

Analysis of Resistance Among Teachers and Staff to Working Hours Discipline Policies at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School in Gunungsitoli City

Bebalazi Lase^{1*}, Sukaaro Waruwu², Syah Abadi Mendrofa³

^{1,2,3} Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics, Nias University, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: Satganbm@gmail.com

Article History

Received: 27-06-2026

Revised: 07-07-2026

Published: 30-07-2026

Keywords: Resistance, Teachers and Staff, Work Hours Discipline Policy

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the forms of resistance exhibited by teachers and staff toward work hour discipline policies, identify the factors causing such resistance, and describe the school's efforts to address teachers' and staff's resistance to work hour discipline policies at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School in Gunungsitoli City. This study employs a qualitative approach using a case study design. Data collection techniques included in-depth interviews, non-participant observation, and documentation. Research informants consisted of the principal, teachers, the vice principal, subject teachers, and administrative staff, all selected through purposive sampling. Data analysis was conducted through data reduction, data presentation, and the drawing of conclusions and verification. The results of the study indicate that teachers' and staff members' resistance to the work hours policy is mostly passive and indirect. Forms of resistance include arriving late, irregularities in filling out attendance records, the habit of arriving only according to their teaching schedules, leaving during work hours for personal matters without clear notification, and complaints regarding the flexibility of work hours. Factors contributing to this resistance include long-standing work habits, differing interpretations of work hours, distance from home, transportation challenges, family obligations, teaching workload, additional duties, insufficiently detailed policy communication, inconsistent supervision, and perceptions of fairness in the enforcement of rules. The school's efforts to address this resistance include policy outreach, dialogue, involving teachers and staff in evaluations, individual coaching, rewards, graduated sanctions, and review of attendance records. Overall, work-hour discipline policies can be implemented more effectively if they are applied clearly, fairly, communicatively, participatively, and humanely.

INTRODUCTION

In the world of education, schools are not only understood as places where teaching and learning take place, but also as social organizations that manage people, rules, time, resources, and work culture (Hilman & others, 2023). The quality of education is greatly influenced by the organization of all elements within the school, particularly teachers as the implementers of learning and staff members as providers of educational administrative support. Teachers are responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating instruction, while staff members play a role in ensuring the smooth operation of administration, student services, record-keeping, and various other operational needs of the school (Muhammadiyah & others, 2022). Therefore, a school's success in achieving its educational goals is determined not only by the curriculum and learning resources but also by the discipline of the school community in carrying out their duties on time and in accordance with their responsibilities (Sulistiani & others, 2023).

Discipline regarding working hours is a crucial aspect of school management because it is directly linked to the reliability of services, orderly learning, and setting a good example in the educational environment. In the school context, the attendance of teachers and staff during working hours reflects a commitment to their duties, respect for students' learning time, and a sincere dedication to supporting the educational institution's vision (Pramudiani, 2024). When working hours are consistently adhered to, the learning process can begin on time, coordination between departments becomes easier, administrative services run smoothly, and the school's work environment becomes more orderly. Conversely, if work schedule discipline is not consistently enforced, obstacles may arise, such as delays in service, disruptions to the learning schedule, reduced coordination effectiveness, and a decline in positive perceptions of the school's work culture (Setianingsih & others, 2021).

Although work-hour discipline policies are fundamentally intended to strengthen organizational order, their implementation does not always proceed without obstacles (Hendrayani, 2020). Schools are work environments with characteristics distinct from purely administrative organizations because teachers have teaching loads, additional duties, student guidance activities, the development of instructional materials, and involvement in school activities outside of face-to-face class hours (Satriani, 2020). Meanwhile, school staff face administrative demands that are often routine, sudden, and require coordination with many parties. These conditions necessitate a proportional understanding of work-hour discipline policies not merely as rules for arrival and departure, but as a work management system that must be communicated clearly, fairly, and in accordance with the school's needs (Rustandi & Jaelani, 2024).

In practice, policies regarding work hours can elicit varied reactions from teachers and staff. Some members of the school community may accept these policies as an effort to improve the work culture, but others may express objections, be slow to adapt, or show a lack of enthusiasm because they feel the policies are disrupting their established work habits. In

organizational studies, such reactions are referred to as resistance that is, the response of individuals or groups to policies or changes perceived as causing discomfort, uncertainty, or new burdens. Therefore, resistance should not always be interpreted as negative rejection but can be viewed as a social phenomenon within an organization whose causes, forms, and management strategies need to be understood so that work-hour discipline policies can be implemented in a humane and effective manner (Rehman & others, 2021).

Khaw et al (2022) explain that resistance to change relates to employees' reactions to organizational changes, whether in the form of attitudes, feelings, or behaviors. In their study, resistance can arise when employees feel under-involved, undervalued, or do not yet understand the reasons behind the implemented changes. This definition indicates that resistance is not merely an act of open rejection but can also take the form of doubt, discomfort, passive attitudes, or low participation in implementing new policies. When applied to work-hour discipline policies in schools, resistance may occur when teachers and staff do not fully understand the policy's objectives, feel that the rules were imposed abruptly, or believe that their working conditions were not sufficiently considered during the policy-making process.

Hubbart (2023) views resistance or reluctance to change as a tendency among individuals within an organization to maintain the status quo because change is often perceived as bringing risks, uncertainty, and demands for new adaptations. In this sense, resistance stems not only from disagreement with the content of the policy but also from psychological factors, work habits, past experiences, and concerns about the policy's consequences. Thus, resistance by teachers and staff toward work-hour discipline policies can be understood as a response that arises when policies are perceived as disrupting established work patterns, are not accompanied by adequate socialization, or are not followed by monitoring and guidance mechanisms deemed fair by all parties.

Dehotman (2023) states that work discipline relates to employees' awareness and willingness to comply with organizational regulations and norms applicable in the workplace. Based on this definition, work schedule discipline policies can be understood as a set of regulations governing attendance, punctuality, task execution, adherence to work schedules, and employees' responsibility to complete their work in accordance with established rules. In a school setting, work-hour discipline policies serve not only as a control mechanism but also as guidelines for fostering orderly, consistent, and responsible work habits. Therefore, work-hour discipline must be implemented based on the principles of clear rules, leadership by example, open communication, and ongoing guidance.

Nurhafizah & Setyaningsih (2023) explain that the principal's disciplinary policies toward educators constitute a managerial effort to guide the school community to work in accordance with regulations through guidance, supervision, rewards, and the consistent application of sanctions. This definition emphasizes that disciplinary policies are not sufficient if they are merely written in the code of conduct; rather, they must be implemented

through processes that are acceptable to teachers and staff. In work-hour disciplinary policies, the principal or institutional leader must ensure that the rules are understood, attendance-tracking mechanisms function properly, reasons for tardiness or absences are handled objectively, and guidance is provided using an approach that upholds the dignity of both teaching and non-teaching staff.

The location of this study is Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School in Gunungsitoli City. According to data from the Ministry of Education and Culture's Education Reference System, Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School has NPSN 10258370 and is located at Jalan Nilam No. 3, Gunungsitoli, Ilir Village, Gunungsitoli District, Gunungsitoli City, North Sumatra Province. This school is a private junior high school. Additionally, the school is known for its active involvement in educational activities and character-building programs for students. One of the activities previously publicized by the Gunungsitoli City Government was the implementation of the Pancasila Student Profile Strengthening Project (P5) with a theme of local wisdom, involving the teaching staff and students of Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School in Gunungsitoli. This information indicates that the school has a fairly active educational program and requires strong work discipline from both teachers and staff.

The selection of Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School in Gunungsitoli as the research site was based on the consideration that private schools have unique human resource management needs. The school must maintain public trust, ensure that the learning process proceeds in an orderly manner, and provide quality educational services to students and parents. Under these conditions, work-hour discipline policies are a crucial component of school governance, as they relate to the timeliness of instruction, teacher readiness, administrative services, and the coordination of school activities. However, any policy involving changes to work habits must be carefully examined to understand how teachers and staff interpret the policy, what forms of resistance may arise, and how the school can manage these challenges in a persuasive and constructive manner.

Based on the researcher's study, several phenomena were identified, including differences in how some teachers and staff interpret work schedule discipline particularly in distinguishing between school attendance hours, teaching hours, administrative service hours, and time allocated for additional duties. Under certain conditions, there is still a tendency toward tardiness, handling personal matters during work hours, and inconsistencies in departure times among individuals. Another observable phenomenon is that while some teachers or staff generally accept the work-hour discipline policy, they still require further clarification regarding the basis of the rules, guidance mechanisms, and consequences in the event of violations. These findings are not intended to cast the school in a negative light but rather to serve as an academic basis for the need to examine work-hour discipline policies from the perspective of resistance, so that the school can obtain a more objective picture of the causal factors, forms of reaction, and resolution strategies that align with the school's work culture.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Type of Research

This study employs a qualitative approach using a case study design. The qualitative approach was chosen because the research objective is to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of resistance among teachers and staff toward work-hour discipline policies at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School in Gunungsitoli under natural conditions. A case study was chosen because it allows the researcher to examine the setting, actors, processes, and social meanings that emerge within a single research location, thereby enabling a comprehensive exploration of the experiences, perceptions, and dynamics of the school organization (Sugiyono, 2022).

Research Location and Context

The research was conducted at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School, located at Jalan Nilam No. 3, Ilir Village, Gunungsitoli District, Gunungsitoli City, North Sumatra Province. The location was selected through purposive sampling due to its relevance to the research focus, namely the differences in understanding and practices regarding work-hour discipline among school administrators, teachers, and administrative staff. The research context includes the school's organizational conditions, leadership structure, and work discipline policies governing attendance, punctuality, teaching schedules, administrative services, and the performance of additional duties. The research period began after the proposal was approved and research permission was obtained; data collection continued until data saturation was reached (Sugiyono, 2022).

Research Informants

Informants were selected using purposive sampling based on the following criteria: having a direct relationship with work-hour discipline policies; being familiar with policy implementation; being willing to provide open information; and being able to reflectively explain their experiences or perspectives. If initial information is insufficient, snowball sampling will be used on a limited basis to identify additional relevant informants. The number of informants is flexible and determined based on the sufficiency of data until saturation is reached; thus, the quality and depth of information take priority over quantity.

Table 1 Research Informants

No.	Code	Informant Name	Role / Description
1	I1	Maria Nita Fau, S.Pd	(Key Informant) Principal of Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School, Gunungsitoli City
2	I2	Meniati Telaumbanua, S.Pd	Primary Informant, Classroom Teacher at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School, Gunungsitoli City
3	I3	Hernita Sigiyo, S.Sn	Supporting Informant, Classroom Teacher at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School,

			Gunungsitoli City
4	I4	Enima Waruwu, S.Pd	Supporting Informant, Classroom Teacher at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School, Gunungsitoli City

Data Sources

Research data sources consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data was obtained directly from informants through in-depth interviews and non-participant observation in the field to understand their perspectives, experiences, and behaviors related to resistance to work-hour discipline policies. Secondary data was obtained from school documents such as school profiles, organizational structures, school rules, work and teaching schedules, attendance records, meeting minutes, circulars, and activity documentation (photos/archives), which were used to corroborate and verify the findings from interviews and observations (Rachman et al., 2024).

Data Collection Techniques

Data collection was conducted in a natural setting using a triangulation of methods: semi-structured in-depth interviews, non-participant observation, and documentation. In-depth interviews were used to explore information not immediately apparent and to provide informants with the space to explain their experiences and perspectives; interview guidelines were developed based on the research question to maintain focus. Non-participant observation was conducted by observing adherence to work hours, use of attendance records, punctuality in starting activities, interactions between management and staff, as well as signs of acceptance or resistance, and the results were recorded in field notes. Documentation was collected to examine written regulations and administrative evidence that supported or contradicted the informants' statements.

Research Instruments

The primary instrument of this study is the researcher, who is responsible for planning the research, selecting informants, conducting interviews, observing the field, collecting documents, analyzing data, and drawing conclusions. Supporting instruments include interview guidelines, observation guidelines, documentation recording formats, field notes, audio recording devices (used with permission), and writing materials for recording field findings.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis follows the interactive model proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña, which includes data reduction, data presentation, and drawing conclusions and verification. The data reduction process involves selecting and grouping relevant data from interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents; data presentation is carried out in the form of narratives, tables, or matrices, as well as informant quotes to facilitate the

identification of patterns and interrelationships among sources; drawing conclusions and verification are carried out through re-reading, triangulation of sources and techniques, and checking the consistency of findings with the research problem statement (Sugiyono, 2021).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Forms of Resistance by Teachers and Staff to Work Hour Discipline Policies

The first theme indicates that resistance from teachers and staff toward work-hour discipline policies primarily manifests in passive and adaptive forms. Generally, informants did not express open rejection of the policies. Teachers and staff fundamentally understand that work-hour discipline is necessary to maintain school order. However, this acceptance has not yet been fully accompanied by consistent behavioral changes. Some forms of resistance observed include arriving late, coming in only according to their teaching schedules, failing to fill out attendance records properly, leaving during work hours without clear notification, and complaints regarding the flexibility of work hours.

“In my observation, resistance is mostly indirect. Teachers and staff rarely refuse openly, but some are not yet consistent in arriving on time or in properly filling out attendance records. So, it takes a more passive form rather than direct refusal. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

This quote suggests that resistance does not always take the form of direct protest or refusal. Resistance can manifest through seemingly simple everyday behaviors, such as tardiness, irregular attendance, or inconsistent compliance. In a school setting, this type of resistance warrants attention because it can affect the smooth operation of instruction and administrative services.

Another form of resistance is evident in the differing ways teachers understand their work hours. Some teachers view their primary duty as being present according to their teaching schedule, rather than always being present from the start of the school day. This understanding leads teachers who do not teach the first period to be more flexible in managing their attendance.

“I’ve seen teachers arrive late, especially when they aren’t teaching the first period. This may be because there’s still a perception that a teacher’s primary duty is to be present when teaching, not from the start of the school day. (I3, Interview, May 19, 2026)”

Among school staff, resistance manifests itself through long-standing habits related to the use of work time. Informants noted that there is still a practice of stepping out briefly during work hours for personal matters without clear notification. Although not always intended as a form of resistance, this practice can disrupt the smooth operation of administrative services.

“Another long-standing habit is stepping out briefly during work hours for personal matters without clear notice. In the past, this might have been considered normal, but with

the implementation of work-hour discipline policies, it needs to be regulated so that administrative services are not disrupted. (I4, Interview, May 19, 2026)”

Based on these findings, the forms of resistance exhibited by teachers and staff can be summarized as passive resistance that is, a response not expressed through open refusal, but through tardiness, formal compliance, slow adaptation, and work habits that are not yet fully aligned with school working hour regulations.

Factors Causing Resistance Among Teachers and Staff

The second theme indicates that resistance to the work-hour discipline policy is influenced by several interrelated factors. The first factor is long-standing work habits. Before the work-hour discipline policy was enforced more strictly, some teachers and staff members had already adopted more flexible work patterns. Teachers were accustomed to arriving close to the start of their classes, while staff members had certain habits regarding their working hours and when they left work. Changing these habits requires a period of adjustment.

“The main factor is long-standing habits. There has long been a perception that what matters is completing teaching assignments, so some teachers do not yet view school attendance as part of work discipline. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

The second factor is a difference in understanding regarding the meaning of work-hour discipline. Some teachers understand work-hour discipline as being present according to the school's start time, while others view it as more closely related to fulfilling teaching hours. This difference in understanding highlights the need for a more detailed explanation of the distinctions between attendance hours, teaching hours, service hours, and time spent on additional duties.

“The rules have already been communicated, but not all teachers have the same understanding of them. Some understand that they must be present by the time school starts, while others believe it is sufficient to be present according to their teaching schedule. This difference in understanding needs to be clarified again. (I2, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

The third factor relates to personal and environmental conditions. Distance from home, transportation, family matters, and responsibilities before leaving for school are common reasons for tardiness. These factors do not necessarily indicate opposition to the policy, but they can lead to inconsistencies in adhering to work hours if they are not openly communicated to the school.

“Complaints have arisen, particularly regarding the distance from home and family matters before heading to school. For example, there was a teacher who was late several times because they had to drop off their child first. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

The fourth factor is teachers' workload and additional duties. Teachers not only conduct classroom instruction but also develop instructional materials, grade assignments, mentor students, attend meetings, and participate in school activities. These conditions lead

some teachers to believe that work hour policies need to be adjusted to account for the nature of a teacher's job, which does not entirely consist of face-to-face instruction.

"The teaching workload and school activities outside the classroom do have an impact. Some teachers have to prepare student activities, handle instructional administration, or attend meetings. Therefore, policies regarding work hours must be accompanied by a balanced allocation of tasks. (I2, Interview, May 18, 2026)"

The fifth factor is communication, supervision, and perceptions of fairness. Informants noted that the rules had been communicated through meetings but still needed to be explained in more technical detail, particularly regarding the mechanisms for leave requests, tardiness, consequences of violations, and follow-up guidance. Additionally, consistent enforcement of the rules is crucial because unclear handling of violations can create a perception of unfairness.

"I believe this policy will be better accepted if all teachers and staff are treated equally. If someone is late, the disciplinary process must be clear and non-discriminatory. Fairness is crucial so that teachers do not feel the rules apply only to certain people. (I3, Interview, May 19, 2026)"

These findings show that resistance among teachers and staff is not solely caused by a lack of willingness to comply with the rules. Resistance is also related to how the policy is understood, communicated, monitored, and implemented in the reality of school work. Thus, the factors causing resistance are individual, organizational, and contextual.

School Efforts to Overcome Resistance to Work Hours Discipline Policies

The third theme indicates that the school has made several efforts to address resistance from teachers and staff toward the work-hour discipline policy. The first effort was to disseminate the policy through faculty and staff meetings. During these meetings, the principal explained the rules regarding arrival and departure times, attendance, and the consequences of violations. However, the informants recognized that a single dissemination session was insufficient; it needed to be repeated periodically to ensure a more consistent understanding among teachers and staff.

"The policy was communicated through faculty and staff meetings. During these meetings, the rules regarding arrival times, departure times, attendance, and the consequences of violations were explained. However, we realized that a single session was not enough, so the information needed to be repeated during monthly evaluation meetings. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)"

The second effort is to open a space for dialogue and involve teachers and staff in policy evaluation. Through dialogue, teachers and staff are given the opportunity to voice the challenges they face, such as distance from home, teaching schedules, family matters, or administrative hurdles. This involvement is crucial so that policies are not viewed as unilateral rules, but as a mutual agreement aimed at improving the school's work culture.

“Teachers and staff have been involved through evaluation meetings. During these meetings, they were given the opportunity to voice their challenges, such as the distance from home, teaching schedules, and administrative matters. That feedback was then taken into consideration by the school in determining the most appropriate form of guidance. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

“In my opinion, the school needs to involve teachers in policy evaluations. Teachers can voice their challenges and provide input on the technical aspects of implementation. If teachers feel involved, they will be more receptive to the policy. (I3, Interview, May 19, 2026)”

The third measure is a phased guidance process for teachers and staff who are not yet disciplined. Guidance is provided through verbal reprimands, one-on-one discussions, instructions during meetings, and written warnings if violations persist. One-on-one discussions are considered more effective because they do not humiliate teachers or staff in front of their colleagues, while still providing an opportunity for self-improvement.

“Guidance is provided in stages. The first stage is a verbal reprimand through a one-on-one approach. If the behavior persists, the school issues a warning during a meeting or provides specialized guidance. The goal is not to punish, but to foster a sense of discipline. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

The fourth measure is the proportional application of rewards and sanctions. Rewards are given in the form of recognition to disciplined teachers and staff, while sanctions are imposed progressively on those who commit repeated violations. Informants believe that rewards and sanctions must be applied fairly so that the policy does not give rise to new objections.

“The school implements rewards in the form of recognition for disciplined teachers and staff, for example, through praise during meetings or positive feedback in performance evaluations. As for sanctions, the school first issues a verbal warning, followed by a written warning if the violation continues to recur. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

The fifth measure is the routine evaluation of attendance records or attendance summaries. This evaluation is important to ensure that the policy does not stop at simply communicating the rules, but is also followed up with monitoring and follow-through. Informants emphasized that attendance evaluations need to be conducted with a humane approach so that teachers and staff do not feel merely monitored, but also supported.

“What needs to be improved is the evaluation and follow-up system. Attendance records should be reviewed regularly, but with a humane approach. In addition, schools need to reach a mutual agreement so that teachers and staff feel they are part of the policy, not just subject to the rules. (I1, Interview, May 18, 2026)”

Based on the presentation of these findings, it is clear that efforts to address resistance cannot be achieved through the enforcement of sanctions alone. Schools need to combine outreach, dialogue, engagement, guidance, leadership by example, rewards, sanctions, and

consistent evaluation. In this way, work-hour discipline policies can be accepted as part of the school's work culture, rather than merely as administrative pressure.

Discussion

This discussion is structured to interpret the research findings more deeply in accordance with the research objectives, namely: describing the forms of resistance among teachers and staff, identifying the factors causing resistance, and explaining the school's efforts to address resistance toward the working-hours discipline policy. The interpretation was conducted by connecting interview data, observation results, and available documents with relevant theories and prior research from the last six years. With this structure, the discussion does not merely restate informants' responses, but rather explains the meaning of the findings within the context of educational management and change management in the school environment.

Forms of Teacher and Staff Resistance Toward the Working-Hours Discipline Policy at SMP Swasta Bunga Mawar, Gunungsitoli

The first research objective was to describe the forms of resistance among teachers and staff toward the working-hours discipline policy at SMP Swasta Bunga Mawar, Gunungsitoli. The findings indicate that the resistance that emerged was generally not expressed as open rejection of the policy. Teachers and staff fundamentally acknowledged that working-hours discipline is necessary to maintain orderly learning processes, smooth administrative operations, and to set a good example for students. However, this normative acceptance was not always followed by consistent work behavior. The observable forms of resistance included habitual tardiness, irregularity in completing attendance records, the habit of arriving only according to teaching schedules, leaving school during working hours for personal matters without proper notification, and complaints regarding the level of flexibility in working hours. These findings reveal a gap between acceptance of the policy's objectives and readiness to adjust day-to-day work behavior accordingly.

Khaw et al (2022) explain that organizational members' responses to change can manifest cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally. Such responses are not always expressed as direct protest or rejection; they may instead appear as indifference, delayed adjustment, low participation, or formal compliance without genuine support. In the context of this study, repeated tardiness, non-compliance with attendance procedures, and the tendency to come in only when scheduled to teach can be understood as passive behavioral resistance. Passive resistance warrants close attention because it rarely produces open conflict, yet can gradually erode the consistency of policy implementation and weaken the school's culture of discipline.

The most prominent form of resistance among teachers was observed in differing understandings of the relationship between working hours and teaching hours. Some teachers still interpreted their professional obligations primarily as being present when teaching in the classroom, while the school's policy required attendance from the beginning of working hours. This difference reveals that the working-hours discipline policy had not yet been fully

translated into a shared operational understanding among all teachers. In practice, a teacher's presence from the start of the working day is not limited to classroom instruction; it also encompasses lesson preparation, coordination with the principal and colleagues, student supervision, and the completion of additional duties. Rustandi & Jaelani (2024) affirm that teacher work discipline is associated with punctuality, responsibility in completing tasks, and regularity in carrying out school activities. Consequently, the habit of arriving solely based on face-to-face teaching schedules should be understood as an incomplete adjustment to a more comprehensive standard of discipline.

Hubbart (2023) employs the term *change aversion* to describe individuals' tendency to preserve familiar conditions when change is perceived to bring risk, discomfort, or new demands for adaptation. This concept is relevant to the present findings, as established work habits such as tolerance for tardiness or attendance based on teaching schedules had become relatively comfortable patterns for some members of the school community. When the school began to enforce stricter requirements regarding arrival times, attendance recording, and departure times, these changes demanded adjustments to work rhythms, family time management, mobility, and existing coordination patterns. Accordingly, the resistance identified in this study is more accurately understood as an adaptive reaction to a shift in work patterns, rather than simply as a defiant attitude toward school leadership.

The findings of this study are consistent with Zai et al (2024), who found that resistance to working-hours policies can be influenced by organizational habits and low levels of staff involvement in the policy process. The distinguishing feature of the present study, however, is that it reveals resistance with characteristics specific to a school environment. Teachers must navigate teaching schedules, additional duties, and the expectation to serve as role models for students, while administrative staff must ensure that services are available throughout working hours. Thus, the first research objective can be answered by concluding that the resistance of teachers and staff toward the working-hours discipline policy is predominantly passive and indirect in nature manifesting through inconsistent compliance rather than open rejection of the school's policy.

Factors Contributing to Teacher and Staff Resistance Toward the Working-Hours Discipline Policy at SMP Swasta Bunga Mawar, Gunungsitoli

The second research objective was to identify the factors contributing to the resistance of teachers and staff toward the working-hours discipline policy. The findings reveal that resistance does not stem from a single cause. Rather, it emerges from the interaction of individual, occupational, and organizational factors. These include longstanding work habits, differing understandings of working hours, distance from home to school, transportation constraints, family responsibilities, teaching workload, additional duties, insufficient detail in policy communication, inconsistent supervision, and perceptions of fairness in rule enforcement. The interconnection of these factors explains that working-hours discipline problems cannot be resolved simply by emphasizing individual compliance; they must be

viewed as matters of policy implementation and human resource management within the school.

The first factor is longstanding work habits. Prior to the stricter enforcement of the working-hours discipline policy, some teachers and staff had grown accustomed to a more lenient work pattern. For some teachers, the primary measure of fulfilling their duties was the delivery of lessons according to the timetable, while arriving at the beginning of the working day was not yet understood as an equally important obligation. Such patterns can develop into routines that are difficult to change in a short period of time. Hubbart (2023) explains that change often generates reluctance because individuals tend to preserve conditions that feel familiar and are perceived as safer. In this study, longstanding habits serve as the basis for the slow adjustment to new or newly enforced regulations.

The second factor is a divergence in understanding of the policy's substance. The findings indicate that teachers and staff did not share a uniform understanding of the distinctions between arrival time, teaching hours, administrative service hours, rest periods, departure time, additional duties, and procedures for leaving the school premises. This lack of consistency in understanding can produce varying interpretations in practice. A teacher with no class in the first period, for instance, may assume that early arrival is unnecessary, while the school regards such presence as required for the fulfillment of professional duties and organizational coordination. Khaw et al (2022) emphasize that individuals' reactions to change are strongly influenced by how they understand the reasons, purposes, and consequences of that change. Consequently, technical ambiguity in the policy can itself become a source of resistance, as teachers and staff lack a shared behavioral framework on which to rely.

The third factor relates to personal and environmental circumstances. Distance from home, available transportation, and family responsibilities before departing for school are all conditions that can affect punctuality. Additionally, teachers carry responsibilities that extend beyond classroom instruction, including the preparation of teaching materials, assessment, student guidance, meetings, and a range of additional duties. While these circumstances cannot serve as justification for non-compliance, they must be recognized as contextual factors that influence an individual's capacity to adapt.

The fourth factor is communication and participation in policy implementation. Although regulations were communicated through meetings, some informants still required more detailed technical explanations, particularly regarding leave procedures, consequences of tardiness, out-of-school assignments, and the tolerance threshold for certain situations. Darmawan & Azizah (2020) affirm that resistance to change can be managed through adequate communication, sound comprehension, and the meaningful involvement of organizational members in the change process. In this study, a one-time or purely general socialization was insufficient to ensure the development of a shared understanding. Communication must be carried out repeatedly, openly, and in a two-way manner so that the

policy is not merely known, but genuinely understood and accepted as a necessity for the school organization.

The fifth factor concerns supervision and perceptions of fairness. Informants indicated that the consistency of supervision, the follow-up on attendance data, and the application of corrective measures need to be strengthened to prevent the perception that rules are applied differently to different individuals. Rehman et al (2021) demonstrate that distributive, procedural, and interactional justice, along with organizational support and the quality of the leader–staff relationship, play a role in reducing resistance to change. In the school context, distributive justice refers to the appropriateness of rewards or consequences received; procedural justice refers to the consistency of mechanisms for handling tardiness and violations; and interactional justice refers to the manner in which the principal or school leadership treats teachers and staff with dignity and respect. When all three dimensions are upheld, the policy is more readily perceived as a shared set of norms rather than as coercive pressure or favoritism.

These findings reinforce the results of Nurhafizah & Setyaningsih (2023), who found that the implementation of disciplinary policies is influenced by the principal's commitment, developmental strategies, reward and sanction systems, and the school's capacity to manage resistance among some teaching staff. Furthermore, Rianda et al (2025) emphasize the importance of establishing clear rules, monitoring behavior, applying sanctions, and involving various school stakeholders in the enforcement of discipline. Based on the foregoing, the second research objective can be answered by concluding that resistance among teachers and staff arises from a combination of longstanding work habits, technical ambiguity or differing interpretations of the policy, personal circumstances and workload, suboptimal communication, inconsistent supervision, and perceptions of fairness in the implementation of the policy.

The School's Efforts to Address Resistance Toward the Working-Hours Discipline Policy at SMP Swasta Bunga Mawar, Gunungsitoli

The third research objective was to describe the school's efforts to address the resistance of teachers and staff toward the working-hours discipline policy. The findings indicate that the school has carried out socialization through meetings, opened space for dialogue, involved teachers and staff in evaluations, provided individualized guidance, applied graduated rewards and sanctions, and begun using attendance recaps as a basis for evaluation. These efforts demonstrate that the school did not rely solely on a repressive approach, but sought to combine communication, developmental guidance, and administrative control. Such an approach is relevant given that the resistance identified was predominantly passive in nature and related to the process of adjusting to the policy.

The first effort, which should be understood as a foundational measure, is clear, written, and repeated policy socialization. Socialization should not be limited to conveying that teachers and staff must arrive on time; it must also explain the standard for arrival, rest

periods, and departure times, attendance recording procedures, leave application processes, out-of-school assignment mechanisms, forms of corrective guidance, and the progressive stages of sanctions in the event of repeated violations. Such clarity is necessary to reduce the divergence between understandings of working hours and teaching hours. Khaw et al (2022) demonstrate that individuals' understanding of a change influences their response to the policy. Accordingly, socialization should be positioned as a process of building shared meaning, rather than merely a top-down transmission of instructions from leadership to subordinates.

The second effort is fostering dialogue and involving teachers and staff in policy evaluation. In this study, opportunities for dialogue were used to accommodate concerns related to distance from home, teaching schedules, family responsibilities, and administrative procedures. Such involvement is important because teachers and staff are not merely implementers of policy; they are also the individuals who directly experience the technical implications of the policy in their daily work. Darmawan & Azizah (2020) explain that participation can reduce resistance because organizational members are given the opportunity to understand the rationale for change, raise obstacles, and contribute to finding solutions. Therefore, monthly evaluation meetings should be directed not as forums for reprimanding violators, but as forums for reflecting on attendance data, identifying implementation challenges, and improving policy mechanisms.

The third effort is providing personal and graduated corrective guidance. Guidance through verbal warnings, clarification of the reasons for tardiness, individual counseling, and written warnings in cases of repeated violations reflects a more educative approach. Nurhafizah & Setyaningsih (2023) identify guidance, supervision, consistent rewards, and sanctions as essential elements of a principal's disciplinary policy. In the context of this study, personal guidance is important because it makes it possible to distinguish between teachers or staff who are genuinely facing obstacles and those who have not yet demonstrated a willingness to adjust their behavior. This approach also preserves the dignity of teachers and staff, as disciplinary matters are addressed through respectful individual communication rather than public reprimand in the presence of colleagues.

The fourth effort is the fair, proportionate, and consistent application of rewards and sanctions. Rewards such as recognition in meetings or positive evaluations in performance assessments can reinforce the desired disciplinary behavior. Conversely, sanctions must be applied in a graduated manner and based on clear evidence of violations such as attendance recaps, tardiness records, and the results of clarification meetings. Rehman et al (2021) affirm that perceptions of fairness and organizational support are associated with a reduction in resistance to change. Therefore, the school must ensure that assessment standards, clarification procedures, and consequences for violations apply equally to all members of the school community. Firmness accompanied by fairness will be more readily accepted than sanctions perceived as lacking transparency or as being applied selectively.

The fifth effort is strengthening monitoring and data-based evaluation. Attendance recaps, tardiness records, leave registers, and documentation of corrective guidance must be managed in an orderly fashion and reviewed on a regular basis. Data-based monitoring is not intended to create an atmosphere of suspicion in the workplace, but rather to help the school identify patterns of problems, determine appropriate corrective measures, and assess the effectiveness of the policy over time. Rianda et al (2025) emphasize that behavioral monitoring and rule enforcement are integral components of disciplinary policy implementation in schools. In practice, evaluation must be accompanied by humane follow-up so that attendance data functions as a basis for improvement rather than merely as an instrument of judgment.

Beyond these five efforts, the exemplary conduct of the principal and school leadership is a reinforcing factor that cannot be separated from policy implementation. Teachers and staff will more readily accept regulations when leadership demonstrates consistency in arriving on time, adhering to procedures, communicating openly, and treating all members of the school community fairly. Rustandi & Jaelani (2024) show that rules concerning working hours, tardiness, and absenteeism support the formation of desired work behaviors when implemented consistently. In an educational setting, the exemplary conduct of leadership also carries symbolic value, as a culture of discipline is built through tangible practices observed daily by teachers, staff, and students alike.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the resistance of teachers and staff to the work-hour discipline policy at Bunga Mawar Private Junior High School in Gunungsitoli is largely passive and indirect; teachers and staff do not openly reject the policy because they understand its importance for maintaining order in learning and service delivery; however, compliance remains inconsistent, as evidenced by tardiness, irregular attendance, the habit of arriving only when their teaching schedule begins, leaving without notice, and complaints regarding the lack of flexibility in working hours. This resistance is influenced by long-standing work habits, differing understandings of working hours (attendance hours vs. teaching hours), distance from home, transportation, family matters, workload, insufficiently detailed policy communication, inconsistent supervision, and perceptions of unfairness. The school has made efforts to address this resistance through outreach during meetings, dialogue sessions, involvement in evaluations, one-on-one coaching, gradual rewards and sanctions, and reviews of attendance records, which indicate that effective management requires a communicative, participatory, humane, and consistent approach. As a recommendation, the school needs to establish clear, written rules regarding work hours that cover arrival times, breaks, departure times, leave, tardiness, off-site duties, absences, guidance, rewards, and consequences for violations to ensure uniform understanding and consistent enforcement. Principals must enforce policies firmly, fairly, and humanely, lead by example, and strengthen two-way communication through evaluation meetings and one-on-one guidance sessions.

Teachers need to understand work schedule discipline as a professional responsibility, arrive on time to be prepared to teach and set a good example for students, and openly communicate any challenges. Administrative staff must improve their adherence to work schedules, as this impacts the quality of administrative services; they should arrive on time and provide notice if leaving the workplace. All members of the school community are encouraged to foster a culture of discipline as a shared commitment and to be involved in policy evaluation. Future researchers can expand their studies to a broader context, involving students, parents, and school committees, and use a mixed-methods approach to provide a more in-depth and measurable understanding of the relationship between work schedule discipline, work culture, and the performance of the school community.

REFERENCES

- Darmawan, A. H., & Azizah, S. (2020). Resistance to Change: Causes and Strategies as an Organizational Challenge. *Proceedings of the 5th ASEAN Conference on Psychology, Counseling, and Humanities*.
- Dehotman, K. (2023). The Relationship of Working Discipline and Employee Performance. *International Journal of Applied Management and Business*, 1(1), 1–10.
- Hendrayani, (2020). Work Discipline and Employee Behavior Change. *Journal of Human Resource Management*.
- Hilman, U., & others. (2023). Management of Educators and Education Personnel in Education Delivery. *Journal of Educational Management*.
- Hubbart, J. A. (2023). Organizational Change: The Challenge of Change Aversion. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(7), 162. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13070162>
- Khaw, K. W., Alnoor, A., Al-Abrow, H., Al Halbusi, H., & Shrafat, F. D. (2022). Reactions towards Organizational Change: A Systematic Literature Review. *Current Psychology*, 42, 19137–19160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03070-6>
- Muhammadiyah, M., & others. (2022). The Role of the Professional Teacher as the Agent of Change in Education. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*.
- Nurhafizah, N., & Setyaningsih, R. (2023). The Principal's Disciplinary Policy towards Educators at SMAN 1 Ukui. *Journal of Islamic Education Management*, 2(2), 49–58.
- Pramudiani, A. (2024). Teacher Education and Educator Professional Competence. *Journal of Teacher Education*.
- Rachman, A., Hania, Yochanan, E., Samalangi, A. I., & Purnomo, H. (2024). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods. CV. Saba Jaya Publisher.
- Rehman, N., & others. (2021). The Psychology of Resistance to Change: The Antidotal Effect of Organizational Justice, Support, and Leader-Member Exchange. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
- Rianda, R. R., & others. (2025). Implementation of Policies on Enforcing Teacher and Student Discipline in Schools. *Journal of Islamic Religious Character Building*, 3(4), 78–85.

- Rustandi, T., & Jaelani, D. (2024). Analysis of Work Discipline in Improving Teacher Performance at Sukasari Elementary School: A Study in Sukasari Village, Gunung Halu District. *Maneksi Journal*, 13(2), 419–424. <https://doi.org/10.31959/jm.v13i2.2273>
- Satriani. (2020). Indicators of Working Hours and Employee Working Time Arrangements. *Journal of Human Resource Management*.
- Setianingsih, F. N., & others. (2021). Implementation of Teacher and Educational Personnel Management. *Journal of Islamic Education and Management*.
- Sugiyono. (2021). *Qualitative Research Methods: For Exploratory, Enterpretive, Interactive, and Constructive Research*. Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Qualitative, Quantitative, and R&D Research Methods*. Alfabeta.
- Sulistiani, I., & others. (2023). The Meaning of Teachers as a Vital Role in the World of Education. *Journal of Education Image*.
- Zai, A., Waruwu, M. H., Telaumbanua, E., & Ndraha, A. B. (2024). Analysis of Employee Resistance to Working Hours Policy at the Gunungsitoli City Education Office. *Journal of Accounting and Finance Management*, 5(4), 734–743. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jafm.v5i4.756>