This is the accepted, post peer review, version of an article published in *Human Relations*

Karen D. Hughes and William A. Silver
Beyond time-binds: Rethinking work-family dynamics for a mobile world

The final authenticated version is available online at:
https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726719846264

BEYOND TIME-BINDS: RETHINKING WORK-FAMILY DYNAMICS FOR A MOBILE WORLD

Karen D. Hughes, William A. Silver

Abstract: Contemporary work is increasingly mobile, sparking new challenges for scholars of work and organizations. In this review article, we argue that a 'mobilities lens' offers strong potential for rethinking established approaches, focusing on one important sub-field: work-family studies. Drawing on a 'problematization' approach (Sandberg and Alvesson, 2011), and a systematic literature review (SLR) of work-family research published from 1995-2015, we show how theoretical assumptions about time, space, and place have narrowed the scope of work-family studies, focusing attention on 'time' and 'time-binds', and a limited subset of mobilities (e.g. telework, commuting). We argue that a mobilities lens can help us 'think differently' about work-family dynamics, prompting theoretical and methodological reorientations that recognize the inextricable connection of time and space (as 'time-space') and the need for a more encompassing excavation of the power, practice, and meaning of employment-related mobility (ERM) in work-family life. We sketch out a 'mobilities inspired' agenda to illustrate how ideas from mobilities studies can enrich work-family inquiry. We also discuss how mobilities studies can benefit, in turn, from greater engagement with work-family and organizational research.

Keywords: work-family dynamics; work-family interface; work-family studies; mobilities studies; new mobilities paradigm; employment-related mobility; work-related mobility; time; space.

> People have always been on the move … it is just the scope of mobility that has multiplied (Strandell, 2014: 257)

> In the weeks following 9-11, when I was suddenly grounded beyond my control, my then 6 year old daughter stopped me while I was giving her some behavioral instructions on a weekday and, with all the innocence of a child that age, asked 'Daddy, why are you here?' It was a moment I will never forget, and one that permanently changed what I was and wasn't willing to do for work … (IT Executive Casey Green, 2014)

Our goal in this review article is to contribute to an expanded understanding of work-family dynamics[1], one that better captures the realities of increasingly mobile workforces around the globe. We focus on important but understudied questions of mobility, space, and place that generate 'place-binds'[2], alongside the well-studied 'time-binds', of work and family life. Sparking our interest in this issue are growing numbers of workers who are 'on the move', due to globalization, outsourcing, mobile technologies, multi-site collaboration, and diminishing job options in their communities (Adey, 2009; Canzler et al., 2008; Elliot and Urry, 2010; Viry and Kauffman, 2015). Following others, we refer to this phenomenon as 'employment-related mobility' (ERM)—a concept that embraces a broad spectrum of mobilities both within, and across, local, regional, national, and global economies, and that varies in its frequency, duration, tempo and scale (Newhook et al., 2011; Roseman et al., 2015; Cresswell et al., 2016).[3]

To the extent that ERM separates individuals from their families across time and space—or 'time-space' (Massey, 2005)—it has many consequences for work and family experiences and practices, both large and small. Yet, despite recent interest in the spatiality of organizational life (e.g. Fleming and Spicer, 2004; Halford, 2008; Nicolini, 2007; Munro and Jordan, 2013; Shortt, 2015), and niche studies on business travel, commuting, and global careers (see for example, Gustafson, 2006; Jensen, 2014; Lazarova et al., 2010), work-family research has not fully taken up issues of mobility, space, and place, focusing largely on a subset of mobilities—most notably

teleworking and commuting (Hislop and Axtell, 2007)—and analyzing them primarily through the lens of 'time'. In this review essay, we argue that the rise of work-related mobility sparks the need to rethink established approaches in ways that recognize the inextricable interconnections of time and space (as 'time-space'), and the need for a more encompassing excavation of the power, practice, and meaning of ERM in work and family life.

To illustrate our central argument, we can consider a range of workers—from CEOs to entrepreneurs, long-haul truckers, and offshore oil workers—who do not engage in typical patterns of daily travel between a workplace and home located in relative proximity to one another, but instead are highly mobile, navigating spatially dispersed landscapes, with multiple, often temporary, 'workplaces' and 'homes', at a distance from their family, friends, and communities. Though freed of the daily 'time-binds' well-studied by work-family scholars (e.g. driving children to school, helping family and friends), these individuals may still struggle with the daily details, and emotional highs and lows, of work-family life. Mobility and space, not just time, are part of their challenge—requiring extra effort to overcome the 'liability of distance' (Liu et al., 2011; Williams and Bargh, 2008; Aguilera, 2008), and rites and rituals to aid a sense presence, rather than absence, in family life. Yet, just as work-related mobility can spark challenges, it may create opportunities too—improving job prospects and financial security, prompting new ways of experiencing and organizing work and family, and strengthening emotional bonds with family and friends as a result of time spent apart.

Precisely how ERM shapes work-family dynamics, however, is a question that is vastly under-examined relative to its growing importance. Despite the historical role of work-related mobility, and the current rise of varied forms of ERM, work-family scholarship continues to approach questions of mobility, space, and place in very selective ways, guided by theoretical

approaches that assume conventional patterns of mobility, fixed spatial domains of 'family' and 'work', and the primacy of 'time' over 'space'. In this review essay, we reflect upon the work-family tradition, using a mobilities lens and a 'problematization' approach (Sandberg and Alvesson, 2011) to consider how we might 'think differently' about work-family dynamics in a world that is increasingly 'on the move'. We argue that a stronger dialogue between work-family, and mobilities, perspectives can greatly enrich work-family research, with a mobilities lens sparking interest in a much broader spectrum of ERM and offering new tools for theorizing time, space, and place. Concurrently, a mobilities approach also serves to address long-standing concerns (articulated by work-family scholars themselves) that studies focus on a too-narrow range of occupations and family types, and gloss over critical questions of power and the linkages between the structural drivers, and micro-level experiences, of work and family (Williams et al., 2016; Greenhaus, 2008; Parasuraman and Greenhaus, 2002).

In taking up these issues, we build on recent writing in *Human Relations*, and other journals, on spatiality and organizational life (Fleming and Spicer, 2004; Halford, 2008; Nicolini, 2007; Munro and Jordan, 2013; Shortt, 2015; Tyler and Cohen, 2010). However, our focus on work-family dynamics and employment-related mobility seeks to push current analysis beyond the purview of 'organizations' and 'space', to connect the 'spatial' and 'mobile' turns, as well as workplaces and households, work and family, and market and non-market activities (Cresswell, 2006, 2011; Sheller and Urry, 2006; Logan, 2012; Fleming and Spicer, 2004). Consequently, we use a broad conceptualization of work and work-related mobilities. We also conceptualize family in an expansive way that reflects contemporary modes of living, including relationships with family and friends, neighbors, and activities of household maintenance, caregiving, community building, and leisure. Finally, reflecting our interest in a more dynamic, movement-oriented

approach to work and family concerns, we use the term 'work-family dynamics', rather than the more commonly used term, the 'work-family interface'.

We begin our arguments in Section 1 by introducing key concepts from mobilities scholarship, specifically *employment-related mobility (ERM)*, *time-space,* and *co-presence.* In Section 2 we use a mobilities lens to examine how questions of time, space, and place have been studied in work-family research to date, discussing established theoretical approaches and a systematic literature review (SLR) of articles from the past 20 years (1995-2015). Our SLR shows how implicit assumptions within work-family studies—reflecting a traditional industrial template of fixed, singular domains of 'work' and 'family' connected by daily mobility—have focused attention on a relatively narrow subset of mobilities (e.g. telework, commuting), while also prioritizing questions of 'time' and 'time-binds'. In Section 3, we suggest how a mobilities lens can enrich work-family scholarship by sketching out a future agenda of research.

Introducing mobilities studies

What is 'mobilities studies' and how might it encourage new ways of thinking about work-family dynamics? Commonly described as a 'multi-disciplinary' project, mobilities studies has its origins in the humanities and social sciences, bringing together scholars from a wide array of disciplines (e.g. geography, urban studies, sociology, anthropology, migration studies, and cultural studies). Connecting them is a shared interest in the growing prevalence, nature, and meanings of varied mobilities in contemporary life (see Sheller, 2011; Cresswell, 2006). Though acknowledging the historical importance of mobility—for instance, in the flow of workers from countryside to city in 19th C industrialization—mobilities scholars contend that a distinct feature of contemporary societies is found in the proliferation of 'multiple mobilities' (e.g. business travel, virtual communication) linking people, information, and resources together in entirely

new ways (see Sheller and Urry, 2006; Urry, 2007; Elliot and Urry, 2010; Kesselring, 2014). A mobilities approach thus challenges traditional scholarship that is static, aspatial, and amobile in nature, encouraging a more 'movement-oriented' approach (Sheller and Urry, 2006).

Several ideas within mobilities studies are highly germane to work-family scholarship. Here we focus on three key ideas that challenge foundational assumptions (often implicit) within work-family research. The first concept, *employment-related mobility (ERM)*, captures a broad spectrum of work-related mobilities, thus expanding the foci of existing scholarship. Best viewed as a continuum, ERM includes: mobility to-and- from jobs (e.g. commuting on varying scales); daily circuits of mobility to accomplish work; and mobility of more extended durations and scales (Roseman et al., 2015: 175). While some mobility scholars emphasize both *distance/scale* and *duration* (Newhook et al., 2011), others highlight the *centrality* of mobility (Cohen, 2010), distinguishing between *mobility for work* (e.g. home repair, offshore oil workers); *mobility as work* (e.g. truck drivers, pilots); and *working while mobile* (e.g. lawyers, CEOs). From an empirical standpoint, ERM encompasses a rich mix of work activity, including: i) home-based employees and entrepreneurs engaged in micro-commutes in their home/communities; ii) blue-, white- and pink-collar workers commuting or travelling by foot, bike, bus, rail, car, train, and plane; iii) mobile workers such as home-care aides and domestic cleaners engaged in peripatetic circuits of mobility; and iv) those for whom 'mobility is work', such as taxi drivers, truck drivers, and flight crews, amongst others.

Tracing the rise of ERM, mobilities scholars point to a constellation of factors. New technologies play a key role, enabling 'work anytime, anywhere'. Transportation advances are central too, making ERM more economically and logistically feasible (Elliott and Urry, 2010). Equally important are political and economic shifts towards globalized production and

networked organizations—what Kesselring (2014) calls 'corporate mobility regimes'—that work to reconfigure and 'stretch' work across time and space, folding mobility into previously immobile jobs (see also Gustafson, 2006; Nicolini, 2012). Other factors contributing to rising ERM include: i) changing client preferences for on-site delivery; ii) escalating housing costs in urban centres that necessitate longer commutes; iii) the rise of dual-earner families and need to coordinate jobs and careers; iv) high unemployment in economically depressed regions that necessitate mobility for work; and vi) government policies designed to spur labour mobility and create more 'flexible' workforces (e.g. unemployment policy requiring travel, trade agreements).

Evidence of rising ERM is found throughout mobilities studies (Adey et al., 2014; Canzler et al., 2008; Collet and Bonnet, 2010; Elliott and Urry, 2010; Gustafson, 2006). Drawing selectively, research confirms increasing commuting times and distances, and more varied forms of ERM, such as business travel, super-commuting, and fly-in, fly-out work (Rapino and Fields, 2013; Viry and Kauffman, 2015; Gustafson, 2006; Australia, 2015; Sandow, 2014). For instance, Adey et al.'s (2014) *Handbook of Mobilities* traces, amongst other things, the rise of 'executive mobilities' amongst CEOs, managers, and professionals in the UK and Europe (Faulconbridge, 2014). At the other end of the occupational spectrum, Venn (2012) documents mobility pressures on the unemployed in several European countries, with policies requiring workers to travel up to 2.5-3 hours a day for 'suitable work'. Future labour force projections also predict rising ERM due to occupational and industrial shifts. For instance, in the U.S., projections to 2030 forecast high demand for mobile workers in home-care, sales, services, and delivery work (U.S. Bureau of Labour Statistics, 2017; IDC, 2015). Yet, even setting aside future projections, current (and past) labour force data highlight the centrality of ERM in many jobs that have been routinely overlooked in work-family studies. Illustrating this in the U.S., for example, we see that CEOs

and professionals are well-studied exemplars of business travel, yet comprise just 300,000 workers. In contrast, highly mobile groups, such as sales reps (2.1 million), heavy truck drivers (1.87 million), and air transport workers (275,000) have been rarely studied, despite the import of ERM in their daily lives (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017).

While the concept of *ERM* highlights the need to study a broad spectrum of work-related mobilities and occupations, a second concept—*time-space* (and related concepts of *space, place, movement and mobility)* prompts valuable theoretical and methodological redirections. Here we see how mobilities studies builds upon insights from the 'spatial turn' in the humanities and social sciences, which argues for the need to make the analysis of space more central and explicit (see Logan, 2012; Sheller and Urry, 2006). Particularly influential for mobilities scholars are the ideas of Doreen Massey (1993; 2005), who has written extensively about the 'long history of aspatial analysis in the social sciences' and the tendency for scholars to privilege 'time' over 'space' (see also Halford and Leonard, 2006). For Massey, time and space are not separable, but inextricably connected together, as *time-space.* Moreover, time-space is not simply a more multi-dimensional context in which individuals live their lives—it is dynamic, socially constituted, and shaped by power relations of domination and subordination. Contrary to much-heralded ideas of 'smooth mobility' and 'hypermobility' in a shrinking world, Massey instead emphasizes the 'power geometries of time-space', highlighting how certain social groups have unequal access to, and control, over time-space and mobility. As she states:

> … some are more in charge of it than others; some initiate flows and movement, others don't; some are more on the receiving-end of it than others, some are effectively imprisoned by it (Massey, 1993: 61).

Taking these insights further, mobilities scholars contend that while the spatial turn has sparked greater attention to issues of space and power, a great deal of scholarly work continues

to be ‘a-mobile’, operating with a ‘sedentarist’ rather than ‘nomadic’ metaphysics that casts mobility as the exception, and immobility as the rule (Cresswell, 2011; Holdsworth, 2013; Sheller and Urry, 2006). Inverting this, mobilities scholars begin from the premise of mobility, working to trace and account for ‘space’ and ‘movement’ (as abstract concepts), and ‘place’ and ‘mobility’ (as lived experiences imbued with human meaning). Space is thus represented by the geographic coordinates on a map—for example, New York, 40.7128° N, 74.0059° W—while place is socially situated, filled with history and meaning (e.g. ‘my home’, ‘my neighbourhood’). Likewise, movement is the abstract process of moving from location A to B, while mobility is ‘movement that is made meaningful’ (Cresswell, 2006: 3, 21). Starting from this conceptual vantage point, mobility studies thus prompts a more dynamic view, encouraging us to move beyond the exclusive focus on ‘time-binds’ so well studied by work-family scholars. But this does not mean simply adding new concepts such as ‘place-binds’ or ‘space-binds’. Instead, it involves reconceptualizing ‘time’ and ‘space’ as inextricably linked (i.e. *time-space).*

A final concept within mobilities studies, especially relevant for work-family studies, is that of *co-presence*—which refers to a subjective sense of togetherness, or ‘being there’ (Urry, 2002; Zhao, 2003; Sheller and Urry, 2006). Though less developed than other mobilities concepts, co-presence underscores important questions about how a sense of togetherness is accomplished and/or impeded, and in particular how it is shaped by proximity and distance. For work-family studies, the concept of co-presence is an especially salient one. Several important questions here include: how do varied mobilities (physical/embodied or virtual) constrain or nurture co-presence; how does the varied nature, duration, and control of mobility shape co-presence; and to what extent do new forms of mobility change ‘the very nature and need for co-presence’ itself (Urry, 2002: 266). Of special note, for work-family scholars, while mobilities

studies argues that physical/corporeal proximity and co-presence is central to building trusting, committed, productive 'economic relationships' in the context of global economies (Urry, 2002; Kesselring, 2014), researchers have paid far less attention to the implications of ERM for familial and intimate co-presence. Bringing mobilities studies and work-family scholarship together thus has great potential to enrich our understanding of whether and how physical distance erodes co-presence and fuels psychological distancing (Williams and Bargh, 2008), or instead sparks new ways of creating familial co-presence while working 'on the move'.

Examining and rethinking work-family scholarship through the lens of mobility

With these key mobilities concepts in mind, we turn to consider a second question: how has work-family scholarship examined issues of mobility, space, and place to date? We explore this question in two different ways—first, reflecting on established theoretical approaches in the work-family tradition to consider how time, space, place, and mobility have been conceptualized and theorized [4], and second, using a systematic literature review (SLR) of work-family articles in leading journals over the last 20 years to see how these issues have been studied.

Theoretical approaches to work-family dynamics

From a theoretical standpoint, a natural starting point is Greenhaus and Beutell's (1985) original conceptualization of 'work-family conflict' (WFC). This work has been highly influential, generating nearly 8,000 citations to date, and informing a vast array of studies on WFC, as well as newer concepts of 'work-family enrichment' (Greenhaus and Powell, 2006) and 'work-family integration' (Korabik et al., 2008), to name but a few (for overviews, see Allen et al., 2000; Amstad et al., 2011; Bellavia et al., 2005; Bianchi and Milkie, 2011; Byron, 2005). What is striking from a mobilities perspective, however, is how little attention is paid in this foundational article to the dynamics of space, place, and mobility. No doubt these issues may

have seemed far less important at the time of writing (in the mid-1980s), prior to the acceleration of globalization and emergence of new technologies. Moreover, Greenhaus and Beutell were focused on a different, but equally fundamental, transformation, the dramatic rise of women's paid work, and dual-earner families, as women's time and presence was redistributed between the workplace and home. Yet, while this shift had clear spatial implications—revising the 'separate spheres model' of household (caregiver) and paid labor market (breadwinner)—these issues receive scant attention. Instead, building on role theory, which assumes a scarcity of time and other resources, Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) propose three forms of WFC: i) time-based; ii) strain-based; and iii) behaviour-based (77). Of note, while 'time' is central to their analysis, space, place and mobility remain untheorized. A close re-reading of Greenhaus and Beutell, however, finds several instances where mobility is identified as a source of conflict and distress (e.g. sailors on deployment, business travel). These examples are folded into 'time-based' conflict, suggesting that 'space' is convertible to 'time' in some way. This use of what we call 'time-space conversion' persists to the present day, an issue we return to in later sections.

From this early, influential, conceptualization, work-family scholarship has grown dramatically.[5] Theoretical interest in conflict- and time-based approaches has persisted, reflecting the influence of *role* and *resource theory* (Greenhaus and ten Brummelhuis, 2013). But other approaches have emerged, most notably: *ecological systems theory*, examining work-family dynamics across micro-, meso-, exo- and macro-systems (Voydanoff, 2002); *life-course theory* (Elder, 1994), focusing on linked lives, historical time, and individual and household strategies (Moen and Yu, 2000); and *border theory* (Clark, 2000) and *boundary theory (*Ashforth et al., 2000; Nippert-Eng, 1996), exploring physical, temporal, and psychological borders and boundary crossing between work and family domains. Of these, border and boundary theory do

take up issues of movement and mobility, space and time. However, they focus primarily on 'mental', 'cognitive', and 'emotional' boundaries, and transitions between fixed domains of work and home, rather than working with more fluid, nomadic, conceptualizations of work and family, or the power relations of time-space that mobilities studies assumes.

More recently, new theories drawing on *positive psychology*, and *theories of affect and cognition* have also emerged, such as Greenhaus and Powell (2006)'s *theory of work-family enrichment* (WFE), examining positive relationships between work and family, and ten Brummelhuis and Bakker's (2012) *integrated work-home model*, exploring temporal processes and linkages between positive and negative outcomes. Yet, even in these recent theorizations, issues of mobility, space, and place receive little theoretical or empirical attention, left to be considered as an independent variable, or taken up as a 'niche' concern (e.g. business travel studies). This ongoing neglect is puzzling given the dramatic rise of mobile work, as well as persistent calls by work-family scholars for 'new theoretical directions'. On this latter point, Matthews et al. (2015) and ten Brummelhuis and Bakker (2012) offer valuable new theoretical ideas aimed at revitalizing work-family studies, as does a recent special issue in *Academy of Management Review* (Powell, Greenhaus, Allen and Johnson, 2019).Yet, as Williams et al. (2016: 520-22) has observed, current theorizing appears to take work-family scholarship in an 'ever more individualistic direction', emphasizing issues of individual cognition, decision-making, and positive affect, while neglecting the power relations and macro-structural drivers of work and family life. These tendencies, in our view, can be traced to the continued influence of role theory, which operates, as Connell (1987) observes, with a theory of norms, expectations, and preferences, rather than a theory of power, practice, and constraint. In light of these theoretical considerations, a mobilities lens offers new ideas and strong potential to address

current limitations.

Searching for ERM in work-family scholarship

We now turn from theoretical approaches, to examine systematically work-family studies in leading journals from the past two decades. We pose the same question: how have issues of mobility, space, and place been taken up? We use a systematic literature review (SLR), which allows us to identify a wide range of scholarship, though it is important to note that it may not capture all relevant studies.[6] Focusing on a 20-year span (1995-2015)—a period which saw an explosion of interest in work-family issues—we follow established SLR methodologies (Petticrew and Roberts, 2006; Reay et al., 2009), identifying leading journals publishing on work-family issues through a search of *EBSCO*, *JSTOR*, and *Web of Science* using key words (e.g. 'work-family conflict', 'work-family balance', 'work-family enrichment'). This first round of searching generated 301 articles in leading management, organization, and work journals.[7] Working with these articles, we then searched to identify articles addressing issues of mobility, space, or place. Our key terms included: 'mobility', 'mobile work', 'space', place', 'travel', 'commuting', 'distance', 'temporality' and 'power'. This generated a smaller group of articles that we read using a standard protocol, noting: i) key focus and questions; ii) occupations studied; and iii) how mobility, space, place, and power were theorized, measured, and analyzed.

Insert Table 1 about here

Working with the studies identified in our SLR, several valuable insights emerge. First, and most striking, we see that issues of mobility, space, and place have received relatively little attention in work-family studies overall—a surprise given the dramatic rise of ERM in the 20-year period studied. Of the 301 articles identified in our review, just 41 articles, or 13.6 per cent,

examined or took up issues of mobility, space, or place in some way. Theoretical discussions are especially infrequent (accounting for just six of the 41 articles), with most focusing on boundary theory and ecological systems theory. There is also little evidence of engagement with ideas or concepts from the 'spatial' or 'mobile turns', even in more recent writing. Instead, of the 35 empirical studies identified, most focus on a narrow range of ERM (notably, telework or commuting), while a few examine mobility or space as one of many of 'explanatory variables' (for example, influence of geographical location, amongst other variables, on job attrition and WFC, as in Deutsch and Yao, 2014). There is also a strong emphasis on elite occupations, especially managers and professionals, as has been noted by others (Greenhaus, 2008; Williams et al., 2016), rather than on a broader occupational range that might shed light on new types of ERM. We also see surprisingly little attention to power dynamics, with just six articles referencing power in some way, and just one of these (2 per cent) discussing power in any substantive manner (Ashforth et al., 2000).[8] Overall, our SLR confirms that questions of mobility, space, and place have receive minimal attention—typically overlooked, or when taken up, analyzed and folded into established approaches.

Most interesting, from a mobilities standpoint, when we examine the specific types of ERM studied, we see how implicit spatial assumptions direct attention to specific types of mobilities. Far greater attention has been paid to patterns of *spatial concentration and proximate mobilities*, especially telework, than to patterns of *spatial dispersion and distal mobilities*, such as long-distance business travel, or super-commuting. Looking across the studies listed in Table 1, telework accounts for roughly half of all studies (49 per cent), followed by commuting (32 per cent of articles) and then business travel (27 per cent of articles).[9] It is only in studies of business travel that we begin to see attention to more varied, distal, mobilities on a regional, national, or

global scale (Gustafson, 2006). In addition, we also see a marked tendency to examine mobility by focusing on what goes on within, and between, 'fixed domains', such as 'work' and 'home', rather than operating with more fluid conceptualizations of work and family that are accomplished 'on the move'. This tendency to assume fixed domains—most evident in assumptions of daily travel between work and home, or alternatively, the intense interest in telework and the attempt to re-locate paid work to the home—is illustrative of the type of 'sedentarist' orientation that mobilities scholars critique. On this point, it is also striking that virtually no studies in the SLR examine 'mobile workers', or those for whom 'mobility is work'.

With respect to methodologies and methods, we can also identify important ways in which the exploration of mobility, space, and place is foreclosed. For instance, the majority of studies in our SLR are positivist in nature, reflecting a 'variables approach' and bringing the sophisticated measurement and analytic techniques that are an admired hallmark of work-family research (Williams et al., 2016). Yet, there are recurring problems in accounting for mobility and space, with a pronounced tendency to engage in what we refer to earlier as 'time-space conversion'—where measures of time serve as proxies for space and mobility. For instance, studies of telework typically measure the number of hours, or percentage of work time, in a home-based location (e.g. Desrochers et al., 2005; Golden, 2007; Kossek et al., 2006). Commuting is measured by combining daily commuting and working time (Nomaguchi et al., 2005; Parasuraman et al., 1996; ten Brummelhuis et al., 2008; Wierda-Boer et al., 2008). Business travel is measured by 'time spent on business travel' or 'number of overnight trips from home'. While some studies adopt more nuanced approaches (for example, Edgell et al., 2012)—which marks an improvement given evidence that travel and work time are experienced differently (Chamorro-Premuzic, 2015; Sandow, 2014; van der Klis and Karsten, 2009)—the

heavy reliance on time-based measures is a great limitation, failing to capture how individuals navigate and experience ERM. Finally, and equally important, we find few studies that consider issues of power, by exploring whether individuals have control over ERM, or the freedom to determine the location of their work (for valuable exceptions, see Kossek et al., 2006; Shockley and Allen, 2007).

In short, our systematic review of studies in leading academic journals highlights important limitations in work-family research. Theoretically, these include: i) the lack of explicit attention to issues of mobility, space, and place; ii) the reliance on approaches that place priority on 'time' and 'time-binds'; and iii) the tendency to gloss over considerations of power and constraint. Empirically, when questions of mobility and space have been taken up, the primary focus has been on situations of *spatial concentration* and *proximate mobilities*, such as telework or commuting—leaving other forms of ERM either unexamined, or to be taken up as a 'niche' concern (Gustafson, 2006). Although these limitations do not diminish the rich insights generated by work-family studies, they do highlight the potential value of greater dialogue and bridge-building between work-family and mobilities perspectives. In the next section, we explore what might be produced through such an exercise, outlining a 'mobilities inspired' agenda that sparks new ways of thinking about mobility in work and family, encouraging a more 'movement-driven' approach (Buscher and Urry, 2009).

Bringing mobilities studies and work-family scholarship together

How might a mobilities lens contribute to future work-family scholarship? What new questions and knowledge are generated by bringing work-family and mobilities perspectives into closer dialogue? In this section, we argue that a mobilities approach encourages three key shifts that have the potential to expand and deepen knowledge about work-family dynamics in contexts

where work-related mobility is increasingly at play. These shifts involve: i) the recognition and excavation of a broad range of ERM, using new research sites and innovative mobile methods; ii) greater attention to the power-geometries of ERM, specifically questions of choice and constraint; and iii) a shift from an individual, outcome-focused, orientation, towards a relational, process-oriented approach that illuminates the experiences, practices, and meanings of ERM, and the ways in which sense of co-presence is realized.

We discuss each of these three shifts in the sections below, drawing from mobilities studies to elaborate on the theoretical, conceptual, and methodological issues involved, and to identify exemplar studies. Where possible, we also identify work-family studies from our SLR (and beyond) that seem well-suited to a mobilities approach. Though our primary goal is to consider what work-family scholarship can learn from mobilities studies we also note where mobilities scholarship might benefit from ideas within work-family, and organizational, studies.

Excavating a broader spectrum of employment-related mobilities

A first and central contribution of a mobilities approach is to prompt critical redirections that are theoretical, conceptual and methodological in nature—acknowledging the twinned role of time and space (as time-space), the centrality of mobility to work and family life, and the need to more fully excavate a broad spectrum of ERM. Here we draw on DeVault's notion of 'excavation' to imagine the new insights and knowledge that future work-family studies might generate by considering varied forms of understudied ERM, thus 'uncovering and articulating what has been hidden or unacknowledged' (1999: 55). It is important to emphasize that this first shift is not at the surface-level, involving a search for new research sites or themes, for instance Instead, it is a theoretically-driven reorientation that embraces a movement-driven point of view, and works to uncover how varied *scales*, *durations*, and *tempos* of ERM shape experiences of

work and family Adding to this process, are exciting methodological innovations, including the use of 'mobile methods', that aid in capturing the fleeting, processual, aspects of work and family as they play out on the move.

Concerning the types of ERM most in need of excavation, our SLR clearly shows the need to study diverse *scales* and *durations* of ERM, moving beyond telework and short-distance commuting (conceptually reflecting *spatial concentration and proximate mobilities*) to study mobility arrangements that are regional, national, and global in scale (conceptually reflecting *spatial dispersion and distal mobilities*). Not only have these latter forms of ERM been vastly understudied relative to their growing importance, there is good reason to believe they pose unique challenges for individuals and families, given evidence on the 'liability of distance', the link between physical and psychological distancing, and the demands associated with what Cohen and Gossling (2015) call the 'darker side' of mobility (see also Liu et al., 2011; Williams and Bargh, 2008). Here greater exchange between work-family and mobilities perspectives could enhance our understanding of many understudied forms of ERM, including: i) manual / trades workers engaged in fly-in, fly-out work in mining, oil, and other resource sectors; ii) those for whom mobility is work, such as long-haul truckers and overseas flight crews; and iii) knowledge workers, project managers, entrepreneurs, creative workers, and others engaged in regular or irregular longer-distance travel and super-commuting.

Intersecting with *scale*, a mobilities lens would also encourage attention to varied *durations* and *tempos* of ERM. For instance, studies comparing national or global ERM that is regular and predictable (e.g. weekly commuting of trades workers or professionals), with intermittent, non-routine, mobility (e.g. irregular trips of professionals or entrepreneurs for projects, conferences, or trade shows) can generate insights into the varied experience of ERM,

and the mobility routines, practices, and knowledge involved. Here the mobilities emphasis on understanding 'lived time' and 'experienced time' can generate new insights, taking us beyond the surface-level accounting of 'clock time' identified in our SLR. It can also enhance our understanding of how ERM shapes work-family dynamics over time—for instance, comparing sustained involvement with ERM, with more episodic or shorter-duration cycles. Beyond these empirical insights, a mobilities perspective can also contribute to recent theorizing on temporality in work-family life, with a mobility lens offering a stronger theorization of time-space than exists at present (see for example, ten Brummelhuis and Arnold, 2012).

A mobilities lens also opens up rich possibilities with the use of 'mobile methods'. Faced with the challenge of capturing 'fleeting experiences' that elude traditional methods (e.g. cross-sectional surveys), mobilities scholars have explored creative new approaches, such as mobile ethnographies and interviews, time-space diaries, and people and object mapping that synthesize the use of ride-alongs, walk-alongs and GPS (see for example, Buscher and Urry, 2009: D'Andrea et al., 2011; Laurier, 2004; Sheller, 2011; and Watts and Urry, 2008). While these methodological innovations are not necessarily unique to mobilities studies, the 'movement' and 'meaning' orientation can helpfully push work-family studies beyond its usual methodological repertoire. Here we also see opportunities for reciprocal exchange with some work-family researchers who are developing innovative methods designed to capture the complex, ongoing, negotiation of work-family life (see for instance, Radcliffe and Cassell, 2014; for discussions, see Eby et al., 2005; and Williams et al., 2016).

Exemplars in the mobilities paradigm that illustrate the approach described in this first shift include Dorow and Mandizadza's (2018) study of Canadian oil sands workers engaged in *long-distance/duration* ERM, completing two to three weeks of work, before returning to

families across the country for short periods of respite. Using ethnographic techniques, Dorow and Mandizadza shed light on the wide-ranging implications of ERM, as work and family are stretched across time-space—necessitating practices of remote parenting, the coordination of the often clashing temporalities of work camp and distant family life, and the emotional effort of maintaining co-presence with family and friends while enduring loneliness, isolation and boredom. Their study also illustrates how gender, race, and class shaped experiences of ERM, and how 'mobility regimes' of long-distance ERM increasingly operate in some sectors (e.g. oil, mining) where costs allow as alternatives to traditional arrangements of 'company towns'. Though their study may see to focus on a 'specialized form' of ERM, it is in fact highly relevant to a growing range of jobs where *long-distance / duration ERM* is on the rise and in need of much greater attention.

Turning to situations of *spatial concentration* and *proximate mobility*, we have already noted how certain examples of such work (i.e. telework) have been well-studied by work-family scholars. But our SLR also identifies striking gaps in relation to other newly emerging forms of recurring, proximate, mobilities that are emblematic of 'fully mobile workers' and 'gig economies' (e.g. Uber drivers, courier and delivery workers). Attention to this form of ERM seems especially important given the forecasted growth of such jobs, and the potential for both constraint (given 'on-demand' services) and opportunity in blending work and family activities in novel ways (e.g. picking up children as part of a circuit of mobility, running family errands or meeting with friends while on a break). Indeed, during the writing of this paper, we have been struck by recruitment campaigns such as Uber's *Where To?* which romantically portrays the work-family benefits of Uber driving, over the store-bound sedentarism of working as a supermarket cashier[10]. Future mobilities-inspired studies can glean many new insights about this

rapidly growing work niche, which include not only Uber and other transport and delivery jobs, but home health care aides, repair techs, emergency workers, and sales representatives, to name but a few. On this last point, we would note that while some mobilities scholars examine this type of mobility (see for instance, Brown and O'Hara, 2003; Cohen, 2010; Sharma, 2017), work-family issues not a central concern. Likewise, though some work-family studies recognize mobile work and the creation of 'third spaces'[11] (e.g. Towers et al., 2006), a deeper engagement with mobilities ideas would help this work move beyond time-based approaches, measures and well-studied forms of ERM (e.g. telework).

Unpacking the power-geometries of employment-related mobilities

A second critical contribution of mobilities studies, one that goes hand-in-hand with the excavation of a broader spectrum of ERM, is to address issues of power, and the linkages between macro-level political economic contexts and the micro-level behaviours and experiences of work and family. Here Massey's ideas of 'power-geometries' are especially valuable. Illustrating this, Kesselring's (2014) examination of 'corporate mobility regimes', which builds on Massey, demonstrates how studies can contextualize individual decisions as they are shaped by employers' changing utilization of time-space, and specific strategies that 'normalize' and 'rationalize' ERM. Studying what he calls 'mobility pioneers' (e.g. knowledge and professional workers), Kesselring (2006, 2014) shows how economies characterized by ever-increasing expectations of productive mobility and continuous availability operate to the advantage of employers, leaving individuals and families to absorb the assorted costs of ERM. Such costs include lost weekends to travel and recovery, regularly missing family events and leisure, and seeing friendships and community involvement atrophy due to dislocation and distance. Yet, Kesselring also takes up issues of agency, tracing how individuals and families utilize mobilities

knowledge, routines, and practices to navigate, negotiate, and resist the macro-level pressures associated with ever rising ERGM—an issue we discuss in more depth in the next section.

Future work-family studies can usefully deploy the concept of 'mobilities regimes', in conjunction with established concepts from work-family scholarship, such as 'work-family orientations', to enhance knowledge about 'opportunity-based' and 'necessity-based' ERM—where the former involves mobility that is voluntarily chosen to improve job opportunities, and economic security, and the latter is pursued, or imposed, due to a lack of viable alternatives. Such an approach would help to address oft-noted limitations in work-family research, where issues of power and constraint are glossed over, in favour of explanations that emphasize individual 'preferences' for segmenting or integrating family and work. Notable exceptions to this approach do exist, such as Kossek et al. (2006), who challenge assumptions that individuals and families can always match their work-family preferences to available work. Such an approach, used in conjunction with an analysis of the mobility regimes in play, could be highly productive for work-family research, especially when used in comparative designs that contrast opportunity- and necessity-based ERM. Likewise, for mobilities scholars, stronger empirical engagement with work-family issues could also help to refine the concept of 'mobility regimes' which, at times, seems to operate deterministically, rather than opening up excavation of how employer-generated mobility regimes are navigated and experienced by workers and families who vary in relative skills, bargaining power, and control over mobility (Massey, 1993).

Concerning specific power dynamics of interest, we would argue that non-standard and precarious work is especially in need of sustained attention. In fact, it is both interesting and puzzling that despite the significant attention paid by work-family scholars to the growing 'time demands' of the 24/7 economy—for example, unpredictable schedules, insufficient hours, and

temporal flexibility that favour employers over employees (Jacobs and Gerson, 2004; Presser, 2003)—there has been so little corresponding attention to questions of space, place, and work location. Yet, rising ERM is central to the time-space restructuring and reconfiguration of work observed across many sectors, whether generated through requirements that employees work across multiple worksites with the same company (e.g. fast food outlets), the hollowing out of regional economies, or the need for growing numbers of service workers to hold multiple jobs due to insufficient hours and zero-hour contracts (Standing, 2014). A prime example of this can be found in Williams and Boushby's (2010) analysis of the 'missing faces' within work-family research, which highlights how low-income, single, mothers travel several hours daily on public transport to cobble together multiple precarious jobs to support their families. While this example draws attention to the power-geometries within relative localized, proximate ERM, we see the same dynamics operating over national/global scales, as Dorow and Mandizadza's (2018) study shows, with mobility regimes of long-distance ERM drawing heavily from peripheral, sunset regions, with high levels of unemployment and precarious manual labourers.

Beyond labour market precarity, a mobilities lens can also make important contributions to illuminating inequalities within, and between, labour markets and households. Here mobilities scholarship, which emphasizes linkages between im / mobile workers, offers strong potential to generate insights into the experiences of immobile family members, who keep the 'home fires burning', thus facilitating ERM while also sharpening gender inequalities in the household as a result. Currently, a handful of studies on business travelers, long-haul truckers, fishers, and military personnel confirm fairly traditional patterns of men as mobile breadwinners, and women as the non-mobile support, especially where young children are involved (Borve and Bungum, 2015; Gustafson, 2006; Willerton et al., 2011; Zvonkovic and Notter, 2006). But not all such

work draws on a mobility lens, and there is far more to learn about the interconnections of im / mobilities in the understudied forms of ERM we have noted. Moreover, how ERM is practiced and experienced in diverse and less traditional households (e.g. single person, female breadwinner, same-sex, multi-generational) is an area in need of greater study. On this point, we again see opportunities for productive exchange, with mobilities studies giving added impetus to long-standing, but relatively neglected, calls in work-family scholarship for greater research attention to issues of class and gender, and more diverse family forms (Williams et al., 2016).

Illuminating the practices, experiences, and meanings of mobilities

A third contribution of a mobilities perspective is to shed light on the practices, experiences, and meanings of ERM, and the ways in which a sense of co-presence is realized. Underlying this contribution is a shift away from the individual tenor of much work-family research, towards a relational approach that attends to context, practices, and meanings. Here several research questions are key: What are the specific practices, routines, and knowledge individuals and families develop in navigating varied forms of ERM? How is a sense of co-presence achieved while 'at a distance' and 'on the move'? In addressing these questions, work-family studies can benefit from the practice-based and interpretive approaches employed by many mobilities scholars. Aiding this, the use of innovative 'mobile methods', discussed earlier, offers a growing mix of creative techniques for capturing work-family processes and negotiation in daily life, pushing our understandings beyond traditional outcome-oriented approaches.

In this vein, a central issue that work-family studies can productively explore concerns questions of co-presence (Urry, 2002; Zhao, 2003), and the *mobility practices* that individuals and their families develop to foster a sense of togetherness, Here, a mobilities lens encourages in-depth exploration of varied practices—for instance, family rituals that smooth exits and re-

entries, the use of portable affect (e.g. photos, music, gifts) to boost spirits;, and embodied and/or virtual travel aimed at creating co-presence (Elliot and Urry, 2010; Zvonkovic and Notter, 2006). In tracing varied practices, a mobilities lens pushes beyond standard approaches of tallying clock time, individual activity, and discrete outcomes, building a relational, process-oriented understanding of work and family life. Equally important, work-family studies can also examine how *mobility knowledge, expertise, and support* shapes experiences of ERM. Here Kesselring's (2014) concept of 'mobility competencies' is highly relevant, raising questions about the ways in which individuals and families accumulate and hone expertise, knowledge, and routines through recurring mobility, as they learn to navigate transportation systems, coordinate temporalities, and retain connections through communication technologies. For instance, Kesselring argues that well-honed mobility competencies enable workers and their families to manage many unique demands of ERM, such as jet lag, time changes, and the physical, mental, and emotional demands of living in, and between, often discordant temporalities of transport systems, varied work locations, and family life at a distance (see Cohen and Gossling, 2015; Chamorro-Premuzic, 2015; Gustafson, 2006).

Valuable exemplars that take up such issues are found in Baldassar's (2016) study of mobility practices, which traces the 'circulation of care' through time-space in families 'at a distance'. Rather than focusing on discrete outcomes, such as whether individuals report work-family conflict, the focus is on developing a multi-layered understanding of how physical and virtual mobility are used to bring family members together. Baldassar identifies distinct forms of co-presence, such as 'active co-presence' (where prompt attention, focus, and emotional engagement is required) and 'passive co-presence' (where lines of conversation are left open over extended periods of time, through ongoing texts or a continual Skype feed during a birthday

celebration or Sunday family dinner, for example. There is also attention to how varied forms of caring (e.g. routine, crisis, instrumental, expressive) are coordinated through hybrid networks of local and distant family, neighbours, and friends. Baldassar argues that physical co-presence should not be assumed as the 'gold standard' of family life; instead, empirical study is needed to determine how distance operates, and whether it is detrimental, as is commonly assumed. This approach generates rich insights into how individuals, families, and friends develop and hone mobility practices to foster a sense of connection and co-presence.

Other exemplars using a mobilities lens focus on recurring, proximate, mobilities—what Strandell (2014) calls 'small scale' mobilities—to understand how the coordination of work and family activities, and the connectedness between family members, is accomplished. For instance, Jensen et al. (2014), explores the 'everyday mobilities' of families in urban households, drawing on GPS tracking, interviews, and memory mapping, to trace the complex mobilities practices of working parents and children in synchronizing their individual and household activities, and affective ties. Likewise, Strandell (2014) and Christensen (2009) examine how working parents, children, as well as paid caregivers, develop practices of coordinated care and remote parenting through virtual mobilities (e.g. texting, mobile phone calls) in order to offer advice, resolve conflict and offer emotional support while at a distance.

Linking these mobilities-inspired research to the work-family studies identified in our SLR highlights the potential value of a mobilities lens. For instance, Geurts et al. (2009) in their study of control over working time, express surprise that 'time spent commuting' does not contribute to work-to-family interference, as they hypothesize. But a mobilities approach can help to unravel this, moving beyond 'clock time' to explore how commuting is practiced and experienced. Likewise, another area where a mobilities lens can generate new insights is around

communication technologies (e.g. mobile phones, FaceTime), which family members use to achieve 'connected presence' throughout the day. Here we see strong potential for exchange between work-family and mobilities research, given a growing body of work-family research on this topic. We concur with Wajcman et al. (2008), however, in noting that work-family studies has primarily focused whether technologies operate as tools of 'work extension', leaving other questions aside. Offering a great exemplar of a more open stance to these questions, Wajcman et al. (2008) explore mobile phone use by individuals and families, showing that contrary to the 'work extension' thesis, phones are primarily used to create 'connected presence' through daily micro-coordination and maintenance of intimate ties. While a mobilities lens is not central to Wajcman et al.'s (2008) study, nor do they focus on specific types of ERM, their work as well as other studies (for example, Duxbury et al., 2014; Mullan and Wajcman, 2017) are instructive in identifying where further exchange between work-family and mobilities ideas can be fruitful.

Conclusions

We began this review essay by noting that in a world where growing numbers of workers are 'on the move', mobilities studies offers a valuable lens for reorienting work-family scholarship. We also began with a puzzle of sorts—noting that despite the rise of work-related mobility in contemporary economies around the world, work-family scholarship has not fully taken up questions of time, space, and place, focusing instead on a narrow subset of mobilities (most notably telework and commuting), and analyzing them primarily through the lens of time. In our review of theoretical work in the work-family tradition, we trace these tendencies back to foundational contributions, noting how assumptions are made about the primacy of time over space, stability over movement, and fixed domains of 'work' and 'home' linked by daily, proximate, mobilities. Building from this, our systematic review of work-family studies over the

past 20 years (1995 - 2015) likewise shows how scholarship continues to be shaped and constrained by these early assumptions, despite stirrings of interest in mobile work, and persistent calls in recent years for 'new theoretical directions'.

In tackling these issues, our central goal has been to introduce ideas from the emergent paradigm of mobilities studies, and to illustrate how a 'mobilities lens' might better equip us to study contemporary work-family dynamics where workers are increasingly on the move. Drawing on key concepts from mobilities studies—in particular, employment-related mobility (ERM), time-space, and co-presence—we argue that a mobilities lens can aid in rethinking foundational work-family approaches that are aspatial and amobile. Sketching out a future research agenda, we show how a mobilities lens sparks important theoretical and methodological reorientations, which direct attention to a broader spectrum of ERM and to critical questions about the power, practices, and meanings of ERM in work and family life. Concurrently, and positively, a mobilities approach also opens up welcome pathways to address other limitations of existing research (noted by work-family scholars themselves), directing attention towards a richer mix of occupations and family forms, and to questions of power and linkages between the structure drivers, and micro-level experiences, of work-family life.

Though the bulk of our review has focused on the questions of what work-family scholarship can gain by using a mobilities lens to rethink standard approaches, we have also noted where mobilities studies can benefit, in turn, from ideas within work-family research and organizational studies. This is a point that has been made by mobilities scholars themselves in highlighting the need for greater engagement with questions of work (Cresswell et al., 2016). Elaborating on this issue, we would note that in addition to drawing insights from work-family scholarship, mobilities studies has much to gain from organizational studies more broadly, with

several traditions of thought having strong affinity with a mobilities point of view. For instance, critical management studies (CMS) has great scope to inform analyses of the power geometries of ERM, mobility regimes, and the questions of opportunity and constraint we have highlighted in our agenda (see Alvesson et al., 2011 for an overview). An ever-growing body of research on practices and routines in organizational studies is also highly relevant to the discussions of mobility knowledge, routines, and practices that have been noted (see for instance, Nicolini, 2007, 2012; 2017). More broadly, a mobilities approach is highly compatible with current work under the umbrella of 'process approaches' to organizational life (e.g. practice-based theory, institutional logics, assemblages), which emphasize relationality, temporality and flow, and a 'strong-process' orientation that moves away from 'arrows connecting stable boxes' to 'arrows all the way through' (see Langley and Tsoukas, 2017: 3-4).

Finally, we wish to emphasize that while a mobilities perspective, with its emphasis on power relations, may seem to focus attention on the potentially problematic nature of ERM, we see potential to generate knowledge about both 'conflicting' and 'enriching' processes (using concepts from ten Brummelhuis and Arnold, 2012). Precisely how varied forms of ERM are practiced and experienced is not predetermined, but remains an open empirical question, requiring deep exploration of the contexts and power geometries involved. For instance, long-distance commuting may impose significant costs for individuals and families; yet, it may generate benefits too, such as economic security, the ability to avoid relocation and disruption of family and community ties, and the strengthening of emotional bonds. Similar complexities may be found in other types of ERM we have discussed, such as recurring mobilities of a proximate nature. A great strength of a mobilities perspective is that it encourages researchers to trace out

the unfolding, processual, nature of such complexities, rather than focusing on discrete outcomes at one point in time.

In concluding, we would only reiterate that a 'mobilities lens' opens up exciting new possibilities for work-family research. But it involves more than simply recognizing the 'mobile world' as a new site of exploration—it involves fundamentally rethinking well established theoretical and methodological approaches along the lines we have described. We hope that work-family scholars will be interested in exploring this perspective as a way to enrich our knowledge about work-family dynamics in a mobile world.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank our handling editor, Tim Kuhn, and the four anonymous reviewers, for their generous and insightful comments. Sincere thanks also to Barb Neis, Sara Dorow, Nora Spinks and other colleagues involved in the *On the Move Partnership* for their interest in our work (http://www.onthemovepartnership.ca/).

Karen D. Hughes is a Professor of Strategic Management and Organization (Alberta School of Business) and Professor of Sociology (Faculty of Arts) at the University of Alberta. She holds a PhD from the University of Cambridge. She has published widely on issues of work and organizations, with a special focus on gender, entrepreneurship, and work-family dynamics. She is the author of *Female Enterprise in the New Economy,* and co-editor with Jennifer E. Jennings of *Global Women's Entrepreneurship Research*. She is a co-investigator on the *On the Move Partnership,* and currently serves on the editorial boards of *Gender in Management* and *International Small Business Journal*. [Email: karen.hughes@ualberta.ca]

William A. Silver is an Adjunct Instructor of Sociology at Queen's University, Ontario, Canada. He received his PhD in Sociology from the University of Alberta. His research interests include customers in the service economy, work and family, and employment-related mobility. Since 2011, Will has been part of the *On the Move Partnership*, a Canadian research initiative with international partners that studies employment-related geographic mobility.

[Email: was3@queensu.ca]

Funding

This research was supported through grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), specifically Insight Grant 435-2014-0657 and the *On the Move* Partnership Grant 895-2011-1019. We acknowledge this support with thanks.

REFERENCES

Adey P (2009) *Mobility*. London: Routledge.

Adey P, Bissell D, Hannam K, Merriman P and Sheller M (eds) (2014) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*. New York: Routledge.

Aguilera A (2008) Business travel and mobiles workers. *Transportation Research A* 42: 1109-16.

Allen TD, Herst DEL, Bruck CS and Sutton M (2000) Consequences associated with work-to-family conflict: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 5: 278-308.

Allen TD, Shockley KM and Poteat LF (2008) Workplace factors associated with family dinner behaviors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 73: 336-342.

Alvesson M, Bridgman T and Willmott H (eds) (2009) *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies.* Oxford Handbooks.

Amstad FT, Meier LL, Fasel U, Elfering A and Semmer NK (2011) A meta-analysis of work-family conflict and various outcomes with a special emphasis on cross-domain versus matching domain relations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 16: 151-169.

Ashforth BE, Kreiner GE and Fugate M (2000) All in a day's work: Boundaries and micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review* 25: 472-491.

Australia (2015) *Inquiry into fly-in, fly-out and other long distance work commuting practices in Regional Queensland***.** Available at: https://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/documents/committees/IPNRC/2015/FIFO/02-rpt-009-09Oct2015.pdf

Baldassar L (2016) De-monizing distance in mobile family lives: Co-presence, care circulation and polymedia as vibrant matter. *Global Networks* 16: 145-63.

Bellavia GM and Frone MR (2005) Work-family conflict. In Barling J, Kelloway EK and Frone MR (eds) *Handbook of Work Stress*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 113-147.

Bianchi SM and Milkie MA (2010) Work and family research in the first decade of the 21st Century. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72: 705-725.

Børve HE and Bungum B (2015) Norwegian working fathers in global working life. *Gender, Work and Organization* 22: 309-323.

Brown B and O'Hara K (2003) Place as a practical concern for mobile workers. *Environment and Planning A* 35: 1565-87.

Buscher M and Urry J (2009) Mobile methods and the empirical. *European Journal of Social Theory* 12(1): 99-116.

Byron K (2005) A meta-analytic review of work-family conflict and its antecedents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 67: 169-198.

Canzler W, Kaufmann V and Kesselring S (2008) *Tracing Mobilities: Towards a Cosmopolitan Perspective.* Hamsphire, England: Ashgate Publishing.

Chamorro-Premuzic T (2015) The health risks of business travel. *Harvard Business Review* (November).

Christensen TH (2009) 'Connected presence' in distributed family life, *New Media and Society* 11: 433-451.

Clark SC (2000) Work/family border theory: A new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations* 53: 747–770.

Cohen SA and Gossling S (2015) A darker side of hypermobility. *Environment and Planning A* 47: 1661-79.

Coffey BS, Anderson SE, Zhao S, Liu Y and Zhang J (2009) Perspectives on work–family issues in China: The voices of young urban professionals. *Community, Work and Family* 12: 197-212.

Cohen RL (2010) Rethinking 'mobile work': Boundaries of space, time, and social relations in the work of mobile hairstylists. *Work, Employment and Society* 24: 65-84.

Collet B and Bonnet E (2010) Decisions concerning job-related spatial mobility and their impact on family careers in France and Germany. *Journal of Family Research* 22: 196-215.

Connell RW (1987) *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cresswell T (2006) *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cresswell T (2011) Mobilities I: Catching up. *Progress in Human Geography* 35: 550-558.

Cresswell T, Dorow S and Roseman S (2016) Putting mobility to work: Conceptualizing employment-related geographical mobility. *Environment Planning A* 48(9): 1787-1803.

D'Andrea A, Ciolfi L and Gray B (2011) Methodological challenges and innovations in mobilities research. *Mobilities* 6(2): 149-160.

Desrochers S, Hilton JM and Larwood L (2005) Preliminary validation of the work-family integration-blurring scale. *Journal of Family Issues* 26: 442-466.

Deutsch FM and Yao B (2014) Gender differences in faculty attrition in the U.S.A. *Community, Work and Family* 17: 392-408.

DeVault M (1999) *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dorow S and Mandizadza S (2018) Circuits of care in the Alberta oil mobility regime. *Gender, Place and Culture*. Published online 18 January 2018.

Duxbury L, Higgins C, Smart R and Stevenson M (2014) Mobile technology and boundary permeability, *British Journal of Management* 25: 570-88.

Eby LT, Casper WJ, Lockwood A, Bourdeaux C and Brinley A (2005) Work and family research in IO/OB: Content analysis and review of the literature (1980-2002). *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 66: 124-97.

Edgell P, Ammons SK and Dahlin EC (2012) Making ends meet: Insufficiency and work–family coordination in the new economy. *Journal of Family Issues* 33: 999-1026.

Elder Jr. GH (1994) Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course. *Social psychology quarterly* 57: 4-15.

Elliot A and Urry J (2010) *Mobile Lives*. London: Routledge.

Evans J and Jones P (2011) The walking interview: Methodology, mobility and place. *Applied Geography* 31: 849-858.

Fagnani J and Letablier MT (2004) Work and family life balance The impact of the 35-hour laws in France. *Work, Employment and Society* 18: 551-572.

Faulconbridge J (2014) The executive. In Adey P, Bissell D, Hannam K and Sheller M (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*. New York: Routledge, 376-387.

Fenner G and Renn R (2010) Technology-assisted supplemental work and work-to-family conflict: The role of instrumentality beliefs, organizational expectations and time management. *Human Relations* 63(1): 63-82.

Fleming P and Spicer A (2004) You can check out anytime, but you can never leave: Spatial boundaries in high commitment organizations. *Human Relations* 57: 75-94.

Geurts SA, Beckers DG, Taris TW, Kompier MA and Smulders PG (2009) Worktime demands and work-family interference: Does worktime control buffer the adverse effects of high demands? *Journal of Business Ethics* 84: 229-241.

Green C (2014) Comment on Max Shireson's Blog, 'Why I'm leaving the best job I ever had', August 5: https://maxschireson.com/2014/08/05/1137/

Greenhaus J (2008) Innovations in the study of the work-family interface: Introduction to the special section. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 81: 343-348.

Greenhaus JH and Beutell NJ (1985) Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review* 10: 76–88.

Greenhaus JH and Parasuraman S (1999) Research on work, family, and gender: Current status and future directions. In Powell GN (ed) *Handbook of gender and work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 391-412.

Greenhaus JH and Powell G (2006) When work and family are allies: A theory of work-family enrichment. *Academy of Management Review* 31: 72-92.

Greenhaus JH and ten Brummelhuis LL (2013) Models and frameworks underlying work-life research. In Major DA and Burke RJ (eds) *Handbook of work-life integration of professionals: Challenges and opportunities***.** Cheltenham, England: Elgar, 14-34.

Gustafson P (2006) Work-related travel, gender and family obligations. *Work, Employment and Society* 20: 513-530.

Halford S (2008) Sociologies of space, work and organisation: From fragments to spatial theory. *Sociology Compass*. 2/3: 925-943.

Halford S and Leonard P (2006) *Negotiating gendered identities at work: Place, space and time*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hill E, Yang C, Hawkins AJ and Ferris M (2004) A cross-cultural test of the work-family interface in 48 countries. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66: 1300-1316.

Hislop D and Axtell C (2007) The neglect of spatial mobility in contemporary studies of work: The case of telework. *New Technology, Work and Employment* 22: 34-51.

Hochschild A (1997) *The time bind: When work becomes home, and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Hochschild A (2005) On the edge of the time bind: Time and market culture. *Social Research* 72(2): 339-354.

Holdsworth C (2013) *Families and intimate mobilities.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

IDC (2015) *U.S Mobile Worker Population Forecast, 2016-2020.* Available on-line at: https://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=US41678216

Jacobs JA and Gerson K (2004) *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender Inequality*. New York: Harvard University Press.

Jensen MT (2014) Exploring business travel with work-family conflict and the emotional exhaustion components of burnout as outcome variable: The job demands-resource perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 23(4): 497-510.

Jensen O, Sheller M and Wind D (2015) Together and apart: Affective ambiences and negotiation in families' everyday life and mobility. *Mobilities* 10(3): 363-82.

Kelly EL, Kossek EE, Hammer LB, Durham M, Bray J, Chermack K, Murphy LA and Kaskubar D (2008) Getting there from here: Research on the effects of work-family initiatives on work-family conflict and business outcomes. *The Academy of Management Annals* 2(1): 305-349.

Kesselring S (2006) Pioneering mobilities: new patterns of movement and motility in a mobile world. *Environment and Planning A* 38: 269-279.

Kesselring S (2014) Corporate mobilities regimes: Mobility, power and the socio- geographical structurations of mobile work. *Mobilities* 10(4): 571-91.

Kirchmeyer C (2006) The different effects of family on objective career success across gender: A test of alternative explanations. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 68: 323-346.

Korabik K, Lero DS and Whitehead D (eds) (2008) *Handbook of Work-Family Integration: Research, Theory and Best Practices.* London: Elsevier.

Kossek EE, Colquitt JA and Noe RA (2001) Caregiving decisions, well-being, and performance: The effects of place and provider as a function of dependent type and work-family climates. *Academy of Management Journal* 44: 29-44.

Kossek EE, Lautsch BA and Eaton SC (2006) Telecommuting, control, and boundary management: Correlates of policy use and practice, job control, and work–family effectiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 68: 347-367.

Langley A and Tsoukas H (eds) (2017) *The Sage Handbook of Process Organization Studies.* Thousand Oaks; Sage Publications.

Lapierre LM and Allen TD (2006) Work-supportive family, family-supportive supervision, use of organizational benefits, and problem-focused coping: implications for work-family conflict and employee well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 11: 169-81.

Laurier E (2004) The walking interview: Methodology, mobility and place. *Applied Geography* 31: 849-858.

Lautsch B, Kossek E and Eaton S (2009) Supervisory approaches and paradoxes in managing

telecommuting implementation. *Human Relations* 62(6): 795-827.

Lazarova M, Westman M and Shaffer MA (2010) Elucidating the positive side of the work-family interface on international assignments: A model of expatriate work and family performance. *Academy of Management Review* 35: 93-117.

Lindsay J and Maher J (2013) The intersections of work time and care time: nurses' and builders' family time economies. *Work, Employment and Society* 28: 189-205.

Liu R, Feils DJ and Scholnick B (2011) Why are different services outsourced to different countries? *Journal of International Business* 42: 558-71.

Logan JR (2012) Making place for space: Spatial thinking in social science. *Annual Review of Sociology* 38: 507-24.

Lyons G (2014) Times. In Adey P, Bissell D, Hannam K and Sheller M (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Mobilities*. New York: Routledge, 154-162

Manderscheid K (2014) Criticising the solitary mobile subject: Researching relational mobilities and reflecting on mobile methods. *Mobilities* 9(2): 188-219.

McLoyd VC, Toyokawa T and Kaplan R (2008) Work demands, work-family conflict, and child adjustment in African-American families: The mediating role of family routines. *Journal of Family Issues* 29: 1247-1267.

Major DA and Morganson VJ (2011) Coping with work-family conflict: A leader-member exchange perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 16: 126.

Massey D (1993) Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place. In Bird J, Curtis B, Putman T, Robertson G. and Tickner L (eds) *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change.* Routledge: London and New York.

Massey D (2005) *For Space.* London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Matthews RA, Booth SM, Taylor CF and Martin T (2011) A qualitative examination of the work–family interface: Parents of children with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 79: 625-639.

Matthews RS, Wayne JH and McKersie SJ (2015) Theoretical approaches to the study of work and family. In Allen T and Eby LT (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Work and Family*. New York: Oxford University Press, 23-35.

Moen P and Yu Y (2000) Effective work/life strategies: Working couples, work conditions, gender and life quality. *Social Problems* 47: 291-326.

Moshavi D and Koch MJ (2005) The adoption of family-friendly practices in family-owned firms: Paragon or paradox? *Community, Work and Family* 8: 237-249.

Mullan K and Wajcman J (2017) Have mobile devices changed working patterns in the 21st century? A time-diary analysis of work extension in the UK. *Work, Employment and Society*.

Munro I and Jordan S (2013) 'Living space' at the Edinburgh festival fringe: Spatial tactics and the politics of smooth space. *Human Relations* 66(11): 1497-1525.

Newhook JT, Neis B, Jackson L, Roseman S, Romanow P and Vincent C (2011) Employment-related mobility and the health of workers, families and communities. *Labour / Le Travail* 67: 121-156.

Nicholas H and McDowall A (2012) When work keeps us apart: a thematic analysis of the experience of business travellers. *Community, Work and Family* 15: 335-355.

Nicolini D (2012) *Practice Theory, Work and Organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nicolini D (2007) Stretching out and expanding work practices in time and space: The case of telemedicine. *Human Relations* 60(6): 889-920.

Nicolini D and Monteiro P (2017) The practice approach. In Langely A and Tsoukas H *The Sage Handbook of Process Organization Studies.* Thousand Oaks; Sage Publications

Nippert-Eng CE (1996) *Home and Work: Negotiating Boundaries Through Everyday Life.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nomaguchi KM, Milkie MA and Bianchi SM (2005) Time Strains and Psychological Well-Being Do Dual-Earner Mothers and Fathers Differ? *Journal of Family Issues* 26: 756-792.

Nomaguchi KM (2012) Marital status, gender, and home-to-job conflict among employed parents. *Journal of Family Issues* 33: 271-294.

Parasuraman S and Greenhaus JH (2002) Toward reducing some critical gaps in work-family research. *Human Resource Management Review* 12: 299-312.

Parasuraman S, Purohit YS, Godshalk VM and Beutell NJ (1996) Work and family variables, entrepreneurial career success, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 48: 275-300.

Perry-Jenkins M, Repetti RL and Crouter AC (2000) Work and family in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62: 981-998.

Petticrew M and Roberts H (2006) *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide.* Blackwell Publishing.

Polanyi K (1944) *The Great Transformation*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart.

Powell GN, Greenhaus JH, Allen TD and Johnson R (2019) Introduction to special topic forum: Advancing and expanding work-life theory from multiple perspectives. *Academy of Management Review* 44: 54-71.

Presser HB (2003) *Working in a 24/7 Economy: Challenges for American Families*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rapino M and Fields A (2013) *Mega-commuters in the U.S.: Time and distance in defining the long commute using the American Community Survey.* Working Paper 2013-03.

Reay T, Berta W and Kohn MK (2009) What's the evidence on evidence-based management? *Academy of Management Perspectives* 23: 5-18

Roseman S, Barber P and Neis B (2015) Towards a feminist political economy framework for analyzing employment-related geographical mobility. *Studies in Political Economy* 95: 175-203.

Sandberg J and Alvesson M (2011) Ways of constructing research questions: Gap-spotting or problematization? *Organization* 18(1):23-44.

Sandow E (2014) Til work do us part: The social fallacy of long-distance commuting. *Urban Studies* 51(3): 526-43.

St. George JM and Fletcher R (2010) Time for work, commuting and parenting? Commuting parents' involvement with their children. *Community, Work and Family* 15: 273-291.

Selvarajan TT, Cloninger PA and Singh B (2013) Social support and work–family conflict: A test of an indirect effects model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 83: 486-499.

Sharma S (2017) Speed traps and the temporal: Of taxis, truck stops and taskrabbits. In Wajcman J and Dodd N (eds) *The Sociology of Speed*. New York: Oxford University Press, 131-151.

Sheller M and Urry J (2006) The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38: 207-226.

Sheller M (2011) Mobility. *Sociopedia*. International Sociology Association.

Sheller M (2017) From spatial turn to mobile turn. *Current Sociology* 65(4): 623-39.

Shockley KM and Allen TD (2007) When flexibility helps: Another look at the availability of flexible work arrangements and work–family conflict**.** *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 71: 479-493.

Shortt H (2015) Liminality, space and the importance of 'transitory dwelling places' at work. *Human Relations* 68(4): 633-658.

Standing G (2016) *The Precariat*: *The New Dangerous Class.* London: Bloomsbury.

Strandell H (2014) Mobile phones in children's after-school centres: Stretching of place and control. *Mobilities* 9(2): 256-74.

ten Brummelhuis LL, ven der Lippe T, Kluwer ES and Flap H (2008) Positive and negative effects of family involvement on work-related burnout. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 73: 387-96.

ten Brummelhuis LL and Bakker AB (2012) A resource perspective on the work-home interface: The work-home resource model. *American Psychologist* 67(7): 545-56.

Thompson CA, Beauvais LL and Lyness KS (1999) When work–family benefits are not enough: The influence of work–family culture on benefit utilization, organizational attachment, and work–family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 54: 392-415.

Towers I, Duxbury L, Higgins C and Thomas J (2006) Time thieves and space invaders: Technology, work and the organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 19(5): 593-618

Troup C and Rose J (2012) Working from home: do formal or informal telework arrangements provide better work–family outcomes? *Community, Work and Family* 15: 471-486.

Tyler M and Cohen L (2010) Spaces that matter: Gender performativity and organizational

space. *Human Relations* 31: 175-98.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017) Employment projects by detailed occupation, 2016 and projected 2026. Available on-line at: https://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_table_102.htm

Urry J (2007**)** *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Urry J (2002) Mobility and proximity. *Sociology* 36: 255-74.

van der Klis M and Karsten L (2009) The commuter family as a geographical adaptive strategy for the work–family balance. *Community, Work and Family* 12: 339-354.

Van Dyne L, Kossek E and Lobel S (2007) Less need to be there: Cross-level effects of work practices that support work-life flexibility and enhance group processes and group-level OCB. *Human Relations* 60(8): 1123-1154.

Venn D (2012) *Eligibility criteria for unemployment benefits.* Paris: OECD.

Viry G and Kaufmann V (2015) *High mobility in Europe: Work and personal life.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Voydanoff P (2002) Linkages between the work-family interface and work, family, and individual outcomes: An integrative model. *Journal of Family Issues* 23: 138-164.

Voydanoff P (2005a) Toward a conceptualization of perceived work-family fit and balance: A demands and resources approach. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: 822-836.

Voydanoff P (2005b) Consequences of boundary-spanning demands and resources for work-to-family conflict and perceived stress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* 10: 491-503.

Wajcman J, Bittman M and Brown J (2008) Families without borders: Mobile phones, connectedness and work-home divisions. *Sociology* 42(4): 635-52.

Watanabe M and Falci CD (2016) A demands and resources approach to understanding faculty

turnover intentions due to work–family balance. *Journal of Family Issues* 37: 393-415.

Watts L and Urry J (2008) Moving methods, travelling times. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 860-874.

Wierda-Boer H, Gerris J and Vermulst A (2008) Adaptive strategies, gender ideology, and work-family balance among Dutch dual earners. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70: 1004-1014.

Willerton E, Schwarz RL, MacDermid Wadsworth SM and Schultheis Oglesby M (2011) Military fathers' perspectives on involvement. *Journal of Family Psychology* 25: 521-30.

Williams JC, Berdahl JL and Vandello JA (2016) Beyond work-life integration. *Annual Review of Psychology* 67: 515-39.

Williams J and Boushey H (2010) *The three faces of work-family conflict: The poor, the professionals, and the missing middle.* UCHastings College of Law and Centre for American Progress.

Williams L and Bargh J (2008) Keeping one's distance: The influence of spatial cues on affect and evaluation. *Psychological Science* 19(3): 302-08.

Zhao S (2003) Towards a taxonomy of co-presence. *Presence* 12(5): 445-455.

Zvonkovic AM and Notter ML (2006) Family studies: Situating everyday family life at work, in time, and across contexts. In Pitt-Catsouphes M, Kossek E and Sweet S (eds) *The work and family handbook: Multi-disciplinary perspectives and approaches*. London and New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher, 141-164.

TABLE 1 STUDIES ADDRESSING SPACE, PLACE, OR MOBILITY			
Journal / Articles	**Focus**	**Considers Spatiality?**	**Definitions or Measures?**
Allen et al. (2008)	Workplace factors associated with family dinners (USA)	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *freedom to work wherever is best—at home or at work* (1 entirely not true - 5 entirely true)
Ashforth et al. (2000)	Boundary work and micro-role transitions in work-family life	Commuting, business trips, telecommuting	Theoretical paper – no definitions or measures discussed
Coffey et al. (2009)	Perceptions of work-family issues (China)	Commuting	Focus group and open survey – no direct measure of commuting time
Desrocher et al. (2005)	Preliminary validation of work-family integration-blurring scale (USA)	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *hours spent working at campus office and at home*
Deutsch and Yao (2014)	Attrition rates and WFC for university faculty (USA)	Commuting	Survey – open-ended question on *reasons for leaving a faculty position* (5% of responses include commuting)
Edgell et al. (2012)	Sufficiency and WFC in the new economy (USA)	Business trips	Survey – measures *overnight travel (yes/no*) as a feature of 'non-standard work schedules'
Fagnani and Letablier (2004)	Impact of 35 hours law on WFB (France)	Commuting (time)	Survey – open-ended question on *impact of laws* (finds increased travel frequency / time for some respondents)
Fenner and Renn (2010)	Impact of technology-assisted supplemental work (TASW) on WFC (southeastern US)	Remote work	Survey – measures *perceived usefulness of technology, climate for TASW, technology-assisted supplemental work, work-to-family conflict, time management*
Geurts et al. (2009)	Work-time and work-family interface (Netherlands)	Commuting	Survey – measure of commuting is *average hours per day commuting from home-work and return*
Golden (2007)	Impact of telework on those who stay in the office	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *teleworker prevalence, face-to-face interactions* (percentage of week spent face-to-face with co-workers who telework), *job autonomy*
Golden and Fromen (2011)	Impact of managerial work mode (traditional, telework, virtual) on subordinate work experiences and outcomes	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *feedback, clarity, professional development, workload, job satisfaction, turnover intention, work climate, managerial work mode, subordinate work mode*
Gustafson (2006)	Work-related travel, gender, and family obligations (Sweden)	Business trips	Survey – measures *travel of 100km+ in past month, or 300 km+ in prior months, with at least one overnight stay*
Hill et al. (2004)	Cross-cultural test of WFI in 48 countries	Business trips	Survey – measures *travel involving nights away from home due to work in past 6 months*
Kirchmeyer (2006)	Impact of family and gender on career success (USA)	Geographic job mobility	Survey – measures *willingness to relocate* (1- any location, 2- some regions, 3- near my current locations)

Kossek et al. (2001)	WFC, family well-being and performance	Place of child- and elder-care	Survey - Measures *location of child- and elder-care* ('home' vs. 'non-home' based care)
Kossek et al. (2006)	Telecommuting, control and work-family boundary management	Telecommuting	Survey – measures use of *telecommuting policy* (yes/no) and *percentage of job done through telework* (0-100%)
Lapierre and Allen (2006)	Impact of W-F and F-W supports, org benefits and coping on WFC	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *telecommuting policy in* (yes/no) and *telecommuting used* (yes/no)
Lautsch et al. (2009)	Managerial approaches regarding telecommunication implementation	Telecommuting	Survey and interviews – measures *supervisor performance rating, employee helping behavior, employee W-FC*
Lazarova et al. (2010)	Positive side of international assignments	International Assignments (IA)	Theoretical paper – IA defined as *physical relocation and extended stay in another country*
Lindsay and Maher (2013)	Work and family time for families of nurses and builders (Australia)	Commuting	Qualitative interviews – *discussion of travel to worksites and school*; not measured by time or frequency
McLoyd et al. (2008)	WFC and child adjustment in African-American families (USA)	Commuting	Survey – measure of work demands includes *commuting* (distance and number of commutes per week)
Major and Morgansen (2011)	Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory and Coping with WFC	Telecommuting, flexplace	Theoretical paper – specifies *flexplace* and *flextime* as examples of problem solving for W-F coping
Matthews et al. (2011) in *JVB*	Work-family interference with disabled children	Telecommuting	Qualitative – open-ended discussion. 18% of respondents identify telecommuting as W-F strategy
Moshavi and Koch (2005)	Family-friendly policy in family firms (USA)	Telecommuting	Survey - Measures 'option to work at home at least one day a week' (yes/no)
Nicholas and McDowall (2012)	Experiences of business travelers (UK)	Business trips	Qualitative interviews reporting *time with and time away from family for trips of 5+ days*
Nomaguchi et al. (2005)	Time strain and psychological well-being for dual earner mothers and fathers (USA)	Commuting, telecommuting	Survey – measures *daily time spent commuting to and from work,* (hours per day x days worked per week) and *option of working at home* (0-home, 1-non-home)
Nomaguchi (2012)	Marital status, gender, and home to work conflict (USA)	Business trips, and telecommuting	Survey - measures *number of overnight business trips in last 3 months; how often paid work is done at home*
Parasuraman et al. (1996)	Work-family, entrepreneurial success, and well-being (USA)	Business trips, commuting	Survey – measures *weekly hours at work* (including travel and commute time) and *out of town travel*
St. George and Fletcher (2012)	Impact of commuting for parenting (Australia)	Commuting	Qualitative interviews reporting *experiences of commuting* (no time-based measures used)
Selvarajan et al. (2013)	Social support and WFC	Telecommuting	Survey – measures if *telecommuting available* (yes/no) on checklist of 7 possible family friendly policies
Shockley and Allen (2007)	Flexible work arrangements and WFC	Telecommuting	Survey –measures *freedom to work wherever is best--at home or at work* (1 entirely not true - 5 entirely true)

ten Brummelhuis et al. (2008)	Positive and negative effects of family involvement on work-related burnout (Netherlands)	Commuting	Multi-method - time diaries tracked time spent on *commuting*, along with work, household work, childcare, sleeping, leisure
Thompson et al. (1999)	Work-family culture, benefit utilization and WFC (USA)	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *working from home*
Troup and Rose (2012)	Formal and informal telework (Australia)	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *worked at home in past 12 months, formal or informal arrangement* (yes/no)
van der Klis and Karsten (2009)	Commuting as work-family adaptive strategy (Netherlands)	Commuting	Qualitative interviews reporting *experience of commuting, time spent with family per week*
Van Dyne et al. (2007)	Work-family practices that enhance group processes and effectiveness	Telework; flexplace; face time	Theoretical paper – identifies work practices targeted at group coordination and group motivation
Virick et al. (2010)	Determining factors related to employee satisfaction with telecommuting (US)	Telecommuting	Survey – measures *extent of telecommuting, perceived performance outcome orientation, worker types, job satisfaction, life satisfaction*
Voydanoff (2002)	Linkages between WFI and work, family and individuals outcomes	Business trips, commuting, and telecommuting	Theoretical paper – travel, commuting discussed vis a vis boundary crossing; within- and between-domain demands
Voydanoff (2005a)	Demand and resources approach to work-fit and balance	Business trips, commuting	Theoretical paper – identifies *travel* and *commuting* as demands both 'within' and 'between' domains
Voydanoff (2005b)	Consequences of boundary-spanning demands and resources for WFC and perceived stress (USA)	Business trips, commuting, telecommuting	Survey – measures *commuting* (minutes spent) and *travel* (nights away from home), *work at home as part of regular workweek* (0-no, 1-yes)
Watanabe and Falci (2014)	Faculty turnover intentions and WFB (USA)	Business trips	Survey – measures average hours per week spent on work activities but does not include time spent on travel
Note: Meta-analyses such as Bianchi and Milkie (2010), Byron et al. (2005) and Kelly et al. (2008) were identified but not included in the table above.			

[1] We use the term 'work-family dynamics', instead of the more commonly used term 'work-family interface', to reflect our interest in a process-oriented approach attuned to spatiality and mobility.

[2] Our use of the term 'place-binds' builds on Hochschild's (1997, 2005) idea of 'time-binds'. Drawing on Polanyi (1944), Hochschild argues that market culture imposes temporal norms on family life, creating 'time-binds' that must be navigated by family members. Linking these ideas to the spatial and mobile turns in the social sciences (Sheller, 2017), our interest in this paper is in considering how market culture also imposes 'place-binds'. We do not, however, advocate for the use of 'place-binds' as a companion concept to 'time-binds'. Instead, we see value in a mobilities approach that conceptualizes 'time' and 'space' as fundamentally linked (i.e. time-space). We develop these ideas in Section 2 of the paper.

[3] This paper builds on the conceptual work of these authors and others who are part of the *On the Move Partnership*, a multidisciplinary, international project, on employment related geographical mobility (http://www.onthemovepartnership.ca/). In this paper, we use the terms 'employment-related mobility' (ERM) and 'work-related mobility' interchangeably to refer to mobilities that are generated by employment demands. We also use the more general term 'mobilities', which includes a broader array of mobilities (e.g. work-related, family-related, leisure-related, etc).

[4] While our theoretical overview is informed by our systematic literature review, it draws more directly from important reviews of the field by Bianchi and Milkie, 2010; Korabik et al., 2008; Matthews et al., 2015; Perry-Jenkins et al., 2000; and Williams et al., 2016. Our purpose in discussing theoretical approaches at the outset is to help situate articles from the SLR, and to consider how theoretical approaches to work-family questions have developed over time.

[5] For valuable overviews of W-F scholarship, see Allen et al., 2000; Amstad et al., 2011; Bellavia and Frone, 2005; Byron, 2005; Eby et al., 2005; Greenhaus and Parasuraman, 1999; Greenhaus and ten Brummelhuis, 2013; Korabik et al., 2008; Matthews et al., 2015; Perry-Jenkins et al., 2000; and Williams et al., 2016.

[6] While an SLR helps to systematically evaluate a wide range of material, it has limitations by virtue of its methodology (Petticrew and Roberts, 2006). We do not claim, therefore, to identify all relevant work on mobility and work-family issues, as valuable studies may have been left out due to the search terms and journals specified, as well as our focus on journal articles rather than books.

[7] The list included: *Academy of Management Journal; Academy of Management Review; Community, Work, and Family; Human Relations; Journal of Applied Psychology; Journal of Business Ethics; Journal of Family Issues; Journal of Marriage and Family; Journal of Occupational Health Psychology; Journal of Vocational Behavior; Work, Employment and Society;* and *Work and Occupations*.

[8] Ashforth et al. (2000) considers how 'power distance' (the extent to which a culture accepts inequality) may shape work-family role transitions. Other articles note power briefly in relation to employment/ industrial relations, or household bargaining (Edgell et al., 2012; Fagnani and Letablier, 2004; Kirchmeyer, 2006; Lindsay and Maher, 2013; Major and Merganser, 2011).

[9] These totals do not equal 100, as several studies count more than one type of mobility. For instance, Nomaguchi et al. (2005) measure telecommuting as well as commuting, Parasuraman et al. (1996) count commuting and business trips, and Voydanoff (2005b) track commuting, telecommuting, and business trips separately.

[10] An archive of this ad can be found at: https://adage.com/creativity/work/supermarket-vs-uber/52137

[11] As discussed by Towers et al. (2006: 597), 'third spaces' are alternatives to a traditional work place or home-based office, and include varied locations, such as cafes, libraries, hotels, and other common spaces. From a mobilities perspective, third spaces are not necessarily fixed locations, and can also include airplanes, trains, buses, subways, trucks, and cars where work is carried out (see for instance, Elliot and Urry, 2010).