Contractual control	Self-control, clan-control. Hidden control
Output	Task-based	Time-based	Task- and time based